



Creating and
Connecting
Communities
in Northern Albemarle

Places29 – Workshop #5 Future Framework Alternatives

May 20th, 2006
9:00 AM to 2:30 PM

Sutherland Middle School Cafeteria

Summary of Input & Comments from the Small-Group Workshop Session

Introduction

The following is a summary of input provided by participants during the small group session at the Places29 Workshop on Saturday, May 20, 2006. Comments and other input were taken from each table's Workbooks (including its maps). Please note that comments from the Open House held Thursday, May 18, 2006, are available in a separate summary.

The summary is organized by table-number (there were 9 tables). The first part of each table summary is divided into three subsections, one for each of the presented Future Framework Alternatives (1, 2, and 3). It reflects the small group's comments with respect to the questions listed for each alternative:

- 1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?*
- 2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward US 29)?*
- 3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?*
- 4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements on US 29?*
- 5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?*
- 6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.*

Some participants posted (additional) comments directly on the framework maps. These have been "collated" into comments under the questions listed above to the extent possible. Comments from maps are identified by the annotation: [Map Comment].

The second part of each summary reflects the group's input on the "Comparison of All Three Alternatives." This input is provided in table format similar to the one provided in the Workbook. Consensus items identified by members of each group with an orange colored marker are grouped under a "Consensus Item(s)" heading after each applicable question and highlighted in **bold** in the comparison tables. The comparison table contains the following questions:

1. Which alternative offers the best distribution of Centers in terms of size and location?
2. Would you like to see either the Midtown or Uptown included in the Preferred Alternative?
3. Which major transit routing works best?
4. Which multimodal road network will best support the Places29 Vision & Guiding Principles?

Consider:

- *Transportation choices: driving, biking riding transit and walking*
- *Efficient and accessible*

5. Which group of Centers and land uses will best support the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?

Consider:

- *Compact development*
- *Mix of uses*
- *Walkable pattern*

6. Alternatives 2 and 3 each show a change in the boundary between the Development Areas and Rural Areas. Would you support a change in the boundary if it helped obtain an essential part of the road network?

7. All three alternatives show an extensive open space network. Some pieces of the network may need to use areas owned by individual homeowners' associations (HOA), in order to connect to nearby centers. Does this approach make sense if the HOAs agree?

8. Now that you have compared the alternatives in various ways, please go back through the questions in Part 4 and circle the parts of your responses you would most like to see in the preferred alternative.

Throughout the summary, comments or clarifications by the preparers of this document are shown in [square brackets].

Following the morning session, some of the participants stayed for a Post-lunch discussion. Where all or most of the participants at a table remained, their comments are included at the end.

COMMENTS ON SKETCH FRAMEWORK CONCEPTS

Group 12

Framework 1

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?

- Too much of the same
- Does not meet vision

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward US 29)?

- Centers should be away from US 29 to draw traffic away from US 29
- Like Neighborhood Service Center near intersection of Polo Grounds and US 29
- Like scattered Neighborhood Service Centers but need to be further removed from US 29
- Upgrade current centers i.e. Fashion Square Mall
- No focal points on these options

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?

- Good synergy between Airport, UVA, and new employment centers
- Density should be increased around major employers—with expansion of NGIC the northern area around jobs should be utilized to avoid traffic on US 29

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements on US 29?

- Like grade separated intersection (Hydraulic/US 29) and add sidewalks
- Not enough alternative transportation routes
- Do not widen US 29 anywhere
- Add sidewalks to Polo Grounds Road, to US 29
- Not enough separation between truck and local traffic
- How do you make transit stops pedestrian friendly? Need to cross US 29 on foot.

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?

- This is severely lacking. No parallel or crossing roadways.
- Mixed feelings on traffic circles
- Pedestrian overpasses connecting both sides of US 29

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

- Add public transit to airport
- New Neighborhood and Urban Residential areas between Polo Grounds Road and Ashwood Boulevard; and airport and related industrial development are good ideas

Framework 2

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?

