Land Use Session Responses

Individual Responses

*Transcribed as written; some responses seem to be general comments rather than answers to the specific questions, but have been listed where they were written

1. As a representative of a Board and Commission, what are your initial reactions to the Land Use Map information presented?
   - Very colorful
   - Some confusion about maps
   - Lack of connectivity between parks along Rivanna/Moore’s (add RTF)
   - MACAA intensity seems disconnected
   - Many barriers to cross
   - Mark city owned land that’s vacant
   - IX property stands out (stark difference – needs more transition/maintain in good open space)
   - Like to see higher density in other places besides the Downtown Mall – celebrates unique areas in the city
   - Belmont Bridge will change the character of Avon – more multifamily instead of SF
   - Shocking imbalance of higher density south of Downtown – options to expand housing options in other areas to take pressure off SIA
   - Consider additional density on Park St.
   - Topo and density – density in SIA in bowl vs. density on W. Main that towers over
   - W. Main in historic area is shown as less dense than being shown (Quirk Hotel, Blue Moon)
   - Grove – opp. To see higher density housing (proximity to hospital)
   - Surprised not to see more color on Cherry
   - Walk/bikeable most important – but taking a back seat on the map. Provide STW typology at future meeting
   - Different perspectives on West Main and Avon – some in favor of increasing density, others in favor of respecting
   - Transitions in some areas seemed shallow
   - Surprised at designations along Water Street
   - Vehicle/bike/ped connection between Pedder property and coal tower
   - The map of distance and time in relation to comparisons of bike/walk/transit is very good and telling! Demonstrates that transit currently is not providing for the needs of the people. More routes, more often!
   - There are a lot of proposed high-intensity areas that lack walkability and bikeability, two top desires
   - Lots of thought and great analysis of data and input. A really good start.
   - Doesn’t quite get at interconnections between areas of the City
• This is an improvement on a regular zoning, land use map
• Need to add UVA and county
• Greenspace is limited to parks, but streams are fingers of green that extend into the neighborhoods
• Generally makes sense. Seems odd that some areas zoned for greater density are indicated as lowest intensity. Student neighborhoods seem light. Curious areas chosen for more density. Cherry seems kind of light.
• In 100 years, how will people see institutional racism in this map? How are we NOT repeating “urban renewal”? 
• Logical process based on public input. 150 people is <1% of city population however
• Somewhat disappointed that the intensity map, in a number of locations, carries on legacy zoning that does not reflect environmental justice principles. Zoning that was established in the early 1900s. So the intensity tends to go in neighborhoods that have a certain racial or socio-economic profile.
• What is confidence level of survey?
• Why can 1 side of street look so different than other side?
• The information is good but the bike-ped connections implied in the connections map are not adequate
• Good data collection. Most responses were from a pre-August 12th world. I would guess affordable housing is more central to thoughts now
• I’m not clear on the map’s purpose – is it designed to inform zoning? Something different?
• Good to see transitions
• Difficult to interpret high and low intensity – narrative needs to be clear
• Areas near stream/waterways are shown as higher intensity than it should (River Road as example – areas near stream/waterways should be clear as transitions)
• Narrative – where text is same keep it same – but keep it vague and big picture

2. To what extent does the map address the information shared at your topic table earlier?
• Hopefully gives city some direction on areas where density and development will be encouraged in support of economic development/employment
• Connectivity and engagement from public and community in connection to reflect the needs and desires of locals
• The need to represent the history and current status of livability
• It doesn’t really – transportation is hard to depict on a land use map. No clear relationship to transportation plans and county plans. Example: Bike/ped bridge to Pantops (in bike/ped plan)
• Clearly shows parks and the highest intensity areas, which is where most facilities are
• The map doesn’t really reflect the value of the Rivanna River
• Fuzziness=beneficial transition zones. Allows details to be worked out at finer grain level.
• The map needs to address the results of the housing needs assessment study
• High intensity areas often equal historic districts (Downtown Mall, West Main, the Corner)
• Map lacks transportation routes, pathways, truck routes. So the development is ok but how do we get there?
• Land use map should wait until housing strategy is complete
• Affordability doesn’t seem to be included on the map
• Green space under only 2 narratives where it could/should be universal (maybe included in all narratives)
• Positive that this map shows transition zones
• Show greenway maps as reference point to compare to land use map
• Community engagement try to account for the misrepresented
• Define intensity to differentiate from density

