Phase III Appendix: Detailed List of Summarized Comments

- **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS IN GENERAL**
  - Multiple concerns for lack of diversity at the meetings
  - Concern over timing of the meetings
  - Desire for more announcements about meetings and access to information before meetings
  - General concern for lack of base data provided
  - Concern for how the plan will address the city’s actual needs
  - Concern over lack of specific measurable numbers in the draft goals
  - Questions about where the community fits into this process

- **1. LAND USE**
  - Desire for an updated glossary and definitions for intensity vs. density
  - Questions regarding previously made pie charts
    - Who was surveyed?
    - Was the sample size big enough?
    - Why is transportation not a pie piece?
    - Are all pie pieces equal? (Affordable housing vs. hardware store)
  - Questions regarding what the land use map is really representing
  - Concern for transportation between high intensity nodes
  - Concern for loss of green space
  - Need for cooperation across borders with UVA and Albemarle County
  - Need to evaluate R-1 zoning
    - Seen as a major road block to housing
    - Too much light yellow on the map
  - Desire for small area plans and individual neighborhood plans
    - Desire to integrate small area plans into this map
  - Desire for pocket parks
    - Green space should be more evenly distributed
  - Desire for more transitions or buffers between high intensity areas and neighborhoods
  - Desire for mixed use and mixed income areas
  - Confusion about the relationship between intensity and height
  - Desire to restrict height but concern for unintended consequences
  - Desire for an inventory and a plan for city owned property

- **2. COMMUNITY FACILITIES**
  - Concerns about city services keeping up with development
    - Trash pick up
    - Drinking water
    - Storm water – specifically with increasing loss of green space
    - Lighting
    - Emergency services
  - Desire for more attention to parks trails and greenways

- **3. ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY**
  - Concern for how to balance economic growth and housing
  - Desire for jobs creation to be seen as equally important as housing
  - Desire for zoning to be flexible to allow for small businesses to exist in residential neighborhoods
  - Concern that Charlottesville is not friendly towards small business

- **4. URBAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
  - Concern for loss of green space
    - Desire for more green infrastructure to keep the target tree canopy
  - Concern for loss of wildlife habitat
  - Desire for plans and development to highlight the importance of “sense of place”
  - Desire for Charlottesville to take more action on and a leadership role in combatting Climate Change
    - Multiple emailed comments seeking:
      - A much more ambitious reduction goal than 30% by 2050 to meet the Paris climate agreement
      - To Incentivize energy improvement of existing buildings in all sectors by partnering with LEAP
  - Ivy Materials Center to accept household hazardous waste monthly rather than twice a year so that emissions of harmful CFL refrigerant gases can be prevented by proper handling.
  - Desire for the Rivanna River and the Rivanna corridor to be prioritized higher in the plan
    - Concern that current zoning for river front is outdated

- **5. HOUSING**
  - Concern about rising rents
  - Large scale concern for the lack of affordable housing in Charlottesville
    - Specific concern for people making less than 30%AMI
    - Specific concern for seniors who do not easily fit into an income bracket
    - Specific concern about eliminating Goal 1
    - Questions about where 15% came from and whether it is enough
    - Questions about what “affordable” actually means
    - Desire for affordable housing to be subsidized
    - Desire for more incentives for developers and homeowners
    - Desire for housing for multiple and mixed income levels
  - Questions about where the community fits into this process
  - Desire to delay comprehensive plan until housing study and housing strategy are completed
    - Desire for a housing strategy to take into account both 1) data and 2) history
  - Large scale concern for the lack of affordable housing in Charlottesville
  - Specific concern for people making less than 30%AMI
  - Specific concern for seniors who do not easily fit into an income bracket
  - Specific concern about eliminating Goal 1
  - Questions about where 15% came from and whether it is enough
  - Questions about what “affordable” actually means
  - Desire for affordable housing to be subsidized
  - Desire for more incentives for developers and homeowners
  - Desire for housing for multiple and mixed income levels
  - Desire for a strategy for anti-displacement and eviction prevention
  - Desire for housing for teachers near schools
  - Desire to delay comprehensive plan until housing study and housing strategy are completed
    - Desire for a housing strategy to take into account both 1) data and 2) history
  - Discussion about a Homeowners Bill of Rights
  - Concern about racial discrimination in the housing process and how the plan will address historically racist practices
  - Questions about the using Accessible Dwelling Units (ADUs)
    - Seen as a missed opportunity
  - Concern that changes are only tweaks of the existing plan
  - Concern over lack of data backing up these changes
6. TRANSPORTATION
- Multiple concerns about parking specifically regarding pricing and how parking fits into other goals
- Desire for accessible transportation for all ages and all abilities
- Desire for connected transportation networks
- Desire for smaller transportation systems made of smaller busses and more stops
- Desire for more and more improved and more integrated bike and pedestrian infrastructure
- Desire for transit to provide access to not only jobs and economic opportunities but also to food, childcare, schools and community as a whole
- Questions about the feasibility of park and ride in suburban areas of Charlottesville

7. HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN
- Desire to define and designate endangered neighborhoods
- Fear of losing sense of place in Charlottesville
- Desire for transition zones and concern over tall buildings intruding into neighborhoods
- Concern for how zoning is interpreted especially by developers
- Interest in and desire for a form based code
- Desire for small area plans
- Confusion about historic preservation and urban design fit together and fit into the comp plan as a whole

8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
- Memorable community engagement experiences?
  - Belmont Bridge Mobility Fair: successful because it was pace specific / gave direct access to planners
  - Neighborhood lemonade stand was a positive experience
  - Development proposals that are developer facelifted were negative experiences
  - Belmont Bash
  - City Market
  - IX park
- Current State of Community Engagement in Charlottesville?
  - Distrust of City government
  - Information gaps
  - Difficulty including minorities
- Vision for the future of Charlottesville Community Engagement?
  - Long term relationship building
  - Clear chain of comma
1. Land Use

1. Emailed Draft Chapter Comments

- The review of our Comprehensive Plan which has been initiated by the Planning Commission and NDS provides an opportunity to eliminate certain zoning clauses in our urban mixed-use districts which currently act as a significant disincentive to developing smaller, more affordable residential units in our walkable urban areas.
- The Comprehensive Plan appropriately encourages our downtown and nearby districts to be a mix of live, work and retail/entertainment uses, creating more healthy vibrant walkable urban neighborhoods.
- Zoning can appropriately control the scale of our districts and the relationship of private development to the public realm (height, setbacks), and it also can appropriately restrict incompatible uses within certain neighborhoods (e.g. no industrial downtown), but it is the marketplace that should determine the type and size of multifamily residential units within our urban districts. The current 43 DUA restriction discourages larger units (for example 4-bed, 4-bath shared student apartments and large luxury condominiums). Requiring that one obtain a Special Use Permit (SUP) to build smaller units is a very uncertain and costly process, which inevitably unnecessarily re-litigates our comprehensive Plan every time a developer wants to develop smaller residential units.
- The attachment expands on this issue. Please consider eliminating the DUA restrictions on our urban mixed-use zones to permit the marketplace to determine unit sizes (controlling building scale through height and setbacks), as we update our urban mixed-use zoning districts.
- 1. Overall the draft land use plan represents a reduction in allowable height across all commercial zones. Height was not discussed specifically in the public input process and if building height city-wide is being adjusted, a thorough public process should be conducted to vet the idea. The reduction of building heights could have unintended consequences that the PC does not have the expertise to predict.
- 2. Eliminating ground floor residential uses in all mixed-use corridors is bad planning practice. We need to move to a nodal form of land use planning with high density in appropriate places with transit connections.
- 3. Bonus densities, or height, are way too low and will not have the desired effect of incentivizing affordable housing or public space. The consultants hired for the SIA Charette recommend 7/8 market rate units needed to incentivize 1 affordable unit. Planning Commission should use a fact based approach to setting bonuses, not guesses. The consequence could be that no affordable units get built.
- 4. Max heights of 5 stories leave an additional possible floor of wood framed construction on the table. This eliminates one floor of economic housing creation and should be considered when deciding building heights.
- Recommendations from the Tree Commission:
  - In 2018 this section has been the focus of the Planning Commission, whose exceptional volunteer effort over weeks and months of work sessions will result in a map of proposed land use intended to inform the evolution of the City’s zoning map and code. Tree Commission comments for this section are in anticipation of certain specific dimensional guidelines that will attempt to reconcile building form with trees and streetscape. In general, we are concerned that current zoning limits or eliminates the possibility of large canopy trees that give most great city streets their character.
  - We have been invited to meet with you on March 7th and hope to discuss these recommendations with you at that time.
  - We recommend a minimum street wall of 10 (ten) feet in all districts to allow larger trees and the attendant coordination of utilities that also threatens large street trees. Please see attached photos.
  - We support more shoulder-to-shoulder buildings in the moderate density mixed-use districts if it means larger street trees could be provided.
  - Large development districts like the SIA and major street redesign present a rare opportunity to coordinate public and private land with respect to trees, sidewalks and utilities.
  - We generally support the recommendations of “Streets that Work” but suggest the Comprehensive Plan specifically address strategies for how existing neighborhoods can transition over time to the new street standards while preserving existing large canopy trees. Citizens should not have to wait for two or three generations in order to new trees to retain the stature of existing trees.
- I favor pursuing the ideal of developing a community in the brown area along River Road north of the By-Pass I reside at 701 Locust Avenue and patronize the businesses along Preston, River Road and the Bypass.
- Reactions to the map
  - The node near MACAA/Park St north of the Bypass seems to lack substantial connections and be a bit of an anomaly. It has two hard edges with Schenck’s Branch and the Bypass, with access to other areas via Park Street, Melbourne Rd, and Watson Ave. This area should further consider connections to the downtown, Free Bridge, and McIntire Place “places” identified in the handouts since it is currently isolated, or build a connection to the area near CHS.
  - Intense development near downtown seems to be predominant along its southern edge near Garrett Street and Monticello Avenue. While these areas present larger infill opportunities for developers as they have larger parcels and less developed conditions due to their legacies as scars from the City’s era of urban renewal, it seems problematic to focus ALL intensity directly near the downtown area to the southern edge, especially after fears of displacement that arose during the SIA form-based code discussion. There should be some balance.
- Topic table
  - It seems like a great step. Strengthening community centers (examples such as CHS, 10th St SW/Cherry Ave, Woolen Mills) to provide walkable centers could help bolster transit opportunities and viability. These nodes should consider present or planned transit lines. This information was not provided right now, unfortunately.
- Serve Board/Commission I serve
  - See above. We need great transit to provide alternatives to parking.
- Opportunities/Constraints
  - Again, hard “edges” near MACAA.
  - I believe North Downtown could densify without losing its historic neighborhood character. Fourplexes and middle housing could fit in with the scale and appearance of the mansions along Park Street – just look at those that have been converted to offices. We should be promoting infill, ADUs, medium density that can blend in with low-density neighbors.
  - Comp plan should match zoning, including east of the Downtown Mall along Water Street. This is not shown to be particularly intense, but this area is obviously facing developments like CityWalk near Carlton Rd and Water St. Seems like a great opportunity to provide more housing close to employment centers like the Downtown Mall, and even the portions of Woolen Mills in Albermarle County.
  - Find opportunities for zoning to allow corner stores and small-scale neighborhood service businesses in existing neighborhoods. I’m thinking of older commercial structures like the one at 10th St NW and Anderson Street in 10th and Page, Keevil & Keevil in Belmont, etc.
  - The transit connections map shows some shockingly high times between the hot spots at Barracks Road and Preston, or Hydraulic/J29 and Preston/McIntire Plaza. Barracks Road and the Bypass aren’t bikeable. Are there opportunities to adjust the land use map to make improved transit more viable between downtown and these nodes? How might future BRT relate these nodes to downtown? Is there an opportunity for an intermediate spaced stop/node that should be called out on this plan?
1. The zoning ordinance seems like an off the shelf product that does not adequately reflect the needs of an older community. More flexibility should be allowed in recognition of the established character of older communities. They should be allowed to continue to develop as they have in the past and not in accordance of some arbitrary rigid standard.

2. Twice in the past year my wife was hit by a driver when biking. In both cases they turned in front of her. Whenever possible protected bike lands should be provided.

3. Trees are vital in cooling a community - reasonable tree requirements should be included as the city develops. The new austere boxes on Main Street could be helped a lot by street trees.

4. The existing on-street parking - particularly loading zones - should be re-evaluated. Can they be limited by time - until 10 AM? Delivery people will take as much latitude as you give them. If you require them to be done by a certain time and ticket them for blocking traffic - they will learn. There seems to be way more loading zone spaces than are needed. If a shop owner asks for a loading zone - are they required to pay? Could we look at handicapped spaces? (A third rail I know) Would it be better to assign spaces in the parking decks.

5. More traffic circles should be retrofitted into older communities. Where there are long, wide streets in residential neighborhoods such as Grove Avenue where I live, measures should be taken to slow traffic.

2. March 7th Boards and Commissions Work Session Comments

Individual Responses

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

2. March 7th Boards and Commissions Work Session Comments

Individual Responses

1. As a representative of a Board and Commission, what are your initial reactions to the Land Use Map information presented?

- 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 1990s. 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
homesowners 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
-建て

- 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)

**Group Discussion Notes**

- Intensity bonuses for affordable housing have been taken out of residential areas in the land use narrative
- Off-street 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
  - 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/disticts
- Preservation has to dovetail with growth areas affect the intricacies of the neighborhood. And transition zones. Overlay!!
- 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 more 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 where city means county. We need to work to ensure it
- Land use plan map: What is it used for?
Lays out plan for intensity of development throughout the City of Charlottesville
- Doesn’t preclude current zoning
- Need to develop zoning to support land use map intensity first – ranges of intensity
- Why not make it all one color?
- Define need is within individual neighborhoods – see pie charts
  - Change for each neighborhood
  - Need text to connect to land use map
- Land use inventory – Can’t just recreate what we already have
- Some areas missed for opportunity (i.e. Preston Avenue, East High Street, West Main Street)

1) What is the map going to be used for? what is it supposed to tell me?
   - Need to define needs within individual neighborhoods
2) What do the colors represent in contrast to current zoning and what currently exists?
3) What will this map be used for? What is it telling me will happen?
   - Clarification of how the comp plan differs from the zoning map
4) What do the colors mean? Is there a real difference from current zoning and what is existing in the city? Is this really a change? If yes, what kind of change?
5) Fuzzy boundaries were viewed favorably – offer opportunities.
6) Need to define needs within neighborhoods – look at the pie charts – How can these be incorporated into the goals of the individual neighborhoods?
7) Some areas of missed opportunity – East High Street, Preston Avenue – for high intensity

3. May 1st Buford Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses
1. What are your initial reactions to the Land Use Map information presented?
- Intensity not necessarily proximate to infrastructure
- My neighborhood (Locust Grove) is not addressed on any of the maps. Can’t tell what the zoning/restricitions ramifications are.
- Wondering who was surveyed for pie chart
- Wish we were being surveyed for the pie chart (per neighborhood)
- We need a glossary of terms
- It’s understudied; does not provide economic/environmental; color coding is ineffective in translation

2. To what extent does the map address the information shared at your topic table earlier?
- To me, it seems focused on avoiding opposition – vast areas of low-intensity, esp. in Northern, NE and SE quadrants
- A little? (housing density forecast)
- Was on historic preservation – worried people will mix up terms “intensity” “density” “increased height”
- Not at all; we discussed sustainable development, livability, great open space
- It would add housing close to where business already exists
- Hard to know without more specifics.
- It doesn’t. City owned land concentrated. Transportation not on color circle.
- What about orange dot?
- Not all “intensity” is equal
  - (e.g. High density student housing with few cars is not same as “commuter” residential)

3. What do you think about our understanding of what we heard about places, housing and jobs and connections to them?
- The planning committee members did a great job listening and answering questions. But I haven’t done enough homework and should have gotten involved earlier.
- I think the dialogue has been short and the city has not examined and found ways to develop economic vitality within the community.
- Good. Very worried that your sample size is small. I always hear that there is too much development, I’m not hearing that here.
- I think we don’t understand the social revolution we are in the midst of and how that affects the physical structure wherein we live.

Group Discussion Notes
- Map of city prop on website
- Map indicates where re-zoning will occur
  - Very important
  - Need to understand zoning better
  - So little space to do anything with
- People seem to want to add intensity where there is already intensity
- Frustrated and concerned! The method to this madness seems to value affordable housing equally to a pharmacy or hardware store. That is a recipe for disaster and ignores the severity of needs for affordable housing in our city.
- Confusion, doesn’t portray community values, very low inc. (<50%) has not visible
- Direct bus routes to each high intensity sections – would like to see
- Affordability in the high intensity areas? Equity
- Narrative – what each intensity represents
- Please provide a [ ] definition to “intensity” that promotes the interaction between form density traffic use, height

4. How much interaction between form density traffic use, height

5. Why have some areas missed for opportunity?
- Some areas of missed opportunity
- Fuzzy boundaries were viewed favorably

6) Need text to connect to land use map

- Change for each neighborhood
- Need clarification of how the comp plan differs from the zoning

- Need text to connect to land use map
- Need to define needs within individual neighborhoods

7. What do the colors mean? Is there a real difference from current zoning and what is existing in the city? Is this really a change? If yes, what kind of change?

8. What do the colors represent in contrast to current zoning and what currently exists?
- Intensity not necessarily proximate to infrastructure
- My neighborhood (Locust Grove) is not addressed on any of the maps. Can’t tell what the zoning/restricitions ramifications are.
- Wondering who was surveyed for pie chart
- Wish we were being surveyed for the pie chart (per neighborhood)
- We need a glossary of terms
- It’s understudied; does not provide economic/environmental; color coding is ineffective in translation

9. To what extent does the map address the information shared at your topic table earlier?
- To me, it seems focused on avoiding opposition – vast areas of low-intensity, esp. in Northern, NE and SE quadrants
- A little? (housing density forecast)
- Was on historic preservation – worried people will mix up terms “intensity” “density” “increased height”
- Not at all; we discussed sustainable development, livability, great open space
- It would add housing close to where business already exists
- Hard to know without more specifics.
- It doesn’t. City owned land concentrated. Transportation not on color circle.
- What about orange dot?
- Not all “intensity” is equal
  - (e.g. High density student housing with few cars is not same as “commuter” residential)

10. What do you think about our understanding of what we heard about places, housing and jobs and connections to them?
- The planning committee members did a great job listening and answering questions. But I haven’t done enough homework and should have gotten involved earlier.
- I think the dialogue has been short and the city has not examined and found ways to develop economic vitality within the community.
- Good. Very worried that your sample size is small. I always hear that there is too much development, I’m not hearing that here.
- I think we don’t understand the social revolution we are in the midst of and how that affects the physical structure wherein we live.

