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1.1 Message from the Mayor

Fayetteville continues to be ranked by national organizations as one of the most desirable places to live, work, study and play in the country. Our residents are fortunate to live in an area of such magnificent scenic beauty combined with a strong economy, robust job market and low cost of living. This success is the result of many decades of goal-oriented leadership, enduring partnerships with the University of Arkansas and progressive urban planning.

So why do we plan? Looking forward, the most daunting challenge that Fayetteville and cities across the globe will face is climate change and its disruptions to the existing order. Regionally, global climate change will result in increasingly extreme weather events such as severe and extended periods of drought, extreme heat waves, and increased storm and rainfall events that will produce unprecedented flooding. Globally climate change will result in rising sea levels, increasingly severe and more frequent hurricanes, rainfall events, droughts, heat waves and flooding. As these events become more frequent and intense large populations of people will ultimately migrate to areas that are less impacted by severe weather events. Fayetteville anticipates that we will be impacted by climate change in-migration as people leave coastal areas of the south and seek opportunities in areas that are more resilient to these changes. This type of in-migration is not unprecedented as many will remember the impacts from people dislocated due to Hurricane Katrina on the gulf coast in 2005. Therefore, we must anticipate, plan, design and construct our community in a sustainable and resilient manner. The City began these efforts when I signed on to the U.S. Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement in 2012. In May 2017, I joined 60 mayors across the nation to sign a statement to President Trump affirming Fayetteville’s commitment to taking every possible action to realize the principles of the Paris Climate Agreement. On January 2nd, 2018 City Council adopted the Energy Action Plan which detailed many strategies for reducing the community’s carbon footprint. For a detailed look at the goals, strategies and action steps included in the Energy Action Plan please visit the plan on the City of Fayetteville website.

Planners often use the term “built environment” to describe manmade infrastructure such as streets, utilities and buildings. The design of the built environment is something that a community can control through thoughtful urban planning to guide growth in the form that their residents desire. The fact that Fayetteville has, and continues to develop, a superb built...
environment that also protects our natural environment is a testament to the generations of people in our community who have thoughtfully planned. This Plan update is reaffirming this legacy and specifically focuses on two of the six City Plan 2040 goals: “We will make appropriate infill and revitalization our highest priorities”, and “We will create opportunities for attainable housing”.

Thank you to the hundreds of members of the public, Planning Commissioners and City Council members for contributing your thoughts and insights to this update. The City Plan 2040 planning process has led to the development of new planning tools such as the Infill Assessment Map and the Growth Concept Map. The plan also proposes several housing initiatives designed to encourage the development of attainable housing including; creating pre-approved building plans for identified neighborhoods to reduce permitting time and cost, identifying opportunities for the creation of attainable housing on publicly-owned land and initiatives to develop partnerships with developers to provide flexible and affordable housing. I am confident that implementation of the recommendations presented in City Plan 2040 will move this community forward towards the inclusive, attainable and vibrant city that we all aspire to create.

“Don't you just love this City!”
- Mayor Lioneld Jordan

“Dull, inert cities, it is true, do contain the seeds of their own destruction and little else. But lively, diverse, intense cities contain the seeds of their own regeneration, with energy enough to carry over for problems and needs outside themselves.” - Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities

“Growth is inevitable and desirable, but destruction of community character is not. The question is not whether your part of the world is going to change. The question is how.” - Edward T. McMahon

“When you look at a city, it’s like reading the hopes, aspirations and pride of everyone who built it” - Hugh Newell Jacobsen

“The mark of a great city isn’t how it treats its special places – everybody does that right – but how it treats its ordinary ones” - Aaron M. Renn
1.2 City Plan 2040 Executive Summary

During the extraordinary growth period of the early 2000’s, the City of Fayetteville struggled with leapfrogging residential development on the City’s outer edges, commonly referred to as suburban sprawl. At the same time, the City was also experiencing redevelopment in the downtown core, around the University of Arkansas campus, Martin Luther King Boulevard and in areas of south Fayetteville. In 2005, the City hired Dover Kohl & Partners Town Planning to help the community to develop a new long-range master plan. City Plan 2025 was the result of intensive public process that included a 10-day charrette process that engaged over 700 members of the public. In 2011, the country was in the midst of the Great Recession and while growth had slowed, the principles and goals of City Plan were still relevant and City staff produced an update of the plan, City Plan 2030, which guided growth for the last 8 years.

At present, the City is once again in a strong growth cycle and City Plan is due for an update. In February of 2018 the City Council directed Planning and Sustainability staff with updating the plan with Resolution # 50-18. A core team of planners was assembled to develop a framework, timeline, and work plan for this update. City Planning staff began by developing a public outreach strategy that focused on gathering community input on what was working with City Plan 2030 and what needed attention or changing. This was accomplished through numerous public meetings, pop-up events, and availability of paper or on-line surveys. Community input was gathered at ten in-person events, through community stakeholders, and on-line. In total, nearly 900 respondents participated. Staff worked diligently to both reach the largest number of groups and individuals citywide and align the characteristics of respondents with those of the larger community in terms of age, gender, race, income, City Council Ward, housing, and other demographics. A synopsis of the public input results can be found in Chapter 2 with full details in Appendix A of this plan.

In the lead-up to the City Plan update, a recurring theme at public meetings and during public input was the phenomenal growth Fayetteville is experiencing and the impacts this has on residents. The significant demographic changes experienced since City Plan 2030’s adoption 8 years ago bears this out, not least of which is The University of Arkansas’ growth from 20,856 students in 2011 to 27,778 students in 2018. This exceptional growth resulted in the City Plan update, a recurring theme at public meetings and during public input was the phenomenal growth Fayetteville is experiencing and the impacts this has on residents. The significant demographic changes experienced since City Plan 2030’s adoption 8 years ago bears this out, not least of which is The University of Arkansas’ growth from 20,856 students in 2011 to 27,778 students in 2018. This exceptional growth resulted

What is a Comprehensive Plan?

A comprehensive plan is the outcome of the comprehensive planning process wherein community goals and aspirations are determined in terms of the natural and built environment. An adopted comprehensive plan provides factual and objective basis to support zoning decisions and, through public dialogue, express a vision of the future. Fayetteville’s comprehensive planning legacy extends to the 1970 General Plan.
in many multi-family and student housing development projects in and around the university and downtown. Given this growth, the update focuses on two of the existing City Plan 2030’s goals: Goal 1, We will make appropriate infill and revitalization our highest priorities; and Goal 6, We will create opportunities for attainable housing.

Fayetteville has experienced significant infill on large and small, vacant and underutilized parcels throughout the City, but predominantly in its core. By their very nature, infill projects take place adjacent to existing homes and businesses and can be controversial and contentious due to factors such as construction noise and disruption, the size of new buildings and their placement on a property, and the increased impact of new residents or businesses. Throughout this period of growth, the City consistently adopted policies, standards and regulations designed to ensure that infill development is appropriate and desirable for the neighborhood and larger community. This included amending existing zoning districts and creating additional zoning districts, developing and adopting commercial and multi-family design standards, and creating new planning tools for accessory dwelling units and cluster housing development. However, there are many additional policies and standards that the City can implement to ensure that infill development is appropriate and an asset for existing neighborhoods. This 2040 plan update includes new planning tools, such as the Growth Concept Map and the Infill Assessment Map, and proposes other short-term recommendations that can address neighborhood concerns regarding “appropriate infill development”.

The other City Plan goal that staff specifically addressed through this 2040 plan update is Goal 6 - “The City will create opportunities for attainable housing”. The phenomenal growth that Fayetteville and the Northwest Arkansas region is experiencing directly impacts the availability of housing that is affordable for people on the lower end of the economic spectrum. New housing development is by and large driven by market forces. Typically in economic expansionary periods, the construction of modest housing for low- to moderate-income households is negligible due to market forces that direct developers to meet the housing needs of middle- and upper-income households where profit margins are higher. This often results in the construction of an excess of higher end housing that serves high earners while exacerbating the low supply and high demand for housing of more modest earners. At the same time, job growth in the service industry sector, which typically pays lower wages, continues to increase. Consequently, as jobs in the service industries continue to grow, the
development of housing for these workers remains flat or may possibly decrease as the existing stock of housing is incrementally redeveloped. The City can, and does, impact this housing need in direct ways by financially supporting institutions and non-profits that work in this arena. These institutions include the Fayetteville Housing Authority and the Seven Hills Homeless Center. The City also supports housing in less direct ways, such as developing zoning codes that encourage cluster housing; accessory dwelling units; or two-, three-, and multi-family developments. This plan update also provides recommendations on policies and programs the City may undertake to help create opportunities for increasing the supply of attainable housing in the community.

