

**Centers, Corridors and Wedges Advisory Group Meeting #1 –  
Summary Notes  
December 9, 2008**

**General Group Discussion Summary**

1. Web site link for survey not working
2. Have we compared Charlotte to Other cities?
3. Need more specific definitions – more subareas identified, especially on map
4. Low participation on survey
5. Need balance between “vagueness” and “specificity”
6. Why aren’t Albermarle and Providence Roads listed as Corridors
7. Plan seems transportation driven
8. Who decides how neighborhoods transition? For example, the Elizabeth Neighborhood

**Break-Out Group 1 Discussion Summary**

1. Low participation in survey – difficult to find on Planning website; link did not always work – how can we get more response; low participation in workshops
2. This document is too general a plan to be used for specific geographies; need to link to other plans and make sure is consistent, not conflicting
3. Which plan trumps? Centers, Corridors and Wedges? Area Plans? Many area plans out of date
4. Was New Brooklyn study (along Beatties Ford Road) incorporated into this plan? Was it considered when Centers, Corridors and Wedges was developed?
5. Why aren’t Albemarle and NC16 identified as growth corridors? These seem to have the requisite elements needed to be defined as a corridor. Why not develop a concept for Community Corridors?
6. How is this document a plan? it’s a ‘vision statement’ that guides other plans; it functions as a framework

7. Document is “dangerous;” it can be (will be) misinterpreted (especially by the development community)
8. The document seems to be very ‘transportation driven;’ was the document produced to get transportation –friendly (and transit-friendly) decisions?
9. It looks like the document has been set up so that transportation access and movement will always trump ‘livability,’ particularly in Corridors (and to some degree, Wedges)
10. Will economic decisions trump livability? How do we address gentrification and transportation needs pressure?
11. Who decides what the balance is?
12. Neighborhood transitions - How can we best guide development and maintain livability as the area grows
13. “activities” and “accessibility” are too vague (guiding principles)
14. How to prioritize infrastructure improvements to improve accessibility in neighborhoods inside ‘Corridors’ – we feel threatened by the designation; would rather be in a Mixed Use Center than in a Corridor because would feel less threatened by the transportation improvements for a Center
15. Corridors are also threatening other areas - Many important corridors that aren’t labeled as formal Growth Corridors are also experiencing negative pressure from growth; how will these be handled?

The most important four items:

1. Vague document for specific geographies
2. What do terms mean?
3. Lack of necessary coordination between this document and other plans
4. Neighborhoods threatened by ‘Corridor’ designation

### **Break-Out Group 2 Discussion Summary**

1. Guiding Principles
  - Add concept about affordable housing - maybe add this concept to the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet (Quality and livable neighborhoods with a range of residential opportunities to accommodate a diverse population)

All deal with growth and development but first one (Empowered, informed and engaged citizenry) doesn’t fit with these

Second principle (High quality community design ) – who’s community are we referring to, perhaps change it to something like “High quality community-based design” – this would,

perhaps be a way to get at the principal of “empowered, informed and engaged citizenry” without a separate bullet

- Many of the principles seem to conflict/compete – concern is also that as we try to balance these competing interests and achieve the principles, the Wedges will get left out and not get the same attention/benefit that the Corridors and Centers receive

2. Like that Wedges have been incorporated into the updated document
3. Not sure we understand why we should be doing this? It seems like this is one plan among many? Does this one hold more weight, or have funding associated with it for implementation? Does anyone really care that we have this plan – will they follow it, and will it include the input from the advisory group?
4. Understand that the document is broad, but as we read it, we keep wanting it to provide more specifics, more definition. It is a good general plan that mentions all the things that seem to be important (such as environment), but things are not very defined. This is true especially for the general Corridor areas. It would help to provide more direction for these areas, or at least show where they are located on a map.
5. Seems to be a lot of ambiguity in some definitions
6. Would help a lot if we could show the subareas on a map – i.e., transit stations, interchange areas, general corridor areas
7. The guiding principles are good if the area plans coming from them will have more weight (i.e., they will provide the specific recommendations and be relied on for decision making)
8. Need to remember that although making areas more viable will have positive economic impacts, there will also be costs involved – not just the cost for the individual development, but also for the City
9. Why is the framework a wagon wheel with linear corridors radiating from the center? Linear corridors seem to bisect neighborhoods. Why are not Centers connected by Corridors?
10. Need to engage more citizens (and the development industry). Should have been more participation in the survey