

## Appendix A – Public Involvement Report

## Brookman Road Concept Plan Public Involvement Report

Prior to beginning the Brookman Road Concept Plan project, the City developed a public involvement plan to engage and inform as many property owners and citizens as possible. The Plan included providing multiple opportunities for formal and informal comments. The plan included the formation of a steering committee consisting of property owners, residents, agencies and representatives from boards and commissions; public open house meetings, monthly updates in the gazette, and regular web updates.

The following is a detail of the multiple outreach actually provided through this process.

	date	Comment
Mailers to property owners in the Brookman Road area	March 23, 2007	
Article in Gazette regarding "kick-off" and soliciting applications for steering committee		
Council forms Steering Committee and formally authorizes contract	April 3, 2007	
Mailer to property owners in area and within 100 feet announcing project kick-off	May 23, 2007	Included scheduled steering committee and public open house dates as well as web address
Steering Committee meeting	June 2, 2007	
Steering Committee meeting	June 27, 2007	
Park Board meeting	July 9, 2007	
Steering Committee meeting	July 18, 2007	
Steering Committee meeting	August 22, 2007	
Open House #1	October 10, 2007	Notices mailed to property owners within 100 feet, within the Brookman Road area, to all Woodhaven HOA members (507 e-mail addresses), to the Arbor Lane HOA contact, to the Interested Parties list, notice posted on the website, on the Robinhood Theater Sign prior to the event, articles in the archer and included on a citywide post card about several events of citywide interest.
Steering Committee meeting	October 24, 2007	
Steering Committee meeting	December 12, 2007	
Park Board meeting	January 7, 2008	
Open House #2	January 9, 2008	Notices mailed to property owners within 100 feet, within the Brookman Road area, to all Woodhaven HOA members (507 e-mail addresses), to the Arbor Lane HOA contact, to the Interested Parties list, notice posted on the website, on the Robinhood Theater Sign prior to the event, and articles in the archer.

In addition to the above date specific meetings or mailings, articles were published monthly in the Archer to inform the public that this project was taking place. The City also provided regular updates on the City web site and had copies of all materials received by the Steering Committee available on the web site.

Detailed interested parties list with updates provided when Steering Committee updates were provided.

### **Steering Committee**

The public outreach and resulting input helped shape the plan. Specifically, each Steering Committee member represents an agency or group of people and brings their own perspective to the process. Simply through the SC participation, multiple view points were considered and heard.

In addition to the Steering Committee representation, the meetings were open to the public with an opportunity to comment at the beginning of every meeting. The Steering Committee heard a presentation from one property owner with specific transportation concerns during this comment period. In addition, there were times at which the Committee would welcome input from the “audience” as they were discussing issues. The Steering Committee meetings were attended by members of the public with as few as two (2) at some and as many as eleven (11) at others.

### **Open House #1**

Approximately 70 total participants attended the Open House. Most of the survey participants live in Sherwood (67%), with a minority that live within the Brookman Addition area. Most survey participants have lived in their existing homes for more than five years (78%).

During the Open House, a presentation was given and posters were exhibited explaining differing aspects of the project, including: Project Timeline, Project Goals. Background Maps, Natural Areas and Goal 5 Resources, Slope, Buildable Lands, Ownership, Market Analysis, Infrastructure, Parks, Stormwater, Sewer and Water Service, Transportation Elements, I-5/99W Connector Study, Existing Transportation Analysis, Transportation Analysis of Three Preliminary Alternatives, and the Three Preliminary Alternatives developed by the Steering Committee and Consultant team.

An on-line survey was created (with hard copies also provided at the open house for those that did not want to complete the survey on line) to obtain feedback on the three alternatives presented and the underlying goals. Most survey participants found each Brookman Addition Goal to be very important or important; some participants felt that the goals should reflect an emphasis on green development and protect existing farmland by encouraging the I-5/99W Connector to be placed north of the study area. Survey participants liked Alternative One’s open spaces and economics, but disliked the transportation and town planning aspects. Most liked the economics and town planning of Alternative Two, but disliked the open spaces and transportation, especially the Ladd Hill realignment. Most liked the transportation elements of Alternative Three, but disliked the lack of green space and high density layout. Of the three alternatives, most survey participants preferred the Western Town Center & Historic Railroad Village and Cedar Creek and Ladd Hill neighborhoods of Alternative One and preferred the Central Neighborhood in Alternative Two.