In many ways Fayetteville and the NWA region is fortunate to be such a highly desirable place to live, work, and study. Many communities in Arkansas are struggling with declining populations, stagnant growth, and job losses. The key for any community that is growing as fast as Fayetteville is to provide a comprehensive approach to planning and managing growth. City Plan 2040 seeks to provide the framework for the community to balance growth while retaining our unique sense of place, exceptional natural beauty, strong economy and rich cultural heritage.
2 Planning Process

2.1 Public Input
2.2 Updating the Plan
2.1 Public Input

City Planning staff began working on the City Plan 2030 update in late 2017 when the initial project scope was presented to the Planning Commission. In early 2018, the project was outlined to the City Council where a resolution of support was unanimously passed. As a part of the update a project team including staff from Communications, Community Resources, Economic Vitality, Engineering, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Planning, and Sustainability was established. Jonathan Curth, Senior Planner, and Leif Olson, Long Range Planner, served as co-project managers and led the cross-divisional team along with City Administration and appointed and elected officials to identify City Plan 2030’s successes and areas for improvement. The project team utilized the Planning Commission as a steering committee with input provided at regular agenda setting sessions. A recurring area of discussion revolved around two of the plans’ six goals: Goal 1 – We will make infill and revitalization our highest priorities; and Goal 6: We will create opportunities for attainable housing.

The project team developed a public outreach strategy that centered on getting input from residents’ experiences with housing and infill development. Outreach served a second purpose of informing and educating residents about the projected population growth for Fayetteville and the realities and costs associated with sprawl development. The project team developed a survey tool that was utilized online and duplicated in a print or tablet version for public outreach events. The project team held eight public outreach events to gather feedback with locations selected to get as representative of a public opinion sample as possible. Locations for public outreach events included the Fayetteville Farmers Market, First Thursday events, the Community Development Block Grant summer outreach event in Walker Park, the Fayetteville Senior Center, the Gulley Park Summer Concert Series, and the University of Arkansas. Overall, 851 residents (as of 11/15/2018) responded to either the in-person or online survey tool.

Survey Results

Key points from the survey results include the following:

- Approximately 900 online and in-person participants
- General disagreement that sufficient housing options are available citywide
- Significant willingness to accept smaller housing in exchange for access to amenities
- Largely positive perception of infill citywide but less when experienced in respondent’s neighborhood
- Among the characteristics of infill development, residents overwhelmingly prioritized the need for affordability, walkability, and greenspace.

“In the neighborhood, I believe that [infill] helps building a sense of community and closeness from one person to another, but Citywide, I am weary of it meaning that every single square inch of underused space must be productively used.” - Survey Respondent
2.2 Updating the Plan

After documenting and reviewing input from staff, appointed and elected officials, and members of the public, the project team worked to assemble a plan framework that keeps intact the original six City Plan goals and identifies additional or updated strategies and action steps for advancing them. One of the fundamental tasks for the plan update was to provide additional tools for evaluating development proposals, such as rezonings, annexations, and developments requesting city cost shares. These were designed to be consistent with City policies and include two new tools: The Growth Concept Map and the Infill Assessment Elements and Map.

Growth Concept Map

The Growth Concept Map depicts, in broad terms, how Fayetteville should grow over the next 20 years. It is based on a series of activity centers and corridors at varying scales. It is a general map that helps form the basis for strategic planning policies across the city. It identifies key growth nodes and major areas that should be conserved for natural resources and open space. This map is intended to inform decisions on public investment and economic development, including public road and infrastructure improvements, and to provide a more certain environment for making public and private investment decisions. It may be used to coordinate, guide and inform the preparation and consideration of more detailed neighborhood plans, but is not a parcel-level planning tool. The map reflects city-wide policies to create diverse, efficient, and well-connected communities that are affordable and rich in local employment, access to transportation, services, and culture. Additionally, staff identified high-intensity traffic and transit corridors to help understand the nexus between land use and transportation as it relates to infill and revitalization. The Growth Concept Map calls out these corridors and provides a basis for understanding anticipated future conditions.

All centers are intended to be mixed-use nodes that are pedestrian-friendly areas served by current or future transit service.

What is a Growth Concept Map?

The Growth Concept Map is a conceptual map translating the vision of City Plan 2040 into an outline for connected and compact development. It also serves as a tool to guide decisions and recommendations about public investments and economic development.
Figure 2.0 - Growth Concept Map
**Tier One Centers** are the most urban places in the region, attracting visitors from both Fayetteville and farther afield. These centers are and will become the retail, cultural, recreational, and entertainment destinations of Northwest Arkansas. Buildings found in a Tier One Center include multi-story residential and commercial with a dense mix of shops, homes, jobs, and amenities.

**Tier Two Centers** are smaller scale urban hubs, with fewer services, residents, and jobs than Tier One Centers. Tier Two Centers largely exist to provide services and employment to residents within two to three miles. They are characterized by housing that ranges from one- to three-story detached dwellings, duplexes, row houses, and mid-rise apartments. Commercial uses will be mixed-use and office buildings. Notable Tier Two Centers include the intersections of Crossover Road/Mission Boulevard, Wedington Road/Steamboat Road, and North Street/Garland Ave.

---

*Figure 2.1 - Downtown Fayetteville*

*Figure 2.2 - Uptown Fayetteville*

*Figure 2.3 - North & Garland*

*Figure 2.4 - Mission & Crossover*

*Figure 2.5 - 15th & School*

*Figure 2.6 - Martin Luther King & Rupple*
**Tier Three Centers** are intended to serve the immediately surrounding residential areas and will cater to the specific needs of a small market. As a result, no two will be the same. Some may be characterized by one or two commercial and/or multi-family buildings located on a single intersection while others develop into a mixed-use core extending over multiple blocks and serving a broad mix of housing. The nodal nature of Tier Three Centers are important for providing a unique sense of place to a neighborhood. Tier Three Centers shown on The Growth Concept Map are not intended to be inclusive of all non-residential services that may be identified at a neighborhood-scale analysis. Neighborhood-scale and micro-retail locations are embedded within the general land use policies discussed throughout City Plan, not on the Growth Concept Map.
High-Activity Corridors are streets that serve a dual purpose. Firstly, they are major transportation routes for people and goods that link other routes and activity centers. The second purpose is as a destination or center in and of itself, with a variety of activities and uses, including but not limited to housing of various types and shopping in horizontal or vertical mixed-use patterns. Although appearing as one continuous corridor on the Growth Concept Map, High-Activity Corridors are often a series of Tier Two and Tier Three Centers that have grown together and continue to evolve into walkable environments. High-Activity Corridors are actively undergoing redevelopment as property becomes available, and efforts should be made to improve mobility for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit use.

Transit-Oriented Corridors are High-Activity Corridors that also represent a regional framework for more frequent transit service that can support and encourage more intense and dense housing and commercial development. Transit-oriented corridors serve to link Tier Two Centers together in a series and have the potential to develop incrementally with a mix of high intensity residential and commercial uses. College Avenue/71B between downtown Fayetteville and Lake Fayetteville Road is an example of a transit-oriented corridor with the potential to develop notable Tier Two Centers at the Evelyn Hills and Fiesta Square shopping centers per the College Ave Corridor Plan.

Special Districts represent portions of the City that are historically or currently intended for more intensive commerce. Special Districts correlate with special-use campuses that are semi-autonomous such as; hubs for education, medical services, employment, manufacturing, and distribution, and may include uses that are not well-suited for residential or environmentally sensitive areas. Special Districts take advantage of proximity to existing transportation routes, but should develop to become more pedestrian and bicycle friendly for the large number of employees in the area. Examples of Special Districts include the primary University of Arkansas Campus, Northwest Arkansas Regional Medical Center, and the Fayetteville Commerce Park.
Parks and Natural Areas include lands that are prioritized to remain largely undeveloped, both inside and outside the urban growth areas. These include large undeveloped areas of open space, tree preservation, hillsides and steep slopes, parks, greenway linkages, stream and trail corridors, and floodplains. These areas are intended for human interaction and enjoyment, active and passive recreation, and environmental conservation. Examples of Parks and Natural Areas include Kessler Mountain Regional Park, Razorback Greenway, West Fork of the White River, Centennial Park, Lake Sequoyah and Lake Fayetteville.