3. How does the map reflect (or not) the perspective of the Board or Commission in which you serve?
• CEDA does not have authority to make land use decisions
• NDS – greatly. The map demonstrates the need for safer connectivity between neighborhoods and services
• Unclear how bike and pedestrian connections and walkable/bikeable high-intensity places will be created and maintained
• Needs to identify where barriers exist so we can better serve neglected neighborhoods
• Difference between types of engagement – the number of people commenting doesn’t reflect the population – more white homeowners had deeper level communication, more shallow conversations with low income communities
• Plan shows why CLR and management plan for Downtown Mall is extremely important
• Lack of visibility for walkable and bikeable routes
• Land use section should be more of a heat map, less of a map with clear demarcations. Stick with general heat map.
• BAR – no conflicts
• Bike/Ped – desire to have things closer together is good (more intensity) notes are positive addiction
• Harris St- CAT – potential for stops

4. Note opportunities and constraints you see on the map. Provide specific detail.
• Wants to see ability to allow a corner store in any land use
• More purple, please
• Needed more info on what colors mean
• Liked the last circle map
• Mixed-use zoning is key
• Opportunities – bring back Vinegar Hill → Staples out → low income in. Re-establish trust.
• Map needs to showcase topography to reflect movement of people connected to class and race
• Vacant parcel at Druid/Monticello/Quarry – opportunity for high intensity. Another at old fairgrounds on East High St. Cherry Avenue shown lower intensity than I’d expect. UVA Hospital also.
• Might be good to show constraints, such as floodplains, steep slopes, ex. Land use, etc.
• Some better graphics
• Make downtown a “historic” zone
• Show barriers and opportunities
• Want to see overlay over entire city for small scale PUD/SUP for small commercial inventors or creative development solutions on a side by side level
• Transit
• Opportunities to create concentrated engagement, in areas with missing
• Need to tie it to data – housing needs assessment, transportation plan and economic development. Also the map needs to tie to long range and small area plans
• Constraints: how to increase density without increasing traffic, congestion, and parking. Map should have transit overlays, multimodal transport map overlay
• This map misses opportunities to create neighborhood centers. Downtown Belmont should be enabled in every neighborhood.
• Many corridors need higher intensity, such as along High Street, Preston, etc.
• Areas that are shown as lighter than what is currently there – is that the intent? (ex. JPA/14th areas closer to)
• Consider potentially areas that are historically low-res that could be included as a node
• Plant cherry trees on cherry street
• Add transit/CAT – transit needs to look in future for higher intensity to serve those areas
• If an area is already a certain intensity (land use on ground), make sure you are not diminishing unless clear objective (Cherry Ave as an example)

Other Notes

*Comments written on backs of sheets, other pages, notecards, etc.

• Intensity bonuses for affordable housing have been taken out of residential areas in the land use narrative
• Offstreet parking requirements should not be specified on land use map. Eliminate it from the “yellow” narrative
• Looks like current land use map
• Difficult to understand impact of various levels of intensity on existing neighborhoods
• How to put intensity in floodplain and preserve scenic areas next to River?
• Disconnect between walk/bike/transit connections figure and map – no connections currently exist – calls for more at nodes – identify on map: overlay
• Make sure map actually leads to bike/walk/transit trails not more parking
• Potential opp to return historic homes that have been converted to office space
• Maps showing different densities by type
  o Housing
Industry → Commercial leads to different transportation needs

1. Make sure transit connections are between node and neighborhoods and not more parking options
2. Be sensitive to types of development in nodes will impact ability to encourage biking/walking/transit use
3. Focusing development in areas downtown could help return historic homes converted to businesses back to original use – protect character of historic area