Survey participants also mentioned that the plan should consider the rural south side of Brookman Road. There were also concerns about the amount of traffic on residential roads north of the Brookman Addition area and concerns about traffic and infrastructure impacts outside of the Brookman Addition area. There were some that preferred a fourth “No Build, No Annexation” alternative.

Approximately 13 Open House attendees then participated in the workshop portion of the Open House where there were facilitated discussions and the opportunity for hands-on participation. Below is a summary of what came out of the workshop session:

#### **Alternative 1**

The groups liked the lower density, increased open space and lots of green. The street system seemed less linear, perhaps creating quieter more private neighborhoods. The groups generally disliked the limited connectivity to the north.

#### **Alternative 2**

Liked the realignment of Brookman Road. Disliked the amount of high density residential and the fact that it was “chopped up” and not consolidated. Townhomes are preferred over high-density attached

residential. Concerned about the green spaces lost between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, particularly in the Cedar Creek area. Also disliked the intersection in the Ladd Hill area.

### Alternative 3

Liked the better connectivity to the north. They liked the idea of a street on the north edge, but not as a collector. Interested in the idea of “main street” commercial area. Felt this alternative eliminates too much green space and packs in too much density. Loses its character. They disliked the idea of a collector along the north edge, due to the impacts on existing homes on the boundary of the area. The groups disliked the amount of retail and commercial lands in all alternatives.

The groups were then asked to construct their own versions of the Brookman Addition Concept Plan using “puzzle pieces” from the three preliminary alternatives. Three groups completed this activity, resulting in: One concept plan identical to Alternative 1, except with a variation in the alignment of Brookman Road in the Eastern section. One concept plan with the Western and Central areas of Alternative 1 and the Eastern section of Alternative 3, with the addition of a Northern Road. One concept plan with the Western area of Alternative 2, the central area of Alternative 3, and the Eastern area of Alternative 1.

Several Steering Committee members were in attendance at the Open House and participated in the workshop. The entire Steering Committee was presented an Open House Summary report at the October 24, 2007 Steering Committee meeting and the members were asked to consider the public input and provide direction on revisions prior to additional analysis and review by the consultant team.

After considering the public input as well as agency concerns and additional consultant analysis, the Steering Committee took elements of each of the 3 original alternatives and provided specific direction to the consultant team to provide even more analysis to determine if specific transportation elements were more feasible than others.

### **Open House #2**

Prior to holding the second Open House the Consultant Team presented the revised plan based on the direction provided to the consultants and providing the additional analysis requested regarding transportation impacts and improvement costs. The Steering Committee gave the approval to forward that revised plan to the public open house for review and comment.

The purpose of Open House was to: Update the public concerning the progress and current status of the Brookman Addition Concept Plan; Provide a forum for the public to ask questions and elicit responses from the project team; Be available to answer questions and inform the public about the Brookman Addition Concept Plan process; and Receive community input both during the open house and through an optional survey available to citizens at the open house and online.

Approximately 70 total participants attended the Open House. The survey garnered 59 respondents. Most of the survey participants live in Sherwood (75%) and close to half live or own property in the Brookman Addition Area (47%). Most survey participants have lived in their existing homes for more than five years (76%).

The Open House was a question and answer event focused on posters that were exhibited explaining differing aspects of the project, including: Project Timeline, Project Goals, Existing Conditions Maps, Natural Areas and Goal 5 Resources, Buildable Lands, Property Ownership, Market Analysis, Transportation Elements, I-5/99W Connector Study, Existing Transportation Analysis, Preliminary Concept Plan - Land Use Map, Preliminary Concept Plan - Functional Transportation Classification Map, Preliminary Concept Plan - Parks, Trails & Schools Map, Transportation Analysis of the Preliminary Concept Plan.

In addition to input and comments provided at the Open House itself, residents were encouraged to fill out a Preliminary Concept Plan survey on-site or online. Project goals developed by the Steering Committee were used as criteria for respondents to evaluate the plan, its design elements and sub areas. The survey focused on four main aspects on the concept plan: transportation; open spaces, parks, and stormwater; economics; and town planning. Survey participants provided opinions on these aspects for the overall draft concept plan and in the three specific sub areas, referred to as the West Sub Area, Central Sub Area, and East Sub Area.