- This works! We like the redevelopment in this.

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward roads parallel to US 29). Note that Alternative 2 features a “Midtown.”

- Need additional centers near new major employment areas

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?

- Much better than Framework #1—further off US 29
- Dislike Midtown concept—too close to Charlottesville
- Need to incorporate shopping with new employment centers
- NGIC—expand for housing [Map Comment]
- Expand affordable housing in North Pointe [Map Comment]

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—the parallel roads and cross connections?

- We like this
- Rio Mills Road should be paved
- Need to connect Proffit Road to Northern Free State Road and continue north to NGIC to alleviate traffic to US 29 with alternate routes
- Make Proffit Road more of a straight shot

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?

- Yes. Like public transit connection to airport; like parallel roads
- Problem: If want to go to UVA from east of US 29 need to transfer at Hollymead town center (public transit) and vice versa

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

- Expand growth area (residential) near new employment area [unclear where]
- Look at Charlotte NC - newer areas; Durham for pretty downtown areas
- Make crossroads streets narrower: not like Hydraulic and Rio at US 29. They're too big and cause accidents
- Historic area

Framework 3

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?

- We like the uptown proximity to major employment and recreation area

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (more clustered than in Alternative 2, focused on US 29 and roads between US 29 and parallel roads). Note that Alternative 2 features an "Uptown."

- More redevelopment as well as Uptown

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?

- Like focus of Uptown center at north

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—including the parallel road to serve development north of the South Fork of the Rivanna?

- Keep parallel road system east of US 29 (Meadowcreek Parkway) extension to Free State Road extending to NGIC and UVA research park
- Extend Proffit Road north

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?

- Problems with access to transit across US 29 (to both UVA and Charlottesville) – by foot and need to transfer

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

- Don't delete land from development area along Rio Mills Road
- Don't delete striped area along Dickerson Road

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

Note: Consensus Items circled in the original Workbook are identified here by **bold** type.

Question	Framework 1	Framework 2	Framework 3
1. Which alternative offers the best distribution of Centers in terms of size and location?	This was last!!	This was second	We liked this the best because of the location of Uptown near employment and had more Neighborhood Service Centers
2. Would you like to see either the Midtown or Uptown included in the Preferred Alternative?			We prefer this strongly
3. Which major transit routing works best? Why do you think so?		We prefer the integrated approach to this one, connecting from the airport to the university. Keep integration of transit consistent through Research Park and North Pointe.	
4. Which multimodal road network will best support the Places29 Vision & Guiding Principles? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transportation choices: driving, biking riding transit and walking ▪ Efficient and accessible 		We prefer this because [it has] more alternatives to US 29. We would like extension of parallel road on east side to employment centers	
5. Which group of Centers and land uses will best support the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compact development ▪ Mix of uses ▪ Walkable pattern 	Walkable pattern: Southern area of Rio Road needs more walkability. We need to improve our walkability in new development and redevelopment of older areas.		We prefer this. We want an affordable rental housing in the uptown area.
6. Alternatives 2 and 3 each show a change in the boundary between the Development Areas and Rural Areas. Would you support a change in the boundary if it		Yes	Yes

*Places29 – Summary of Input from Public Workshop on May. 20, 2006
August 15, 2006*

Question	Framework 1	Framework 2	Framework 3
helped obtain an essential part of the road network?			
7. All three alternatives show an extensive open space network. Some pieces of the network may need to use areas owned by individual homeowners' associations (HOA), in order to connect to nearby centers. Does this approach make sense if the HOAs agree?	Yes	Yes, but not extensive	Yes, but not extensive
8. Now that you have compared the alternatives in various ways, please go back through the questions in Part 4 and circle the parts of your responses you would most like to see in the preferred alternative.			

Group 13

Framework 1

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?

Consensus Items:

- Doesn't increase connectivity due to lack of parallel roads, traffic forced onto US 29
- Widening US 29 is a good first step

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward US 29)?

