



## **Places29 – Workshop #1**

### **Community Visioning**

May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2005  
6:30 PM to 9:30 or 10 PM

Ballroom of the Doubletree Hotel  
999 Hilton Heights Road  
Charlottesville, Virginia

***DRAFT***

## **Summary of Major Discussion and Priority Items and Rankings from the Small-Group Breakout Session**

---

The results of the small group breakout sessions were recorded by the participants on large 5-foot x 3-foot base maps of the study area. The participants wrote the comments in response to several questions asked by the facilitators. The questions and the comments cover a wide range of topics and areas of concern, including a number of traffic and land use-related issues. Many of the comments are site- or place-specific, while many others are general and apply to the Places29 study area as a whole.

Following the question and response exercise, participants distilled their comments into one set of Major Discussion Statements for the whole table; then table members were asked to prioritize the statements by “voting.” Each member was given 3 votes, which he/ she could distribute among the Major Discussion Statements, turning them into priority statements.

The topics in List A have been compiled from Major Discussion Items that appeared on more than one table’s list of Major Discussion Items. In some cases, multiple tables produced Major Discussion Statements that address nearly identical or overlapping issues, but each table expressed the topic slightly differently. In these cases, the statements have been consolidated to make them more consistent across the tables and to identify trends in opinions. In other cases, a single Major Discussion Item may have included multiple ideas or topics. In these cases, the item has been divided into multiple Major Discussion Statements. Major Discussion Statements that appear on only one table’s list and that received one or no dots in the ranking exercise are not included in List A.

**LIST A: FREQUENCIES**

<b>Summary of Major Discussion Statements</b>	<b># of Tables</b>
Sidewalks/Pedestrian Overpasses/Crossings Needed	9
Preservation of Open Space and Natural Character	9
More/Better Transit Needed	8
Redesign US29 (Boulevard, Parkway, Two Lanes, More Scenic)	8
Public Parks/Trails/Greenways Needed	8
Redirect US 29 Traffic onto Parallel Road Network	8
Bypass Needed	6
Better Connections Between Neighborhoods (Internal & Across US29)	4
Better Quality Architecture and Urban Design (Green Design, New Urbanist)	4
Bike Lanes/Paths Needed	4
Affordable Housing Needed	6
Diverse Types of Housing Needed	3
Locate Housing Near Jobs, Infrastructure, Shopping, Transportation	2
Do Not Redirect US29 Traffic Onto Parallel Roads	3
Traffic Congestion Solutions Needed	3
Create Village Centers	2
Infill Development (Locate in declining shopping centers and near jobs, design carefully)	3
Library (preserve library and add in northern area)	2
Schools (value high quality and local schools)	2
Do Not Need More Stores (Big Box)	2
More Stores Needed (Locally Owned, "People-Sized")	2
Buffer Neighborhoods from New Development/Traffic	2
Better Grading Practices Needed (Aesthetics)	1
More Roundabouts	1
Protect and Improve Water Supply and Quality	1
Renovate Old Shopping Centers	1
Roads Before Development	1
Need Another Recycling Center	1
Ultimate Limit to Growth	1

Based on the data in List A, the following issues emerge as trends in opinion:

- Pedestrian Issues: sidewalks, pedestrian overpasses, and crossings are needed.
- Preservation of Open Space and Natural Character.
- Transportation and Transit Issues: better transit is needed. US 29 needs to be redesigned as a boulevard, parkway, two-lane road—a more scenic highway. The County needs to create a parallel road network and redirect traffic from US 29. The bypass is needed. Better connections between neighborhoods are needed. Bike lanes and paths are needed. Traffic congestion solutions are needed, and neighborhoods need to be buffered from traffic from new development.
- Public parks, trails, and greenways are needed.
- Neighborhood & Housing Issues: better quality architecture and urban design, including green design and New Urbanist features; affordable housing is needed; housing should be located near infrastructure, shopping, and transportation; and village centers need to be created.
- Commercial Services Issues: the community is divided over what, if any, new retail opportunities are needed.
- Employment Issues: employment was not raised as a direct issue but the issue of locating housing near jobs was identified as a concern.

