

Process

Phase 1

During Phase 1 of the project, the UDA team met with focus groups to learn first-hand their perceptions of community issues, the strengths and weaknesses of the Study Area, and their visions for the future. The focus groups included residents, major employers, service institutions (churches, schools, social services), building owners and real estate brokers, merchants, City staff, the Mayor, and members of Council. A public meeting was held on 24 April 2005 at the G.A. Treakle Elementary School. All participants at the focus groups and the public meeting were asked the same three questions:

- What are the strengths, or good things, about South Military Highway?
- What are the weaknesses, or bad things, about South Military Highway?
- What is your vision for the future of South Military Highway?

In addition, each participant was asked to place colored dots on a map identifying good places (green dots), bad places (red dots), and places where things can improve (blue dots).

The images and charts on the following pages summarize the responses to the three questions and the dot exercise.

Prior to the design charrette in May 2005, a one-day working session was held with key members of the client group at UDA's office in Pittsburgh to review the data analysis and drawings produced by UDA and KHA.

Phase 2

The second phase of the planning process included an intense three-day working session in Chesapeake in which the design and development principles developed in the first phase were translated into a series of design alternatives. The focus groups and steering committee were re-convened throughout the Charrette and design ideas were presented and refined. On Thursday evening a public meeting was held at G.A. Treakle Elementary School where design alternatives were presented. Attendees were invited to comment on what they liked and disliked about the alternatives.

Phase 3

The third phase included developing a preferred plan and an implementation plan which identifies sources and uses of funds and phasing. This report was presented to City Council December 21, 2005.



STRENGTHS

- Central location and access to the region
- Strong Market: rooftops, employees, traffic volumes, and Deep Creek
- Loyal and established surrounding neighborhoods
- Historic sense of place
- Redevelopment opportunities



WEAKNESSES

- Traffic: trucks, dangerous intersections, poorly timed signals, feeder roads, no sidewalks
- Nuisance uses intermingling with the neighborhoods
- Lack of service retail for the community
- Unattractive. Poorly maintained businesses and infrastructure



- VISIONS**
- Improved road with better access and circulation
 - Healthy businesses serving the community
 - Better enforcement and compliance with codes
 - Access to parks and open spaces
 - Coordinated design of infrastructure and private development