Figure 2.11 - Parks and Trails Map
Introduction

Over the past five years, staff, elected, and appointed officials have debated the merits of many projects, trying to decipher if the request is consistent with the adopted goals of the comprehensive land use plan. Two of the goals often discussed are whether a project, such as a City cost-share, rezoning, or annexation, should be approved to further the goal of “encouraging appropriate infill”, or whether it should be denied to further the goal to “discourage suburban sprawl”. To add analytical criteria addressing these topics, the Infill Assessment Map was created. This is a geospatial tool that identifies a given parcel’s access or proximity to amenities that are complimentary to development and serve to further the City’s goals. Conversely, the tool can identify parcels that may not be appropriate for development or increased intensity.

This map is a living document with the data continuously updated as conditions on the ground or in the Future Land Use Map change over time. In this way, neighborhoods, nodes, and corridors will build upon the success of previous projects to develop complete, compact, and connected places. A further element of this dynamic tool is the ability to score and weight elements. As the City’s policies towards infill evolve, prioritization of one element may rise above others, and the map can be amended accordingly.

The two new mapping and spatial analysis tools described above, in addition to updated Future Land Use Map and Master Street Plan Map were reviewed during several work sessions with the Planning Commission to solicit additional feedback and then presented to the City Council on December 13th, 2019. City Plan 2040 and the four maps were formally adopted by the City Council on January 21st, 2020.

Infill Assessment Map

The Infill Assessment Map is an interactive map-based tool for assessing a specific property or area’s appropriateness for infill. This is achieved through aggregating and overlaying elements of the built and natural environment that can be complimentary to or incompatible with infill.

The elements include the following:

- Street intersection density
- Future land use map designation
  + City Neighborhood
  + Urban Center
  + Neighborhood Master Plans
- Transit stops
- Public water
- Public sewer
- Multi-use trails
- Public Schools
- University of Arkansas campus
- Fire stations
- Grocery stores
- Parks
- Steep slopes and hillsides
- Floodplains
Infill Suitability

Low

High

Figure 2.12 - Draft Infill Assessment Map

Figure 2.13 - Future Land Use Designation

Figure 2.14 - Transit Proximity

Figure 2.15 - Parks and Trails Proximity
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3 Framework

City Plan 2040 utilizes the framework established with City Plan 2025 and City Plan 2030. This framework outlines the vision, goals, objectives, and action items designed to guide the decision-making process of the public, city staff and appointed and elected officials. This chapter identifies the six primary goals of the plan and their subsequent objectives and actions. The six goals of the plan were developed through an intensive public input process during the creation of City Plan 2025 and are recognized as still relevant today. Each goal contains policies that provide guidance for promoting the stated goal. The policies typically are not tied to specific time frames, as they provide direction only; however, action steps are specific measures that the City pursues to implement these policies. Experience gained since the adoption of City Plan 2025 demonstrates that action steps are accomplished incrementally over time with lessons learned along the way and are subject to constant updating and improvement.

Vision Statement

In 2040, Fayetteville will be a resource-efficient community, in which citizens and stakeholders can live, work, learn, and grow. Fayetteville will have adopted policies to achieve sustainability, to provide economic growth, to preserve and protect our natural and cultural resources, and to enhance the quality of life for all residents. Residents will have equitable access to neighborhoods that are healthy, walkable, and distinct.

Goals

The six goals in this Framework chapter reinforce the community’s vision for Fayetteville in 2040, and individually, address major concerns raised by the public. Collectively, these goals advance the idea of a sustainable community, in both rural and urban areas. The City of Fayetteville defines “sustainability” as meeting the needs of the present population without compromising future generations’ abilities to meet their own needs. Fayetteville’s land use policies intentionally combat climate change. The six goals in this Framework chapter lead to compact development patterns in the core of the city, attainable housing, and a robust and multi-modal transportation system; all of which reduce greenhouse gas emissions compared to more land consumptive development patterns and accommodate in-migration. The goals for natural resource preservation in floodplain and steep wooded areas reduce vulnerability to natural hazards.

While this comprehensive plan update is specifically focused on clarifying and furthering two of City Plan’s goals, to “make appropriate infill and revitalization our highest priority” and to “provide opportunities for attainable housing”, the following sections go through all six City Plan goals one-by-one, prioritizing objectives and action items to further the advancement of achieving the goal.

City Plan 2040 Goals

1. We will make appropriate infill and revitalization our highest priority
2. We will discourage suburban sprawl
3. We will make compact, complete, and connected development the standard
4. We will grow a livable transportation network
5. We will assemble an enduring green network
6. We will create opportunities for attainable housing
3.1 Goal 1 - We will make appropriate infill and revitalization our highest priority

Encouraging appropriate infill and revitalization as a top priority will allow Fayetteville to maintain its unique character and minimize the impacts of sprawl. By making infill a priority, the City should also consider mechanisms to ensure quality development and promote appropriate development that reflects the existing community character of Fayetteville’s neighborhoods. With this plan update, staff developed two new tools as described in Section 2: Planning Process. These tools will be helpful in targeting key growth areas at a city-wide scale and objectively measuring an individual parcel’s contribution to the City’s goal for appropriate infill. The plan update also included a survey to evaluate the public’s perception of what constitutes appropriate infill. The results of the survey generally identified that infill development that complements the context and character of existing neighborhoods is appropriate, but infill resulting in large out-of-scale buildings with a completely different architectural style and neighborhood impacts such as overflow parking, noise, and privacy are not appropriate.

Goal 1 Objectives

3.1.1 Allow as-of-right development in designated locations.

As-of-right development in infill locations can lower the cost of development by removing uncertainty and speeding up the approval process. One way to achieve as-of-right development is to prepare specific area plans and revise the land development regulations to allow for the type of growth and development the community desires. Additionally, creating pre-approved building types for identified areas or locations would provide neighbors with compatible building designs appropriate to the context of their neighborhood.
3.1.2 Recognize the benefits and cost savings of utility and road infrastructure that already exists in the core of the city and develop a fee structure that benefits infill over greenfield development.

Impact fees must have a rational nexus to actual development impacts. The current fee structure is the same for infill as for greenfield development placed far from the urban cores. Dispersed development requires more infrastructure per unit resulting in higher per unit costs, and additional maintenance costs. Development in the city core has access to existing infrastructure that is already available and currently maintained. There are impacts from infill development, but when such development encourages walking or transit use, thereby reducing the burden on the existing transportation system, a lower fee or exemption may be warranted. The City should allocate resources to reviewing and updating the impact fee structure for Fire, Police, Water and Sewer services to better balance the true impacts of development based on proximity to these services. Similarly, the City should adopt an infill boundary, within which development is eligible for cost-sharing and/or reduced fees.

3.1.3 Convert shopping centers and commercial corridors to mixed-use centers by adding residences, offices and lodging.

The infill of existing shopping centers and corridors allows the economic re-capture of land value for the developer while producing development that shortens trips for residents by using existing transportation infrastructure. This strategy for converting shopping centers into mixed-use centers has been used widely by national developers and shopping center owners. Re-development that provides more opportunities for people to live and work in the same area has several benefits, including: less daily trips that rely on the regional road network, increased support for local businesses, and a greater variety of housing options for Fayetteville residents. The City can encourage redevelopment of strip commercial centers through corridor planning processes and the implementation of mixed-use zoning districts. As an example, the 71B Corridor Plan provides a framework for reinventing College Avenue as a more walkable and livable place primarily through the conversion of aging and outdated retail shopping centers and strip commercial development. Additionally, the Tier-One, Tier-Two and Tier-Three Activity Centers identified on the Growth Concept map recognizes locations for targeting these development and/or redevelopment opportunities.
3.1.4 Promote the densest development around logical future transit stops.

For transit to be utilized and cost effective requires density; density of residences, jobs, commercial areas and other destinations. The University of Arkansas Razorback Transit is well used in areas of the city close to campus where many students live and study. On the other hand, Ozark Regional Transit serves areas of Northwest Arkansas that may not be particularly dense or have high employment numbers. The lack of density challenges the cost effectiveness of transit and the real or perceived convenience of utilizing transit for commuting and day-to-day transportation needs for residents. One of the things that the City can do is to encourage redevelopment of College Avenue to increase residential density and commercial intensity. The 71B College Avenue Corridor Plan envisions this arterial roadway to transform incrementally over time into a mixed-use urban thoroughfare that would provide transit operators with more “capture”, thereby becoming more cost effective and increasing customer convenience with more frequent buses. Logical transit stops city-wide should be planned and developed in accordance with the tiered activity centers identified on the Growth Concept Map. Ultimately, transit can make housing more affordable for Fayetteville residents by freeing up money typically encumbered by transportation expenses in household budgets.