11. Group Discussion Notes
- Map of city prop on website
- Map indicates where re-zoning will occur
  - Very important
  - Need to understand zoning better
  - So little space to do anything with
- People seem to want to add intensity where there is already intensity
- Frustrated and concerned! The method to this madness seems to value affordable housing equally to a pharmacy or hardware store. That is a recipe for disaster and ignores the severity of needs for affordable housing in our city.
- Confusion, doesn’t portray community values, very low inc. (<50%) has not visible
- Direct bus routes to each high intensity sections – would like to see
- Affordability in the high intensity areas? Equity
- Narrative – what each intensity represents
- Please provide a [ ] definition to “intensity” that promotes the interaction between form density traffic use, height

- Change for each neighborhood
- Need clarification of how the comp plan differs from the zoning

- Need text to connect to land use map
- Need to define needs within individual neighborhoods

- Intensity not necessarily proximate to infrastructure
- My neighborhood (Locust Grove) is not addressed on any of the maps. Can’t tell what the zoning/restricitions ramifications are.
- Wondering who was surveyed for pie chart
- Wish we were being surveyed for the pie chart (per neighborhood)
- We need a glossary of terms
- It’s understudied; does not provide economic/environmental; color coding is ineffective in translation

- People seem to want to add intensity where there is already intensity
- Frustrated and concerned! The method to this madness seems to value affordable housing equally to a pharmacy or hardware store. That is a recipe for disaster and ignores the severity of needs for affordable housing in our city.
- Confusion, doesn’t portray community values, very low inc. (<50%) has not visible
- Direct bus routes to each high intensity sections – would like to see
- Affordability in the high intensity areas? Equity
- Narrative – what each intensity represents
- Please provide a [ ] definition to “intensity” that promotes the interaction between form density traffic use, height

- Change for each neighborhood
- Need clarification of how the comp plan differs from the zoning

- Need text to connect to land use map
- Need to define needs within individual neighborhoods
• How does the map inform us on areas for economic development and areas for environmental protection.
• Look at underutilization parcels: where do we have land that could be further developed
  • For example: auxiliary units – small-scale commercial opportunities
• Keep neighborhoods vested in and proposed changes – less of potential change
• Look at city parking regulations and how might they be changed and to compel developers to build more on their parcels. Fear of parking issues that need to be addressed and understood – are people unnecessarily afraid?
• No high density houses in high income districts
• * More intensity in less intense areas
• ** Rose Hill good the way it is, don’t intensify
• Define terminology (intensity vs. density)
  • Need a glossary in comp plan
• ** Transportation improvements along Preston Ave corridor to accompany future growth
• Rebuild trust
• * Understand how comp plan process translates to enforcement (make it happen)
• ** Opposed to increase height downtown but not increase intensity/density (maintain historic preservation)
• ** Need more focus on workforce housing
• Concerned about how pie charts were created. (Explain how pie chart doesn’t reflect values)
• ** Need more commercial intensity in Woolen Mills area (south of tracks)
• Higher value on transition zones with regards to how they feel to neighborhood
• Neighborhoods are unclear (need clearer guidance) Increase sense of neighborhood
• Affordable housing
• High end housing is not reducing housing costs
• Borders problematic – county
• Development around Belmont Park that supports families
• Lets intensity around Monticello Ave
• Safety on corridors
• Kurt & Missy LU table minutes (Nancy Obrien, Joy Johnson, Barbara, Allen Bailey)
  • Allen: ask what “intensity” means
  • Kurt: intensity – more activity
  • * Nancy: hard to relate LU map to affordable housing and values that community holds. It is impossible to relate values of community to the map
  • Kurt: how could map convey the need for more affordable housing
  • Barbara: use the pinwheel info to link to map
  • * Allen: map of city owned property could be potential for development. Discuss the landbank. What parts of city own map help see areas for potential
  • Joy: affordable does not speak to her peers. Does not speak to those <50% AMI. Housing is not affordable
  • Nancy: what does affordable mean to Joy
  • Joy: less than 60% AMI
  • Kurt: not this may relate to Question #2
  • * Nancy: the map with part pinwheels and city properties. Need to have some in other areas. The LU map does not address preservation.
  • Kurt: affordable housing – housing for all. Question 3 –
  • * Barbara: good to have map to demonstrate now – does not address future
  • * Nancy: need to address social revolution – not sure how to map that.
  • Joy: more people are talking but people don’t have housing choices
  • Nancy: the less you make the further you live
  • Joy: most of her neighborhood does not dine downtown
  • Nancy: things for sale downtown are for young people
  • Joy: notes IRC families are left out of conversations. Discuss development on Hydraulic. Ask where Heathwood was so oriented.
• * People having difficulty reading the maps
• Joy: housing authority may sell Riverside
• Nancy: Riverside has a variety of housing types
• Kurt: ideal to have places with many services and types of housing. Work to fill in “circles” in the pinwheels.
• Joy: need to think about transportation – trans access
• Nancy: could achieve if fill in all the “circles”
• Allen: need links to the circles
• Barbara: why don’t kids walk to schools? Talk about schools as parks
• Allen: the LU map is a pretty picture but no information. Does not tell me anything.
• Nancy: the land use map is basis for zoning. The map doesn’t show values but not sure how to present the values. * What see from LU is we value SF residential
• Allen: read the back of map noting the items which could be built in various places. ** The descriptions on back are helpful.
• Nancy: note Greenbrier is like living in suburbs. Words – read opposite side
• Joy: not satisfied by the words. Should have strategy for 50% AMI and below. Mixed use not always work for low wealth. Example provided
• Nancy: we don’t understand social revolution the community is having and how it affects the physical environment
• Joy: note affordable housing for those under 50% AMI
• Land use map #1 & 7
  • 1. Reactions
    • Like the approach
    • Connectivity (transit) between high intensity areas is needed (no transfers)
  • 2. Not assured that this achieves values – affordability
    • Traffic comes to mind, walkability
    • How was map created – accurate representation?
    • Narrative is a critical part – should be on front
  • 3. Trust you heard based on data
    • What are standards applied to consider adequacy of services/facilities
    • So little space to work with
    • Neighborhood resistance to density
      • What will our neighborhoods look like in future
    • Infrastructure to support density
      • Emergency services
      • Roads, utilities
    • Loss of green space
    • Density will lead to higher housing costs
4. May 10th City Space Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses:

1. What are your initial reactions to the Land Use Map information presented?
   - Map shows a lot yellow- low intensity, but narrative on the back shows mostly high intensity with low intensity so small
   - Infill special use permits (SUP) [ ] City
   - Like the hub and spoke neighborhood design
   - However high intensity neighborhoods on boarder of Albemarle imply we need community agreements with Albemarle
   - Pie charts with missing pieces > how to fill in?
   - How does this plan proactively achieve these goals
   - Map achieves affordable housing goals
     - If we’re not requiring builders to build affordable housing how does this map achieve affordable housing
     - City schools losing students because families cannot afford
   - Greenspace – main st buildings being built are to property line without any green space
     - Special use permit – ask for more stories on buildings

2. To what extent does the map address the information shared at your topic table earlier?
   - ADU’s (accessory dwelling units)
   - High intensity nodes can support more aggressive economic development
   - How does map work to achieve affordable and low income housing goals
   - Fire and police substations
   - Lewis and Clark Neighborhood – pieces big enough to accommodate new development?
   - Water street corridor very dark
   - Slide about amenities
   - Impassable sidewalks
   - Streetscapes – what transportation infrastructure is coming online
   - Horrible sidewalk on Yorktown
   - Bike lane
   - Build less parking
   - What incentives do landlords have to raise rent, displaces long term residents?
   - Shows some places where new units to alleviate the housing crises might be built, bust most of the identified areas are already intense

3. What do you think about our understanding of what we heard about places, housing and jobs and connections to them?
   - Hire the Long Range Planning and Design ACM
     - Place advocacy for 3rd ACM for long term planning
     - Impressive work so far
     - Incentives for small businesses
       - Mixed use to support residential communities
       - If FBC (form based code) is city wide, does this map apply, what’s the “feel”
   - Flat’s was supposed to have courtyard access off street
   - How is this TOL planning staff
   - 5th street is underutilized area – why not purple?
   - How can city support mega growth n 5 st at? With pocket parks?
   - Infill that is extremely dense not near transit
   - Do we have a good grip on the way “intensity” affects neighborhood “feel”
   - Good start in identifying areas for growth but missing high intensity opportunities in areas like Preston east of the [ ] currently filled with tire shops etc. Meanwhile transition zones around downtown have little in between in intensity areas
   - Also required parking in medium density areas/ places within 5 blocks Pavillion?!
   - Create neighborhood nodes with corner mom/pop stores + tiny park
   - Encourage mixed density housing in all neighborhoods
   - Needs a finer grain of detail

4. Group Discussion Notes
   - No affordable housing around Walker + CHS
   - Add some mixed use on [ ] lane
   - No green space in Barracks road area
   - How to interpret greenspace within High density/ intensity
   - Need more greed space with [ ]
   - Need to establish new high intensity areas instead of build off old land use map
   - Mixed use should also include business not just rental
   - Need a housing strategy
   - Need to make the case to convince the rich people or just take it
   - Concerned about how low the [ ] was for walkability in low income areas
   - Need to reverse the zoning ordinance so that so that it better promotes affordable housing
   - If give everyone in R-1 the option of an accessory dwelling then it increase the housing options
   - Should invest money from west main into affordable houses. City has prioritized street trees over housing needs
   - Needs to create sense of place but need flexibility to make it happen
   - Forest + Albemarle are shown underutilized
- Not utilized the low density, big lot residential areas, for growth + redevelopment
- Too much growth is occurring adjacent to low income areas, blocks sun
- Need to create an oversupply of units to improve affordability
- Does city have sustainability statute that says we do or don’t have the infrastructure to support the growth and [ ] or affordable
- Must follow the principals that are on paper – stop letting the developers do whatever they want
- Needs assessment and community housing has not played out yet
- Identify what is needed, how to get there, then implement
- Need more intensity in North Downtown
- Dense area has been disenfranchised because of current zones
- Look at past to see how housing ended up like this
- Sense of community is vital; development can harm
- Zoning ordinances need to be rewored
  - To disperse plans for development
  - Can rise in development be sustained?
  - What population we see a bust at?
- R1 zoning needs to be relooked at; major road block to housing
- DRAFT plan discriminates against the north downtown + locust grove
- 5th/ OAK area is area needed to be looked at
- Affordability is lacking near schools
- Transportation needs revamped by schools
- Green space in high density areas needs to be considered
- Start over from scratch with land use map
- Land use map can guide zoning decision
- Housing authority needs to be involved in land use map?
- Affordable housing should be top priority
- Zoning ordinance prohibits affordable housing in certain neighborhoods
- Incentive diverse development
- Rehab affordable houses instead of focusing on projects in downtown
- Flexibility in ordinances to become no deal
- Add more retail to residential areas
- Infill SUP for entire City of Charlottesville
- Incentivize small scale development including lower income housing
- Corner store nodes
- Code + design concerns
- Need to be more conscious about high/size difference + transitions glob away
- Downtown mall should be most important
- Need to integrate small area plans into this draft
- Redistribute density funding
- Liberalize ADU regulations
- Predatory developments need to constrained
- Take all green space and imagine what could be?
- City yard for housing
- Make ADUs available
- 3 story houses with six apartments
- Worries about who is the builder/ developer
- Importance of neighborhoods as people change (move in and move out)
- Need identity study of each neighborhood
- ACTIONS
  - Transition zones – looking at the whole city
  - Land use map – city wide – does not provide a solution to heterogeneous mix – trying to be several things at once, but does not offer was forward for tall buildings next to a residence or big building next to bungalows
  - Impossible to deal with problems without form based code solution – big next to small
- NEED
  - Granular study of neighborhoods and how they relate to one another – how they transition from one to another
  - Prior Comp Plan creates nuisance, design problem
  - All of this is in the 2013 Plan
  - Neighborhoods by neighborhood granular examination
- Discussion about Albemarle county, this a very realistic map
- Discussion about easier/ more convenient to walk then take CAT
- Need a comprehensive transit plan to pair with Land Use Map
- Want to make sure high density/ high intensity areas do not just occur in low income areas
- This seems to make sense, like the idea of people having a market + business place close to where they people live
  - What other options verses what is being provided as the proposed land use map as other options?
  - What other options did the Planning Commission look at?
- Is this a shift for more opportunities to develop?
- Whatever is in place for affordable housing is not working
  - How do we intermix housing price points?
  - How big do we want this to be?
  - What are our resources
- Habitat burnet commons is a good model for income mixing
- We can have all the city policies – people who live across city boundaries have different policies
  - Albemarle comprehensive plan should be complimentary to our
- Affordable housing is tied to zoning
- Is there an ideal growth rate or ideal growth number?
  - A plan as opposed to letting growth happen?
  - We are seeing growth – is the plan reactionary?
  - This is how big we think the city should be
  - West Main will help define what we are building
- The city should use the person who should be hired to look at the future and comp plan/ growth
- Support of idea of making development outside of center/ downtown area as long as there are amenities to support
- How can developers be incentivized to accommodate while not provided larger buildings?
- Don’t understand the process by which development happens
  - If planning commission says “no that’s not a good idea” how can the council approve it?
  - How can the community fit into this process—it’s a huge issue for me
  - What can a citizen do?
- Discussion about the community engagement process – What is “significant change”? language
- Having ADUs is a major opportunity, missed opportunity
- Air bnd is an issue that must be looked at with ADUs
- Concerned about the number of rental units that have turned into air bnds
- What are ways that we can incentivize people who live here / have air bnd to put restrictions on it
- This has to be a regional effort with the county getting involved
- Happy to see greenspace/ number of low density areas still left on the map
- Response: I have no idea when I look at map
- No room for housing (too much pale yellow)
- New double and triple occupancy housing types to increase housing density
- Environment [previous participant – one month in city] landscape architect [need more greenspace increase density but maintain greenspace]
- Housing Participant
  - High density around green space – not sure if this is good or bad
  - Pen park – no exclusive feel
  - McIntire – inclusive
  - Green space should be more evenly distributed – vest – pocket park all around city is needed
- Experience in Mexico encourages implementation of more pocket parks
- Is the land use map created correctly?
- Not sure if her opinions were incorporated due to being outnumbered in group. Single family homeowners dominated input; afraid of high density nodes encroaching into their neighborhoods
- Rugby road should have higher density in the future (not immediately)
- Desire to see different affordability options around city. Low income residents have very few options
- Lost community between houses
  - Move two blocks way the community is totally different
  - Everyone knows everyone else
- Bus system needs to be improved
- Sidewalk system could be improved
- Not navigable with stroller: Can’t pass along sidewalks – need to be wider: ramps to get from sidewalk to street need to be implemented
- I want to be able to walk more, bike more, walk to get milk in neighborhood for example
- Change contrast of legend – such as parks and centrality space. Centrality space is NOT high quality open space
- 3 stories at 10th and Page – antique shop
Does this correspond to small area studies? A road for future studies?

Resize Rose Hill neighborhoods

Commercial properties

Getting a sense of the fabric

Shift map to get clues about space, black shapes are buildings

Lack of green space shown on map

Overlay with food access points and etc.

Think in terms of nodes as places of activity

More flexibility within the nodes

Within a certain space of that node we can anticipate certain characteristics of that neighborhood

Not site specific

Show where city encourages nodes of activity

Within a certain space of that node we can anticipate certain types of activity

Show recognition of neighborhoods being result of exclusionary planning

Didn’t spring from nothing

Talk about an inclusive Charlottesville by changing the characteristics of that neighborhood

Heard this presentation from mainly quarter about racial issues being told that, I’m a racist because I live in a white neighborhood. Tell us what you mean

This is a “pre-zoning map” – if making recompense look at wealth and job disparities

Upzoning and increase diversity and tying it to then to build affordable housing

Require upzoning and make affordable to people who have been victims of racism

Since map came out uncomfortable with it. Like heat map that is not site specific

Show where city encourages nodes of activity

Within a certain space of that node we can anticipate certain types of activity

More flexibility within the nodes

Think in terms of nodes as places of activity

Each node could have a narrative with written description

Each node is unique

Need map that shows areas for small area plans and get these going

Overlay with food access points and etc.

Accessibility to grocery stores

What is there? What is lacking?

Lack of green space shown on map

Shift map to get clues about space, black shapes are buildings – gets a sense of the fabric

Map isn’t the right tool, but it is the best tool we have

MAP DISCUSSIONS

Map 1

Parking – “Why do I need to build a driveway if I don’t have a car?” when building a new house

“worst case scenario” seems like a weird way to do this

Preston should be considered High intensity

Report on engagement (comments, demographics, etc)

Concern about housing/pricing

More intensity in R1 and R2

More housing

Stop tearing down modest houses

Integrate more / not segregate

More ability to build accessory units

Incentive to landowners for low income

More transition

Housing prices

Balance – can’t continue to grow infrastructure

Lobby to get rid of Dillan Rule

Map 2

Potential pocket park near Monticello ave

Lack of green space near barracks road

Potential for higher density in Greenbrier area

Potential for higher density in downtown area

Potential for higher density Fifefville backing up to west main

Map 3

Not all intensity is equal (form, traffic, height, density, use)

Could there be 20 small plans?

Need for food transit and housing on River rd.

Need higher intensity on 14th st NW and Venable neighborhood area

Potential for more commercial in Rose Hill neighborhood area

Map 4

Higher density in downtown Belmont

Higher density along Long st.

Park south of I-64 on Library Avenue

Need for connectivity from 5th St. SW through azalea park to Fontain around the south side of the City of Charlottesville

Map 5

Potential for pocket park or mom / pop store on Rugby Rd.

Map 6

Potential for higher density on Preston ave

POSTER DISCUSSION

Map reflects the existing conditions

Would like to see the future land use map with the pie chart + proposals showing what’s missing

Need for affordable housing especially for low income – how do we achieve goal if developers are not providing affordable housing

City schools are losing students because families can’t live in the City

Johnson village is gentrifying and changing demographics in schools

Street (trees, planters?)

Concern about people asking for more via SUP (i.e. market plaza, water house)

Flats had a courtyard that went away

How is future land use map a tool for the city?

5th st. is underutilized – could support density + transit

Azalea park is least walkable in City

Neighborhood needs access to park

Likes idea of moving away from “corridor thinking”

Lots of infill (dens but so far from transit)

Need to offer incentives to make density/ transit closer (land bank?)

What can city do to incentivize developer to provide housing?

Can the city require anything in the permit process

Can you require developers to use local labor?