- Less likely to create feeling of town center close to US 29
- Too many commercial areas close to each other
- Advantage of D[estination Centers] close together is shopping is consolidated
- Like spine roads north of Hollymead and [in] Hollymead

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?

- Separation between residential and employment is a negative
- Some discussion of whether residential is easily accessed by transit
- Local transport networks not shown

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements on US 29?

- Widening US 29 is a good first step between South Fork and Hollymead
- Not enough local connectivity (between residential and work [places] and between north and south)

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?

- No: all traffic focused on US 29
- Local transport not shown
- Focus on US 29 makes it harder to do bike trails and multi-modal [streets]
- Good to have bike and walking paths parallel to roads that connect to shopping areas
- Downtown trail a good idea—connecting US 29 North, neighborhoods (Hollymead, Forest Lakes, Proffit Road) to downtown [Charlottesville]

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

- Perhaps too many jobs close to airport too centered in one area—far from town and existing employment centers

Framework 2

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?

- NO COMMENTS PROVIDED

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward roads parallel to US 29). Note that Alternative 2 features a “Midtown.”

- Likely success of centers enhanced by parallel road network
- Why no widening from South fork of Rivanna to Hollymead Drive?
- Expect widening of US 29 (South Fork to Hollymead) will still be necessary even with parallel roads
- Don't like shift of commercial from US 29

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?

- Concerns about Midtown effects on property owners (zoning)
- Midtown already developed—might be difficult for Midtown to coincide with Places29 vision given that it's already developed

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—the parallel roads and cross connections?

- Like connectivity—viability of redevelopment (e.g. property owners' rights/incentives)
- Don't want to see Northern Free State developed—not efficient at connecting downtown
- Focus on grade separated interchanges

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?

- Like transit on parallel road—is better for pedestrian orientation (except on east side of US 29)
- Pedestrian/bike overpasses would be nice to provide access over US 29
- Pedestrian/bike access from shopping centers to residential

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

- Scared that Midtown might deplete downtown Charlottesville—very close to existing commercial
- Change in development area is a plus for some group members

Framework 3

1. *How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?*

- NO COMMENTS PROVIDED

2. *What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (more clustered than in Alternative 2, focused on US 29 and roads between US 29 and parallel roads). Note that Alternative 2 features an “Uptown.”*

- Uptown development is good—more integration and possibly less competition with Charlottesville’s downtown
- Uptown with more mixed use close to employment center is good
- Should prioritize improvements to go toward US 29 and Berkmar extended (one person says without grade-separated interchanges)

3. *What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?*

- More possibility for consolidation of trips

4. *What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—including the parallel road to serve development north of the South Fork of the Rivanna?*

- Would like to see more parallel roads to service north development area—especially eastern connector (extension of Northern Free State Road)
- Most group members think parallel roads are better than grade-separated interchanges

5. *Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?*

- Will bus routes service most residential areas?
- All frameworks: concern about getting to bus routes

6. *Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.*

- Skeptical about funding of road improvements
- Questions about expense of grade-separated interchange (traffic concerns)--\$15-25 million/\$30-50 million—under construction for two years

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

Note: Consensus Items circled in the original Workbook are identified here by **bold** type.