3.1.5 Reinvest in parks, streets, and civic buildings within the heart of the city.

The tree-lined streets, parks, and historic civic buildings found in Fayetteville’s older neighborhoods greatly contribute to the unique community character and high quality of life that residents treasure. Preservation of our tree-lined streets and parks and adaptive reuse of our historic civic buildings will maintain the community cultural identity. The City should continue to utilize the Enduring Green Network map to identify and preserve high-value open spaces that help to create an interconnected green network throughout the community.

3.1.6 Encourage historic preservation and adaptive re-use of buildings.

Historic preservation is crucial in retaining a community’s character, identity, and evolutions. Preservation and restoration can be an effective tool for economic development and revitalization, achieving urban sustainability through reducing waste and emissions, and maintaining property values. Recent calculations indicate that it takes 35 to 50 years for a new energy efficient building to save the amount of energy lost in demolishing an existing building (National Trust for Historic Preservation).
Preservation and adaptive reuse of Fayetteville’s historically significant structures and landscapes should be encouraged and achieved by a variety of methods, such as public education and outreach, establishing local historic districts, accepting façade easements, and amending the City’s zoning and development regulations.

At the time of this plan’s adoption, City Planning staff is working on the creation of a Historic Preservation Ordinance that would allow for the appropriate rehabilitation of historic structures.

### 3.1.7 Encourage protection of community character in established neighborhoods.

Many of Fayetteville’s most vibrant and diverse neighborhoods do not meet the requirements for inclusion on the National Historic Register but are worthy of preservation efforts because they are stable and foster a sense of community among their residents. Many of Fayetteville’s neighborhoods built in the 1940’s, 50’s and 60’s in the City’s core and in proximity to downtown and the University of Arkansas have seen significant development pressure in recent years. Much of this development has been positive with once vacant and overgrown lots being developed with infill housing, however, the City is now experiencing a significant amount of demolition of existing structures with replacement of structures that are out of scale and character. Zoning and development actions occurring in existing neighborhoods should be closely evaluated and development tools should be established to ensure that neighborhood cohesion and character is not sacrificed at the expense of new development. Zoning provisions, such as height, setbacks, and building mass remain the primary tools that policy makers can use to preserve these neighborhoods.
3.1.8 **Encourage new development that supports and compliments the unique characteristics and economic values of employment clusters in and around downtown, the U of A, the north end, the rail corridor, Drake Field and the Industrial Park.**

There are two emerging central places in Fayetteville that contain a mixture of residential and commercial land uses, alternative transportation linkages, and employment centers in proximity to each other. At a neighborhood scale, this mixture of uses is often described as a “complete, compact and connected” place. The downtown/university area of the central city is rapidly redeveloping with residential and commercial activities and the uptown area is filling-in with medium-density residential to complement some of the existing commercial and office uses. Both districts have street network needs that should be addressed to encourage the efficient use of land and transportation improvements for each are described as recommendations in the Fayetteville Mobility Plan.

The Infill Assessment Map tool that staff developed as part of this plan update provides a general locational framework for identifying parcels and areas that have proximity to existing utilities, infrastructure and services. Undeveloped or underutilized lands that score highly on the Infill Assessment Map should be considered prime candidates for future development with uses and building forms that are complementary to the existing neighborhood.

3.1.9 **Determine feasibility of a tiered impact fee system.**

A tiered impact fee system requires new development to pay its proportionate share of the costs to the municipality associated with providing necessary public services to the development based on its location. Tiered impact fees are based on the general acknowledgement that parcels and locations that are near the core of the city would have less impact, and areas on the urban fringe have more impact. Development on the fringe of the city will cost the City more over time to provide street infrastructure, water and sewer, and life-safety services. Therefore, development on the fringe should pay a higher impact fee upfront for these utilities, infrastructure and services. Phoenix, Arizona, Bellevue, Washington, Kansas City, Missouri and Conway, Arkansas have all implemented an impact fee system where the fee varies depending on where the development is proposed.
3.2 Goal 2 - We will discourage suburban sprawl

As Fayetteville’s population continues to grow at a fast rate, the City must work with the community and enact regulations that discourage suburban sprawl on a local and regional scale. Until very recently, zoning practices have supported a separation of land uses. This can lead to development that spreads across the landscape in a single-use, low-density and low-intensity land use pattern which promotes auto-dependent transportation modes. The impacts of sprawl are widely acknowledged; high numbers of single occupancy vehicle trips, increased traffic congestion, disconnected street networks, inadequate or non-existent pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and negative health outcomes for residents. Over the last five years the City has repeatedly discouraged annexation and single-use residential zoning on the periphery of Fayetteville to further this goal. However, unless regional smart growth efforts are taken, market forces will shift periphery growth to other communities, which has occurred. For employees that work in Fayetteville, this results in longer commute times from outlying communities.

There has been criticism that this goal needs clarity to help determine whether development in a specific geographic location will contribute to sprawl. To aid in this effort, staff created a Development Matrix and Map as described in Section 2: Planning Process. This new tool applies a score across all parcels in the city, awarding points for projects in high growth areas on the Future Land Use Map and in proximity to infrastructure and amenities, and removing points in areas targeted for preservation of natural resources or rural character. This matrix reflects multiple land use policies and goals that lead to prioritizing geographical locations for development. The matrix discourages development resulting in the negative impacts of suburban sprawl. The basis of this goal is to build complete, compact and connected places.

“I support infill development because it prevents sprawl and the over extension of utilities and the over use of a car and traffic in general. If you live closer to things you do, you drive less, bike and walk more.” - Survey Respondent
Goal 2 Objectives

3.2.1 Develop alternative development patterns that encourage efficient use of land at the edge of the city, or in newly annexed areas.

Development techniques such as conservation subdivisions allow the same number of homes as a conventional subdivision, often with reduced infrastructure costs, while also preserving open space, valuable farm land, and natural resources. Additionally, the City should evaluate the low-density and agricultural zoning districts in the existing zoning code and propose new ones if necessary.

Many communities have adopted low-density residential agriculture zoning districts that set housing density at one dwelling unit per 10 or 20 acres. This type of zoning on the urban fringe allows the community to plan for, and anticipate, the incremental expansion and development of the city outward as the population increases.

3.2.2 Direct capital improvements into infrastructure that encourages and supports infill and revitalization.

Replacing and upgrading aged infrastructure in the core of the city provides improved service and fire protection for residents and businesses. These improvements can provide a financial incentive for revitalization projects instead of extending new services into greenfield areas. In recent years the City has completed numerous important capital improvement projects in the core of the City such as the reconstruction of College Avenue from downtown to North Street, the on-going trails network build-out, Garland Avenue, and many linear feet of new or reconstructed sidewalk.

3.2.3 Maximize City influence over development and preservation in outlying unincorporated areas.

The City’s Planning area is primarily under the jurisdiction of Washington County, and as such development here is generally allowed at a density of one unit per acre depending on septic system compatibility. The City should develop an annexation policy that quantifies the benefit and costs of annexing lands adjacent to the City limits to prioritize appropriate future growth needs and discourage leapfrog development. Annexation of adjacent lands could be at the owners request or through a public referendum. If large areas of Fayetteville’s periphery are ultimately annexed for future growth, zoning tools should be in place to ensure that growth happens adjacent to existing development and leap frog subdivision patterns are discouraged.
Figure 3.7 - Fayetteville Historic Growth and Future Development Scenarios
Introduction

3.3 Goal 3 - We will make compact, complete, and connected development the standard

Historically, a traditional town form is the concept of creating compact, complete, and connected neighborhoods at a human scale, as opposed to an automotive scale. Much of Fayetteville developed post-World War II is created for the convenience of automobiles. Over the last decade, citizens of Fayetteville clearly indicated through public planning processes that they desire development patterns that place a high priority on human scale development patterns. This means pedestrian-oriented buildings, streets and multi-modal transportation options. This has been reflected in new form-based zoning codes where buildings address the street, construction of multi-use trails and an on-street bicycle network, and public investment in new sidewalk and pedestrian improvements along major corridors. Traditional town form alludes to development patterns prior to World War II that placed an equal priority on humans and automobiles. As a result, this pattern can achieve a much higher level of neighborhood cohesion and land use diversity compared with an auto-oriented development pattern where land uses are rigidly separated. Components that are common to a compact, complete, and connected built environment include: interconnected street networks, build-

“[Infill] makes spaces more walkable. It’s frustrating to have to drive through a large, empty parking lot to get to a storefront. It makes one feel exposed as a pedestrian as well. I love the new infill developments because it seems like a better use of space.” - Survey Respondent

Figure 3.8 - Dover-Kohl Corridor Development
to zones that orient buildings close to the street with parking to the rear and side, a wide variety of land uses, housing types and sizes, and convenient access to nearby trails, parklands and public open spaces.

