

CITY OF CEDAR RAPIDS AREA MEETING #2

Barriers to Opportunities

The following is a list of barriers to opportunities presented by participants in the Central Area. The numbers following each item indicate how many dots the item received from participants – a higher number indicates a higher concern for that issue. The barriers which received dots were grouped into the following categories to identify related concerns. The barriers which were presented but received no dots are listed in the “other barriers” section.

Attitudes (29)

- Need for physical and attitude transformation (7)
- Willingness to accept less than excellence (7)
- Too conservative – afraid to fail (4)
- Distrust in community (3)
- Citizen motivation/involvement (3)
- Lack of risk-taking (2)
- Fear of change (1)
- Attitude adjustment (1)
- Fear of change (1)

Leadership (26)

- Need of long-term vision (9)
- Lack of leadership (6)
- Lack of visionary leadership/action (6)
- Leadership – community and council (3)
- Lack of vision, not seeing what could be, and committing to it (2)

Regulations (20)

- Politics/ordinances (9:00 PM time limit on street vendors) (4)
- Lack of incentive for core development as opposed to fringe (4)
- Complex development rules (4)
- Regulations (2)
- Zoning and building code and its enforcement (2)
- Require mix use of property (2)
- Getting permits (1)
- Red tape (1)

Culture & Attractions (16)

- Embrace industrial heritage (4)

- Moving central gathering places around. Ex: uptown Friday nights not held just at Green Square Park (3)
- Space for amphitheater? (2)
- City needs to commit to rebuild existing cultural facilities (2)
- Lack of venues and local events (2)
- Investing in downtown (1)
- Communication and spatial constraints to large events (1)
- Balancing of ongoing business vs. large events (1)

Design (15)

- Transform (5)
- Parking difficulty (4)
- No “signature streets” (2)
- Distinctive architecture – housing options – West Bank (2)
- Riverfront not dressed-up (1)
- Lack of design standards (1)

Money (15)

- Money (grants) (5)
- \$ -- where’s the money (3)
- Expense (3)
- Need to appeal to private monies, with a clear vision of advantages city cooperation (2)
- Plan – leadership, money (1)
- Skywalk ownership – 50/50 public/private (1)

Flood Plan (11)

- Lack of flood wall stops people from wanting to develop (6)
- No accepted flood plan (3)
- Flood protection (1)
- Type of flood control – river wall or not (1)

Pedestrian vs. Vehicular Traffic (9)

- Wider sidewalks (3)
- No pedestrian mall (like Iowa City) – we drive on too many streets (2)
- Infrastructure – streets not wide enough – lack of sidewalks (2)
- One way streets – change to two way – slow traffic (1)
- Bike lane safety (1)

Open Space Recreation (9)

- Greenspace backed to sidewalks (6)
- Lack of green space (2)
- Not enough recreational uses (1)

Developers (9)

- Lack of developer creativity (3)
- Land ownership (3)
- Need to build up, not out (2)
- Lack of support for creativity (1)

Miscellaneous (9)

- What comes first – housing or entertainment (5)
- Missed opportunities (2)
- Equal sharing of opportunities among neighborhood (1)
- Not using business industry as attractions (1)

Housing (7)

- Truly affordable housing (2)
- Location/availability of suitable sites for housing (1)
- Lack of housing (1)
- Family-friendly typologies (housing) (1)
- Housing affordability and mix (1)
- Lack of young people living downtown (1)

Communication (6)

- Lack of awareness of features and benefits (2)
- Lack of shared vision between medical and college districts – communicate and coordinate (2)
- Lack of strategic communication (2)

West Bank (5)

- Lack of vision for West Bank (2)
- West Bank connectivity (2)
- Lack of tall buildings on the West Bank (1)

Transit (3)

- Space available for transit (1)
- Determining transit options and routes (1)
- Transit routing (1)

Other Barriers

- Lack of connectivity, vibrant centers, & identity is creating the lack of diversity
- Lack of customers to diversity market place or vice-versa
- Economic development
- Additional financial incentives
- Lack of options after business day
- Lack of Information
- Consistent to Council
- Lack of involvement