Question	Framework 1	Framework 2	Framework 3
1. Which alternative offers the best distribution of Centers in terms of size and location?	Like least; too centered on US 29. Really don't like or want.	Like mixed use. Maybe too many centers, especially in S. 29/Hydraulic Road area. Maybe fewer centers? Like farther apart centers.	Like this distribution. Like mixed use. Good by airport.
2. Would you like to see either the Midtown or Uptown included in the Preferred Alternative?		Redevelopment viability. Fairness to property owners.	CONSENSUS: Least expensive? Seems like a lot of development Two distinct centers Might improve transit and traffic situation
3. Which major transit routing works best? Why do you think so?	No!!	Like express bus one on US 29 and one on parallel road	Perhaps more economically feasible
4. Which multimodal road network will best support the Places29 Vision & Guiding Principles? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transportation choices: driving, biking riding transit and walking ▪ Efficient and accessible 		Parallel [roads] better for biking and walking. Maybe better connectivity in the south.	Better than [Framework] 2 if eastern connector to Polo Grounds Road is added. Concern about efficiency of Free State/Polo Grounds connector. Pedestrian walkway across US 29.
5. Which group of Centers and land uses will best support the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compact development ▪ Mix of uses ▪ Walkable pattern 		More housing supply. Perhaps more appropriate for affordable housing.	CONSENSUS: More mixed use. Walking more feasible. Can't comment on housing choice. More housing supply.
6. Alternatives 2 and 3 each show a change in the boundary between the Development Areas and Rural Areas. Would you support a		Concern about steep slopes. Property rights? What is the reason not	

*Places29 – Summary of Input from Public Workshop on May. 20, 2006
August 15, 2006*

Question	Framework 1	Framework 2	Framework 3
change in the boundary if it helped obtain an essential part of the road network?		in developed area? Protect natural resources?	
7. All three alternatives show an extensive open space network. Some pieces of the network may need to use areas owned by individual homeowners' associations (HOA), in order to connect to nearby centers. Does this approach make sense if the HOAs agree?		Of course, as long as right of way is obtained.	
8. Now that you have compared the alternatives in various ways, please go back through the questions in Part 4 and circle the parts of your responses you would most like to see in the preferred alternative.			

Group 14

Framework 1

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?

- No—lacks parallel extensions

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward US 29)?

- Center at Hydraulic and US 29 must have grade-separated intersection
- I agree with Ned McFadden's letter to Daily Progress editor a couple of days ago. Leave it up to the developers, promoters, lenders.
- Not enough single family detached

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?

- To be successful mixed use areas need community centers, e.g. schools, library, government services

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements on US 29?

- Build a bypass or widen US 29 to Greene County
- System of parallel roads: Extend Berkmar Drive to Hollymead; Extend Meadowcreek Parkway across South Fork
- Design the improvements without a western bypass

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?

- Don't like to see public tax funds used for bike paths –bike paths on US 29 an oxymoron
- Bike paths should be within neighborhoods
- Trails are important—Charlottesville Marathon—there are a lot of runners

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

- How will people connect to main bus routes?

Framework 2

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?

- NO COMMENTS PROVIDED

2. *What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward roads parallel to US 29). Note that Alternative 2 features a “Midtown.”*

- Midtown is too close to downtown [Charlottesville]
- Put destination center at North Pointe further south, in place of neighborhood center

3. *What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?*

- Need considerably more single family detached residential
- Too little commercial around east side of airport—airport activities may expand
- Albemarle Square should coordinate with Fashion Square (including road/path connections); “wayfinding”

4. *What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—the parallel roads and cross connections?*

- Better than Framework #1
- More access points [to transit]—on Framework #1 it [transit] was on US 29
- Many who live in the affected neighborhoods moved there before the parallel road emphasis. Please be sensitive to them in your development plan.
- Don’t force connection of Forest Lakes South neighborhood to Polo Grounds Road without neighborhood support [Map Comment]
- Eastern bypass [Northern Free State Road extension]: support for alignment along railroad [Map Comment]

5. *Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?*

- NO COMMENTS PROVIDED

6. *Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.*

- Express bus service from north to UVA/downtown
- Park and ride

Framework 3

1. *How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?*

- NO COMMENTS PROVIDED

2. *What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (more clustered than in Alternative 2, focused on US 29 and roads between US 29 and parallel roads). Note that Alternative 2 features an “Uptown.”*

- Like Uptown on Framework #2
- Uptown and airport inconsistent with vision of Research Park?