As cities grow it is natural to both fill-in and redevelop existing areas, and to develop new neighborhoods. Whether making an existing neighborhood more complete, or creating an entirely new one, it is important to keep the larger neighborhood geography in mind with more than a single use development where appropriate. New neighborhood development should optimally create places where people can carry out some of their typical daily errands within walking or cycling distance. A complete neighborhood contains not just housing, but a mix of structures and uses that are adaptable for changing uses over time. Optimally, housing types would be varied with a mix of housing densities, sizes, floor plans and building forms within the neighborhood. Housing variety within a neighborhood is important because it allows residents to alter or change their housing options as they age without the need to move far from the neighborhood to upsize or downsize. Traditional town form also values a low-speed street network with small blocks, numerous intersections, minimal cul-de-sacs and on-street parking where appropriate, especially in areas with higher residential densities. An interconnected street network at the neighborhood level encourages walking, slower traffic, and neighborly interaction in front yards and along the street. Alley loaded development further encourages an attractive streetscape because amenities and services such as rear garages, utility locations, and recycling and trash collection can occur in the rear of the homes or apartments.

Traditional town form can most easily be described and visualized through an “urban transect”. The transect is a system of ordering human habitats in a range from the most natural to the most urban. The transect is generally illustrated as series of seven zones that show the rural to urban progression.

Figure 3.9 - Dover-Kohl Fayetteville Development Transect
Goal 3 Objectives

3.3.1 Require new growth that results in neighborhoods, districts and corridors that are:

- **Compact** – via denser housing; meaningful open spaces and preserves; small blocks
- **Complete** – via housing; mixed uses; civic uses; jobs-housing mix in the neighborhoods
- **Connected** – via street-oriented buildings; interconnected streets; interconnected greenways and trails

3.3.2 Prepare a transit-worthy community: increase density in highly walkable areas along logical future transit routes, and anticipate rail, street cars and other alternative transit modes.

The 71B College Avenue Corridor Plan provides a framework for incrementally redeveloping this major thoroughfare into a series of inter-connected and livable mixed-use districts. The City can provide redevelopment catalyst by making capital investments in increased street, sidewalk and trail connectivity.

3.3.3 Increase the viability of businesses by leveraging the economic performance of appealing environments that are mixed-use, walkable, and integrated with green space.

The Razorback Regional Greenway illustrates the ability of the City to leverage capital investments in trail infrastructure to drive economic development. The City created the Fayetteville Alternative Transportation and Trail Plan in 2003 and began building the Scull Creek Trail with $2.1 million in funding provided by a bond issue passage. Additional yearly Capital Improvement Project funding of $1.3 million annually was used to build-out the remainder of the trail. The economic development catalyst that the trail provided is evidenced by the residential and commercial development occurring in nodes along the trail spine in south Fayetteville, throughout downtown/Dickson Street, in mid-town around Poplar Street, and throughout the uptown district along Mud Creek.
The Growth Concept Map is a tool that can provide the framework for transforming the 71B College Avenue corridor in a similar way as the original Fayetteville Alternative Transportation and Trails plan laid the groundwork for the development of the Scull Creek Trail spine that has become the Razorback Regional Greenway.

3.3.4 Aggregate employment into mixed-use centers with amenities.

Existing single-use business districts should be expanded to include a mix of residential, retail, open space, civic and entertainment users. Mixed-use developments create active urban areas during more hours of the day, increase housing options, reduce auto dependence, and create a local sense of place and a unique destination.

3.3.5 Continue to develop zoning and development ordinances that ensure infill that is compatible and appropriate.

Infill development can be controversial. Zoning and development tools such as regulating building mass, setbacks, and land use should be evaluated and amended to provide the right tools for planners, neighborhoods, and developers to ensure that new development is compatible with the existing fabric of the neighborhood. One action that the City should take is to develop preapproved building types and floor plans for identified neighborhoods. These could be developed through a public process with input from neighbors and developers. Infill development can also be inconvenient or intrusive for neighbors during the construction process. The City should develop a “good neighbor” policy. Good neighbor best practices would provide construction companies and neighbors with expectations for construction site and logistical issues.
“Longtime residents in neighborhoods should be able to decide if they want their neighborhood to become higher density or not. Higher density feels like they are living in a big city and lower density feels like they are living in a smaller town or more rural area as well as it preserves more trees and parks. The latter is what my neighborhood prefers. If we want various living situations in Fayetteville, we need to allow for this type of neighborhood density.”

- Survey Respondent
3.4 Goal 4 - We will grow a livable transportation network

The City’s adopted Mobility Master Plan is the guiding document for the development of our transportation system. Its vision is “a transportation system that is equitable and safe for all users, provides desirable access opportunities for all transportation modes, and promotes and supports the continued economic growth and prosperity of the city and its citizens.”

Growth projections indicate that Fayetteville will need to grow to accommodate an additional 50,000 people by the year 2040. This exponential amount of growth will require the community to make increasingly important choices regarding the City’s transportation network over the next 20 years. The Mobility Master Plan lays the groundwork for creating a truly multi-modal transportation network that is designed for all travel modes; cars, transit, walking, and bicycling.

Planning for transit is especially relevant now as we look to the future and envision how our street network and development patterns will function in 2040. In 2018, Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning (NWARP) released a request for proposals to develop a NWA 10-year Transit Development Plan. Analysis that will be completed with this 10-year transit plan includes: a demand response operations analysis of both the existing fixed route system and the ADA/demand response services, a future fixed route and ADA/demand response service area analysis, a fixed route service concept review process, a transit hub feasibility analysis, a full public reporting out of findings, and a final report with supporting data. Once completed, this analysis will be invaluable for setting the framework for a convenient and efficient transit system. Specific tasks and recommendations to be completed include; creating a baseline understanding of the current system, conduct a benchmarking analysis of other peer regions, develop specific program and policy recommendations, develop individual community transit action plans, propose a regional fixed route transit network, and develop a funding plan based on existing and future needs.

As part of a regional strategy, transit will be an invaluable asset and quality of life amenity as the region continues to develop. A well-planned, convenient and efficient transit system can mitigate against rising automobile ownership costs and increasing traffic congestion while providing an affordable transportation option for all residents. The first city in the region
that capitalizes on creating complete, compact and connected neighborhoods and districts linked with transit and active transportation networks will have a strategic advantage in the marketplace due to the level of livability that its’ residents will enjoy. Fayetteville is poised to be that City, and the following objectives will generate the framework for achieving the goal of “creating a livable transportation network”.

Goal 4 Objectives

3.4.1 Community design should precede and outrank traffic planning.

To achieve urban places that encourage and thrive with pedestrians as part of the mobility mix, the patterns of proposed development must be specified first during the community planning stage. Land use decisions should be the first priorities for cities, with suitable transportation planning to follow. Then, transportation plans for balanced mobility can be crafted with all modes of travel being considered. Planning tools such as the Future Land Use Map, Growth Concept Map and Infill Assessment Map are intending to direct development to locations that are appropriate. The Mobility Master Plan, 71B College Avenue Corridor Plan and Active Transportation Plan are then used to ensure that the transportation infrastructure is in line, and complementary, with the land use tools.

3.4.2 Make walkable, cyclist-friendly road designs with slow design speeds, block and street layouts the standard; walkability is part of the street function.

As new streets are added, or existing streets are improved, walkability can be sustained through the construction of walkable street sections. Walkable streets typically exhibit the following characteristics: low vehicular speeds, separation from the vehicle path with green space, short blocks, adequately wide sidewalks, street trees and on-street parking. The more these elements can be designed in a street cross section, the higher the probability that the street will be comfortable for pedestrians. On-street bicycle facilities should also be retrofitted into appropriate existing streets. This may sometimes be accomplished with striping and vertical protective treatments during the re-surfacing schedule. The installation of on-street bicycle facilities that provide east-west connectivity are especially important given the north-south axis of the Razorback Regional Greenway.
3.4.3 **Plan and construct multiple corridors instead of single oversized ones.**

An interconnected network of streets offers motorists a variety of options to get from one destination to the next. Generally, more streets per square mile result in a more open network and drivers can avoid the degree of peak hour congestion that occurs when a limited number of large streets become congested. Two two-lane roads are better than one four-lane road. Traffic can be easily dispersed within a road network, rather than all motorists having to depend on one major thoroughfare. Adherence to the City’s Street Connectivity Ordinance is vital for ensuring that the expanding street network is interconnected with minimal dead-end streets.

