

## CITY OF CEDAR RAPIDS AREA MEETING #2

### Barriers to Opportunities

The following is a list of barriers to opportunities presented by participants in the South 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.

#### **Flood Protection (21)**

- Floodwall (5)
  - How high is it?
  - Visual barrier in neighborhoods
  - How far down river?
  - Not protecting Rompot
- Flood protections issues (4)
- Lack of flood protection/cost of flood insurance may keep people away (3)
- What is interim flood protection? (3)
  - Current lack of confidence
  - People need affordable flood insurance
  - National program
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Redevelopment impacted by loss of parking due to proposed flood mitigation (2)
- Know how to be involved in making the floodwalls look attractive (2)
- Floodwall system could be a huge barrier to connect (1)
  - Use them as a gateway
- Flood mitigation plan takes away too much property on the West side of river and may not protect the East side and Rompot (1)

#### **Unclear Costs Prohibit Bold Action (15)**

- Dam impedes ability to use river for recreational uses near Czech Village to New Bohemia (low water) (2)
- Space – row for trails(1)
- Cost to rebuild lost structures as they look (4)
  - Solid brick buildings
  - New Crandic train bridge
- Money (3)
- Empty houses are eyesores (2)
  - Hesitancy to invest
- Housing costs more to rebuild than repair (1)
- Need plan to finance and sustain new housing (1)

- Transparency (1)

### **Unfriendly Zoning Building Codes (10)**

- Zoning and building codes are unfriendly (3)
- Trying to balance multiple uses that compete with each other (2)
- Misunderstanding of density (2)
- More understanding of “mixed use” (2)
- Time/building schedule (1)

### **No clarity about the Future Undermines Action (9)**

- Uncertainty (5)
- Disjointed start/stop; no flow (2)
- Fear of Change (1)
- Our attitude is a barrier (1)

### **Restructure to Incorporate Brownfields in the Future (8)**

- Cleaning up brownfields for parkland (4)
- Clean-up expense of Sinclair (3)
- Sinclair Landfill - Public health issues to use space (1)

### **Reluctance to Get Engaged and Involved (6)**

- Absence of critical mass (2)
- Attract younger ages (2)
- Social Economic (1)
- Getting people involved (1)

### **Identification with “the way it was” impedes future practicality (5)**

- Moving the museums loses identity (2)
- Pre-conceived idea of what Oakhill – Jackson actually is (1)
- Loss of landmark attractions (1)
- How two identities of New Bohemia and Czech Village become solid (1)

### **Other Barriers**

- Safety and security with multi-family
- Concentration of resources in Downtown
- River splits East and West side
- No ideas for Sinclair/ landfill - want a beacon
- Getting people to use mass transit/share the road
- East / West - mental
- Know how to get involved in flood wall Design Center
- Utilize 16th Ave. Bridge for community events
- Removable floodwall is opportunity – wall storage to be close
- HC access if elevating structures
- Landfill should be a park
- Methane is a barrier

- Housing would be more difficult
- Czech village to be pedestrian only
- PED. Connect to new BO w/ Bus, Trolley
- Bike trails should not deal with vehicular traffic
- Move from Down town to river
- Make buses smaller – not enough riders
- Daytime orientation to Czech village, Nighttime at 3rd St.
- Truck traffic – going to Cargill staging area for Penford
- Rules (red tape) for community events
- Bridge across Wilson Ave.
- Uncertainty
- Cleaning up Brownfields
- Zoning and Building Codes are unfriendly (to infill)
- Perceived cultures
- Absence of critical mass, need more understanding of mixed use
- Time
- Staff resources
- Permission to rebuild in historic district
- Difficulty in relocation of structures
- Need professional development plan
- Handicapped accessibility for facilities
- Change in demographic living in Czech Village and New Bo.
- Preconceptions of Zoning and mixed use
- Since single family housing preferred
- Single family rental next best
- Multi-family undesirable – lose small town feeling
- Who would move back to Czech village?
- Lack of age diversity
- Current state of the economy limiting investment and redevelopment
- Loss of long term residents/culture
- Getting people to work together
- How houses are built – front porches
- Having local businesses
- Encourage to come back
- Rebuild
- Start new
- Connectivity
- Uses of the river
- Boat Access
- Docks
- Recreation
- Need bridge to connect to Rompot Area
- Attract people to public transit
- Truck routes/Traffic