Need for job training so there is skilled labor that doesn’t currently exist

Concern about water with new apartment/condo

Trash pickup/ cans in park

Water St. Corridor is dark – especially around bus stops

Improvements (transit, lighting and utility poles)

Tripping hazard on water St at Yorktown

Build less parking + accommodate other modes

Not conducive to small business, startups don’t have money to participate in tech incubators

Can have mixed use – auto repair in proximity to restaurants – people should be able to explore

Civile is not business friendly, wealthy people are buying all land

Residential / condos for retirees etc

If FBG is city wide would future land use map follow this map?

City owns so much land – opportunity for city to do something with those parcels

Is the plan for main st dead?

Transportation networks important to show

(i.e. RRS RTF)

Public Comment

Rory – Why is parking required

area between downtown and Preston is not noted intense and should be

Serena – At community engagement – glossary with definitions

What is intensity?

Who is showing up and who is coming
Have info on comments, people see themselves in the process

Rory – Concern about price of housing
Much of area is R1, R1S only way to change is to change some areas to be more intense Not certain where more housing okay

Claire – More differentiation between yellow areas

Rory – Purple areas should have more orange around them
Serena – Push back site adjacent to historic issues
Ellen – [ ]
Rory – used to live in Mosby – mostly duplexes but not allowed now lack of split of large buildings for more units
Bekah – [ ]
Serena – allow those who own to have more accessory units
Bekah – like high 4 unit building hear here
Someone bought and renovated for new people
Rory – Housing can WM good so students not in wonders about mixed housing [ ?] Near downtown should be orange
Ellen – Rents are still increasing though lots of housing
Rory – choose as community do we want more people
Ellen – [ ] We don’t want to grow indefinitely – there are affordable units not being used/ maintained
Be realistic about resources
Serena – where to build is profit driven
People who have been here are getting pushed out
Rory – about affordable units: if get unit, hard to get units
Ellen – wealthy parents of students buy sites
Henry – have a giving tree
Rory – ask about density bonus tool not too far away – more units

Jeff Fogel: what is important of work done?
Everything is a disaster
City is not going to follow
Ad hoc decisions are now made
Look at last plan + how we failed
RI zones are areas

Public Comment General Points
• Look at why it failed
• Need to get the needs assessment **
• Timing of meeting / work schedules (diversity)***
• Hold off on comp plan **
• Off child care for those meetings
• Some other form of outreach for diversity
• Requirements for affordable housing
• Innovative design in other parts of the country that incorporate greenspace
• Pocket Parks
• Lack of Green Space
• Not friendly to small business

• What is the importance of these comprehensive plans? Ad hoc decisions mark improvements – look at past plans.
  o What failed in last plan
• Needs assessment should be conducted before plan
• Timing needs to be changed to avoid work times
• Need assessment before plan. Timing could change
• Respondents are mainly white
• Requirements NEED to be put on developers to provide affordable housing
• What has city done to have vest – pocket parks
• Troubled by status quo – not enough pocket parks
• Green space needs to be incorporated into building development. Zero setbacks
  o Concerned about small business not being able to flourish
• Renters need to have rent go DOWN
• Successful work happens ad hoc
  o Can housing group members implement in an ad hoc manner
• City council should not be able to override planning commission recommendations
• Rent needs to go down
  o Policies for lower rent
• More ad hoc solutions and change
• Planning commission policies need [ ] power
• Need a needs assessment to address affordable housing
• Adjust times of meetings so that more diversity will be in attendance
• Offer child care to help people be able to attend these meetings
• Need proactive effort to set the lower income other race groups
• Need to be requirements for developers to build affordable housing
• Need proposals for pocket park parks in the Plan
• Charlottesville is not [ ] to small business
• Need the rent to go down
• Empower people to create coalitions
• City council should not vote against the planning commission

5. May 12th Central Library Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses
1. What are your initial reactions to the Land Use Map information presented?
• How can mixed use and mixed income work together to support the need for very below income housing?
• SIA (sustainability impact assessment) – 3 housing authority sites + Friendship Court
• Concerned mainly about <30%AMI (area medium income)
• Desire mixed-use and mixed-income so very poor people can live with other income levels
• Zoning needs to change to accommodate the mixture of housing
• SIA part of 2013 comprehensive plan implementation
• Focus on SIA because of 3 CHRA sites and Friendship court

• Need places for 30% AMI
• Need both mixed income + some concentrations for poor alone – their choice
• Main focus is on the SIA
• The need for housing for 30% AMI and below is critical
• How can mixed use and mixed income work together to support the need for very below income housing?

2. To what extent does the map address the information shared at your topic table earlier?
• Where the places to live/work are – mixed use?
• 29/Hydraulic – potential for employment and housing
• Concern: restricting height could prevent potential for affordable housing
• DU: re-look at that measure
  o Forces builders to increase 3 bedroom units vs. 1 bedroom
• Affordable housing from an economic standpoint
  o How much does it cost to build – site work / utilities
• Cost effective to build taller buildings
• 5th St. Given what is already done – why is it not [ ]
  o Higher potential
• Reflect existing conditions at Hospital area
• Small area plan in works for Cherry Ave
• What are land owners saying about changes to areas with different [ ]
• Phase 1 of the forum: Zoned code presentations showed higher intensity occupation in the north of the SIA
• Zoning Policies need 5 blur boundaries between low-income +medium income
• We need to deconcentrate zones of poverty
• We need more one bedroom units

3. What do you think about our understanding of what we heard about places, housing and jobs and connections to them?
• Mixed use and mixed income

Group Discussion Notes
• Does not address affordable housing strategy for disabled elderly or on SSI, anyone that’s working part time
• Must have an anti-displacement strategy – eviction prevention
• Need rental assistance, in other chapter sand chapters related to the housing chapter and connect to one another
• The city should not have to reinvent the wheel
- Opening up accessory spaces to allow for affordable housing
- Section 5.2 – discussed residents bill of rights → as formally adopted
  - Should be a primary impact statement (not where appropriate)
- 6.5 federal fair housing
  - Look at how criminal background checks effect housing choices
  - Landlord requirements and safety concerns could come out of the Tenant Rights Commission
  - Language should not be “support of”
- Where are the poor people going to live
  - 30% AMI and below a lot of people
- Want mixed income = difficult to deal with this
- Support of mixed income communities
  - How will this address lower income folks
  - Discussion about reducing barriers
- Questions about where the 15% affordable housing goal came from
  - Is 15% not enough?
- People need to be specific about which level of income it should target
- In some areas the height of buildings is being decreased
  - This could affect the opportunity for affordable housing
- We need to request that UVA build housing for upper classmen to take the pressure off the city

Group 1
- Mixed use A-B streets that work?
  - Add streets that work map and description
  - Do not abbreviate [STW] streets that work on map
- Property owner – Albemarle – Rose Hill – Forest
  - Currently zoned M-1 -- small business employment
  - How does comp plan work in context with current residence
  - Could be due to black neighborhoods
  - Certain # of feet
  - Problem: one next to another (industrial to single family house)
- TRANSITIONS:
  - HUB Zone – preferential treatment for government contracts
  - Caveat is that certain number of people live in that area – this is Rose Hill Area

- Who defines HUB zones – Federal
- Overlay federal HUB zones on land use map
- SWAM – small woman and minority business
  - Is that a map?
- What other federal defined property
- JOB OPPORTUNITES
- Plan doesn’t show Live/Work as well as it should yet
- Buffering single family + RZ – all over City
- Accessory dwelling units
  - Advertise accessory dwelling unit more
- Live/Work Relationship
  - Make sure we make greenspace in planning
- Comp Plan must incentivize for better development
- River road – industrial by nature
- Narratives – make more specific – clear zoning
- Where will the city be in 30 years?
- Does it work financially
- Land lock makes it challenging
- More density to gain better transit
- Color map needs to show how we incorporate environmental design
- Everyone is talking about housing it’s not talking about job creation
- Put more product on the market price goes down
- What are tools?
- DUU kills City
- Eliminate density restriction
- Less parking per unit
- Make decision (council) grow or not
- RI – Core issue – waste of land
- Put product on market – to keep prices low
  - We need live + work
  - Zoning ordinance / N Articulate
  - Too much social tensions – we need better dialogue to get a better City
- Broad based housing strategy
  - Deals are coming + going – we are losing great architecture
- Enable the market
  - Process a barrier

Table 2
- Height Restrictions
- Rose Hill neighborhood: keep current zoning or improve
  - Concord, dale, Henry ave area density issues?
    - High low medium density open to interpretation?

- Limited space for growth
- CATEC – emphasis on technical education
- Off-site affordable housing should not be on Harris St.
  - The affordable housing on Harris would not be served by a bus
  - Need better system – will not wait more than 20 min for a bus
- Places that have been historically RI need to have more density that is compatible with the neighborhood
- New homes need to complement existing homes
- Density needs to go in the “right” area
- Carlton is a food desert
- South of Belmont more density?
- Belmont streets are small and could not handle more people without improvements
- More density along Avon st
  - More density along roads that could handle it
- Fontaine mixed use
- Preston ave, the 2 lane section is not working and should be widened
- The old k mart could be a great node for live-work-play
  - This could be a small Reston VA
- Riverside needs to be a marker on the map
- 5th st needs more
- Charlottesville High School could be more housing
  - Housing for teachers

6. May 29th Belmont Arts Community Engagement Notes

Individual Responses

1. What are your initial reactions to the Land Use Map information presented?
   - How did you determine quarry is high density?
     - I live on quarry rd – not much there but residence and a park
     - Wasn’t clear it was FUTURE
     - Good explanation, would like to know what properties the city owns
     - A lot of areas that density could increase
   - Food access points are not mapped like soup kitchens, gardens food banks
   - Standards of these live work play elements need to be defined – example affordable food access, walkable in low income neighborhoods
   - Generally positive, though confused about what intensity means, confused
   - Very well presented and good articulating needs/ desires
   - Its not legible, readable.
• There are no clear definitions for the “intensity” scale
• Does high intensity include open space?
• This looks more like a historical map then a plan
  - There is not a lot of vision regarding a shared responsibility towards smart growth with an emphasis on equity
• Done good job locating intensity along fringes
  - Rio Rod trails / bridge not good
• Not defined scale
• Doesn’t relate to how we create a sense of place / open spaces
• Data on infrastructure
• Scale of environmental amenities
• Start at establishing nodes of networks – needs to be fleshed out
• City needs more nodes – employment and related housing
• Changes need to be designed rather than top down
• Map is too vague – people can’t grasp the map and respond
• Incorporate orange dot
• Opportunity for public to better understand the map
  - Where is the data coming from
• Purple places are places where people buy things
• Divide city into environmental precincts (storm water watersheds)
  - May create more nodal opportunities

2. To what extent does the map address the information shared at your topic table earlier?
• Doesn’t address HOW transportation will be improved between the areas of high intensity – more buses?
• Show's lack of affordable housing in density areas
• I think more emphasis needs to be on the NEEDS of the people
• For bus connections you need to make transit times from every point to every other point
• O little bity but wish there was more on parkways/ trails
• I think it doesn’t do enough to articulate how to create more and more accessible housing
• I think higher density is important even in “low intensity” areas
• That could be done through ADUs or zoning shorthand but there is a lot of ideas
• Great use of pie charts – full and missing pieces
• There was NO correlation between the discussion of community infrastructure and land use
• No base data or base line is provided for potential abilities and or related needs schools etc.
• I would like to see environmentally sensitive sites (species habitat) identified on the map
  - Culturally sensitive sites might be helpful as well (historic preservation)
• The river corridor north of 250 doesn’t reflect the city’s need for a healthy beautiful river corridor
• Not a zoning map,
  - Bicycle lanes end in many places
  - Not enough data
  - Bus routes / transportation / school needs/ green infrastructure
• Needs connection
• Needs density increased in a controlled way to be gradual
• Need to include school and food access
• I think housing and transportation are central issue
• We really have to incentivize more housing and affordable housing
• Transportation is everything – door to door, timely, “cheap”
• Crossing point is necessary – else all the rest is pointless
• The sample population in phase 1 and 2 was far TOO small to be meaningful.
  - 156 respondents over many meetings
  - City goals need to be articulated for respondents to react towards
• It’s a nice framework, need to see more detail
• This needs to be an opportunity to examine the historical divisions vs. what would make a healthy vibrant City
• Traffic getting worse, jobs isolated in certain areas – need to spread it out some
• Only development is high rise housing
• Construction costs have increased las few years, so must do housing
• Next steps?
• See the history
• Is this reactive or proactive
• Are we over-relying on public input vs expertise

3. What do you think about our understanding of what we heard about places, housing and jobs and connections to them?
• Needs connection
• Needs density increased in a controlled way to be gradual
• Need to include school and food access
• I think housing and transportation are central issue
• We really have to incentivize more housing and affordable housing
• Transportation is everything – door to door, timely, “cheap”
• Crossing point is necessary – else all the rest is pointless
• The sample population in phase 1 and 2 was far TOO small to be meaningful.
  - 156 respondents over many meetings
  - City goals need to be articulated for respondents to react towards
• It’s a nice framework, need to see more detail
• This needs to be an opportunity to examine the historical divisions vs. what would make a healthy vibrant City
• Traffic getting worse, jobs isolated in certain areas – need to spread it out some
• Only development is high rise housing
• Construction costs have increased las few years, so must do housing
• Next steps?
• See the history
• Is this reactive or proactive
• Are we over-relying on public input vs expertise

Date: 10-14-14
Time: 2:30-4 PM
Location: City Hall
Facilitator: ADD
Delegate: ADD
Matching: ADD

Group Discussion Notes

- Community land trust
- Zoning code update
- Staff did a great job
- Not everyone had updated chapter at tables
- Does zoning allow development and mixed land use in the Belmont Neighborhood?
- Allow zoning to convert “single family homes” into “multifamily homes”
  - Creates and opens affordable housing
- Zoning code flexibility
  - Allow basement dwellings for potential rent spaces
  - Current zoning regulations are strong disincentive
- Include vacant/open parcels on the comp plan map
- Convert “paper streets” into useable lots for growth
- More urban growth in lower intensity areas
- Vesting time limits?
- Either affordable housing or developer contribution
- Wetland area doesn’t make sense to resident who lives near it as currently is.
  - Would REALLY need better ability to cross the road
- Support the intensity transition philosophy if possible to act on it
- Would the intensity transition require compete redevelopment?
- What are the potential types of employment that are associated with the proposed high intensity areas?
  - Are incentives considered? Intention for small entrepreneurial spaces?
- Can the low intensity areas have affordable housing?
  - How would that happen? (want to see it happen)
  - Depends on additional dwellings etc. – how?
- Option to develop basement as a separate unit conflicts with current zoning limits. This is a barrier to more affordable housing is the current low density areas. Associated with lower development costs and local economies
- Concern regarding conversion to air bnb typ units. (general concern, but would even more it’s in an area that needs more affordability)
- A lot of purple areas get attention now… need clearer understanding of how connects and what theses would entail
- Want more paths like the john warner parkway (multi-use trails) that connect TO GET TO places. Not just a loop or a dead-end recreational trail (ex. Dayton OH)
- Better non motor connections to destinations outside of the city (example: places such as Monticello)
- Sharrows aren’t enough – if 35 MPH feel unsafe biking
- Alley ways (city owned but not maintained) are a big potential asses for the Belmont area
- If we can do the intensity transition, we can do bike paths. Transportation Limits are the biggest barrier.
- Bus taking more time that walking is a problem/ barrier
  - Its “nuts”
- Not sure of the solution but narrow streets are a big barrier to our wanted development
- Possible to have more centralized parking options (ex on weekends) with free trolleys or shuttles to big destinations
- Until we solve the transportation challenge can’t do the rest of this
- For decades people want better pedestrian (bike) connectivity
People are asking the right questions and they are difficult to answer as well. Are the pin wheels meant to be small areas plans? Which areas are mixed use? Areas can increase in intensity. Can grassy shoulders be investigated to be right of way and paved bike paths? Regional growth and light rail. But are we big enough for that (regionally?) Can we use our land use regulation to land use regulation? 1.1 respect nearby residential areas where considering changes to land use regulations. 5.4 when updating zoning ordinance provide for protection of valuable historical resources. 5.6 Review + revise light industrial zoning regulation. New regulations should increase buffering adjacent to low density residential neighborhoods. 5.7 revise zoning classifications based on density high and maximum size. ALSO revise zoning classifications to be much more specific and disallow certain uses like all hours use when next to residential areas. Question: are the purple areas all areas that have been historically dense areas. Which areas are mixed use? Answer: purple and maroon and orange, but even residential areas can increase in intensity. Are the pin wheels meant to be small areas plans? Whether they are small areas plans or not does the city have the right to enforce? Descriptions of areas are helpful but there needs to be some restrictions as well. Ex. Markets are present but are the affordable. Need to define where food access points are. Big expanses of low density yellow. Not intended to be mixed use. People in these areas still don’t have a way to walk or bike to get groceries. People are asking the right questions and they are difficult to answer. Want to make sure that we are not just doing the same thing. IS the goal to adjust square footage. DC and northern VA use areas as a measure leads to smaller units. Unintended consequence is it would lead to less multi-person family plans. Are there incentives now for ADUs. Possible goal: add community gardens to the pie chart. Feels like there is not an honest / upfront conversation from the planning commission. We will not get to the affordable housing numbers we want JUST from incentives. What are the benefits of the Dillan Rule? Some people like it because they can stop cities from being experimental. Surprising how fast people can build in the US compared to Haiti. Very cumbersome and long process to make affordable housing. Need a streamlined process for developers trying to build affordable housing. Much of the funding for affordable housing comes from State / federal and the cycle is too long. Need to talk to the county because low income people are living out there. Need a coordinated system between UVA Charlottesville and the county. Has the Planning Commission looked into land trusts? Tax credits after a certain period of time. Land that could be used for affordable housing doesn’t always stay. Is there going to be any policy for city owned land? This is the one area of land that we do have control over. General land use comment: What has the discussion been on what the density will be on the corridors connecting nodes. Is Harris road already intense? Yes but lot of land for a few buildings. What are we doing to increase transportation. Critical mass = key competent of these discussions. Land use requirements and impact of traffic? West main particularly and concerns about upcoming projects. Disconnect between land use and transportation planning. Not assume people will use transit if available. Affordable housing, pocket neighborhoods and impacts on zoning. Trails needed to help in intensity (high) neighborhoods. Approach with pie is optimal … best approach. Need complete communities. Do citizens support though? Rio road is large congestion. Intense areas need more amenities. How have we gotten to where we are now? Developers only look at large scale housing development. Charm is no longer part of equation. Once regulations are in place they must be enforced. Map is based on lower turnout. Puzzled by map – map appears to be just a snapshot of the current situation. Reference points with current conditions in order to be able to respond to the plan. Look at city map in concert with county maps. Transit connections to county centers. More like a historical map then a plan. Reflects current zoning / use more than suggesting future changes. Business centers do not necessarily reflect best use for that area. Very similar to 1950s map segregation zoning keep separate white upper income from [   ]. Intensity should not overwhelm lower income households while benefiting those in power. How to better serve most vulnerable. Walk / bike connections why combined on spider map. Disconnect between intensity centers and residential development opportunities. Everything is a building site and all tall – concerned it will encroach on residential neighborhoods. FRC acquisition zones to help. Zoning affects everyone. Developers focus on by right development. Outside developers ad changing our landscape. Cost of development is impacting affordable housing -- does map reflect that need? Apt in downtown Belmont storm water issues any wat to incentivize developers to responsibly manage storm water runoff? Change zoning code to allow for smaller lots, smaller houses – would not change character of neighborhood. City is crowing – how to ensure available to all. Lots of potential in single family zones. Ratio of homeowners to renters to not reflected in meeting participants more renters in city but most event participants are home owners. Map is not aspirational enough. How to get fewer cars, more housing more amenities in more areas. Higher density possible without giant buildings. Hard to interpret map without details like height density ect. Does the map show existing or proposed (or is a lot the same?)
- Is there a current land use map?
- Will this map / plan affect decision
  - Such as rezoning
- Is form based planning being considered
- Language/ title of the map could be more explanatory of its purpose (i.e. “future”)
- Downtown Belmont as a mixed use area is a good model
  - Pie chart style
- Northern Neighborhoods have no mixed use / small shops
- Buffer commercial and residential
  - Depending on building style
- Rose hill office building discussed in terms of size/ bulk
- Transportation, streets that work can help with buffer and green space
- Map with times (transit, bike etc.) to food work etc.
- Emmett/ Ivy good corridor example
- Show where city owns or can buy land for housing
  - Tied to a housing study with numbers and % of mixed use per zone
- Appearances matter
  - Example: fry springs corner and downtown Belmont both mixed use but look/ feel different
- Will the Comprehensive Plan affect the height of new development is Belmont
- Lot of square footage zoned land. If I have a basement large enough to create additional unit, I can’t
- If you let homeowners decide to add housing within their home
- If city did not require following building code we could serve affordable housing
- Current zoning: disincentive to converting parts of homes for affordable units and some flexibility with building code that allows for affordable housing when that is the intent.
- Need to see a map of vacant parcels
- Paper streets that don’t exist
- Convert “paper streets” to buildable lots
- East side of McIntire Road re-zoned for high rise buildings
- Storm water run from Belmont down to Hogwaller - areas flood in heavy rain – do not try to squeeze things everywhere, it may not be the right place.
- Need to allow more density in residential neighborhoods in order to equal things out Out
- Given R1 or R1S; permit additional density on it

