

Workshop #2 Recap

The format of the second workshop differed from the first. Whereas the first workshop was organized to generate creative thought and provide a more intimate setting to get to know the redevelopment team, the second workshop was formatted to collect unbiased, independent thoughts around specific design topics, while providing opportunities for dialogue through a larger group discussion/Q&A. While the first workshop's objective was to introduce the redevelopment team, the developer's objectives, and understand what topics were important for stakeholders to discuss throughout the masterplanning process, the second workshop's objective was more focused on receiving specific feedback on specific topics demonstrated through the presentation of four different concepts. This feedback and the resulting discussion will be used to shape a proposed development concept that will be presented at the next workshop.

The workshop began with Brian Horton, Urban Planner with Zeilder Architects providing a recap of the first workshop's intent, outcomes and relevancy to the presentation that attendees would see that evening. In response to the amount of feedback received in the first workshop around transportation/traffic concerns, Western Securities brought Transportation Engineer, Bruce Nelligen, to present specific transportation/traffic items pertinent to the masterplanning process and the approved TIA.

Following the transportation discussion, architect/design team lead, Nathan (Nate) Cherry of RTKL presented four masterplan concepts and asked attendees to vote on questions using an electronic remote control. Prior to voting, Nate took questions from attendees in an open floor, timed Q&A format.

The electronic voting technology is a timed voting system that does not allow for multiple voting. Results are only representative of the attendees who chose to vote on a particular question as some chose to not vote at all or did not vote within the time allocation.

The first two questions that attendees were asked to vote on were test questions to help familiarize attendees with the technology and its function. The other questions were as follows:

Question 2: What type of intersection do you prefer?

Question 3: Do you think the complete street concept as required by the ARP for Uxbridge Dr is a good idea for the district?

Question 4: Which Option has the best interface with the community?

Question 5: Which Option provides the best retail experience?

Question 6: Which type of pedestrian amenity is most important to you?

Question 7: Which option provides the best open space?

Question 8: Do you agree that all the options provide the potential for good connectivity?