

# Cherry Avenue Small Area Plan

## Community Think Tank

May 24<sup>th</sup> @ 6pm

Meeting Notes

### Attendees:

#### Think Tank Members

Willow Gale  
Brooks Hefner  
Natasha Sienitsky  
Carmelita Wood

Sarah Malpass  
Nancy O'Brian  
Rydell Payne

#### Staff

Chip Boyles  
Missy Creasy  
Will Cockrell  
Julian Hyter  
Nick Morrison  
Kristian Zimmerman

### **LESSONS LEARNED DISCUSSION**

**6:00-6:25**

---

Will opened the discussion on the project reset and then turned it over to Think Tank Members

Nancy stated that she had used bar charts with roles and responsibilities and the past and that they had worked well

Brooks echoed what Nancy said, and added that he was disappointed in the turnout at the March event and that more time is needed to properly plan for such events. Part of the reason this event was to be first was to get people that normally aren't at the table to get involved. He also added that he had some concerns over the Better Block event- it's not a great time of year and it's a lot of space to cover, noting that it may need to be scaled back

Will said that the focus was to get the event right, and adjustments would be made to scope and timing to ensure that

Natasha had similar concerns to Brooks, stating that she felt like at the Better Block walking tour that we were pretty far from realizing our goal. It takes planning and figuring out what exercises will achieve the desired goals. She added that she would like to see a cohesive process that builds on the prior work accomplished at meetings, events, etc. The challenge is how to get the important feedback, take a step back and then figure out what we want and what are the important bits

Sarah agreed with other Think Tank members. She added that more conversation should occur around the language of the charts on roles and responsibilities. She also wanted to know more about the design by committee statement in the lessons learned document

Brooks said that the group met about how the March event would be structured and felt like it didn't turn out how he initially thought it would

Willow stated that she had frustrations with spending time discussing past issues raised at past meetings and not digging into the work of what the group is trying to accomplish and said that she was not sure she wanted to be involved in the process anymore. She also had some concerns on the timeline

Missy said that there's some wiggle room but that there is an endpoint and we need to be making progress and moving in the right direction

Willow said that a group for the Rio/29 project came to the Library with maps and posters on the project to solicit feedback from the community. She said it was a great way to get people to respond to deliverables and that we should pursue similar avenues

Sarah added that the intent of the schedule with the focus groups was to build on one another. She added that Alisa noted that the Think Tank has representation from diverse geographic areas of the Fifeville neighborhood

### **GROUP STRUCTURE**

**6:25-6:37**

Will spoke about the role and goal of the focus groups and how the Think Tank will help set the agendas for the focus groups. They will identify the issues and the technical group will help with implementation and provide feedback on ideas

Missy went into more detail on the technical committee's role

Nancy asked what exactly setting the agenda for the focus groups would entail and what were we trying to accomplish with them

Natasha had a question about the role flow chart, asking how the City and the TJPDC connect to the rest of the groups

Sarah suggested adding broader community events to the role chart so that we can show that this is an open process

Willow said that she has neighbors that have lived in the neighborhood for 25 years and asked how we engage with them. Will said that if she would share their contact information and set up a meeting time that we would come and sit down with them

### **STUDENT WORK DISCUSSION**

**6:38-7:25**

Will introduced the student work as part of the deliverables, but not the entire deliverable set. They were points of data. He then asked Think Tank members if they had any takeaways from the work.

Nancy said that she was concerned that the work was analyzed by the computer and not by actual observation of the neighborhood. She also noted some grammatical errors and that her comfort level with building on the student work as a foundation was not as high as she would like

Rydell had a question on how they took into account the Greenstone on 5<sup>th</sup> neighborhood into the analysis

Sarah said that the analysis using census block data contradicted the assessment data

Brooks noted that included what pressures would cause people to leave and how do we keep them and their families in the neighborhood

Rydell said that the responses may be different for renters versus owners and noted that rents are rising in the neighborhood

Willow asked who made the definitions for the housing conditions

Rydell said that the data skews and doesn't take into consideration the secondary and tertiary areas of the neighborhood and added that we should look at what housing is being rented and what of that needs improvement

Natasha said that we should look at the zoning map from the City and noted that the corner of Roosevelt and Cherry has more of the CH zoning designation and could become denser and that it would be good to get feedback on building heights

Sarah said that sending a focus group schedule so that Think Tank members could attend would be helpful

Brooks asked what policy solutions exist related to generating affordable housing and what was possible

Sarah added that we should look at the tools available to achieve more affordability

Nancy asked how we could maintain affordability

Missy talked about City-wide efforts to address affordability housing and that the vacancy rate below 1% complicates things

Sarah had questions related to the focus groups and how the technical group and focus groups differed

Discussion then turned to transportation

Brooks noted issues related to the tight turn at 7 ½ St. and sight line issues as well as the location of a bus stop along Cherry and the turn into the ice cream store

Nancy said that the network of 1-way streets, speed limits not being enforced, and flow improvement at peak travel times may be hard to improve.

Chip said that a future study of the Ridge, Cherry, 5<sup>th</sup> St. Extended intersection would provide more detail and opportunities for improvement

Sarah said that it would be helpful to get a sense of where there are opportunities with land use and that an ownership map that is color-coded that shows where public land is would be beneficial

Sarah asked what tools the City had for a catalyst project and that if there were any projects that could shift the development pattern

Kristian opened with a discussion on Better Block

Brooks said that more families would be here in the fall and not July

Sarah said that taking a step back to try and understand what we want the Better Block event to be would be useful and that she felt like we were talking about things too early to actually test recommendations

Brooks asked if there was a problem with pushing it back

Carmelita suggested holding the event around when school starts

Nancy asked exactly what are we putting out for the community to respond to and how to accomplish that in so little time

Brooks suggested that the event could be tied into the existing basketball events

Sarah said that the community events need to be intentional on how they build on one another