3.4.4 **Transform existing corridors into great streets: tree-lined, moderate speed, multi-modal, good addresses.**

More than any other feature, streets define a community’s character. Great streets are walkable, accessible to all, interesting, comfortable, safe and memorable. While great streets accommodate vehicular and pedestrian travel, they are also signature public spaces. Great streets showcase high quality buildings; mixed-use streets provide good addresses for sustainable commerce while residential streets are key to livability in neighborhoods. It is the City’s aspiration that the 71B College Avenue Corridor project will demonstrate that a cohesive vision, plan and implementation strategy for redevelopment can create transformative places.

3.4.5 **Develop context sensitive corridor plans for major thoroughfares.**

Major thoroughfares are intended to carry heavy traffic volumes, often at high speeds. However, thoroughfares connecting regions vary in context greatly from those that exist within the city. Often these streets travel through established neighborhoods,
3.4.6 Commit to evolving a rich menu of transit choices, including citywide and regional mass transit.

The Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission is funding a 10-year transit plan called Connect Northwest Arkansas that is expected to be completed after multiple public meetings. The transit plan is expected to include a regional vision but with the ability to be adapted to each community. It will include performance measures, service standards and look at transit across all modes. The final plan will include a technical analysis that will determine implementation objectives and timelines.

3.4.7 Develop a partnership with the Arkansas and Missouri Railroad.

The Arkansas and Missouri Railroad has an established 139-mile rail corridor providing services to communities from Fort Smith to Missouri. Railroads provide opportunities to transport raw materials and goods without using already congested roadways. And unlike the highway and interstate systems, railroads don’t depend on governments to maintain or improve infrastructure. There is approximately seven miles of railroad within the City of Fayetteville, providing current opportunities for economic development, and through the cooperation with the railroad, additional opportunities in the future.
3.4.8 Plan employment in locations with access to walkable amenities and transit rather than in isolated locations.

The Growth Concept Map developed for City Plan 2040 offers guidance to the public, developers, and appointed and elected officials for locations to develop nodes of mixed-use development at appropriate scales for districts, neighborhoods and intersections. Large employment centers such as downtown, the UofA campus and the uptown area are all located in highly walkable environments that offer bike and pedestrian access to shops, restaurants and entertainment. Emerging and redeveloping nodes should be designed to encourage walkability. Examples include: the intersections of North St. and Garland Ave., Razorback Road and 15th St., and Crossover and Mission Blvd.

3.4.9 Expand and interconnect the sidewalk and trail system at the neighborhood, citywide, and regional levels.

The trail network has expanded by 14.5 linear miles of new trail since the adoption of City Plan 2030 in 2011. Major trail projects completed in this time frame include connecting Kessler Mountain Park and the completion of the Niokaski Trail. Trail projects currently underway include the extension of the Mud Creek Trail to Gulley Park, Clabber Creek Trail and the St. Paul Trail in Southeast Fayetteville. Numerous short trail segments are also included in the Trail 5-year Plan to close gaps.

“We need more places we can walk and bike to. Less car-focused amenities. This can much more easily happen with infill.” - Survey Respondent
3.5 Goal 5 - We will assemble an enduring green network

The natural environment is part of what makes Fayetteville special. Residents treasure the quality of life associated with living in a place that offers magnificent natural amenities and numerous outdoor recreational opportunities. Ultimately, preserving the important places and features of Fayetteville’s natural environment are critical for giving the City it’s “sense of place”.

Fayetteville’s location on the divide between the Springfield Plateau and the Boston Mountains results in a wide variety of land forms and features worthy of environmental preservation. These include native prairie wetlands, steeply sloped and forested uplands, and a variety of streams and water bodies. Many of these features have been added to the public domain as public parklands, most notably with Mt. Sequoyah Woods, Kessler Mountain, Centennial Park, and Lake Fayetteville. Other open space lands like the Woolsey Wet Prairie and Kessler Mountain Preserve are held in private land trusts or other legal instruments. Typically, these lands have passive recreational uses with a variety of walking and mountain biking trails to provide access and exploration opportunities. The City has also made significant investments in the paved multi-use trail system to connect and link the City’s parks and open spaces together. The trail systems eventual build-out is on track to bring a shared-use paved trail within ½ mile of 83% of all Fayetteville residents’ homes by the year 2020, and 97% by 2040.

The Enduring Green Network (EGN) is a mapping tool created to understand areas of the city that have identifiable ecological value and would provide human and biological greenway linkages between major open space anchors. The map was created by highlighting existing natural resources and open spaces including; floodplains, riparian corridors, parks and trails, and land identified as having high ecological value by a 2010 Fayetteville Natural Heritage Association study. The EGN was mapped as a very generalized and
broad boundary for use in locating property that would have high value in creating a continuous network of greenspaces and trails throughout the City. As the Enduring Green Network is realized, it will likely be a network of many narrow and interconnected green ribbons and parks. The boundary is not intended to be used as a regulatory tool, rather it is utilized by planners to inform land use recommendations and decisions. Parks planners will use this map during development review to make recommendations for parkland acquisition and trail corridors. This mapping tool is also used as a resource for policy makers when considering and prioritizing land for preservation or conservation.

### Goal 5 Objectives

3.5.1 **Vigilantly nurture a continuum of greenspace, including:**

1. Riparian buffer areas
2. Tree canopy restoration and protection
3. Small neighborhood parks, squares, commons and greenbelts
4. Major parks and recreation facilities
5. Greenways and trails
6. Large-scale preserves for preserving hillside, protecting natural habitats and water quality, and scenic vistas

3.5.2 **Strategically plan for and acquire land that can be incorporated into the Enduring Green Network.**

In 2010 the City added the 200-acre Kessler Mountain Park to the Parks System. An additional 350 acres adjacent to the park is preserved in a land trust and contains miles of soft surface trails. In 2018 the City, in partnership with the Walton Family Foundation, was able to purchase 228 acres on Millsaps Mountain north of Martin Luther King Boulevard and west of I-49 for the development of a mountain bike park. Both locations show up prominently on the Enduring Green Network Map and are valued for their proximity and unique ecologies. Future land acquisitions will likely not be on this scale but may include pocket parks, stream corridors, and urban plazas. A network of these smaller open spaces within walking distance of all residents provides both environmental services and benefits to the mental and physical health of residents in surrounding neighborhoods that may not have access to larger, regional parks. The City’s ability to recognize and acquire important green spaces, both large and small, is essential for building a vibrant and healthy city for future generations. Additionally, the City should encourage development that captures the intrinsic value of these green spaces, whether through complimentary land uses, shared access, or visibility to the public, thereby ensuring the community’s investment in further preservation, expansion, and use of these lands.

3.5.3 **Promote conservation easements and alternative development patterns that encourage efficient use of land.**

The City can proactively encourage the preservation of land while still allowing development by creating new policies or best management practices for lands that have identified ecological, environmental or agricultural values. For instance, property owners that are interested in preserving their land from future development may choose to place their lands in a conservation easement.
Conservation easements are a legal tool that allows a property owner to establish an agreement with a private land conservation organization, commonly called a land trust, to constrain future development while retaining ownership of the land. The decision to place private lands in a conservation easement is a voluntary one and the easement may be sold or donated. The restrictions of the easement, once set in place, are perpetual and may therefore reduce the future resale of the property due to its development potential being restricted. The landowner who grants a conservation easement continues to privately own and manage the land and may receive significant state and federal tax advantages for having donated or sold the conservation easement. Although a conservation easement prohibits certain uses by the landowner, such an easement does not make the land public.

The City can also create new development tools such as low-density zoning designations (one home per 20 acres), or a conservation subdivision design ordinance that allows a denser cluster development in exchange for perpetual open space conservation of the more environmentally sensitive areas of the property.
3.6 Goal 6 - We will create opportunities for attainable housing

Housing is the most basic unit of a neighborhood. It forms the basis of neighborhood identity and contributes to a sense of place. Housing from a business and development point of view can be reduced quantitatively to a pro forma or profit-based analysis. However, a pro forma does not get to the qualitative or subjective nature of a neighborhood. The traditional residential development pattern of most American cities prior to World War II was made up of a variety of housing types, sizes, and densities all mixed with convenient commercial uses nearby. This pattern was disrupted after the war with the advent of suburban, auto-oriented development patterns that are most familiar today. Large swaths of land dominated by a monoculture of homes of the same type, size, and density is what typified most residential development in the post-war period.