List B contains the results of the ranking exercise for the Major Discussion Items. List B gives those Major Discussion Items that received at least one vote. Complete lists of each table's Map Comments and Major Discussion Items (including the ones that did not earn any votes) are included in a separate "Summary of Input & Comments" Memorandum. List B also contains the number of votes each Major Discussion Item received. Please note that each table of participants voted on a different subset of the Major Discussion Items given in List B. Therefore, the number of votes shown in List B should not be construed as an exact numeric measure of the relative importance of each Major Discussion Item across all tables; the votes do, however, suggest basic trends in opinion among the participants and illustrate that certain topics are of concern to a number of people.

**LIST B: VOTES**

<b>Summary of Priority Statements</b>	<b># of Votes</b>
Sidewalks/Pedestrian Overpasses/Crossings Needed	17
Public Parks, Trails, Greenways Needed	17
Redesign US29 (Boulevard, Parkway, Two Lanes, More Scenic)	15
Preservation of Open Spaces/ and Natural Character	13
Bypass Needed	12
Better Connections Between Neighborhoods (Internal & Across US29)	8
Locate Housing Near Jobs, Infrastructure, Shops, Transportation	7
Do Not Need More Stores (Big Box)	7
More Stores Needed (Locally Owned, "People-Sized")	7
More/ Better Transit Needed	7
Protect and Improve Water Supply and Quality	7
Traffic Congestion Solutions Needed	7
Affordable Housing Needed	5
Bike Lanes/Paths Needed	5
Better Quality Architecture and Urban Design (Green Design, New Urbanist)	4
Renovate Old Shopping Centers	4
Buffer Neighborhoods from New Development/Traffic	4
Redirect US 29 Traffic onto Parallel Road Network	3
Better Grading Practices Needed (Aesthetics)	3
More Roundabouts Needed	3
Roads Before Development	3
Infill Development (Locate in declining shopping centers and near jobs, design carefully)	3
Ultimate Limit to Growth	3
Schools (value high quality and local schools)	2
Need Another Recycling Center	2
Do Not Redirect US 29 Traffic onto Parallel Road Network	1
Diverse Housing Types	1
Library (preserve library and add in northern area)	0

Based on the data in List B, the following issues emerge as Priority Items (there is no significance to the order in which the items are presented):

- Pedestrian connections and facilities in both developed areas and areas to be developed in the future must be improved to facilitate access and ensure safety.
- The County's natural environment, both its open space and its natural character, should be preserved.
- Creating *public* parks (a variety of types were suggested, local parks, regional parks, trails, greenways, and other recreation facilities).
- The transportation system needs improvement. A broad variety of potential improvements have been proposed in order to address a range of specific transportation issues, including: truck traffic on US29, a belief that congestion on US29 is a result of traffic that is passing through Charlottesville and Albemarle County, and concerns related to potential cut-through traffic in neighborhoods.
- Protecting existing neighborhoods while improving the quality, diversity, and affordability of new housing is important. There was also consensus that housing should be located near jobs, infrastructure, shopping, and transportation.
- The provision of retail services is important. There is no consensus on how it should be provided, except that older shopping centers should be redeveloped.
- The County's public facilities (such as schools and libraries) are both a source of pride and a resource for the community.

Lists A and B illustrate different approaches to analyzing the workshop Discussion and Priority Items. The two approaches reflect similar patterns in the items, but each is based on different and independent methodologies. List A documents which items emerged as priorities from multiple tables' discussions. List B reflects how strongly individuals prioritized the items generated at their table.

The consultant team will continue to review the information gathered from the first workshop, paying special attention to those issues where there was a diversity of opinion. This information will help to guide the existing conditions and assessment work that will be developed over the next few months in preparation for the October Charrette.