Regarding how well the Draft Concept Plan met a variety of specific project goals, the response was positive in terms of meeting goals for a transition of land intensity throughout the site and the preservation of land for parks and green spaces. Respondents were more neutral when evaluating the Preliminary Concept Plan in terms of creating connections to Sherwood, establishing a complete community, providing for transportation choices, encouraging long-term quality of development, a planning process rooted in consensus, involvement, and partnerships and implementation of the Concept Plan. Implementation drew the most uncertainty with 56% of participants responding "neutral/don't know."

Regarding the Concept Plan in general the majority of survey participants liked the approach to open spaces, parks, and stormwater areas in the draft concept plan. Survey participants disliked the approach to transportation and town planning.

Regarding specific Sub Areas in the Concept Plan participants liked the open spaces, parks, and stormwater planning in each sub area. Of the three sub areas, participants responded most favorably to the West Sub Area and least favorably to the East Sub Area.

- West Sub Area:  
Participants liked the approach to economics and town planning  
Responses regarding transportation planning were more evenly distributed between "like" (33%) and "dislike" (39%).
- Central Sub Area:  
Participants largely responded "no opinion" to transportation, economics, and town planning.
- East Sub Area:  
65% of participants disliked the approach to transportation.  
Responses were evenly distributed for town planning.  
Responses were largely "no opinion" for economics.

Survey participants also:

- Strongly opposed the connection of Redfern Drive with the Brookman Addition area;
- Requested additional connections, especially north-south, with Sherwood;
- Expressed a desire for additional parks and open space in the plan;
- Raised concerns about the enhancement of Brookman Road's level of service in terms of potential impacts to existing property owners and traffic safety;
- Questioned infrastructure capacity and public facility impacts, especially on the schools, outside of the Brookman Addition area.

### **Final Steering Committee Recommendation**

At the February 27, 2008 Steering Committee meeting, the members were asked to provide direction on several key issues identified in the second open house. Specifically:

- Connection of Redfern into the Brookman Road area
- Alignment of Brookman Road
- Parks and Open Spaces (amount and location)
- Densities (overall and in the eastern portion)

- Constrained lands as mapped do not necessarily reflect what is “on the ground”
- How much “green” development should be encourage, required or provided

After discussion of the public input and the key issues, the Steering Committee provided the following direction to the consultant team to make modifications to the draft concept plan report:

- Connection of Redfern into the Brookman Road area – keep the connection in the plan but provide specific recommendation that the traffic volumes on Redfern may not exceed the typical volumes for a local street of this size (1000 ADT). If this is adopted as part of the concept plan, implementation would be via amendment to the Transportation System Plan.
- Alignment of Brookman Road – The committee discussed comments supporting the realignment of Brookman to remove the “S” curve. Ultimately, it was determined that the existing alignment was preferred.
- Parks and Open Spaces (amount and location) – The Committee supported re-locating the eastern most proposed park to the Cedar Creek area near Red Fern. No specific recommendations were made to increase the total number or general amount of park space.
- Densities (overall and in the eastern portion) – The committee recommended coordinating with Metro to determine if a reduction in density in the Cedar Creek area would be accepted if it would help preserve additional openspace and natural vegetation. If Metro was not supportive of a density reduction, the Committee recommended the Planning Commission look at either further up-zoning property to the west to allow lower densities adjacent to Cedar Creek or look at other ways to help enable the retention of large standards of natural vegetation in the Cedar Creek area.
- Constrained lands as mapped do not necessarily reflect what is “on the ground” – The Committee determined not to modify maps at this time, but rather reflect in documents and maps that the information is for general planning purposes and will have to be defined in greater detail as development occurs.
- How much “green” development should be encourage, required or provided – The Committee discussed and decided to recommend that an action plan be developed to help facilitate green development throughout the Brookman Road area.

With the direction provided, the Steering Committee agreed to forward a recommended concept plan to the Planning Commission and, ultimately, City Council for review.

### **Planning Commission Recommendation**

In June 2008 the Planning Commission began public hearings and work sessions on the plan and provided initial input that led to a hybrid version of the Plan (referred to as the July 2008 Hybrid). Ultimately, the Planning Commission made a recommendation to the Council in December 2008 which was a significant change from the Steering Committee recommendation and required a policy direction from Council. The Council considered the Commission recommendation and the opportunities and consequences of proceeding consistent with their recommendation. After discussion at a public meeting, the City Council provided direction to staff to proceed with the Steering Committee recommendation.

### Attachments:

Open House Report #1  
Open House Report #2  
Meeting summaries from the steering committee meetings  
Copy of project kick-off flyer  
Copy of open house #1 flyer  
Copy of open house #2 flyer