

Infill Workshop Series
02/09/2010
Discussion Draft

Topic - What is infill?

- Introduction to series topics
- Visual Preference Survey
- Defining terms and types appropriate for Columbia

I. Introduction:

Timothy Teddy, AICP, Director of Planning & Development

Mr. Teddy began the program by thanking the audience for attending and introduced the workshop series topics: What is infill? Where and when is Infill appropriate? and Infill in practice: processes, regulation & application. Mr. Teddy briefly described each of the workshop topics, dates, and potential activities, and explained that the third topic would be covered over two meetings. He said the location for the next three workshops would be announced shortly. Mr. Teddy framed the series in the context of Visioning goals and strategies and as an outcome of the Neighborhood Congress meetings held in May and October of last year. He described how the series would balance educational opportunities with a forum for discussion and feedback by interested citizens. Mr. Teddy then introduced the next part of the agenda, the "Visual Preference" survey, and described "Visual Preference" surveys as a tool to gauge group preference and consensus on aspects of design and development.

II. Visual Preference Survey:

Rachel Bacon, Planner

Ms. Bacon presented a "Visual Preference Survey" for attendants to complete and explained that an identical survey was available online through the Planning Department website for participation by those unable to attend the meeting (<https://www.gocolumbiamo.com/Planning/Infillworkshopseries2010.php>). She explained that fifty-five images of different development types and design elements would be shown on the screen for twelve seconds each and participants were asked to judge the images on functionality, design, ascetics, context or any other design or development aspect they felt relevant. Participants were asked to rank images on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning they disliked the image and 5 indicating they liked, or preferred the image. At the end of the survey, participants were asked to share their impression of the survey, and if it seemed like a tool to use in the future. Members of the audience indicated the survey format was appropriate and could be useful and gave suggestions as to how to improve upon the survey method. Ms. Bacon said the department appreciated the feedback and would make the results from both the web survey and the participants' survey forms available at the next workshop meeting for the participants to review and discuss.

III. Defining terms and types appropriate for Columbia:

Steve MacIntyre, Planner

Mr. MacIntyre passed out a handout which listed three discussion questions for participants to fill out following his presentation:

1. What does the term “infill” development mean to you?
2. What neighborhood do you live in?
3. Are you aware of property in your neighborhood that is a good candidate for infill development?

Participants were also asked to write general comments they may have about the workshop so as to provide the Planning Department feedback on the direction of the workshops. Mr. MacIntyre then presented a series of PowerPoint slides and reviewed the common definition and types of ‘infill’ development. He presented an overview of the challenges and opportunities associated with ‘infill’ development and said the topic would be more fully developed by participants at the next meeting. The PowerPoint slides presented by Mr. MacIntyre are available on the Planning Department website at:

<https://www.gocolumbiamo.com/Planning/Infillworkshopseries2010.php>

Mr. MacIntyre then welcomed the crowd to take a few minutes to finish their questionnaire and to openly discuss their answers. Participants discussed the need for greater community awareness regarding ‘infill’ development, and that interest in ‘infill’ was building. The Great Hang-Ups rezoning was discussed at length as an example of ‘infill’ which was raising policy and process questions within the community. The importance of corridor and intersection planning was also discussed as a key tool for ‘infill’ development. The use of ‘infill’ for affordable housing and financial incentives was discussed, and TODs (transit-oriented development) were described as being a key element. The upcoming Downtown Design Charrette was mentioned as a forum which would address many ‘infill’ concerns such as: What is important to save?, community character and compatibility concerns, and the need for proactive community dialogue to get ahead of potential problems.

Mr. Teddy was then asked to give an example and definition of form-based codes (which were referenced as a tool for achieving ‘infill’ development). Mr. Teddy explained that form-based codes focused on building and landscape form rather than on land use, and that form-based codes would be discussed as a tool for ‘infill’ at the last workshop. He also said that form-based codes could be a stand-alone topic to explore under the Neighborhood Congress series. Mr. Teddy then asked the crowd to mention specific examples of excellent and horrible ‘infill’ sites, and sites that could potentially be good or bad sites. The crowd shared some examples, such as the southwest corner of Broadway and Providence as a potentially good site for redevelopment. Mr. Teddy asked the group to think of more sites for the next workshop, “When and where is infill appropriate?”

Mr. Teddy ended the program by thanking participants for braving the weather. He also gave a reminder to check the Planning website for additional resources, including a great video from Sacramento, CA, which gave a nice overview of ‘infill’ development. This video is available at:

<https://www.gocolumbiamo.com/Planning/Infillworkshopseries2010.php>

Participants were also asked to share the workshop series with others unable to

attend and invite them to visit the department's website for more information and to complete the online Visual Preference Survey.

DRAFT