Recently there has been a paradigm shift in thought within the planning profession where increasingly high value is placed on creating new, or enhancing existing, neighborhoods with a wide variety of housing types, densities and price points. These neighborhoods often have the advantage of an economically and socially diverse population that can support pockets of density that make the neighborhood desirable for transit and small convenience commercial uses. These places are also much more likely to have housing available at a variety of price points that can meet the needs of households with varying incomes. Examples of Fayetteville neighborhoods that exhibit wide variety of housing density, type, size, and price point include areas of south Fayetteville, the neighborhoods north of North Street, and areas around the University of Arkansas campus. Care should be taken that these neighborhoods do not redevelop to the extent that they drive out the residents of modest means.

One strategy to extend the life of these affordable neighborhoods, which are few in Fayetteville, is to evaluate the existing zoning to be context sensitive. If the underlying zoning district does not reflect the pattern language of the built environment, it can encourage tear down and reconstruction of housing that is out-of-scale and unaffordable. To encourage preservation of affordable neighborhoods, the zoning should reflect the community character and allow incremental urbanism and construction of missing middle housing which is a range of multi-unit or clustered housing types compatible with detached single-family homes that help meet the growing demand for walkable living.
A more traditional approach to providing housing is through The Fayetteville Housing Authority (FHA) which oversees four public housing complexes and a housing choice voucher program. It is the goal of FHA to provide decent and safe rental housing for eligible persons of low income, the elderly, and persons with disabilities. There is typically a wait time of three to nine months for FHA’s public housing units. Rent for public housing is typically the greater of: 30% of adjusted monthly income; 10% of monthly unadjusted (gross) income, or $50.

Defining affordable housing

Affordable housing is a term that is defined by the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as “housing for which the occupant(s) is/are paying no more than 30 percent of his/her income for gross housing costs, including utilities”. The 30% amount was set by the U.S Congress in 1981 and any household paying more than this proportion of their income on housing is considered cost-burdened. Increasingly, the 30% figure is being challenged as arbitrary for several reasons. First is that different households have different necessities, with a single individual household less burdened by a 30% housing cost compared to a family of four with associated clothing, food, and medical necessities. Secondly, the 30% figure does not consider cost of living, where rents and mortgages in some markets may readily exceed this threshold, which is further aggravated by higher costs for goods and services. Lastly is that the 30% cost-burdened threshold does not consider total income and trade-offs. When considering total income, a household that makes more than $500,000 a year and spends $150,000 still has far more surplus income than a household that earns $20,000 a year and spends $6,000 a year on housing. Similarly, a high-income family that chooses housing with a long-distance commute to work and services is not fully-comparable to a low-income family that must select a home a long-distance from job opportunities because that is all they can afford.

Defining attainable housing

Attainable housing typically refers to housing needed by those who make more than the income limit established for federal subsidies, but still struggle to find housing in the current market. Attainable housing as a measure of affordability is more dynamic given its combination of housing and transportation costs. A basic rule of thumb is that optimally

Calculating Housing Affordability

Although HUD’s definition of housing affordability is based on the idea that households spending >30% of their income on housing are cost-burdened, there are new and dynamic means of assessing housing costs. Transportation costs are often excluded despite the cost of vehicle ownership, public transit, and commuting times all impacting housing affordability. Even when housing and transit costs are combined, it may still be excluded from questions of land use and development. There is a link between a municipality’s decision to zone for housing on the periphery and increased transportation costs to residents. A comprehensive approach is needed to understand and overcome the obstacles to attainable and affordable housing.

Photo 3.21 - Hillcrest Towers and Bus Stop
Goal 6 Objectives

3.6.1 Increase housing choices by encouraging a mixture of housing types and sizes dispersed throughout the city and in proximity to transit and active transportation networks.

Varied housing types promote mixed-income neighborhoods and vibrant communities where attainable housing does not exist in isolation. These neighborhoods reflect traditional urban neighborhoods where households of varying economic means are integrated in the same neighborhood, allowing residents to age in place. Form-based zoning districts are a tool that can be utilized to encourage a mixture of housing types and sizes.

3.6.2 Maintain the quality and quantity of existing attainable housing.

The City of Fayetteville contains a lot of housing that due to the size and date of construction are relatively affordable to own – compared to constructing a similar sized unit with today’s land and construction costs. However, older housing units are not usually energy efficient, and without proper care, will begin to decrease in quality. Allowing these homes to fall into disrepair can force families to leave, resulting in the loss of their primary investment. Dilapidated homes can also hurt values for surrounding properties and even entire neighborhoods. Energy efficiency upgrades can be obtained, often free of charge, through the local energy providers; AEP SWEPCO, Black Hills Energy, and Ozarks Electric. These resources should be directed at low to moderate-income households in the City’s more established neighborhoods to save residents energy costs and to extend the longevity of the existing housing stock.
3.6.3 Establish partnerships with non-profit and private entities to facilitate the development of attainable workforce housing.

Planning tools such as zoning can only go so far in addressing attainable housing needs in the community. A comprehensive approach to increasing the attainable housing available requires multiple partnerships among the public, non-profit and private sectors. However, attainable housing should not be grouped or focused in any specific area of the city and should always respect the scale of surrounding developments. It is important for the City to continue to effectively communicate and develop partnerships with the Fayetteville Housing Authority to create opportunities for additional housing units to serve the communities low-to moderate-income households. Similarly, the City should continue to look for opportunities for the creation of affordable housing on publicly-owned land and develop partnerships with developers to provide flexible, affordable work space and housing.

3.6.4 Make housing relatively more affordable by influencing cost of living items such as utilities and transportation.

Complete, compact and connected neighborhoods are pedestrian-friendly and provide everyday services within walking distance, allowing residents to reduce transportation costs, which could positively affect their ability to obtain housing. Likewise, programs that support energy efficient housing and home energy retrofits reduce monthly utility bills and overall cost-of-living expenses.

Transportation costs for residents is an issue that City government can directly impact. Investments in multi-use paved trails and support for public transportation can significantly reduce residents’ costs for getting to work, school or other daily needs. The City is currently on track to have 87% of all residents within ½ mile of a trail by the year 2020. The Active Transportation Plan goal of having 97% of all housing units in the City within ½ mile of a trail by 2040 will be crucial to providing equitable active transportation options to all residents regardless of where they live. The City is currently on track to achieve this goal with three additional miles of trail on average being constructed yearly.

The City should explore developing a community educational campaign addressing housing affordability including; loss of existing affordable housing and why, utility and transportation costs, and the need to maintain affordability as part of Fayetteville’s quality of life.
3.7 City Plan 2040 Benchmarks

Short Term 2019-2025

• Develop a conservation development ordinance, or other form for rural properties, or those with environmentally sensitive features. (Goal 2 & 5)

• Develop internal processes to align funding, development and planning of city infrastructure with the goals of City Plan 2040. (Goal 1 & 2)

• Identify existing properties that are vacant or prime for redevelopment and initiate form-based rezoning discussions with property owners. (Goal 1, 2, & 3)

• Use the Enduring Green Network boundary map as a tool when making decisions on parkland acceptance and acquisition, off-site tree preservation, and when updating the Master Trail Plan (Goal 4 & 5)

• Develop a system of metrics for the city to evaluate and prioritize properties for inclusion in the enduring green network. (Goal 5)

• Continue to develop and implement form-based codes that establish clear design standards and assure neighbors that new development will be desirable and compatible. (Goals 1,3,4 & 6)

• Determine the feasibility of a Local Housing Trust Fund and Land Bank. (Goal 6)

• Develop protocols for infill construction projects. Infill construction protocols are typically designed to outline "good neighbor best practices" and provide construction companies and neighbors with expectations for construction site and logistical issues such as; street or sidewalk closures, hours of construction activity, contact information for City Departments involved in the construction process, etc. (Goal 1)

• Evaluate and recommended modifications to existing zoning districts to create context sensitive districts. This would include analyzing and amending permitted and conditional uses, building mass, setbacks and lot area coverage requirements. (Goal 1, 2, 3 and 6)
Short Term 2019-2025 (contd.)