- Lack of cultural ideas & marketing
- Art District affordability (patron)
- Community involvement
- Entertainment & Attraction
- Feasibility
- Security/safety issues – crime on trails & skywalks
- Downtown feel on West Bank of river
- Community negativity
- Public transit – hard to use, need smaller more practical vehicles
- Funding
- One-way Streets
- Fear of Tax increase
- Lack of space as regional draw
- Railroad tracks – traffic & noise
- Compatible housing – maintain neighborhood identity
- Nice gems buried in not nice areas
- Market & cost for transit
- Aversion to dense housing options
- Dependence on cars
- Pass demolition
- Parks vs. development
- Bike lane vs. parking
- Families identity with school district
- Flood wall against green space expansion
- What is the identity of business along the river?
- Movement of people in and out of downtown
- More curbside space
- Hard to get people out of their cars
- Better use of US Cellular (sports & conventions)
- Lack of connection to street & shops
- Lack of imagination
- Housing market & zoning
- More weekend availability downtown
- Increase & expand availability of services downtown
- Personal services for residents of downtown
- Neighborhood/residential services located downtown
- High-speed Internet access (air and hard line) downtown (dead zones)
- Communications infrastructure downtown
- Encourage and allow space on pedestrian areas/bridge for commercial areas/vendors (late tour operation hours)
- Decorative/Aesthetic lighting on street fronts
- Lighted fountains in river
- Distribution of housing
- Ability to finance mixed income housing

- Economic responsibility
- Lack of amenities
- City needs to commit to amenities
- Becomes a bigger project with West Bank
- Not previously considered
- Downtown property owners' motivation

Evaluation Criteria

The following is a list of evaluation criteria proposed by participants from the Central Area. The numbers following each item indicate how many dots the item received from participants – a higher number indicates a higher priority. Evaluation criterions which were proposed but received no dots have no number listed afterwards.

Housing

- Will housing develop sense of community through mixed use (6)
- Encourage green buildings (5)
- Does it encourage sustainability (5)
- Does it provide pedestrian access from residential to commercial and community resources (4)
- Decide on best spots for infill housing and help them it, help developers get “off the ground” (4)
- Incentives versus regulations (4)
- Defined replacement housing better (4)
- Single family houses (4)
- Good through traffic (3)
- Green building practices, affordable/sustainable (3)
- Incentives for housing (3)
- Does it promote smart growth (3)
- Provides mixed housing (2)
- Housing that meets market needs (2)
- Keep neighborhood character (2)
- Fix plan review process (2)
- Sustainability (triple bottom line) (2)
- Good mix of housing (1)
- Economically feasible (1)
- Fit in with neighborhood (1)
- Do regulations fit within concept of neighborhood (1)
- Will the community accept mixed housing options (1)
- Restrictive regulations (1)
- Economically feasible (1)

- Economic feasibility (1)
- Architectural character consistency (1)
- Availability of sidewalks
- City scale, not neighborhood scale
- Good mix of housing
- Restore what we have
- Quality of construction
- Pedestrian access from residential to commercial and community resources
- Driveways not primary house access
- Prominent sidewalks and porches
- Don't change character of neighborhood through gentrification
- Follow infill plan
- Insures neighborhood identity – maintains neighborhood pride
- Parking
- Replacement housing
- Police presence
- What is desired character
- Schools
- Is it connected to services
- Need good replacement housing
- Make compatible
- Not uniform
- Housing clustered together

Business Revitalization

- Does it meet adopted design standards (6)
- Does the development encourage mixed use properties (5)
- 24-hour community areas (5)
- Parking (5)
- If the business is appealing to the neighborhood (4)
- Good enough incentives (4)
- Is it LEED certified (4)
- Development in context/compatible with surrounding properties (3)
- Process for development – streamline – and user-friendly (3)
- Is it easy to navigate (info kiosks & wayfinding signs) (3)
- Create job growth (3)
- Common open spaces (3)
- Diversity of jobs (3)
- Open spaces promote events (3)
- Parking behind buildings (accessibility, safe parking, adequate) (3)
- Encourage neighborhood services & retail (3)
- Community is important
- Add “to be included in regional plan”
- Parking arrangements that keep streets open (2)