- Hollymead “D[estination Center]” (Target)—not connected to Forest Lakes for pedestrian access [Map Comment]

Consensus Item:

- One Uptown [at Rio/US 29] (instead of near airport) [Map Comment]

3. *What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?*

- Difficult to get big chains to all the places (centers) identified
- Need spaces for chains
- Question of vacant/underutilized buildings
- Redevelopment at Greenbrier a good idea [Map Comment]

4. *What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—including the parallel road to serve development north of the South Fork of the Rivanna?*

- Like parallel road (Berkmar extended) only on west side because it would be less disruptive of existing neighborhoods
- Need eastern parallel road

5. *Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?*

- NO COMMENTS PROVIDED

6. *Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.*

Consensus Item:

- Land swap of vertical-lined area next to US 29 with horizontal-lined area next to airport [Map]

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

Note: Consensus Items circled in the original Workbook are identified here by **bold** type.

Question	Framework 1	Framework 2	Framework 3
1. Which alternative offers the best distribution of Centers in terms of size and location?		This one but with Midtown in Albemarle Square/Fashion Square area (more Midtown from west of US 29).	
2. Would you like to see either the Midtown or Uptown included in the Preferred Alternative?		Midtown	
3. Which major transit routing		Yes—minimal buses	

Question	Framework 1	Framework 2	Framework 3
works best? Why do you think so?		on US 29; more on connector roads. Only plan with airport transit connection.	
<p>4. Which multimodal road network will best support the Places29 Vision & Guiding Principles?</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transportation choices: driving, biking riding transit and walking ▪ Efficient and accessible 		<p>Do not support connection of Polo Grounds to South Forest Lakes.</p> <p>Do support extension of eastern connector north of Forest Lakes—ending at Polo Grounds throws traffic back on US 29.</p>	
<p>5. Which group of Centers and land uses will best support the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compact development ▪ Mix of uses ▪ Walkable pattern 		Most people do not walk.	
<p>6. Alternatives 2 and 3 each show a change in the boundary between the Development Areas and Rural Areas. Would you support a change in the boundary if it helped obtain an essential part of the road network?</p>		Prefer concept of “land development swap” whereby land at end of airport remains undeveloped while intensive development is transferred to US 29 North area.	
<p>7. All three alternatives show an extensive open space network. Some pieces of the network may need to use areas owned by individual homeowners’ associations (HOA), in order to connect to nearby centers. Does this approach make sense if the HOAs agree?</p>			Yes—least disruptive of neighborhoods as a refuge
<p>8. Now that you have compared the alternatives in various ways, please go back through the questions in Part 4 and circle the</p>	Be careful when making changes to neighborhoods. To the extent we		

Question	Framework 1	Framework 2	Framework 3
parts of your responses you would most like to see in the preferred alternative.	emphasize development to the south of Charlottesville. (Provide for big box stores, etc) without turning 295 into 29 N.		

Additional Discussion [noted on Workbook cover sheet]

- “Neighborhood is Refuge”. What are the benefits of changing neighborhoods?
- What Housing types do we want? – Choices
- Mitigate impact of changes (Architectural Review Board work)
- Sustainable Building Practices: energy efficient; permeable paving
- Farmers market as community centers – alternate season use: pumpkins, Christmas trees; alternate uses for employee parking (weekend uses)

Comment Sheet Received After The Workshop

1. Which alternative offers the best distribution of centers in terms of size and location? Why?

- Midtown – closer to UVA – would make more sense – higher participation of people who could access by alternative transport. Suburban uptown is too far.

2. Would you like to see either the Midtown or the Uptown included in the Preferred Alternative? Why?

- Midtown – somewhere central for getting shopping stuff done – and walk around easily once there.

3. Which arrangement of residential, employment and mixed use areas would best suit your needs? Why?

- NO COMMENTS GIVEN

4. A pair of major transit routes is shown on each alternative. If there was a convenient connection from your home to one of these routes, would you use transit to commute to work at least several days each week? Would you use transit for other purposes at least once each week?

- Yes – if it were frequent and fast.

