

Consolidated Responses to Charlotte Avenue – Richland Park Detailed Corridor Design Plan Survey conducted May 12, 2008 Meeting



Presented below are the consolidated results of the survey conducted at the May 12, 2008 meeting. Based on the sign-in sheets, 73 people attended the meeting and signed in. In all, 35 survey forms were completed and turned in as of June 2nd (this summary will be updated if additional surveys are received.) The following paragraph was the leading paragraph on the survey form:

We would like you to take a few moments and assist us by completing this survey. Your thoughts let us know what is working in our design plan process and what can be improved. Thank you again for being involved in your community and in the corridor design plan process.

1. Rate your overall satisfaction with the design plan process (amount of time, meetings, information):

8 *Extremely satisfied* 6 *Satisfied* *Dissatisfied* 21 *Extremely Dissatisfied*

2. Did you attend the community meetings to discuss the plan update?

7 *Yes, all of them* 17 *Several of them* 2 *This is my first meeting*

3. What did you like about the planning process?

Comments on Responses that marked “Extremely Satisfied” or “Satisfied” for item 1

- Inclusive – good product.
- It provides a framework for future decision.
- The facilitators, their assistance and guidance were great. The input by everyone involved was positive and the process was positive.
- Leadership from the speakers.
- Staff’s professionalism and composure when confronted with extremely rude people.
- Very inclusive, slow-moving, time of meetings, skill of staff in translating citizen input into plans.
- The patience of the staff and the graphics of the presentation.
- Opportunity for input. The plan reflects the interests/needs of the residents.
- The staff was courteous in the face of rude attacks from a local church congregation none of whom are local residents.
- Very professionally handled. Prepared and courteous to rude people in the crowd.
- Very methodical and detailed.
- Good explanations of the plan.
- That we had one – and public comments were relayed back to attendees

Comments on Responses that marked “Dissatisfied” or “Extremely Dissatisfied” for item 1

- People and certain opinions were ignored. The conversation was controlled to result in a predetermined outcome. The lingo used by those “professionals” in control was explained in a passing manner to keep “anti” opinions cowed.

- Liked nothing about it.
 - Nothing. Leave it alone.
 - Not one thing.
 - Not a lot.
 - The meetings were very one-sided. Any opposition was either deferred or not addressed at all!
 - Listen and engage sounds good, but that isn't what you do. Balance – means do what you as professionals think best. I DO NOT WANT RULE BY TECHNOCRATS !!! “Walkable” is your agenda, not the majority of the community.
 - Since the majority of us are property owners, I found it interesting how transparently biased all the staff is – it was very easy to see their agenda which is divide and conquer / neighbors-vs-owners.
 - I did not receive any notice of prior meetings. Heard about this one through word of mouth.
 - Very little.
 - Does not need to be implemented.
 - Does not need to be implemented.
-

4. What could be improved about the planning process for future design plans?

Comments on Responses that marked “Extremely Satisfied” or “Satisfied” for item 1

- Age limit for attendees – no one over 65.
- Nothing, good as is.
- From a planning process, very little could be done to improve the process. Small groups gave people a chance to speak over the mass negative folks in the room.
- Mark Lambert not being involved would be a HUGE improvement.
- Larger venue with enough seats for all.
- Fewer rude people. Hah!
- “Pre-information” that allows people to understand that this is a process that is ongoing and required by state law. People seem to think that certain events prompted this process. I think liability could have been stressed.
- More seating, later start times for meetings.
- I don't know.
- Clear instructions that disturbances to the meetings will not be tolerated. More discussion as a group would be good as it informs the community/attendees.

Comments on Responses that marked “Dissatisfied” or “Extremely Dissatisfied” for item 1

- Listen to opposing ideas. (Evidently, a non-binding vote at one of the meetings would have resulted in Metro being taken over by the Huns and falling into chaos.
- Offer more than one option for a result.
- The “professional” staff needs to gain an understanding of “our” neighborhood. We don't aspire to be Green Hills Village, Jr.
- Respect people's property rights.
- I think you should not alter anything from how it is now. If you work and own a spot of land, I think NO ONE should be able to change anything or tell you what you can or cannot do with it. If you want to go from a furniture store to a strip bar, bar or nightclub.
- You should talk to the people who OWN and run the business before going this far.
- Discuss on an individual basis with the owners.
- Talk with the business owners.
- Require all property owners' consent prior to initiation of any DCDP, UDO's, SP zoning, etc.
- Let everyone state their position and at least take a vote. No vote was allowed.

- The community should be asked to determine whether or not they want a detailed plan. Then, what details, if a plan is to be done, should be incorporated? Once that is determined, THEN ask for input on a vision. This spends a great deal of time and money to create a plan that the community largely opposes.
- This process has been so unpopular among the property owners because the plan process began without any dialogue with the owners. Why begin such a process by alienating the owners? Rewrite the process to avoid this in the future.
- Leave things alone. A few want to control others. People don't want control over their homes and property.
- Spend the public time and money in a more effective way. The city has many more important needs than this effort.
- Waste of time.