- Commercial businesses (2)
- Financial component is missing on 2 of 3 (2)
- Do public spaces reflect city character (2)
- Crappy town (2)
- Arts and culture fits in (2)
- Criteria – enable businesses to go forward, rather than forbid to happen (2)
- Re-use of facilities (2)
- Are incentives needed to get you what you want? (2)
- Encourage other neighborhood centers (2)
- Example is the opposite: neighborhood center encourages business
- Encourage arts & culture destinations (2)
- Yes build it; they will come
- Save some of the history & character (1)
- Sustainability (1)
- Not enough lighting on sidewalks (1)
- Not vibrant (1)
- Looks quaint (1)
- Looks like old town (1)
- Encourage other commercial development (1)
- Parking arrangements that needs and fits long-term planning (1)
- Not requiring the business to be responsible for parking availability (1)
- Encourage business diversity (1)
- If the neighborhood will retain integrity
- Off-street parking
- Create design standards that reflect city
- Promote attractive uniform feel for downtown
- Non-conforming architecture
- Encourage arts/culture
- Unique/specialized shopping
- Interior parking
- Uninviting market place
- Safety
- No neighborhood centers
- Item A & C: not a neighborhood
- Too “touristy”
- Not inviting
- Not descriptive building phases
- District identities – does it have one?
- Encourages “porch life”
- Encourages walking
- Variety/mix
- Mix of open space
- Trees/landscaping
- Business revitalization – good

- Pedestrian-friendly
- Arts and culture
- Hidden parking
- Variety/mix
- Encourages revitalization & preservation
- Economically feasible
- Understand purpose of regulation – common sense
- Criteria for Council to help applicant to succeed (not other way around)
- Regulation to encourage – not restrict
- Mixed use
- Not much open space
- Residential not broken up
- Visibility for drivers is good
- Space (lots of)
- Don't see biking/pedestrian connections
- Bicycle racks present
- Wide sidewalks
- Bus shelters with seating & information
- Mature trees/shading
- Landscaping
- Free parking (no meters)
- Bike lanes lacking
- Does it provide public spaces

Connectivity and Open Space

- Walkable, pedestrian friendly need more information on walkability enjoyable and quality of experience (4)
- Recreation opportunities (4)
- Bike and pedestrian accessibility (3)
- Comfortable streets (3)
- Good open space (3)
- Transition from one mode of transportation (3)
- Parks (2)
- Perception of safety (2)
- Good bike and pedestrian connections (2)
- Vehicular circular pattern (2)
- Good character of housing (2)
- Mix of housing (2)
- Wide sidewalk and open space (2)
- Sustainable decision making process (triple bottom line) (1)
- Wide sidewalks and adequate green space (1)
- Transit scale (1)
- Safety (1)
- Bike racks (1)

- Neighborhood friendliness (1)
- Specific routes for bikes (1)
- Good transit connection (1)
- Replacement housing (1)
- Industrial criteria (1)
- Interesting place to wait for transit
- Innovative indoor or outdoor facilities – weather
- Bikes and bike racks
- Bike friendly
- Transit connections
- Landscaping and tree canopies
- Wide signature streets
- Inviting landscaping
- Good ambience
- Multiple transit options
- Enough space
- Automobile connection already existing
- Congestion
- Need auto access
- Need open spaces
- Need to make bike and pedestrian friendly
- Bike destination (and pedestrian)
- Quality and safe bike parking and storage
- Trolley
- No conflict in traffic patterns between pedestrians and cars
- Clean safe public transportation
- Jumbled mess of modes of transportation
- Long term maintenance and sustainability
- Attractive sidewalks
- Wide sidewalks
- Good transit connections
- Good car connections
- Economical
- Well maintained
- Comfortable and pleasant streets
- Greenery