- Economic Pros & Cons
- Balance different, needs unilateral benefit
- Recreation center in Landfill/Sinclair/other open areas - health concerns of building on Brownfields
- Unknown contaminants in ground/water
- Balance improvements on both new Bo and Czech Village
- Need to find common ground between Czech Village and new Bohemia (combine/connect the two area)
- New name?
- Lack of housing to bring people into area
- Loss of long term residents/culture
- Round house
- Historic buildings
- Closure/more decisions made by now
- Flood protection for Rompot
- Need more info regarding flood protection
- Health and safety concerns on un-inspected homes
- Info on where they can locate
- Walkway over 12th Ave & 9th St
- Safety concerns of vehicle speeds on 12th Ave.
- 5th St & 6th St - truck route traffic through residential area
- Making use of Rock Island bridge for direct trail crossing
- Additional bridge access to Rompot

## Evaluation Criteria

The following is a list of evaluation criteria proposed by participants from the South 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**

- Affordable housing (utilities and price) that is still visually appealing (7)
- Energy efficient buildings that are still affordable (6)
- Needs to be economically feasible/affordability for present residents (6)
- Mix of housing/ variety of style (6)
- Need to keep character of the neighborhoods pre-flood with variety of setbacks and local small businesses (3)
- Compatible housing - styles that fit / match (3)
- Mix of segregate housing? (3)
- Does this help people rebuild? (3)

- Does it create a safe / inviting neighborhood? (2)
- Are they marketable? It will pass if you can get the subsidies (2)
- Replacement housing (none shown) all new (1)
- Replacement housing for whom? (1)
- What is cost of replacement housing?(1)
- Timing - how soon can we have it available?
- Is the housing sustainable over time?
- Is it stable for the long haul?
- Is there housing for extended stay?( Conventional Residence/short- term residence)
- What type of housing is appropriate to surroundings?
- Mix of housing sizes / types
- Economically feasible
- Business
- Housing that has front porches
- Housing that maintains the character and culture of the neighborhood design style
- Specialized contractors capable of maintaining ethnic aspects of buildings

### **Business Revitalization**

- Does it encourage pedestrian traffic? (4)
- Giant parking lots don't connect
- Is it integrated with residents' options? (3)
- Does business help or hurt neighborhood? (3)
- Does business overpower neighborhood? (3)
- Size of building should be small to match neighborhood scale
- Height should be minimal
- Not too many –good ratio of business to residential
- Pedestrians/bicycles movement thru area have a “friendly feel” (1)
- It doesn't ask about missed uses, retail below on street level/ housing above
- Specialized contractors available to maintain original ethnic aspects of buildings
- Not manageable, how would you evaluate it?

### **Connectivity and Open Space**

- Play spaces for kids (3)
- Town square/ park-like area, abundance of trees, coolness/shade (3)
- Design leads to slower speeds (2)
- Is it designed according to smart growth and sustainable design? (2)
- Can it be maintained –we have winter (2)
- Trees, Green stuff not plain sidewalks, curved concrete (1)
- Park benches (rest areas) (1)
- Handicap accessibility needs at fit in evaluation criteria(1)
- Tree canopy (1)

- How does neighborhood connect to other areas? (1)
- Pedestrian access to retail and open (green) spaces (4)
- No vehicular need
- Good auto connection with on street parking (1)
- Cannot tell from photos what are met needs (2)
- On street parking (1)
- Bike racks
- Comfort and pleasant?
- Transit connections not accommodated
- Doesn't show trail
- Not enough space
- Comfortable pleasant wide sidewalks
- Paved bike trails, well maintained/ good condition/ sized appropriately
- Good bus shelters (clean and well maintained)
- Convenient bus routes (quick from place to place)
- Easy access to major roads, safe intersections, good signage
- Convenient parking
- More benches / planters
- Well lit, decorative lighting
- Inviting sidewalks with walkability from place to place
- Water connection – better use of the river
- Does the plan preserve existing open spaces/parks
- Good bike and pedestrian, space for bikes, with main thoroughfare
- Open spaces seem private – pictures – (bad)
- Does meet the need of the immediate area?
- Didn't see a lot of open space –(bad)