**NOTES WRITTEN ON MAPS**
- Map 1
  - Possibility of a Trolley on avon st
- Map 3
- Map 5
  - Would like to see mixed use at: 5th street near Cleveland ave, fry springs JPA area, Calhoun and locust ave area, barracks rd and rugby road area
  - Downtown and SIA need intense robust infrastructure have (groceries, amenities) so people really don’t need cars for daily lives
  - Downtown Belmont is unable to accommodate with existing road/ sewer setups
  - Cherry ave off of 5th street is more intense in reality then map shows
  - Does increased intensity near Monticello ave allow for protection of moores creek?
  - Too much height without transition will ruin charm of neighborhood (down town Belmont)
  - Emmet St density btw barracks and old Ivy road should reflect UVA plans

**PUBLIC COMMENT**
- If end goal of pinwheels is small area plans then they need to use participatory budget tools
- Need to use community land trusts because of Dillan rule and state regulations
- Planning commission should have a set policy for city owned land because that is what we do have control over
- Need to delay the comp plan because we don’t have a housing strategy
- Should consider this a draft until we know the needs of the people
- Need to take race and those who are most vulnerable into account
- Everyone talks about pedestrian and bike pr-11ans but not a lot has happened
  - We need something that can actually sink some teeth into this issue
- In reality do not see transitions from low to high intensity
  - Is affordable housing really affordable
- Should get the word out better about these events
  - Not done in an appropriate number of venues
- Concrete measurable goals are necessary
  - Need some flexibility still but unless we know what the goals really mean we have no way of measuring
- Come to community bikes and see the city from a different angle
- Need to have a GIS or digital maps to inform people about new development
  - Better than just TELLING the public
- Hope that planning commission folks who are leaving will stay part of the process

**NOTES WRITTEN ON MAPS**
- Map 1
  - Possibility of a Trolley on avon st
- Map 3
  - Would like to see mixed use at: 5th street near Cleveland ave, fry springs JPA area, Calhoun and locust ave area, barracks rd and rugby road area
- Map 5
  - Downtown and SIA need intense robust infrastructure have (groceries, amenities) so people really don’t need cars for daily lives
  - Downtown Belmont is unable to accommodate with existing road/ sewer setups
  - Cherry ave off of 5th street is more intense in reality then map shows
  - Does increased intensity near Monticello ave allow for protection of moores creek?
  - Too much height without transition will ruin charm of neighborhood (down town Belmont)
  - Emmet St density btw barracks and old Ivy road should reflect UVA plans

**PUBLIC COMMENT**
- If end goal of pinwheels is small area plans then they need to use participatory budget tools
- Need to use community land trusts because of Dillan rule and state regulations
- Planning commission should have a set policy for city owned land because that is what we do have control over
- Need to delay the comp plan because we don’t have a housing strategy
- Should consider this a draft until we know the needs of the people
- Need to take race and those who are most vulnerable into account
- Everyone talks about pedestrian and bike pr-11ans but not a lot has happened
  - We need something that can actually sink some teeth into this issue
- In reality do not see transitions from low to high intensity
  - Is affordable housing really affordable
- Should get the word out better about these events
  - Not done in an appropriate number of venues
- Concrete measurable goals are necessary
  - Need some flexibility still but unless we know what the goals really mean we have no way of measuring
- Come to community bikes and see the city from a different angle
- Need to have a GIS or digital maps to inform people about new development
  - Better than just TELLING the public
- Hope that planning commission folks who are leaving will stay part of the process
2. Community Facilities

E-Mailed Draft Chapter Comments

- What have we missed?
  - Technology on citizen side as well
  - Distinguish "facility" from "infrastructure" and define
  - Overhead utilities – put on 1 side of street
  - Should trees be infrastructure?
  - Locate underground utilities in streets not green spaces
  - Ensure cross discussion between silos/depths. i.e. utility/tree/trail
  - Where are shared opportunities with county (parks/trails)
- Remove? Nothing
- Challenges
  - Money
  - Facility space (police)
  - Better chapter layout – user friendly and simple language
  - Vision statement
  - How to intersect and overlay with zoning/permitting/etc.
    practices and policies
  - Tree/canopy benefits to water section

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

March 7th

- It would be good for the chapter to have a vision statement
- The police section needs to tie the items requested to the vision it supports.
- This section should be reviewed in light of events of last summer
- There should be additional goals for training and community relations
- A definition of multimodal should be provided
- Trails: There should be a goals which noted completion of the trail system around the city (not using roads for the breaks in the trails)

Recommendations from the Tree Commission:
- There is no mention of the word "tree" in this section. This chapter should be explicit that community facilities can provide examples of best practices related to the urban forest.

2. March 7th Boards and Commissions Work Session Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
- Inventory and condition assessment is great. Will also require prioritization since City won’t be able to do it all. Maybe this can include level of service goals and analysis for facilities.
- What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
- Integration between infrastructure and facility categories. For instance, when upgrade or maintenance done to a utility, consider piggybacking some storm water, trail, sidewalk, or other improvement to enhance efficiency. Also, shared, facility development/management with County, others.
- What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?
- Explain clearly relevance of facilities to citizens’ everyday lives – make it more compelling

Group Discussion Notes

- 1: Define level of service per facility to help guide and prioritize needs
- 4: need more police space and regional approach
- 1: sustainable and stewardship should be in all areas
- 1: use technology on public side too
- 1: include libraries specifically

3. May 1st Buford Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

- What is largest impediment to goals?
  - School issues reiterated
  - How are emergency evacuations to be handled
  - Emergency responders reach citizens (knox boxes updated?)
  - Are we ok with fire requirements?
  - Concern about ice rink
  - More money for infrastructure improvements
  - Are we ok with fire requirements?
    - Emily answered Emergency management needs more work (from staff)
  - What happens in an earth quake with people in high rises?
  - How do emergency responders reach citizens (knox boxes updated?)
    - Emily will respond with email
  - How are emergency evacuations to be handled
  - School issues reiterated
  - What is largest impediment to goals?
    - Coordination between people
    - Does not see communication

4. May 10th City Space Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
- Goals seem doable and obtainable
- More city kids having to go out to county because of capacity (school impact)
- Trash cans / lights / Streets / Parks (more)
- Where does this fit into comp plan?
- Ex. Lewis and Clark at Water St. “dark as hell” Need more lights
- Belmont needs more trash receptacles
- Storm water upgrades and drinking water pressure with increase in development
- Look doable; easy to achieve
- More community trash receptacles and better street lighting
- Dog poo stations should be abundant
- What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
  - Is fire department well planned? EMS
  - Improve event facility coordination
  - Example UVA graduation
  - Hazard mitigation a coordinated response evacuation
  - Evacuation plans in case of disaster?
  - Remove nothing

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

- Coordination within Govt. and providers
- BAR – greenspace / storm water
- Police are doing a good job
- Mall presence
- More community outreach for parks and rec events including for people without technology/web
- Lack of communication between Mayer – city manager – staff

Group Discussion Notes

- What is the sample size and distribution of participants in earlier conversations?
  - Miss answers questions
- Goals look probably (easily obtainable)
- Children being lost to county
- Safe tours in county
- We won’t have a Florida issue
- Where is lighting in the plan
  - Need more community trash receptacles and lighting around trash receptacles
- 9th floor balcony has storm water that backs. On water street not enough capacity (250 west main) for storm water from building to storm sewer system
- Need more (higher) water pressure to Lewis and Clark building (250 w main)
- Concern about ice rink
- More money for infrastructure improvements
- Are we ok with fire requirements?
  - Emily answered Emergency management needs more work (from staff)
- What happens in an earth quake with people in high rises?
- How do emergency responders reach citizens (knox boxes updated?)
  - Emily will respond with email
- How are emergency evacuations to be handled
- School issues reiterated
- What is largest impediment to goals?
  - Coordination between people
  - Does not see communication
“BAR is out of control” no green space incorporated with buildings development
- Concerned about storm water runoff without greenspace.
  - No capacity for runoff
- Rivanna Trail was scary (people’s encounters were frightening) other people
- People in county are afraid of mall
- Lives across from ridge st. fire department. There are a lot of calls. Many nuisance 911 calls
  - Not resource for people smoking irresponsibly
  - Do ambulances need to accompany fire trucks
- Likes general theme of community relations
- How do people learn about upcoming community events?
  - How about low tech citizens?
- Worry about people

5. May 12th Central Library Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

6. May 29th Belmont Arts Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

- Generally positive but would like more attention to parks/greenways
- Nice concern for more facilities in low income areas (park trails)

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

- My interest is more parks with [ ] doesn’t need technology as much as fire department/police
  - However mapping infrastructure is very important in long term
  - Would be great if these infrastructure mapping was available to view on a GIS portal
- What is enforcing measure?
- Having more meetings around town is helpful to get more voices heard
- Trail connectivity and multi-use parks
- Storm water drains, sidewalks in development and runoff
- Base data at infrastructure and level of service
- Sub regional storm water plans

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

- I imagine funding but otherwise I wouldn’t know

- Don’t need more police
- Do need more police
  - Types quantity of police matters
- Challenging to absorb data and respond in 5 minutes
- GIS – fire station

Group Discussion Notes

- It was brought to my attention by an unhappy resident and sports enthusiast that we need one or two multi-use rectangle fields for young people. She said this was a point that people made in the last comprehensive plan but nothing has been done on this issue
  - We have more than enough fields specific for softball. Can we alter on of them? She also thought a multi-use field could be developed in Washington park which she said is now primarily used by college students
- How will neighbors proved this input ex SIA more RTF entries
- More parks and greenways
  - Barriers = railways and water
  - Get more types of use of out (multi-use)
  - Parks (ex example Quarry has no playground)
- Too technology based
- Public does not have data of capacity of water, sewer
- How do we get more urban and integrate open space and transportation and not separate
  - EX IX PHA and CHARA land is enough land for a city within a City
- But how to integrate jobs. Open space, housing and great infrastructure over a long time period
- Knowledge barrier for meaningful conversation is great
- Seems like a lot has been decided
- General public does not understand things like universal design, etc. to really help plan
- Need more and better maps and more specific questions to the public
  - Example: where is a bus stop needed
- Land use map is too broad
- GIS portal or TJPDC wiki map
- Urban forestry is important especially with urbanizing
- Livable is important (trees)
- Forest is storm water infrastructure
3. Economic Sustainability

1. E-Mailed Draft Chapter Comments
   - Include more links to CATEC and PVCC programs
   - For 2.1 - add information for training for current community members
   - For 4.1 – the wording “lifestyle diversity” is not appropriate and should be changed
   - For 5.2 – consider adding Westhaven (CRHA) as a partner
   - For 5.3 – Encourage public/private partnerships

2. March 7th Boards and Commissions Work Session Comments
   **Individual Responses**
   1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates? Individual responses:
      - I like the focus on raising awareness of the city’s ethnic diversity
      - Would like to see more development of African American historic/tourist sites
      - See e.g. Blue Ribbon commission recommendations
      - Please keep the specific reference to African American history
   2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
      - Not enough about land use and economic generators
      - Active creation of economic centers
   3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?
      - Balancing economic development and housing
      - Legislative inadequacies

   **Group Discussion Notes**
   - Cliff – concerned about how land
   - Parker and Brenin and Jenimia – UVA students – working on economic policy
   - Hosea – like WF dev price. Wore CATEC. Speak specific to what do
   - Cliff – recommended updates note accomplishments – not much active relationship with eco and LU planning. Lots of talk about housing. How get additional. LU to increase job creation
   - Emily – job creation at all levels – not start with entrepreneurs. Look at job training. Living wage
   - Cliff – map is not much economic development. Much more yellow.
   - Kurt – topics all come back to LU – note next table discussion
   - Cliff – housing impact on locality – schools etc. Primary economy – import/export. Secondary economy – supports. Housing – mortgage is economy leaving the community. Rewrite ZO you can incentivize housing.
   - Emily – Need housing strategy to drive the process. Pass out talking point sheet.
   - Hosea – want to talk about DT Belmont – don’t forget other areas are economic generators. Pockets beyond DT mall
   - Cliff – lots of other places have different nodes and need that in Civille. Currently all trans goes downtown. Would be good to have going to different nodes. If have 50K more people, need to plan for them to recreate
   - Emily – city have UVA pay living wage.
   - Cliff – note competition

   **Notes from Councilman [ ]**
   - Keep business in City
   - Downtown mall startups
   - Hard to develop in city, it should not be so hard

3. May 1st Buford Community Engagement Comments
   - Emily – it’s university town – major employer.
   - Kurt – note size constraint.
   - Brendin – startups allow aff.
   - Cliff – integrate UVA/city/county to regional economy. Go than of greens – grow veg on rooftops. This can add up over time
   - Emily – part of challenge as how drafted – not focus on racial justice, don’t continue displacing people.
   - Kurt – note that may be a challenge to address
   - Emily – eco dev not acknowledge the concerns

   **City Space Community Engagement Comments**
   - Joy – talk about comp plan, how outreach to get people to come, have neighborhood people to outreach. Not every neighborhood flourishing. Need to build wealth for people.
   - Cliff – comp plan help find direction on how to set goals and achieve
   - Joy – pay living wage, OED more in the chapter. OED programs are not as through as could be.

4. May 10th City Space Community Engagement Comments
   **Individual Responses**
   1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
   2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
   3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

   **Group Discussion Notes**
   - Council spends too little time with this area – goal 5
     - If you don’t have the economic revenue you have nothing
     - Mall focus on tech sector business
     - Focus on housing alone is a mistake – it’s a connected system
   - Core space is vital. Strong housing policy is first
   - Build at core – live/ work/ play
   - Isolative zoning is prohibitive
   - Figure out incentives to build creative ideas/ projects
   - Traffic + transportation needs to be addressed
   - Building development entitlement process is slow + turns away small business
• Zoning needs to be better aligned
• Shouldn't be hard to open new business
• Harris + River road has long term local business
• Business sectors advisory council
• Set of advocates within industry clusters led by OED
• Zones + planning discrimination practices prohibit low income growth
• Like to see OED be proactive where issues prohibit core economic development issues
  o no one in OED will advocate for pro-business friendly policies
  o for zoning changes, need staff advocate
• Business growth sustainable? Chance to review high growth companies?

5. May 12th Central Library Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

6. May 29th Belmont Arts Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
   • Tweak zoning in residential neighborhoods to allow for small businesses to exist i.e. coffee shop bakery mini mart
   • Zoning needs to be flexible

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes
4. Urban and Environmental Sustainability

1. E-Mailed Draft Chapter Comments

- Chapter 4 needs to address food-specific issues. A "Green City" that the vision outlines is not complete without a robust and resilient local food system. Charlottesville needs to pledge its efforts toward creating a food system that actively supports local farmers and producers and works to give access to fresh, healthy food to all residents regardless of age, income, race, etc. A targeted line focusing on more vulnerable communities is of the utmost importance if Charlottesville truly sees itself as a socially equitable city. Charlottesville already sees many actors working on the grassroots level to promote a healthy local food system, but we now require institutionalization and coordination in the form of government planning and support to progress toward a better food system for all.

- I urge the Comprehensive Plan writers to include a fleshed-out section on strengthening our local food system, as well as specifically mentioning food in the vision.

- Goal 3: Reduce Greenhouse Gases and the overall carbon footprint, thereby safeguarding human and planetary health.

  - 3.1: Encourage high performance, green building standards and practices such as the U.S. Green Building Council’s (USGBC) LEED certification program, Earthcraft, Energy Star, or other similar systems.

  - 3.2: Promote compact block and street networks and a built environment that facilitates walking, biking and bus riding that diminish reliance on single occupancy vehicles.

  - 3.3: Encourage sustainable site design standards and practices such as the LEED-ND certification program.

  - 3.4: As appropriate, create policy and financial incentives to encourage increased building and site performance that reduce greenhouse gases and the City’s overall carbon footprint.

- Sorry for the late input since I know you are quite far a

- The scene at noon today in Riverview Park looked like this:

- The photo above captures less than half the vehicles on site.