Love the idea of zones/districts
Preservation has to dovetail with growth
Interesting that most intense is next to Mall
Be responsive to needs of the surrounding community in and around the south zones
Logical next step to zone in on neighborhoods and look at how those growth areas affect the intricacies of the neighborhood. And transition zones. Overlays!!
Need to connect the nodes on map with transit/bikes etc. (i.e. getting from Barracks to Downtown without a car)
Need to look at it with county. What is happening on the fringe areas where city meets county
Transportation is key to connect (greenways, facilitate biking, etc.), SRTS (What’s missing/exit)
Event should be planned to bring city and county together for discussion
Does small area plans need to be revised to align with nodes
Opportunity for cultural areas incorporated into land use – draw people to the cultural areas asset
Small area plan overlay with zones
Make sure comp plan doesn’t prohibit opportunities for art and cultural resources (don’t prohibit art studio in garage for example)
Create a place to support culture and celebrate and remember history
Embrace the cultural pieces
Show established transportation connections
Opportunity to pick and choose overlays (at our meeting)
SRTS – kids don’t appear to be represented
Tie map into housing needs assessment
This is a qualitative with regard to experience and how it feels...where community can be, not where is
More focus on having various amenities within 5 minutes walking distance (more smaller circles)
Parking lots are opportunities, show on map
Note environmentally sensitive areas
What does high intensity really mean physically?
- Pie chart for neighborhoods
- Regional transportation
- Be able to de-mystify the process/impacts for neighborhoods
- More transition in some areas between density and single family – topo plays a part of density/form on street and neighborhoods
- Additional mixed use density along key corridors
- Likes the higher density in other places beside the Downtown Mall
- It would help to define what intensity means (is it high density housing, or retail development? Or industrial?)
- Really should have bike/ped routes on the map – identify where they are lacking, and put those in comp plan (be specific)
- Too much of the plan is too general and lacks the detail needed to encourage the plan to become reality
- Would like better intensity transitions to the river; particularly in high-intensity areas along the Rivanna and Moore’s Creek
- Like having this map narrative stay more general/vague; not specifying heights or densities
- In map narrative, opportunities for green/park/open space should be in all categories (even if scale may vary)
- Specific area along Barracks (behind Millmont) is shown as semi-public or public on current map. Should remain so on new map (big natural area and park now shown for development at mid-intensity)
- In the effort to increase affordable housing, we need to ensure we are keeping city strong to be able to find these goals in the future – so need to keep city beautiful, safe, stable, attract additional jobs and employers, good schools, lively rich lives for residents, we cannot assume our prosperity will continue, we need to work to ensure it

**Group Discussion Notes**

- Concentration of zones is a “+”
- Preservation must co-exist with growth
- Highest intensity appears to surround the core of city (Downtown Mall)
- *Do the nodes correspond with the needs of neighborhood?*
- Conversations should occur at the macro-level as well to confirm we get it right (view city block by block)
- Nodes created must be coordinated with all chapters of comp plan to be successful
- *Look at how the city interfaces with county at fringe areas*
  - Engage HOA’s
- Transportation is an issue to consider and discuss how it ties with neighborhoods and events
- *How do small area plans overlay with land use map*
- Map missing pie pieces on land use map
- Define intensity
• How does art tie into the plan? Culture?
• Identify a place that celebrates culture that has existed here previously
  o Economic development
• * Integrate regional transportation and greenways to indicate
  o What’s existing
  o What’s missing/disconnected
  o How do you connect with county
• Organizing layers via GIS would be helpful
• * Develop safe bike/ped routes to schools
• Have housing needs assessment inform land use map
• Scale doesn’t lend itself to place
• Commission input heavily
  o Place is in the micro-level (i.e. street sections, adjacencies, etc.)
• Diversity of uses via pie chart is informative in terms of edges of places and accessibility
• * Surface parking lots are opportunities for development – particularly at and around Downtown mall
• * Environmental concerns regarding high density along river (Long St. area of map – NE corner)
  o Floodplain
• Downtown fixed color similar to high intensity color – why?
  o Graphic development
• Is there representation reflected of flood plains? No
• Low intensity color areas are far from services, but do those areas particularly desire commercial development?
  o Define desires from neighborhoods through community engagement/feedback
• Color intensities combine residential and commercial
• Is it possible to re-introduce corner shops? – small local markets
• Form based code = removes emphasis for what the zone is – speaks more to the form of development versus use
• Current model reflects current points/areas of interest – what about land that is open to development?
• On map – railroads look like roads – needs clarification.
• Where are barriers highlighted on map?