5. All three alternatives show an extensive open space network. Some parts of the network may need to use areas owned by individual homeowners associations (HOAs), in order to connect to nearby centers. Does this approach make sense if the HOAs agree?

- How productive is the open space to non-auto users? Is it recreational, natural habitat? Yes – makes sense if it leads to a desired destination.

6. Do you have any other comments about the Places29 Alternatives that you would like to share with us?

- Rapid Bus [sign for does not equal] higher quality and improved transit stop. Rapid = frequency, punctuality, speed, not waiting in traffic.

E-mail Comment Received After The Workshop

I was unable to attend the May 20 open house and would like to submit a comment related to proposed new land uses shown in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Rio and Northfield Rds. I am a resident of Still Meadow and moved here after working in the land use area throughout Florida for over 20 years for both public and private entities.

I request that you remove the proposed new uses designated New Retail District, Neighborhood Service (NS) Center and New Urban Residential District from this area along Rio and Northfield Roads from all three pending alternatives. These uses are unnecessary, unrealistic and intrusive. They would only set a bad precedent and pattern of encroachment in close-in neighborhoods that are currently intact and buffered by transitional uses such as worship sites. They also would adversely impact private green space and mountain viewsheds that exist along Northfield Rd, thereby turning one of their intended purposes on its head.

The proposed new uses are unnecessary. The neighborhoods bounded by Huntington Rd., Rio Rd., US 29 and the Rivanna River South Fork have perhaps the most convenient access in this

area to retail uses at all intensity levels. There are three existing convenience markets already located less than 1/2 mile from this site at Rio and Greenbrier Roads. The regional mall, Albemarle Square, Rio Hill shopping center, the newly approved retail north of Woodbrook Dr. and other retail uses are already within walking distance or convenient for passerby car trips. There are numerous existing employment uses in the retail areas and the existing and approved new office buildings along eastern Rio Rd. If the proposed "New Urban Residential Development" shown intruding along Northfield Rd means apartments or other higher-density residential uses, there are numerous multifamily housing choices immediately south of Rio Rd. We do not need or want any more commercial north of Rio Rd. along neighborhood streets.

The basic "mixed-use" planning concept of locating neighborhood commercial use within a central location in a new development is well understood. However, this use is proposed on the edge of established neighborhoods that have existed for decades. It will not serve the textbook purpose envisioned at this location because it will simply be more of the same "convenience level" use, but spot zoned, across the street or down the road from where similar uses already exist. Rio Rd. has sidewalks and these existing uses are easily accessible to pedestrians. These existing established neighborhoods also are not looking for a new "center".

The uses encroach in an unacceptable manner on private, intact neighborhoods. Once any retail or multifamily uses are allowed along Northfield Rd., the argument against further encroachment in an intact residential area is substantially weakened. Any student of land use and zoning knows that approval of this area for retail or apartment use would bolster arguments in favor of such uses across Northfield Rd. in the northwest quadrant, as well as further north along Northfield Rd. "Midtown" neighborhoods in this area should be carefully protected to avoid penalizing those who have chosen to reduce their traffic impacts by living close in and nearby to essential services. Time and again, all over the country, incremental planning and zoning decisions that allow retail uses to "creep" into single-family neighborhoods have had unfavorable impacts on the vitality of those neighborhoods. Don't do it.

Moreover, the uses that currently exist at this location on the eastern side of Northfield Rd. include large-lot residences that provide a wonderful benefit to all those who travel in these neighborhoods by foot, bike, or car. The large lots offer views of private green space and, more importantly, significant viewsheds to the mountains to the east that are unique and should not be replaced by unnecessary retail, office or apartment uses. This small stretch of Northfield Rd. is scenic and should not be disturbed.

In summary, the new uses proposed at this location are completely unnecessary, will not serve their intended textbook purpose, and will hurt neighborhoods that should be protected. Please remove them from the next version of any of these map alternatives that may proceed. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.