- This is what we get from smart planning in the Rivanna River Corridor.

- Please reconsider the de-emphasis of Rivanna corridor planning in draft Urban Environmental Sustainability Chapter where Rivanna corridor planning has been down rated from its 2013 Comp Plan position (Goal 1 and goals 1.1-1.4 to goals 2.10-2.13).

- Geography, the topographical features of a region, matters to residents, and goals 1.4) to goals 2.10 down rated from its 2013 Comp Plan position (Goal 1

- In the 2003 plan, the Goal 3 of the original plan read: “PROTECT, INCREASE, AND PROVIDE AN INTERCONNECTED SYSTEM OF GREEN SPACE AND BUFFERS THAT SUPPORT HABITAT FOR WILDLIFE, IMPROVE WATER QUALITY, AND DELIVER VALUABLE ECOSYSTEM SERVICES.” (Sorry for the all caps, it’s how it was written). Goal 3 is now about “Sustainable Development”. The original goal is now gone completely, and I can find no reference to native plants, biodiversity, habitat or ecosystem services whatsoever. This is a pretty huge oversight and needs to be addressed. In contrast, Albemarle’s natural resources section of their comprehensive plan proactively seeks to conserve/restore habitat and has specific goals (like a requirement that 80% of plants in County projects be native).

- Lastly, it’s worth noting that native plants and habitat conservation have significant funding opportunities associated with them (like VCAP), and that many of those goals recommended in the 2013 plan now would count towards the MS4 and other Chesapeake Bay requirements.

- This morning at 7:30 I ran into two tourists from Tennessee walking the trail next to the Rivanna River. They asked for a breakfast recommendation.

- Recommendations from the Tree Commission:

  - Goal 1 should remain as it was in the 2013 plan: Protect, increase, and provide an interconnected system of green space and buffers that support habitat for wildlife, improve water quality, and deliver valuable ecosystem services.

  - Retain 2013 language of goals 1.4, 1.5, 1.10, and restore 2013 goal 2.3:

    - 1.4 Continue to Implement and update the Urban Forest Management Plan to protect quality of air, water and lands, manage stormwater, provide shading and absorb CO2 with an emphasis on addressing invasive species, diversity, and distribution.

    - 1.5 Monitor, expand and protect the overall tree canopy of the City and increase the canopy of neighborhoods in an effort (Remove: “to achieve American Forest canopy recommendations (urban: 25%, suburban: 50% and center business zones: 15 %”).

    - 1.6 Include trees, as practicable, in all city priority streetscape plans (e.g., framework streets, safe routes to school, Strategic Investment Areas).

    - 2.3 Develop methods, including financial incentives, to support retaining and increasing healthy tree canopy on private lands.

  - 1. The stated goal of 30% greenhouse gas reduction by 2050, compared to baseline 2010, is not nearly enough to do our fair share to limit global warming to not more than 1.5 degrees C. If the world does not solve the climate challenge, it will become the overwhelming problem of daily living. Therefore, the City should plan to facilitate a much more ambitious welfare of Charlottesville inhabitants.

- Existing planning/zoning allows less than ideal treatment of river frontage. (this photo is from the river facing side of Pantops shopping center)

- Long range we have high hopes for cooperative planning in the Rivanna Corridor with the County. Meanwhile, both jurisdictions should immediately embrace thoughtful planning in the corridor.

- Engaging this planning issue holds great promise for our City.

- The scene at noon today in Riverview Park looked like this:
Sustainability Draft.

what I believe is the current draft of the Urban Environmental Household Hazardous Waste. The City should arrange that Ivy Materials Center accepts this category of waste. The City should seek, or set aside, adequate funding for this. In many ways State law limits such recycling programs. So reducing our energy consumption footprint is our main path to forward.

3. To prevent the emissions of extremely damaging refrigerant gases (CFC’s and HFC’s) from old refrigerators and air conditioning equipment, the City should arrange that Ivy Materials Center accepts this category of waste. The city should make available educational resources and engage in promotional campaigns drawing attention to the severity of the problem and the role individuals and business can play in mitigating it.

The goals set forth in the Urban Landscape, Sustainable Development and Resource Efficiency all support GHG balance and should so state.

The Materials Recovery and Waste Management section should give attention to the disposal of refrigerants. Most refrigerants are more than 1000 times more effective in trapping heat than CO2. Their use and disposal has been identified as the single most effective step we can take in reducing the effects of GHGs.

Your comprehensive plan is woefully lacking in its commitment to combat global climate change. Our wealthy and educated community can and should be doing much more. It is too late to stop some of the harm global climate change is already doing, but we should be doing as much as we can to lessen the impact. Take the lead of the many active renewable energy organizations in town to work out the specifics of responsible planning.

1. Set a more ambitious reduction goal than 30% by 2050, largely through partnering with and incentivising the UVA, business and residential sectors, since the City itself produces only 4% of emissions. We need to commit to a 26-28% from 2005 levels by 2025 in order to meet the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement.

2. Incentivize energy improvement of existing buildings in all sectors (residential, business, etc) by creatively expanding partnership with LEAP, helping facilitate bulk purchasing agreements, or other measures.

3. The Household Hazardous Waste at Ivy Materials Center should accept appliances monthly rather than twice a year so that emissions of extremely harmful CFC refrigerant gases, that were legal when older refrigerators and HVAC units were manufactured, can be prevented by proper handling. The Materials Recovery and Waste Management section should give attention to the disposal of refrigerants.

2. What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

1. 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3 – were better in 2013 language

2. Goal 3 – Mention "sites"

3. 1.7 – can we reword it to "open up opportunities" for tree planning or inform

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

1. Trees and rivers don't vote

Whole is greater than sum of parts

2. After thought

Inability to change code

Group Discussion Notes

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

1. Charlottesville has a waterfront – not appreciated, river needs attention and should probably be highlighted as separate entity

2. Fry Springs developed property – how does that impact environment

3. What have we missed with the updates? Please provide comments.

4. As of March 4 there wasn’t an update online for the land use chapter

5. Connection to development and food

6. Some language is troubling like “encourage” and “monitor”

7. Difficulty in determining public vs private for public members

8. 1.6 utilities and streetscapes – were not able to accomplish this in many areas

9. Should include protection of urban agriculture spaces

2. March 7th Boards and Commissions Work Session Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
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1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
Group Discussion Notes

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

Individual Responses

3. May 1st Buford Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses
1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
2. What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

- Work needs to be done for water resources protection program
- Drainage issues
- Concerned about removing tree canopy
- Piping streams that lead to wetlands
- Solar ready construction
- Disconnect between planning and development
- Goals should have clear outcomes
- Tree canopy is being reduced and it’s just being monitored
- Tree canopy should increase
- Vision of tree lined streets, but unable to accomplish due to utilities and streetscape design
- Sites, LEED program, include as reference

Goal 3
- 2013 plan was better and stronger for trees 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6, 2.3
- 1.7 rewrote to open up tree plantings to increase efforts to provide more tree planting

Goal 4
- Not one sided
- Challenge to find places for trees
- Not able to change code

3. May 1st Buford Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses
1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
2. What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

- More public announcement to lead folks/citizens to info documents (website, etc.) before meeting
- Corey
  - More collaboration needed with developer and neighbors (observation)
- Charlottesville Food Justice Network
  - This section should include protection of existing, and addition of, urban agricultural spaces. The city bolsters multiple urban agricultural spaces in all 18 neighborhoods regardless of income level, as well as 7 of the 8 public schools. Many of these community gardens are used for food security access, and some are under threat of destruction from redevelopment. Pursuing a healthy ecosystem can also support our food needs by encouraging and supporting the development of urban food production businesses that employ and are owned by residents living in lower income communities.
  - Add 1.10 Establish and enforce a minimum standard for square footage of green space per person in low-income census tracts that preserves (and in some cases increases space where standards are not met) space for urban agriculture, production and garden use throughout development.
  - Add 1.11 Promote and protect green and urban agriculture spaces in all 18 neighborhoods (emphasize equity in investment across all neighborhoods) in the city for the sustainable production of locally grown foods or community gardens, by participating in programs or engaging with networks that maintain these spaces.
  - Add 1.12 Streamline and make clear the process by which neighborhoods may create shared gardens
- The Rivanna Corridor Planning topic should be moved to a different chapter
- “Green living” concept – how does this work into City thinking (eg policing by vehicles versus walking/biking, water bottles). Maybe these are policy issues?
  - How can we (neighborhoods not undergoing development activity) get some improvements that are coming with new projects (eg underground utilities)?
- Food system access comment submitted by the Charlottesville Food Justice network (scan attached)
- In Fry Springs Neighborhood, concern expressed about several underdeveloped lots and future development especially that tree protection un under-enforced
- How can citizens speak up about the environment and convey the value of trees? How can we get developers to talk to the neighbors and hear that they would like to see… this would contribute to an improved “community”
- More collaboration is required between neighbors and developers (? topic for the community engagement chapter?)

4. May 10th City Space Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses
1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
2. What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

- Broader language to describe goals
  - Move away from specific limits and towards broad solutions
  - Ex. Parking zones vs mass transit
- Density of people/development prohibits concept of “open space”
- Regardless of how development happens there should be equivalent amounts of public/greens space
- More city/county/ university collaboration
- Plan should include language about urban agriculture
  - Related to food availability/ security (community gardens)
- Incentivize better development
- Plans should highlight importance of “sense of place”
- Having city map at the table would be helpful
- Water consumption/protection section is important
- Specifics pertaining to trees?
  - Keep target # for tree canopy
- Tree canopy
  - Integrate more green infrastructure
  - Livability, access improve existing buildings
  - Less auto central (more mass transit)
  - Impediments (density limitations) (open visible space)
  - Can’t design compact housing to create open space with current limitations
- Month long resident
  - Density has positive attributes if designed well
  - Connected green spaces throughout the City of Charlottesville
  - Green space/public space % goal
- Food specific goal
  - Community
  - City county uva need to work more diligently
  - More access to fresh food equality
- Employment aspect
3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

- Urban agriculture
- Loss of Green space
  - Change state code to give locality authority to tell people what they can do with their property for development
- Create sense of place
  - Zoning prohibits
- Developing renewable energy
- Coordinating with county city line on storm water management

5. May 12th Central Library Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses
1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes
- General theme – keep more info
- Taking away some specifics
- Give specifics on tree specific
- Cliff   keep broad focus on green infrastructure
  - Improve livability/ access
- Restructure away from parking goals
- Density restrictions inhibit usable live in space
- Cant design more compact housing to do green space/ open space
  - Better design of 2
- Inc density has positive attributes in designed well
- Connectivity of green space throughout City
- Vertical dwelling units
- Make sure enough green space in all communities
- Address food specific issues
  - Suggest 2/3 bullet points
- Cliff: City/County / UVA more cooperation
- Urban agriculture development
- Martha: what about food justice?
- Have food equity/ access
  - Price issue   community gardens
- Bethany: Prevent development   loss
- Trade with other options
- Cliff: rewrite 178
  - Bad [   ] with conservation easement issues
- Environment legislation changes

- Support of [   ] easements
- Community form Mexico is great
- Discussion on stormwater/ TMDL
  - How is the city / county relationship with storm water specifically with wollen mills

6. May 29th Belmont Arts Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses
1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

- Not much, but needs order and priorities so things don’t go missing
- A lot missing w/ global warming and climate change. Needs to be a bigger priority and more action as a whole community
- City should take more of a larger leadership role in this
- Robust urban forest: needs more teeth or consideration to ensure this actually happens

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes
- Instead of using term “monitoring” tree canopy write “increasing” tree canopy or at least maintaining and supporting”
- Add requirements and incentives for more permeable surfaces when new developments occur or businesses and homeowners are working on repairing or replacing surfaces
- Support suggestion of more focus on native plants and urban habitat
- Look at increasing number of pocket parks
- Beauty / the environment absent in city budget
- Rivanna River should be a strong asset and valued/ prioritized higher

Written comments provided by Marcia Geyer
- Revisit global warming goal and doing our fair share
- Current goal is too little; cville must do more
- Want to see stronger partnerships with comm groups and bigger priority with city vision
- Partner with LEAP and greater funding for energy efficiency and demonstrations/ outreach
- Reduce environmental contaminates
- Refrigerants should be accepted more frequently (monthly at least at ivy MWC)
- Where does specific action from the city come from in relation to the comp plan?
- GHG related: city needs to do more than leading by example

- Investments and Bills etc.
- River Comp Plan and Zoning:
  - River isn’t just a woo woo, zoning map has poor, outdated zoning in approved river front
- Ex. Industrial next to river doesn’t align with citizen wants for a reinvested river front. Want to see zoning overlaps specific for the river
- Traffic concerns and popularity of the river park(s) need attention
- Something specific in place to guide future development and embrace/ establish the river as an asset and resource to be treated and considered carefully
- Planning and zoning and Development are out of alignment
  - Ex. Storm water devices can be out dated but only thing that fits development density
- So why do we allow that density?
- Food systems
  - Climate change and resilience and food system threats
  - Need dedicated land for food/ public space
  - Need more local food systems (currently <1% is locally sourced)
  - Climate change will affect availability and cost of food that is imported to VA
  - Projections of Temp are steep and WILL impact our food
- Development and Species and Environmentally sensitive areas
  - Invasive species control   does the city do anything with this?
- Would like to see partnerships
  - Current consideration / protection of environmentally sensitive areas is insufficient
- Want to see it as a planning priority and want to see the city partner with resources available (ex. natural heritage SOL)
  - GHG   by 2050 cville needs to be fossil free
5. Housing

1. E-Mailed Draft Chapter Comments

- Language was removed regarding considering the effect that regulation has on the cost of housing. Regulations are responsible for a significant percentage of the cost of building and providing new housing. A 2016 NAHB study showed that regulation accounts for nearly 25% of the cost of a new for-sale home. Because regulations apply nearly uniformly across all pricing levels, that percentage is lower for expensive homes and higher for affordable housing. Regulations have a greater cost impact on lower-priced new housing. Our community values affordable housing. One of the most effective and significant ways to make housing more affordable is to take a long hard look at the details of regulations that add cost (they all do) and evaluate those regulations in the context that there is a tradeoff. Additional regulations and requirements absolutely lead to less affordable housing. A different class of sewer pipe may be better, but it costs more. With the knowledge that that requiring a developer to install a more expensive sewer pipe makes the new housing served by that pipe less affordable, is it worth it? In some cases the answer may be yes, in some cases it will be no. Without the context of the cost implication we will always opt for the better, more expensive pipe without realizing that we are hampering our ability to provide affordable housing. Reinert old sections 6.1 & 6.2 and add reinforcing language emphasizing the need to evaluate cost consequences of regulation along with the benefits.

- Language about encouraging PUDs and creative, green, mixed-income, and mixed-use approaches. PUDs are some of the most effective tools the City has at its disposal to get vibrant, diverse, sustainable, creative design. I'm sure that PUDs are difficult zoning districts to administer. They are also difficult for the developer to create. But they're better. That is the point. The extra effort is worth it. PUDs are also one of the most effective ways to produce affordable housing because of the flexibility they offer. Take a look at Phases 1, 2, & 3 of Burnet Commons. All 3 projects are wonderful places to live. They are shining examples of mixed-use, mixed-income, vibrant, sustainable, and creatively designed neighborhoods. Without the PUD, those couldn’t exist. Instead of simplifying the comp plan (and then following that with a similar simplification of the zoning code), we should be looking for more ways to push the envelope and innovate. We are not a boring straightforward community. We are progressive and innovative. We should embrace and strongly encourage creative development in our comp plan because it is the only way to truly develop great places. You can be sure that the Downtown Mall doesn’t fit within any standard zoning. It was creative and extremely progressive. Charlottesville took a risk in developing it. By removing the push for creativity from our comp plan, are we now saying that those great places weren't worth the risk? Reinert old section 6.4 and deleted portions of old section 6.5. Strongly reinforce language encouraging creative and innovative housing and development. Specifically call out the need to maintain flexibility in design standards in order to accomplish other City comp plan goals.