5. Rate your overall satisfaction with the draft plan (land use policy, transportation plan, corridor design):

9 *Extremely satisfied* 5 *Satisfied* 4 *Dissatisfied* 17 *Extremely Dissatisfied*

6. What are your comments about the draft plan?

Comments on Responses that marked “Extremely Satisfied” or “Satisfied” for item 1

- Looks great.
- Excellent.
- It is great!!! The Planning Dept. listened to the community's input and their desires for the future of the area.
- Thank you.
- Loved it – you have done an excellent job.
- I hope much of it will come to pass.
- Again, it will greatly improve the look, value and pleasurability of this historic part of Nashville. I'm glad there will be some guidelines.
- Very complete.
- Good job, well done!!!
- Not sure the greenway should be connected with Richland Park.
- Something was said earlier about “connecting the Nations with Sylvan Park.” Not in favor of that!
- [E-mailed response Tuesday May 13th:
 - (1) The proposed design plan is well-thought out and if properly implemented would sustain the vitality of this corridor and the surrounding neighborhoods for decades to come. It would truly become a “Gateway to the West” for Nashville.
 - (2) Given the relative proximity of the urban neighborhoods (there are scant few left in Nashville), the plan appropriately focuses on family-friendly and pedestrian-friendly concepts such as sidewalks, curbside parking, bike-paths, and shopping and living spaces being within walking distance.
 - (3) The plan appears not to be hostile to any single commercial group – in fact, one reason I support the plan is because it would appear very attractive to potential commercial developers who wish to invest in “new urbanism” in West Nashville.
 - (4) The plan carefully balances the needs of the area's industrial/commercial/transit sectors against the reality that these properties are directly adjacent to housing and community properties (churches, parks, etc.). This area of Nashville is quite unique in how close in proximity all these different sectors are able to coexist, and the plan is careful not to disrupt that harmony.
 - (5) I particularly enjoy the fact that the plan would do away with the “asphalt landscape” that currently comprises most of the western-most portion of the Charlotte Pike corridor. There must be far more efficient and attractive ways to utilize these spaces, and I believe the plan makes valuable proposals in this regard.

(6) I applaud the plan for seeking to highlight Richland Creek, which is currently ignored and virtually invisible as you drive down Charlotte Ave.

(7) I believe this plan would go a long way towards finally getting sidewalks throughout Sylvan Park – something that is desperately needed, and portions of this plan recognize the need.

(8) I would hope that business owners in this area would not be hostile towards the design plan, but instead recognize that it can benefit all who own property within its borders in the long run. The only way to guarantee the future success of this part of Nashville is to assure that plans are in place that promote intelligent growth. Without such plans, the area risks falling into urban blight which will hurt both entrepreneur and homeowners alike, as property values dwindle, population shrinks, commercial traffic slows, and the area becomes a pockmark on the map.

- Overall I am pleased but disappointed that there was not more inclusion of environmental amenities proposed and green technologies to be encouraged here; in this flood plain. The neighborhood center that is proposed should especially be held at the highest environmental standards and employ those green technologies. I strongly disapprove of any underground parking here!

Comments on Responses that marked “Dissatisfied” or “Extremely Dissatisfied” for item 1

- It is not needed at this time.
- It is too limiting.
- It doesn't use the word “Vision” enough.
- Pipe-dreaming to push some people around.
- Not needed.
- There is not enough room for cars and people. So there is not room for outdoor tables, coffee shops or bike trails.
- No comment at this time.
- Waste of time, money and resources. The councilman and Planning Commission did not take into consideration the wishes of the property and business owners on Charlotte Avenue.
- I find it highly unrealistic and quite “utopian” in the sense it assumes that if you plan it, it will automatically develop that way.
- Jennifer Carlat lacks the skills to moderate these meetings. She causes acrimony by shutting down any dissenting viewpoint.
- This exercise has been an unnecessary waste of Metro resources.
- Obnoxious.
- I don't like any of it. The Nations isn't a place Sylvan Park residents will blend with. Easy shopping for the Nations is needed, big grocery store, drug store, etc.
- Waste of time and effort.
- Pie in the sky! Metro is laying off – now where is all this money coming from?

7. When you reviewed the draft plan, did you feel it was ready to present to the Planning Commission?

9 Yes 1 Close, with a few minor changes 23 No, some issues need further discussion.

8. After having participated in the plan update process, do you feel better equipped to influence development decisions in your community?

17 ½ Yes 2 ½ Somewhat 14 No

Comments on Responses that marked “Extremely Satisfied” or “Satisfied” for item 1

- The tension in this process seems to be the split between those interested in their own or their institution’s financial gain or status and those interested in livability issues – those who want to improve this area as their “stomping ground”. I have lived in the area for 28 years. My children went to Sylvan Park, participated in the library activities, played ball at McCabe. In addition, we shopped at Sysco, Goodwill, Southern Thrift and ate at Sir Pizza and Bobby’s. I want more of these things! I have been appalled by the behavior of people who feel their financial investments may be threatened. The patience and professional behavior of the planning staff has been exemplary. Thanks for providing an opportunity for the area that I live in and use.
- I cannot express how much this plan and the efforts of the Planning Dept. are appreciated by the new and long-time residents of this community. We look forward to being a positive avenue in and out of the city. Thank you! Please do not let the few negative, destructive voices prevent this plan from becoming reality.

Comments on Responses that marked “Dissatisfied” or “Extremely Dissatisfied” for item 1

- Dissatisfied.
- This question presumes that the community feels it actually was allowed to participate in the plan.
- How can one influence development when the presenters act like they set up the plan and are hell-bent on being the implementers?
- If you insist on the public meetings, please get speakers who can be heard. These three girls just jabber. They are like quacking ducks. The man was fairly articulate.
- [response re: question 7] missing elements which are mentioned in it [ed. the response form]