2. March 7th Boards and Commissions Work Session Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
- Update the vision – How is Charlottesville changing? One page with vision and goals then lay out goals in more detail in additional pages
- Homelessness needs to be included in the funding goal – homeless programs like Rapid Re-housing and Permanent Supportive Housing need to be scaled up with additional funding
- Pretty good – organized differently but hit most of the issues
- This eliminated Goal #1 which established impacts of regulating and land use change on affordable housing – provides the basis for FC and Council to evaluate rezoning, SUPs, and other ZTA, SMAs, etc. with the context of impacts on affordable housing
- Ensure stated housing goals are reflected in the land use map

2. What have we missed with the updates? Please provide comments.
- Define affordable housing and levels in Charlottesville so each goal speaks to each level
- Homelessness as a separate goal
- Not sure about community impact concerns
- Some titles need working on (Goal 1 has no title)
- This chapter should emerge from housing strategy. Presumably it will have goals and strategies
- Tie increased density and height bonuses for affordable housing to real data on needs and costs (i.e. housing needs assessment)
- Goals to be more precise
- UVA – partnerships, student impact on housing
- Homeless housing needs – funding for, make sure these are explicit
- Need housing strategy first
- Stronger wording re: fair housing enforcement
- Definition of affordable housing – need to include/identify tiers and focus goals
- Land use map and housing chapter need to align
3. What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
   - Either shorten and keep strategies vague or add specific about income levels, neighborhoods, and land use
   - 6.2 and 1.4 seem to be the same
   - Enforcement of fair housing act
   - Remove emphasis on pushing affordability at extremely low incomes onto developers or these units will not get built

4. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?
   - Creating coalitions to work together to have the goals tied into council decision making
   - Need to identify key parcels that can reconnect neighborhoods that are hidden valleys
   - Funding
   - Concerns about affordability – define (levels)
   - Please don’t update housing chapter until comprehensive housing strategy is adopted

Group Discussion Notes

3. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
   - Add to 8.2: Link housing options, transportation FOOD ACCESS (add here) and employment opportunities in City land use decisions (Charlottesville Food Justice Network)
   - Add 7.5: Encourage the incorporation of food access avenues (eg, affordable stores, agriculture space such as greenhouses, school and community gardens, neighborhood farmers markets) in all housing developments to the maximum extent feasible both to increase self-sufficiency and as a way to be more sustainable and to increase access to food. (Charlottesville Food Justice Network)
   - Add: food access to description goal 8. (Charlottesville Food Justice Network)

4. May 10th City Space Community Engagement Comments
   Individual Responses
   1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
      - Not far enough for extremely low income
      - Need more robust housing chapter
      - Need anti-displacement strategy
      - Need neighborhood protection – small affordable homes
      - Open up accessory uses
      - Adopt 5.2 AND ENFORCED
      - 6.5 remove word “support”
      - Where will the poor people live > 30%AMI
      - Hope = mixed income housing
      - Remove barriers between income levels
      - Maybe 15% is not enough
      - When people talk about affordable housing be specific about % of AMI
      - 0-30% – Rental critical need
   2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
   3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

3. May 1st Buford Community Engagement Comments
   Individual Responses
   1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
      - Updates sound insufficient: “consolidate,” “reorganize,” “clarify” are just tweaks to existing plan
   2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
      - I would have liked to see the vision statement include wording about very low income housing and addressing race
   3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?
• Need more low income housing and mixed parcels: more options outside of downtown
• Large portion of city staff live 2 counties away
• Higher density around parks – for example around Belmont Park. This would be too expensive
• Concern about land use legend: Downtown not represented as high intensity

5. May 12th Central Library Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses:
1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
   • No comp plan without a housing strategy
   • Eviction prevention
   • Residents Bill of Rights (housing authority)
   • Replacement guarantee or residents whose housing is being replaced or redeveloped
   • Provide for development in the SIA such that anyone can walk, bike or drive and live there no matter what their income

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
   Before we have a comp plan we need a housing strategy

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes:
• Anti-displacement – eviction prevention
• Safety nets/housing strategy plan
• Data from housing assessment need
• Protections for economic solutions
• Neighborhood protection of smaller affordable housing
  ○ Transitions zones / buffer zones
• Accessory uses
  ○ Smaller lots more space for affordability
  ○ Markets for affordable accessory units
  ○ Adopt 5.2 Bill of Rights
• Criminal background checks can be racially divisive
• 30% AMI and below + hope to mix population
• Where did the 15% come from
  ○ Housing replacement needs will replace with more specific goals
• Changing DUA
  ○ Efficiency studio apartments – more popular
  ○ Request UVA build housing

6. May 29th Belmont Arts Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses:
1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
   • What recommended updates?
   • We need concrete measurable steps
   • We need measures defined for clarity of need and accomplishment
   • What are they based on?
   • Do we have a broad strategy vision based on good data and an understanding of discriminatory processes
   • Will the plan / chapter address the historic concerns / in equity that contributed to current housing crises
   • Very vague

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
   • Input from those in need of affordable housing
   • We need to be specific about what affordable is and target very low income folks

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?
   • Lack of affordable units, along a scale of need
   • Need concrete measurable goals with outcomes that are pre-defined
   • Lack of authentic engagement with all segments of the community
   • Data underlying goals?
   • Does not address responsibility of city and mitigate historic damage

Group Discussion Notes:
• Community land trust
• Delay comp plan until housing study done or write plan so it is open to change with results
• Make money available for family members to buy out heirs in designated areas
• Question: what are the goals? How does the goal get carried out in objectives? In reality?
• Concern: how affordable is affordable housing?
  ○ May be way out of line for some people especially seniors
• High end vehicles in front of low income housing
• What is the process for applying for low income housing?
• Trouble for someone making less than 30%ami
• Housing study will name specific concerns
• Concern for seniors
  ○ Difference between a working family income and a senior’s income
• Too many variables in the AMI that we are not sure what we are capturing
• Who are the incentives given too?
  ○ Answer: landbank and developers
• We need a PR campaign for affordable housing
  ○ Affordable can’t just mean “people I don’t want to live with”
• Need to get away from thinking affordable means public housing
• UVA studies says: really affordable housing needs to be subsidized
  ○ Who is subsidizing?
• No way that the market can take care of affordable housing on its own
• There is a history that Charlottesville has of driving people out (ex. Vinegar Hill)
  ○ Some is gentrification currently but also historic pattern
• Incentive needs to be: streamlining the process
• Where is the data that all of these updates are coming from?
  ○ What about demographic analysis? Income age education race?
  ○ That data will determine housing
• Trend now in more people renting
• Need more data
• We have gotten all of these goals without ANY data
• So far we have had only very general information
• Broader housing strategy will take into account 1) data 2) history
   ○ Housing needs assessment will be part of this
• If we don’t have a broader based strategy based on data then what is our vision / goals?
  ○ What is the foundation if there is no data?
• Would it be possible to simply adopt the housing strategy after this?
  ○ What did we learn from Apex and Champaign
• Would like to see more initiatives to show low income renters what it looks like to be a good neighbor
  ○ Could be very simple things
• Need more programs to give low income/ students information on how to be good neighbors
• In vision statement, please include something on importance of preserving historic houses and buildings
• Goal 1.1 – this is good
  ○ Can we point out that we have some affordable housing in modes older houses with small houses like Venable (near 10th and page) 10th and page rose Hill and woven mills parts of little high and Belmont
  ○ So we’d like to preserve and rehabilitate older homes and keep those small homes which are affordable
• Encourage publicize and add incentives for increased numbers of accessory dwellings in R-1 neighborhoods where the main building is owner occupied
- Change zoning ordinance to increase a buffer between residential zoning districts and more intense zoning districts (B1, B2, B3 and industrial and large R3 apartment buildings)
  - These buffers would involve more distance from wall edge of new buildings and the boundary with their residential neighbor’s property line
  - Require setbacks on buildings that are significantly tall
- Limit height of houses to fit in with heights
- Disallow appurtenances on new buildings
  - (please look at new duplex on commerce st. that dwarfs houses nearby)
- Also encourage home ownership
- Limit amount of land paved in front yard
- Limit the assessment on modest homes that have been added on to and whose assessment has been raised
- Keep Goal 1 because of affordable housing
- Incorporate incentives that target the specific recommendations in the housing assessment study
- Add height bonuses for goal 3.3
- Reinsert 6.1 and 6.2
- Reinsert 6.4 and 6.5 to keep PUDs
- Unsure of what is happening in chapter – vision is vague
- Vision – middle income only group specially called out – why?
- Burnett Commons – lived in market rate right next to habitat homes
- Heard people worried friendship court redeveloping will push out folks
- Not many moderate priced homes available
- Goal so that people from minimum wage to maximum wage can live in the city
- Allow people to rent larger accessory units
- Allow full basement to be rented
- Need a plan so that assessments don’t go up because the neighbor buys for a lot but then you pay back the difference when you sell the house
- In 10th and Page – when elderly person passes individual family members can’t afford to buy out owners so sell outright – give assistance to keep first family in place
- What is affordable housing fund?
  - 80% AMI but most is much lower such as 50% or even 20%
- AMI = 89600 currently
- Why are we moving forward with Comp plan when housing needs strategy not completed?
  - Support waiting
- Housing strategy is another year until completion – will replace the existing chapter
- Housing strategy – robust engagement with friendship court and habitat

- Greatest challenges to affordable housing:
  - Land prices
  - Density (too low)
  - UVA property acquisition
  - Zoning codes need revamped
  - More incentives to homeowners to do accessory units
  - Built in conjunction with affordable transportation
- What is going on to help people graduate from subsidized housing?
  - Ladder is missing in many cases
  - Some are multi-generational
  - Snowballing due to access to education
  - Generations are stuck
- People choose housing based on quality of schools – get “bad” schools better to disperse a variety of housing
6. Transportation

1. E-Mailed Draft Chapter Comments

- The concept of “future-proofing” was touched on with the acknowledgement that emerging technologies are disrupting the traditional transportation fabric. This concept should be expanded to also incorporate how people live and how their lifestyles relate to transportation. For example, in a near-downtown new development where people want compact walkable living, are standard neighborhood streets really necessary? Could adequate fire protection be achieved another way? Does the rescue squad absolutely need to be able to pull a vehicle right up to the front door? Might environmental goals be better served by allowing lots that only have pedestrian access and no street frontage, thus reducing earthmoving and tree clearing? Before the automobile, streets were very different. We seem to be on the verge of heading back to a time where the automobile doesn’t dominate. Might these “old-world” transportation and access strategies found all over the rest of the world also help achieve housing affordability by reducing infrastructure where not needed? With technology that already exists and is in use, it is easily imaginable that in the next 20-50 years very few people will own cars and that our City will be grossly over-parked. Let’s modernize our comp plan so that it allows the market to dictate how much infrastructure is needed as the technology changes. By changing the comp plan now we aren’t changing the rules, we’re just changing the constructs within which the rules can evolve.

- Pupil Transportation should be addressed. (1) When new developments are built within the city limits the developer is not addressing school bus pick-up and drop-off to make sure student safety and bus clearance is highlighted. (2) When constructing sidewalks bus routes should be addressed, as well, which will improve transportation efficiency.

- Goal 2: Improve quality of life and promote active living by reducing automobile congestion and expanding multi-modal transportation options via integrated land use and transportation planning and community design.

- 2.6: Promote urban design techniques, such as placing parking behind buildings, reducing setbacks, building active, transparent and habitable spaces at the ground floor level and increasing network connectivity, to create a more pedestrian friendly streetscape and to reduce speeds on high volume roadways.

- Add 2.11, Delete 5.8 from Parking: Develop suburban park and ride facilities and provide express transit service to and from these during peak demand periods to reduce traffic congestion into and out of the City’s urban core and employment areas.

- Question 1 – Reactions to recommended updates
  - I appreciate the consideration of emerging trends and technologies including autonomous vehicles (AVs), electric vehicles (EVs), etc, but I was surprised to see that ridehailing services such as Uber, Lyft, etc weren’t included. These services may be having impacts on transit ridership or demand for curb space (dropoff zones, etc) that aren’t yet being realized.

- Question 2 – Missed?
  - The above trends/tech including AVs and ridehailing could potentially impact urban design/form by decreasing the need for proximate parking lots (AVs being able to park without the passenger) or increasing demand for drop-off zones w/ lower parking needs (ridehailing). Perhaps a strategy in the chapter would be exploring opportunities for converting existing assets (e.g. parking); or adjusting zoning/parking standards or even street design standards to accommodate pickup/dropoff zones, bus pullouts, limited street parking spaces, or even food trucks. Our design standards should accommodate and anticipate future change.

  - 6.10 discusses increasing transit ridership: however, it seems that our goal of decreasing usage of personal vehicle modes is intertwined with our goals to encourage bike/pedestrian mode usage and even parking provision. A more measurable alternative, or even a parallel strategy to “Explore innovative approaches” could be “Coordinate marketing and engagement efforts between transit providers, bike/pedestrian advocacy efforts, and parking providers”, or something to this effect. We have to provide and market attractive alternatives to driving.

- Question 3 – Remove?
  - 5.4 addresses parking metering – although I personally have no issues with this as part of a parking policy, it might be worth revisiting in the wake of the public reaction to the parking meter pilot. Would it be possible to address the different needs for short-term/medium street parking versus long-term/structured parking, as well as concerns of pricing impacts on equity and downtown businesses?

- Question 4 – Challenges
  - See 2. Issues with transit ridership and competition with ridehailing services could make any gains difficult. Making transit or bike/pedestrian competitive and attractive compared to driving or ridehailing will be crucial. AVs could provide opportunities to reduce the cost of transit provision due to reduced need for drivers, or allow for expansion of on-demand services a la JAUNT, but it’s unclear when these opportunities will come.

- Overall: I’d like to see the plan set some quantified mode share goals based on existing mode splits. For example, if we’re at 80% single-occupant auto travel for commute trips, let’s cut that to 40% by the plan’s horizon year (and list the corresponding goal shares for bike, walk, and transit).

- Goal 1: Revise the goal’s wording to refer to the establishment and maintenance of a connected network of walking and biking facilities for all ages and abilities.

- 1.2: the goal should be convenient and safe pedestrian connections citywide, not just within 1/4 mi of the stated destinations.

- 1.6: meeting ADA is a minimum requirement and should not be the goal. Universal design that is safe and accessible for all ages and abilities should be the goal, with ADA compliance wrapped into that.

- 2.5: “option” should be “options” and “or” should be “and”.

- 2.6: instead of “consider,” how about “facilitate” or “incorporate”?

- 2.7: I’d rewrite as “Encourage businesses to provide on-site facilities such as transit shelters, bicycle storage (racks/lockers), and showers to enable more travel choices for workers.”

- 2.8: TSM is most often a roadway issue, so consider merging this with 3.2 in the Arterial Roads section.

- 2.9: How about parking maximums instead of minimums, coupled with properly managed curb parking? If parking requirements are rethought, remove this item.

- 3.1: is “continue to” appropriate? Does the city do this at all? How about “partner with RideShare to provide TDM”? Also, I’d like to see the Comp Plan mention the benefits of individualized TDM that is tailored to a particular person’s commute and needs. It’s more costly than traditional TDM but cheaper than building roads.

- Should Goal 3 include something about preparing City streets and signals to interface with connected and automated vehicles? (Ah, it’s in Goal 4. Come to think of it, goals 3 and 4 might do well with a merger.)

- 3.3: Instead of “develop,” maybe say “adopt” – VDOT has these and the City could just adopt them rather than spending time developing something new.

- 4.3 (and 3.5, to an extent): Consider whether there are streets and/or sidewalks that should be abandoned rather than maintained. Or whether other maintenance practices could be efficient (e.g. regaining only the center 22 ft of some extra-wide 1960s residential streets rather than the entire 40-ft width that is nearly half underused parking lanes).

- Goal 5 is nonsensical if parking pricing continues to be off the table; “demand” is meaningless/infinite when the price is zero.

- 5.2, 5.3, and 5.6 aren’t actually about parking but are instead about multimodal transportation. They affect parking but shouldn’t be under the Parking goal.

- Put something like 4.4 under Goal 5 – one of the questions about AVs is what we’ll do with all this parking we have once cars can just drive themselves back home or to satellite lots.

- Consider adding items about (1) encouraging businesses to offer parking cash-out options for employees, (2) de-coupling parking costs from housing costs, and (3) encouraging or requiring that paid parking be in more granular time increments, i.e., at daily rates rather than monthly, yearly, or by semester, because then the user has more of a
financial incentive to avoid driving even if it's only one or two days a month.

- Goal 6 should be aligned with the Transit Development Plans of CAT and JAUNT. Also, whoever is writing this goal should read this. I'd love to see the "goals" in the comp plan reflect quantified, measurable ridership and coverage goals, rather than the vague ridership goals such as 6.1 and vague coverage goals such as 6.5.

- 6.1: more frequent service and longer span is not necessarily appropriate for all routes. Some routes that exist to serve coverage goals rather than ridership goals (see link in previous bullet) will not benefit from frequency increases. Same deal on 6.7. How about specifying that key transit corridors will be identified and served at high frequencies (pick something - every 15 minutes, or every 10 minutes) during commute hours/ daytime hours/ 24/7?

- 6.3: What's the meaning of the asterisk

- 6.5: Quantify this spatially: perhaps a goal could be that 90% of city residents would be within 1/4 mile network distance of a bus stop or served by low-cost demand-response service. Also, revise terminology from "accommodate travel needs" to something like "ensure access for all ages and abilities."

- 7.3: add "and pedestrian" between "bicycle" and "counts"

- 7.1 uses the acronym VDRT and 7.7 uses DRT. Pick one; the agency typically goes by DRPT.

- 7.7 is outdated; Amtrak’s Roanoke Extension started operating in fall 2017.

- Goal 9: is the word “protocol” a typo? Also, if quantified mode share goals are in the plan, this goal should mention that funding percentages should match those mode share goals (i.e., if we want 20% of trips to be by bike, we should spend at least 20% of our transportation budget on bike projects).

- 9.2: There have been statewide changes in transportation funding since the last comp plan; do we know what others we’d like? Or is it more about increased local authority?

- 9.6: add "and UVA" after "developers"

- Goal 6: Create a transit system that increases local and regional ability and provides a reliable and efficient alternative for Charlottesville’s citizens.

- Add 6.11: Evaluate transit services to food access points including emergency food banks, soup kitchens, nutritional services, community and school gardens, farmers markets, and grocery stores.

- Add 6.12: Incorporate bus stops to the maximum extent possible to food access points including emergency food banks, soup kitchens, nutritional services, community and school gardens, farmers markets, and grocery stores.

- A transit system with no clear goals for expanding citizens’ access not only to jobs and economic opportunities, but specifically to food, child care, schools, and the community as a whole for better inclusion, is a weak system.

2. March 7th Boards and Commissions Work Session Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

- Add universal design – i.e. accessible city

2. What have we missed with the updates? Please provide comments.

- Rider share, ev charging stations, ride hailing drop off

3. What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

- Remove huge buses running empty

4. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

- Is parking pricing in the comp plan already? It should be.

Comment from Charlottesville Food Justice Network, representing 20 organizations and more than 1000 stakeholders and community members served:

- Universal design, not just meeting ADA

- Addition – urban development

- Goal 8 – more specific on new modes of transportation (uber, emerging technologies)

- Sustainable – term vague

- Why are we running big buses

- Encourage UVA to have students live closer to UVA to decrease traffic

- Tech – AV’s, electric charging stations, parking loading at curb space

- Regional strategies – suburban park and ride facilities, Hydraulic/Emmet planning efforts, Lynchburg-Cville rail system

- Safe ped ¾ mile radius – provide safe ped

- Construction detours not consistent and adequate for ADA

- Goal 8 – “sustainable” transportation is vague, replace terms

- Wants quantifiable goals (ex. 20% by 2020...)

- Better marketing coordination – one central coordination for all modes, European model

- Need to state vision better in other chapters
General Comments

3. May 10th Buford Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

- Shifting mindset
- Bus routes not working at airport
- Regional bus issues

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
   - Investments in SRTS
   - Concern for people that don’t have automobiles
   - Pay more attention to community garden with focus on access to food

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
   - Concern about how bus routes are selected / planned
     - Based on neighborhood needs or city wide?
   - Concern about hydraulic 250 infrastructure
   - Concern about effectiveness of crosswalks
     - And why some pedestrian lighting was removed

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?
   - Parking is a major issue
   - Questions w/ feasibility of park and ride in City of Charlottesville
   - Desire to look at comparable city in region / nationwide to see how then address need
   - Questions regarding interaction + mutual contribution
   - Architectural board incorporated to plan?
   - Closing date for public comment?
   - TJPDC role in plan?
   - Parking is a major issue
   - Are park and ride really feasible in a city setting?
   - *Park and ride to serve bikes/ Pedestrians also — trail connections to park and ride
   - Questions about how UVA is coordinating with strategic planning
   - Happy to see some suggested changes have been incorporated

Group Discussion Notes

- Charlottesville Food Justice Network rep has suggestion of transportation chapter
  - Provided detailed draft with revised language
  - Draft details desires of organization
  - Suggestions include
     - Invest in SRTS, Bike/ pedestrian plan (continue efforts of last plan)
   - Concern with public transportation availability in areas where carless individuals live
   - Community gardens / school gardens to provide access to food where transit is limited
   - Concerns with planning of bus routes
   - Desires voiced for express lanes for buses, transit
   - Hydraulic/ 250 → poor pedestrian access, flow
   - How is coordination with BAR done?
   - Advertise closing date for public comment

5. May 12th Central Library Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

6. May 29th Belmont Arts Community Engagement Discussion

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
   - There is not base data to establish where we are w/ infrastructure to identify needs/goals
   - Technology will not address many issues

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
   - No base data is provided

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?
   - City government/ organization: zoning ordinance

Group Discussion Notes

- In the interest of safety and quality of life for residents, reduce the speed limit on rose hill drive to 25mph and add a 4 way stop along the way several traffic calming islands bump outs and a sidewalk from rugby ave to burley field on west side of street
  - Also trees along burley filed for pedestrians
  - Better protection of pedestrians on rugby ave – maybe pass
- Reduce speed limit on Elliot from 35 to 25 we now have lots of homes built close to the road and children can easily be hit by speeding cars
- Emerging Tech seems too advanced
  - Focus on current infrastructure (sidewalks signals and shared use)
- Goals are contradicted by actions of the city (park and ride vs parking requirement)
• Rugby ave bridge project did not implement streets that work plan
• Implemented plans during design + construction
• Construction activities should not hamper bike/ PED access
• How does transportation get connected to other goals/ places of city (food access, community gardens, farmers market)
• No clear goals for expanding citizens access to food child care schools
  o As a whole need better inclusion
• Lack of education for PED/ bike rules
• More clear transitions for when bike land ends
• Better coordination between county and city when it comes to trails
• Higher density to eliminate commuting
• Park and Ride cooperation with county for park and ride needed
  o Development hampers implementation of plans of this nature
• Increase bus frequency?
  o More consistent transit stops/ times
  o Seems as if stops are diminishing
• Proactive better than reactive to safety concerns
• Quicken staff response
• More emphasis on safety
• Economic growth, development and funding all viewed as barriers to implementations
• Demographic response may not be truly representative of population
• Transparency in implementations
• Better communication on transparency of ongoing projects
• Communication!!!
• Better public/ private with grass roots involvement
• Build trust with organizations who can aid in outreach
• Fill voids left by rapid development
7. Historic Preservation and Urban Design

1. E-Mailed Draft Chapter Comments
   - 1.4: Develop pedestrian-friendly environments in Charlottesville that connect neighborhoods to community facilities, to commercial areas and employment centers, and that connect neighborhoods and residents of all ages to each other, to promote a healthier community.
   - 1.8 Use Small Area Plans city-wide to safeguard the City's historic urban landscapes even as the Charlottesville community seeks to expand the City's stock of affordable housing; foster economic development opportunities without displacement; and encourage context-sensitive planning and contemporary design.

Recommendations from the Tree Commission:

- 7.10: (retain 2013) Encourage retaining and replanting shade trees, particularly large trees where possible, in all neighborhoods as we strive to make the City more walkable.

2. March 7th Boards and Commissions Work Session Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?
   - Generally agreeable
   - Particularly agree with prioritizing CLR for Downtown Mall and prioritizing unsurveyed neighborhoods for survey
   - Downtown Mall – cultural landscape
   - Not all goals are specific (measurable – need more specific)
   - Be clear about public vs private

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.
   - Vision setting and long range planning
   - Historic preservation and urban design are different things
   - Should look at using zoning to help former residential areas to return to their historic use – now that housing is short and office space more available (Little High, MJ, JPA, etc.)
   - Develop a standards manual by PLACE – street furniture, lights, etc.
   - Protect/encourage trees and natural areas
   - Use alleys for historic purpose
   - Need to continuously update Comp Plan, incentive, lobbyist for money
   - Same goals in 2013
   - Goal 1, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3 should be removed

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?
   - Not letting the status quo absorb innovation
   - Complexity, zoning/land use, code, lack of metrics

Group Discussion Notes

- Prioritize Downtown Mall
- Prioritize un-surveyed neighborhoods
- Cultural and landscape resources are critical elements of what makes city special
- Lots of overlap with city departments
  - Need to talk to each other and get on the same page

Missing in Draft:
- Continuous review of design guidelines – must keep them current and evolving
- Lobbying the General Assembly to protect/encourage tools and incentives for historic preservation
- Clear goals for a long range planning effort. Not just historic preservation, but overall design characteristics of the city
- Emphasis on place making and specific goals for urban renewal
- Consider putting things back to what was there (i.e. Vinegar Hill)
- Do more with design than just preserve – not everything necessarily deserves historic designation.
- Nurture and take into account the edges near various districts
- Allow merge and overlap of some uses
- Within neighborhoods look for opportunities to add things that maybe aren’t there now
- Make use of small area plans
- Develop neighborhood conservation plans (look to Galveston, TX as example)
- Allow flexibility that allows creativity
- Work towards viewing neighborhoods and districts not just as individual properties by recognize other and diverse elements that together form the neighborhoods character, not just large old, historic homes
- Look at preserving elements such as tree canopy and landscapes. Foster/form a sense of public ownership of city’s public spaces in the character
- We are site by site demolishing sites without looking at how they fit into the historic fabric:
  - Example: Old industrial or service buildings on Water Street. When doing neighborhood surveys loot at what might often be overlooked or ignored
- Don’t let plans become a dormant document
- Possibly need an urban design component of the chapter
- Develop an urban design manual for the entire city

3. May 1st Buford Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

- Designate endangered neighborhoods, early notification, socio-economic, having sense of place, update Mary Joy’s stuff, Downtown Mall
- Not sure why urban design is the top bullet
  - Theme is related but not sure why it is its own section
- Urban design shouldn’t be central to historic preservation
- Protections for historic fabric system weaken
- Some goals have actionable strategies for the staff/public, others remain as goals
- Category for “endangered neighborhoods”
  - Define “endangered neighborhoods” (ie fifeville)
- Strengthen the first two bullets
- Worry about neighborhoods
- City staff be more attentive about getting word out (about development and new projects)
- How to better inform neighborhoods about new projects
- Losing sense of place
- Historic value of the neighborhood is of individual properties
- Value of the sum of its parts
- Re-zoning impact of gentrification
- Transition zones – intrusion of taller buildings into neighborhoods
- Places that maybe aren’t that old, but have character that needs preservation
- Downtown mall – ways to make that an interesting place, bring it to the surface
- Visual displays of history
- Better tours and guided walks of historic sites in the city
- Provide something for everyone
- Neighborhoods are getting more active
- Need more education of the community about planning and zoning
- Affordability – we want people to live here
- Look at Arlington and how they addressed affordable housing
- See Preservation Piedmont letter – inventory of city owned land in city
- Anticipate future zoning needs in the next 20-25 years
- If things implode – big city collapse then no one wants to live here.
- Not sure why Urban Design is the top bullet (in 2013 Plan). This is related, but not sure why it has doesn’t have its own section. Urban design should not be central to historic preservation.
- Pretty good but devil is in the details.
- Separate Urban Design from Historic Preservation.

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

- Consider having endangered neighborhoods. Study those neighborhoods.
- Inventory city owned property
- Consider “endangered neighborhoods” as a category
  - Ex. Star Hill, Rose hill, 10th and Page, Fifeville
1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

- Share information with neighborhoods in a way that will get to them
- Please consider all of Preservation Piedmont’s suggested provisions
- Form and mass regulation of development is a huge problem that is being deferred by this process (except in principal)
- Inventory all city-owned property, including property owned by local housing agencies [CHA, CHRA, etc.] Inventory empty lots and unoccupied/condemned houses. This would help with identification of possible low income housing. [These comments were about affordable housing.]
- Share information with neighborhoods [about proposed development/changes/etc.] sooner and in a way that will get to them.
- Consider establishing “endangered neighborhoods” as a category. Example: Starr Hill, Rose Hill, 10th and Page, Fifeville.
- Promote the history of the DT Mall through art or use technology (smart phone links, etc.)
- Need transition zones between commercial and residential areas. [re: “endangered neighborhoods”]
- Worried about intrusion of taller buildings. Losing sense of place.

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

- This chapter sets goals for places / neighborhoods but those fail to be implemented because the plan does not have the specificity that would define what is mean at a project/ neighborhood/ transition

Group Discussion Notes

- Promote history of the mall through art or tech, information
- Transition zones between commercial and residential areas

4. May 10th City Space Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

- Historic Preservation Plan
  - City being run over with development
  - Anything about Historic Preservation and Urban Design
    - How does it differ from land use plan?
    - Is it more a 3D plan?
    - Principle of all chapters affect land use plan. Has land use plan involved with what has been shared
    - Intent is to infill. We don’t have infill of historic fabric.
      - A lot of design has nothing to do with historic preservation
      - Some places in the city do make historic preservation element

- Fabric of city is held together by neighborhoods. Sense of commonality that is not necessarily a historic building issue. So much new development that neighborhoods are losing grounds.
  - Very diverse neighborhoods (i.e. Belmont vs Greenbrier)
  - If we want walkable neighborhoods look at what is successful in city
  - Making a place walkable begins with good design
  - Can we make have a target maximum population, based on available infrastructure
  - Where is historic fabric – it is about neighborhoods – comp plan does talk about spaces
    - Missing is specificity of different and various places throughout the city
    - Show all the fabrics that are distinct to Charlottesville
  - How can neighborhoods respond to different types development and design
  - Living neighborhoods – not Ryan Home development in the county
  - People forget that something was planned/approved somewhere and years later it gets built and they are upset about it

- Not always linked

5. May 12th Central Library Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?

Group Discussion Notes

- I have worked with Kay Slaughter and Preservation Piedmont to submit document with detailed editing and additions for this chapter
  - A couple points to add
  - Add rose hill drive as well as chaney ave to list of “entrance corridors”
  - Provide information and support to neighborhoods which are considering applying to be designated as historic conservation districts or architectural design control districts – or if they have individual properties they’d live to be designated
  - Goal 5 of Chapter 7 of Comp Plan
    - How will this be achieved
    - What is the action of this in the comp plan
  - Possible rezoning of commercial corridor in historic Belmont neighborhood
  - Keeping neighborhoods at the scale of the human
  - The concern of meshing neighborhoods and commercialism
    - Help protect neighborhood fabric
    - Be more concise and clearly identify this commercial/neighborhood intent
  - Language in comp plan of appropriateness of programmatic uses in neighborhoods
    - Interpretation and intent of zoning
    - The issue lies more in zoning than in the comp plan
    - There is a need for new regulations in terms of zoning
  - Tying together of uses
  - Where? How? What?
    - A clear and gentle transition between urban areas and neighborhoods
  - Recognize Virginia Landmark Register and National Register of Historic Properties in land use transition
    - Rezoning
    - Form based code
    - Keep goals consistent with public
  - So much in comp plan, yet there is no stepping in or action from PC
  - More specific goals within the comp plan
  - The “disappearing” of green spaces
    - Green spaces are becoming pocket parks and courtyards, rather than being open, public spaces
  - Does the comp plan focus on either historic preservation or urban design?
  - New green spaces for different characters or public figures
  - Creating new spaces
    - Commercial industries are buying space, even though it seems there are no more empty parcels – how is this happening?
  - Developers are creating “by-right” areas
  - Better determine the scale of new development. Write zoning code such that better judgement can be used and not handcuffed by what developer wants and how they chose to interpret the part of code.

6. May 39th Belmont Arts Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. What reactions do you have to the recommended updates?

2. What have we missed with the updates? What should be removed from the chapter updates? Please provide comments.

3. What are the greatest challenges to achieving the chapter goals?
- Interpreting zoning is a problem, previse zoning to be more predictable and cannot be interpreted in a way that is detrimental to the community
- Would form based code fix the above?
- Doesn’t state and national registrar designation help protect neighborhoods without local designation?
- Preservation of green space and open space is important
- Lots of focus on historic preservation is not addressing the need for new places – the creation of new open spaces and civic spaces (the Comp Plan says enhance existing character)
- Some areas of the city seem to be viewed as disposable
- Industries and enterprises are buying more space, develop it, and not leaving open space
- Need public investment in civic/open space
- Developers need to provide on their property
8. Community Engagement

1. Emailed Draft Chapter Comments

- I am VERY disappointed that the Community Engagement Chapter was cut. A few months ago, there seemed to be broad agreement about adding it.
- During the outreach for the Comprehensive Plan, officials told community members that the Planning Commission would add a Community Engagement section to the Comprehensive Plan. However, in the 2018 Update Draft to the plan on the City’s website, this section is not included.
- It is imperative that the Planning Commission informs and involves community members in its decision making process. As a resident of the City of Charlottesville, I am in favor of the planning commission’s decision to have a community engagement chapter and I would implore you to include it in the comprehensive plan. At present, it is absent.

2. SEEK MORE DIVERSE INPUT AT THIS PHASE FOR TAKING THE PLAN TO CITY COUNCIL

- MAKE ONLINE COMMENT EASIER: I have received conflicting information about where and how to make comments for the Comp Plan process. The commissioners have not been in agreement or well-educated on where public comment should be made. Some said that there was a web link online (a URL) and some said it needed to made through this email. Lisa Green indicated that the URL was made clear on the comp plan website but I am having trouble locating it and it has not been made available at the meetings. When I google search to find the comp plan 2018 materials this is location I am directed to: http://www.charlottesville.org/departments/services/departments-h-z/neighborhood-development-services/comprehensive-plan. Neither the "CompPlan2018" email and comment link are not displayed there as far as I can see. None of the commissioners I spoke to actually knew what the email address or the URL were at the meetings – it’s been very difficult to effectively engage our broader communities in the input effort as a result.

3. SEEK MORE DIVERSE INPUT AT THIS PHASE FOR TAKING THE PLAN TO CITY COUNCIL - Several people made comments last night about the lack of representation at these meetings from people of color. I understand from the presentation and commissioners that the commission has made various attempts to engage and get feedback from a representational cross-section of the community. And as a program manager working with refugee families, I can relate to how difficult it can be. But I do have a few ideas and suggestions. Please excuse if have tried any of these methods already.

- Advice from my observations of the tabling the commission did at Michie Market and Westhaven – I manage the New Roots program and commissioners attended Michie Market one day during the community input period (in Phase 1?). I don’t believe they got much input that day. I suggested that we discuss the content prior to tabling to help make it accessible and meaningful to the community we serve although the commission didn’t take me up on that. I also recommended they provide interpretation at the table so that they could have a more rich conversation with the community. I can understand that this could have been an additional $150 expense, but would likely have resulted in more input. I was also set up across from the commission at the Westhaven Day and visited the table. I think it would help get more content if table staff were more outgoing and there were really tangible and easy ways to give input – like as a game with large imagery or posters. I wasn’t clearly engaged when I visited the table and I witnessed a lot of people pass by the table without being invited to stop. I just think you’ve got to get in there are really warm people up!
- Ask members of the community how and when getting input would work and be prepared to go to them. – When the issue of diversity was raised in the meetings I did hear the commission acknowledge that there may be a lack of trust between people of color and the City and an unwillingness to participate in the most recent phase of the planning process as a result. That may be true. I would suggest that the commission increase its transparency about the limitations of the impact that comprehensive plan can have (because of the way the plan is put together, for example) but also the power of the comprehensive plan – for example that the City uses the plan to help guide allocation of resources and decision making. I also heard one commissioner express that she’d invited many people of color to come to these meetings and participate. Based on my personal experience, these types of meetings can be very intimidating even when they are not meant to be, especially for people of color stepping into "white spaces**. You might find that working through community centers and grassroots orgs that you might have greater luck in getting meaningful input from people. Also consider ensuring that your commissioners of color are involved in those meetings and that you leverage the community leaders in that neighborhood to help you make the invitations. I can’t speak for these organizations’ willingness to participate but some that come to mind are the West Haven Community Center, Greenstones on 5th community center and organizations such as Sin Barreras. Be prepared to provide resources for grassroots organizations and agencies to help you get meaningful input.

- IMPROVE/USE THE MY CVILLE APP TO GET COMMENTS AND GET THE MAYOR’S FACEBOOK PAGE INVOLVED: I was really excited to learn that Cville has an app! I downloaded it, but so far it is very slow and won’t load (so far 2 hours spinning in limbo). It would be great if people could vote, take a survey, or give input to the comp plan through it. My program team could definitely get lots of input that way through the people we interact with. Also you would up usership significantly if you could pay bills and tickets there! The mayor seems to get a lot of traffic on her facebook page- could she do a live video showing the updates to the process and how to people can give feedback?

4. WAIT TO FINALIZE THE PLAN UNTIL THE HOUSING PLAN is COMPLETE

5. CREATE MORE CLEAR GOALS AND PRIORITIES IN THE PLAN FOR THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE FOR LIVING, EATING AND WORKING AFFORDABLY – There needs to be more language in the land use section and map about defining not just the intensity of development for certain areas of the city, but also set a priority area for necessities- affordable housing food and transport to work. I heard a lot about accommodating visitors to Charlottesville in park and ride between high density hubs, but not a lot about making sure the city meets it’s residents’ basic needs. I would recommend setting some quality levels on the live/work/play areas. For example, a market is useless if it only serves the highest income residents in the neighborhood. Also consider adding greenspace and gardening access to the pie charts as well.

6. CONSIDER HOW THE INTERFACE WITH THE COUNTY COMP PLAN WILL HAPPEN: Albemarle is also doing its own planning – are representatives from the city attending those meetings and vice versa? Has the city invited the county to be present at the comp plan meetings or vice versa? This would be useful considering Charlottesville’s urban ring an traffic pressure now located in the county as well as many low income residents that work in the city.

Again, thanks for all of your effort towards this project.

*Since the end of the Civil Rights Movement, large numbers of black people have made their way into settings previously occupied only by whites, though their reception has been mixed. Overwhelmingly white neighborhoods, schools, workplaces, restaurants, and other public spaces remain. Blacks perceive such settings as “the white space,” which they often consider to be informally “off limits” for people like them. Meanwhile, despite the growth of an enormous black middle class, many whites assume that the natural black space is that destitute and fearsome locality so commonly featured in the public media, including singular books, music and videos, and the TV news—the iconic ghetto. White people typically avoid black space, but black people are required to navigate the white space as a condition of their existence.- Anderson, Elijah; “The White Space”: Sociology of Race and Ethnicity; American Sociological Association; © 2015; https://sociology.yale.edu/sites/default/files/pages_from_sre-11_revprinter_files.pdf.
2. March 7th Boards and Commissions Work Session Comments

Individual Responses

- Social media
- Bring in people that don’t feel like they’re part of the decision-making process
- Lack of community engagement with the African American community
- Have people that don’t use electronic media
- Backbone of effective government
- Value process, not rushes to a product
- Use of posters and radio to market
- More transparent about process so less of a learning curve, start from a higher common ground
- How to balance community needs/desires with the process mandated by state
- Community events
- Everyone is complaining but not working together
- Have an action plan
- Language barriers
- Dialogue on how people are affected by white supremacy and class (social, money, education)
- Decision is already made when community engagement starts
- Listening spaces
- Don’t paint with a broad brush (not every department in city hears the feedback from community)
- Network of community connection
- How to create a common vision and stay plugged in if can’t make a meeting
- Build resilience and trust
- Note where people’s input had an impact
- Should know who the decision maker is, know what rule are, know what power citizens have
- IAPP (International Association for Public Participation)
- Private process of engagement to convey a combined or community position
- Identify avenues of communication
- Community design center no longer against
- Funding source for neighborhood associations
- Community engagement is most important chapter
  - Special constituencies
    - Under-represented
    - Youth

Group Discussion Notes

- Why are you interested in community engagement?
  - Decisions are made by people who do not reside in the City
  - Low-income residents are outside of the decision-making process
  - Concerns with lack of community engagements – specifically the African American community
  - Learn from mistakes of the past
  - Have a hard time getting people engaged
    - People who do not have electronic media
  - Community engagement is the backbone of effective government
  - Underrepresentation limited to seniors, those with low education
  - Racial justice issues – African American community
  - Characteristics of white supremacy in organizations – lack of community engagement – value process, rushing to product/outcome
  - The need for outreach outside of electronic media – need for grassroots outreach (posters, radio), 101.3 reaches the public in a different way than the government does – input from other sources
  - Find ways of being transparent about how development processes happen, to support the learning curve of the community (higher common ground), terminology and lack of information
  - People are not understanding one another
- How do we balance the need and desire with the process that the City is currently under? How do we balance the clock? Deadlines and timelines?
- Community events with working around community and collaboration
  - Everyone is complaining but not working together
  - Having an actual plan with action steps and strategies
  - Collaborative meetings working together towards a solution
  - Creating organizations and systems that lead to empowerment – through media, website, and community events
  - Having a dialogue on how we are affected by white supremacy and class

- People who are not heard and are not a part of the process and a product is provided
- Design of the conversation – format that is healthy – creating listening spaces
- There have been a number of comp plan meetings – not everyone can make all of the meetings
- Not every body in government listen to the community – a decision is made
- Underlying issues
- Meetings that feel like formality
- How do we find the tools within the system to provide accountability?
- There is no sense of the overall reason why community engagement happens
  - How do we create a big common vision so we have a sense of community engagement so everyone is plugged in and updated
- Issue of trust and mutual respect, how do we build resilience and mutual trust?
- How do we get people interested?
- Should know who is the decision-making body and what the roles are (explanation of level of power)
  - IAAP – International Association for Public Participation
    - Community designs the public participation process
    - So we aren’t guessing how to engage people, when to have meetings, etc.
- Should there be more of a private process?
- Important to know who can talk
- ID avenues of communication
- Posters – could be a system of artists developing posters
- Community design center
- Defunding of neighborhood association has led to collapse in communication
- Suggest that community engagement be the first chapter and not the last chapter

3. May 1st Buford Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. Describe a memorable community engagement experience (preferably in the City of Charlottesville).

- Belmont Bridge Mobility Fair was successful because it was place-specific, provides direct access to planners, and multiple ways to give input for different styles of thinking – BUT – in general the project managers really only listened meaningfully to their own engineers
- Neighborhood lemonade stand – neighbors facilitated – positive experience
1. Describe a memorable community engagement experience (preferably in the City of Charlottesville)

- City market
- Belmont Bash
- W Main / 3rd PLACE concept – where you find community
- Created DIY / Lemonade stand, neighborhood design day activates
- IX – porchella – ted talks – Belmont bash – every Saturday at City Market
  - Meade market

2. What are your thoughts and feelings about the current state of community engagement in Charlottesville?

- Civic – deliberation
- Democracy community building
- Visual art
- Music
- Film
- I see efforts to reach community members, in person + online
- Continue to wonder how to include people other than white people (maybe church groups?)
- Jefferson school.

3. What is your vision for the future of Charlottesville’s community engagement? What would you like to see happen?

- Educated citizens – city university
- Long-term relationship building – takes time
- Building relationships and informing citizens
- Clear chain of command
- What does authentic community participation look like?
- Feel public is engaged AFTER grants, etc. have been acquired for projects instead of during the process
- Education on policy – citizens and policy makers
- Clear, understandable process and expectations
- Build relationships – takes a long time
- What does authentic participation look like?
- Clear chain of command
- Resources.
- Need a historic resources/urban planning architect. Mary Joy and now Jeff can’t do it all.

Group Discussion Notes

4. May 10th City Space Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

- Development proposal – developer facilitated – negative experience
  - Need to engage early
  - Applicant run meetings – doesn’t work, design is too far progressed
  - Belmont Bridge – defer to engineers, not to attendees

- Positive examples
  - Neighborhood lemonade stand – informal, prompts
  - Belmont Bridge Mobility Fair – on site, multiple exs
  - Redevelopment Committee – grant was written before engagement started, would prefer engage at start

2. What are your thoughts and feelings about the current state of community engagement in Charlottesville?

- Distress in City government
- Desire to do the right thing
- Need for education on processes
- Info gaps – how a city works – needs funding
- Distrust of government
- Desire to do the right thing (both sides)
- Education on process needed

3. What is your vision for the future of Charlottesville’s community engagement? What would you like to see happen?

- Educated citizens – city university
- Long-term relationship building – takes time
- Building relationships and informing citizens
- Clear chain of command
- What does authentic community participation look like?
- Feel public is engaged AFTER grants, etc. have been acquired for projects instead of during the process
- Education on policy – citizens and policy makers
- Clear, understandable process and expectations
- Build relationships – takes a long time
- What does authentic participation look like?
- Clear chain of command
- Resources.
- Need a historic resources/urban planning architect. Mary Joy and now Jeff can’t do it all.

Group Discussion Notes

- "Third place" where you find community (bookstore, coffee house, city market, Belmont bash, neighborhood st, CE as social experience
- Wide swaths of population
- Creative and different: lemonade stand (not pizza + speak to council/PC)
- Like neighborhood design day – activities in every neighborhood
- Expectations about where feedback would go

- Format accessible and approachable

- POSITIVE EXPERIENCES
- Developer talking to neighborhood about a project
  - Timing of meeting is not good (difficult to change plans at that stage
  - Power struggle with developer as the facilitator
- Developer came with no plans asking for input + didn’t respond to community feedback
- Better to have some form of plan for neighborhood to respond
- Other community meetings they asked community what they wanted
  - Clear expectation
  - Better for developer to come with a schematic

- NEGETIVE EXPERIENCES

- Current state of Community Engagement in Charlottesville
  - Systemic forces where there is not equitable ability to participate
  - Difficult for lower economic + people of color
  - Many events are free + located close to where people live but they might not feel comfortable to attend
  - Some locations have "baggage" (Ex. Some people won’t attend a meeting at a local school because of a past experience)
  - Venabral school segregation
  - Difficult to find a neutral space. Jefferson school might be only school that’s neutral
  - Blue ribbon committee at Tonsler / Buford were diverse
  - Need to get away from CE and think about relationship/ community building
  - Festivals that are free, nearby to low income neighborhoods
    - Doesn’t allow all types

- Art is a way to connect people
- Consider guiding principles moving forward – meeting people where they are
- Who’s missing from the table, who should be at the table
  - Consider effect of time/location (is there childcare?}
  - Have criteria / questions to ask

A3-37
• Need accountability for the feedback process (citizens should know their opinions count
  ○ [e.g. 5% of the project was CE, 95% was budget]
• Setting expectations, evaluating + access transparency and visibility
• Comm office needs to explain how choices effect every day
• People have a basic relationship
  ○ Need to start small
  ○ Build an individual relationship
• Need opportunities to interact with different types of people
• Neighborhood leaders don’t support building community opportunities to hear other complaints/take in feedback
• Schools are microcosm of neighborhood
• Public hearings feel bad—space contributes to the feeling
  ○ Could they be somewhere else?
• Need to have media/technology to facilitate broad [...]?
• “build relationships before you work the issues”
• TRUST is key + missing currently / my voice matters
• Where are people? Office of social and economic engagement
  ○ Nexus to create opportunities for connecting people
  ○ Social connections

5. May 12th Central Library Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. Describe a memorable community engagement experience (preferably in the City Charlottesville)
2. What are your thoughts and feelings about the current state of community engagement in Charlottesville?
3. What is your vision for the future of Charlottesville’s community engagement? What would you like to see happen?

Group Discussion Notes

6. May 29th Belmont Arts Community Engagement Comments

Individual Responses

1. Describe a memorable community engagement experience (preferably in the City Charlottesville)
   • IX park WTJU concerts
   • Can’t think of one ➔ no people of color participating
     ○ Re-organize how we reach the public

• A lot of consolidation of knowledge and power in the city (public comment)
• Structural issue within the City of Charlottesville
• Shouting
• Planning Commission – passionate neighborhood, organized (rose hill)
  ○ Neighborhoods working well together
• People most often impacted by the change are the least represented
  ○ Frustration, hostility
  ○ Neighborhood Meetings are poorly attended, not represented
  ○ TomTom is NEGATIVE ➔ doesn’t pertain to lives of most people
  ○ African festival – positive time
• Distinction between festive engagement and civic engagement
• Be able to answer the question: What’s in it for me?
• IX park / WTJU concerts
• Discouraged w/meetings – comp plan doesn’t get used to change zoning

2. What are your thoughts and feelings about the current state of community engagement in Charlottesville?

3. What is your vision for the future of Charlottesville’s community engagement? What would you like to see happen?

• Follow the comprehensive plan
• Make sure zoning ordinances are in line with the comp plan
• Form based planning
• Public housing – responsibility to engage w/ residents
• Re-do council chambers!
• Train leaders in running meetings
• Re-consider how democracy works / participative democracy and deliberative democracy / childcare/ food/ timing/ building capacity
  ○ In neighborhoods to make decisions
• Other models
  Group Discussion Notes
**Improve Pedestrian Access**
- Belmont streets are small and could not handle more people without improvements
- Add a 4 way stop along the way several traffic calming islands bump outs and a sidewalk from Rugby Ave. to burley field on west side of street
- Need for connectivity from 5th St. SW through azalea park to Fontaine around the south side of the City of Charlottesville
- Need to connect the nodes on map with transit/bikes etc. (i.e. getting from Barracks to Downtown without a car)
- Monticello wave near Altavista B south ➔ want to be able to cross the road by bike or foot without “oh shoot of shoot”
- Cannot bike/walk safely from Elliot / Avon to Wegman’s area
- Stribring is dangerous, cars don’t yield to pedestrians at Dirty Nelly’s
- Need for connectivity from 5th St. SW through azalea park to Fontaine around the south side of the City of Charlottesville**
- Azalea park is least walkable in City Neighborhood needs access to park
- The node near MACAA/Park St north of the Bypass seems to lack substantial connections and be a bit of an anomaly. It has two hard edges with Schenk’s Branch and the Bypass, with access to other areas via Park St., Melbourne Rd. and Watson Ave. This area should further consider connections to the downtown, Free Bridge, and McIntire Place “places” identified in the handouts since it is currently isolated, or build a connection to the area near CHS.
- Rio rod trails/bridge not good
- Horrible sidewalk on Yorktown
- Hydraulic/250 ➔ poor pedestrian access, flow
- MACAA intensity seems disconnected
- Trans improve – Preston
- Lack of connectivity between parks along Rivanna/Moore’s (add RTF)
- Better non motor connections to destinations outside of the city (example: places such as Monticello)
- It seems like a great step. Strengthening community centers (examples such as CHS, 10th St. SW/Cherry Ave. Woolen Mills) to provide walkable centers could help bolster transit opportunities and viability. These nodes should consider present or planned transit lines. This information was not provided right now, unfortunately.
- Vehicle/bike/ped connection between Pedder property and coal tower
- Better protection of pedestrians on Rugby Ave.

**Increase Density / Intensity**
- 5th St. is underutilized area – why not purple?
- Another [opportunity for greater intensity ] at old fairgrounds on East High St
- Consider additional density on Park St.
- Preston should be considered High intensity
- 5th St. is underutilized – could support density + transit
- South of Belmont more density?
- More density along Avon St.
- Higher density around parks – for example around Belmont Park. This would be too expensive
- Need for more commercial south RR Carlton
- Vacant parcel at Druid/Monticello/Quarry – opportunity for high intensity.
- Potential for higher density Fifeville backing up to West Main
- Grove – opp. To see higher density housing (proximity to hospital)
- Potential for higher density in Greenbrier area
- East side of McIntire Rd. re-zoned for high rise buildings
- Need higher intensity on 14th St. NW and Venable neighborhood area.

**Add Green Space**
- How can city support mega growth n 5th St.? With pocket parks?
- 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)
- No green space in Barracks road area
- Lack of green space near Barracks Rd.
- Potential for pocket park or mom / pop store on Rugby Rd.
- Potential pocket park near Monticello Ave.
- Park south of Ivy Rd. in Lewis Mountain Neighborhood area

**Do Not Intensify**
- Rose Hill good the way it is, don’t intensify
- Rose Hill neighborhood: keep current zoning or improve
- Less intensity around Monticello Ave
- Like to see higher density in other places besides the Downtown Mall – celebrates unique areas in the city

**More Emphasis**
- My neighborhood (Locust Grove) is not addressed on any of the maps. Can’t tell what the zoning/restrictions ramifications are.
- Prioritize Downtown Mall
- The map doesn’t really reflect the value of the Rivanna River
- Charlottesville has a waterfront – not appreciated, river needs attention and should probably be highlighted as separate entity

**Increase Mixed Use**
- Would like to see mixed use at 5th St. near Cleveland Ave.
- Would like to see mixed use at Barracks Rd. and Rugby Rd. area
- Increase Affordable Housing
  o Great to have little “nodes” for people traveling off busy roads (i.e. 250 bypass) stores – high density nodes in low density areas
  o Downtown Belmont as a mixed use area is a good model
  o 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)
  o Fontaine mixed use
  o Would like to see mixed use at fry springs JPA area
  o 29/Hydraulic – potential for employment and housing
  o Would like to see mixed use on Calhoun and Locust Ave. area
  o The old kmart could be a great node for live-work-play. This could be a small Reston VA
  o Northern Neighborhoods have no mixed use / small shops

- Promote Small Business
  o Opportunities for small businesses in Downtown Belmont encouraged?
  o Harris + River Rd. has long term local business

- Improve Community Facilities
  o Convenience for services – don’t have to go to Barracks Rd. Pantops if something is needed
  o Water St. Corridor is dark – especially around bus stops
  o Would like to see a small grocery store (i.e. Market St. Market) or library in Belmont, bank branch, biking, walking
  o Downtown Belmont is unable to accommodate with existing road/ sewer setups
  o This map misses opportunities to create neighborhood centers. Downtown Belmont should be enabled in every neighborhood.
  o Tripping hazard on Water St. at Yorktown
  o Ex. Lewis and Clark at Water St. “dark as hell” Need more lights
  o Possibility of a Trolley on Avon St.
  o Need more (higher) water pressure to Lewis and Clark building (250 w main)
  o 9th floor balcony has storm water that backs. On water St. not enough capacity (250 west main) for storm water from building to storm sewer system
  o Concern about hydraulic 250 infrastructure
  o Belmont needs more trash receptacles
  o Apt in downtown Belmont ⇒ storm water issues ⇒ any way to incentivize developers to responsibly manage storm water runoff?
  o Downtown and SIA need intense robust infrastructure have (groceries, amenities) so people really don’t need cars for daily lives

- More Intense Than Shown
  o Cherry Ave. shown lower intensity than I’d expect. UVA Hospital also.
  o Surprised not to see more color on Cherry
  o Cherry Ave. off of 5th St. is more intense in reality then map shows
  o 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.
  o Potential for higher density in north downtown area
  o Harris St.- CAT – potential for stops
  o W. Main in historic area is shown as less dense than being shown (Quirk Hotel, Blue Moon)
  o Surprised at designations along Water St.
  o Areas that are shown as lighter than what is currently there – is that the intent? (ex. JPA/14th areas closer to)

- Reduce Speed to 25 MPH
  o Reduce speed limit on Elliot from 35 to 25 we now have lots of homes built close to the road and children can easily be hit by speeding cars
  o In the interest of safety and quality of life for residents, reduce the speed limit on rose hill drive to 25mph and add a 4 way stop along the way several traffic calming islands bump outs and a sidewalk from Rugby Ave. to burley field on west side of street

- Concern About Future Development
  o Confused/concerned about high intensity/density near Altavista area
  o We are site by site demolishing sites without looking at how they fit into the historic fabric. Example: Old industrial or service buildings on Water St. When doing neighborhood surveys loot at what might often be overlooked or ignored
  o Disallow appurtenances on new buildings (please look at new duplex on Commerce St. that dwarfs houses nearby)
Different perspectives on West Main and Avon – some in favor of increasing density, others in favor of respecting West Main particularly and concerns about upcoming projects Land use requirements and impact of traffic?

**Environmental Concern**
- Does increased intensity near Monticello Ave. allow for protection of Moores creek?
- Fry Springs developed property – how does that impact environment
- The river corridor north of 250 doesn’t reflect the city’s need for a healthy beautiful river corridor
- Rivanna River should be a strong asset and valued/prioritized higher
- Industrial next to river doesn’t align with citizen wants for a reinvested river front
- Want to see zoning overlays specific for the river

**Increase Safety**
- People in county are afraid of mall
- Rivanna Trail was scary (people’s encounters were frightening) other people

**Uncategorized Comments**
- $5^{th}$/ OAK area is area needed to be looked at
- Emmet St. density btw barracks and Old Ivy Rd. should reflect UVA plans
- Alley ways (city owned but not maintained) are a big potential asset for the Belmont area

- Carlton is a food desert
- Riverside needs to be a marker on the map
- McIntire – inclusive
- I live on Quarry Rd. – not much there but residence and a park
- Concern for the future of several undeveloped lots in Fry Springs
- Small area plan in works for Cherry Ave
- Johnson village is gentrifying and changing demographics in schools
- Emmett/ Ivy good corridor example
- Pen park – no exclusive feel
- Interesting that most intense is next to Mall
- Highest intensity appears to surround the core of city (Downtown Mall)
- Topo and density – density in SIA in bowl vs. density on W. Main that towers over
- Burnett Commons – lived in market rate right next to habitat homes
- Would like better intensity transitions to the river; particularly in high-intensity areas along the Rivanna and Moore’s Creek
- Rose hill office building discussed in terms of size/ bulk
- West Main will help define what we are building
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