- Evaluate and modify standards for commercial, mixed-use and urban residential uses that are complementary to the existing context of the neighborhood and adjacent property. (Goal 1, 2, 3 and 6)

- Evaluate development thresholds based on quantitative metrics such as building form, not building type, and the encouragement of missing middle housing. (Goal 1, 2, 3 and 6)

- Create pre-approved building types for identified neighborhoods. (Goal 1, 2, 3 & 6)

- Evaluate conditional use permit vs. use-by-right for appropriate infill. (Goal 1)

- Discuss "spot zoning" in the midst of established neighborhoods, and potential for large rezoning's. (Goal 1 & 3)

- Work with the City Council to develop a formal annexation policy to strategically and deliberately plan for controlled growth on the City's outer edges. (Goal 1, 2, 3 & 5)

- Develop additional rural/agricultural zoning districts that can be utilized to manage rural growth and maintain rural character on the City's outer edges, and limit development of sensitive areas throughout Fayetteville. (Goal 2 & 5)

- Identify gaps in affordability throughout the city and set numerical targets for housing that is affordable to a variety of households, including workforce, supportive, low-income, families with children, and senior housing. (Goal 1, 3, 4 & 6)

- Promote long-term affordability by targeting the use of public funds for the lowest-income households, including those who are homeless, at risk of homelessness, or who have other special needs. (Goal 6)

- Identify new or expand existing dedicated revenue sources for affordable housing. (Goal 6)

- Examine potential regulatory barriers and policies that impede the provision of household
**Short Term 2019-2025 (contd.)**

affordability, including: infrastructure costs, the costs and benefits of development ordinances on housing development, and how the City’s fees and requirements impact the cost of living for households in Fayetteville. (Goal 1 & 6)

- Develop a community educational campaign to address housing affordability such as; the loss of existing affordable housing, rising utility and transportation costs, and the need to maintain affordability as a part of Fayetteville’s quality of life. (Goal 6)

- Identify opportunities for the creation of affordable housing on publicly-owned land and develop partnerships with developers to provide flexible, affordable work space and housing. (Goal 6)

- Develop a trailside development plan. As part of the trailside development plan, gauge the feasibility of creating this plan with existing resources or through an external consultant, engage the public, assess land use and zoning adjacent to trails, and evaluate existing ordinances. (Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6)

- Seek funding to complete a citywide Community Preservation Plan to identify resources for future historic survey and registration, assess current preservation efforts, and plan for new initiatives. (Goal 1)

- Work to preserve the historic character and integrity of neighborhoods with multiple approaches including but not limited to: create one or more Local Regulated District(s) in neighborhoods listed on the National Register of Historic Places; and utilize other preservation tools such as overlay districts with the main goal of preserving historic character. (Goal 1)

**Long Term < 5 Years**

- Utilize the Historic District Commission to educate the public on tax credits, appropriate design standards, neighborhood preservation tools. (Goals 1, 2 & 3)

- Evaluate the development and implementation of a tiered impact fee system. (Goals 1 & 2)
On-Going

- Support rezoning proposals that result in increased density around logical future transit stops, rail corridors and major transportation corridors. Recommendations should generally align with the Growth Concept Map. (Goal 4)

- Support development and redevelopment opportunities along the existing rail line. (Goal 4)

- Support and implement the goals, strategies and actions of the transformational 71B Corridor plan. (Goal 1, 2, & 4)

- Include public transportation providers in the design phase of new, and retrofitted, street projects and determine if there is a current or future need for benches, shelters, or bus turn-offs. (Goal 4)

- Continue developing and implementing the Infill Assessment Elements and Map with elected officials as a tool for understanding a parcels proximity to existing utilities, infrastructure and services. (Goal 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6)

- Implement and utilize the Growth Concept Map to strategically incentivize the development of Tier-1, Tier-2, and Tier-3 commercial and mixed-use nodes along major corridors and as neighborhood centers. (Goal 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6)

- Actively participate and engage in the regional dialogues and initiatives as outlined in the report completed by the Northwest Housing Regional Planning Commission entitled “Our Housing Future- A Call to Action for Northwest Arkansas”. (Goal 6)
• Promote long-term affordability by supporting a local or regional community land trust and other shared equity approaches. (Goal 6)

• Support the creation of a “real-time” database of available affordable housing units, services, resources, and incentives to strengthen the process of connecting qualified buyers and renters with affordable housing to comprehensively lower monthly household expenses. (Goal 6)

• Promote long-term affordability by developing new goals, targets, and strategies to promote the distribution of affordable housing in all parts of the city, including incentives for affordable housing in new developments and for the preservation of existing rental units. (Goal 6)
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4.1 Location

Fayetteville, the third largest city in Arkansas, is an attractive and prosperous city of approximately 80,522 people (U.S. Census Bureau – ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates 2012-2016). Fayetteville is part of the Northwest Arkansas (NWA) Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) which is comprised of Washington, Benton, and Madison Counties in Arkansas and a portion of McDonald County in Missouri. In 2016, the U.S. Census Bureau estimated the population of the NWA MSA at 525,032 people.

Fayetteville was first incorporated in 1836 on the western edge of the Boston Mountains, an elevated feature of the greater Ozark Plateau that extends further west and north. This modest mountainous terrain helps to shape the historically north-south oriented land development and street pattern concentrated primarily along the lower elevations and valley floors. The City is home to the University of Arkansas, a public land grant institution and the flagship campus of the University of Arkansas System, established in 1871. In the fall of 2017 the University of Arkansas had a total enrollment of 27,558 students.

As the largest city in Northwest Arkansas, Fayetteville has historically served as the economic, political and cultural center of a diverse and growing region. The City’s strategic location enables it to serve as the gateway to the outdoor tourism opportunities provided by public lands in the adjacent Ozark and Boston Mountain regions. These growing tourism opportunities are one of the factors associated with the Fayetteville’s rapid economic development.

4.2 Planning Area

Arkansas State law grants cities the power to have limited extraterritorial jurisdictional power over land located in unincorporated county adjacent to city limits. Prior to 2013, this included all land within five miles of the corporate limits, but following a change in Arkansas Code §14-56-413, local government extraterritorial jurisdiction was restricted to two miles. In Fayetteville, these powers are limited to joint authority with Washington County over the subdivision of land. The Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission coordinates with regional cities, including Fayetteville, Greenland, Johnson, Springdale, and Farmington to revise Planning Area Boundaries.

Currently, Fayetteville is comprised of 55.4 square miles of land in the City limits with an additional 35.3 square miles of adjacent unincorporated land located in the Fayetteville Planning Area.
4.3 Historic Growth Patterns and Transitions

Fayetteville has experienced five distinguishable transitions in growth and development since the mid-1800’s. These transition periods have each centered on time periods tied to major economic changes. A sixth transition is emerging in the new millennium because of the diversified economic expansion attributed to the University of Arkansas’s growth and the expansion of Fortune 500 companies that call the NWA region home.

Early Settlers

The original community of Washington, as Fayetteville was first called, was established in 1828. The name was changed a year later due to confusion with a city named Washington in southern Arkansas. The McGarrah family was among Fayetteville’s first settlers and laid claim to a large tract of land containing a natural spring located at what is now the corner of Spring Street and Willow Avenue.

Early settlers were involved in the relocation of the Cherokee Nation to the west. Fayetteville, being near the terminal point of the relocation, became the new home for the escort party.
In 1834, Congress authorized Washington County to sell 160 acres to underwrite the construction of a proper courthouse; these 160 acres became known as the original town of Fayetteville. The city grew over the next three and a half decades, and in 1870 there were approximately 1,200 acres of land incorporated as the City of Fayetteville.

Although the early settlement period appeared to be blessed with prosperity, the community was greatly impacted by the Civil War. On April 18, 1863 Confederate forces led by Brigadier General W. L. Cabell launched an attack on the Union command of Colonel M. L. Harrison stationed in and around the Tebbetts House, also known as the Headquarters House, on East Dickson Street. The Confederates approached via what is now East Huntsville Road and moved up the valley between College Ave. and the base of Mount Sequoyah. Harrison was able to repel multiple charges against the Union’s strong position at the top of Dickson Street. Unfortunately, much of the original Fayetteville community was destroyed by fire during the Battle of Fayetteville on April 18, 1863.

Reconstruction Period

Following the Civil War, in 1869, the McGarrah farm was purchased by the Mason family who subdivided the land into lots on a plat known as the Masonic Addition. In the 1870’s several large homes were constructed on the large lots of this subdivision. Portions of the land were again subdivided and built upon in the 1880s and thereafter. The Masonic Addition represented the beginning of Fayetteville’s reconstruction period in the post-Civil War years. This growth period saw the construction of many Antebellum era houses that became home to many of the City’s wealthier families.

In 1871, Fayetteville was chosen as the site of the land-grant Arkansas Industrial University on a hill west of downtown at the western end of Dickson and Maple Streets. A north-south railroad was constructed through town in 1882 solidifying Fayetteville’s initial growth period.

In the 1890s, Fayetteville established itself as a banking and distribution center that focused on the lumber and fruit and
vegetable processing industries. It was during this period of prosperous growth that two of Fayetteville’s current Historic Districts, Mount Nord and Washington-Willow, became the area with the most prestigious residences. These new resplendent residential districts attracted bankers, lawyers, lumber merchants, furniture manufacturers, university professors, railroad men, and wholesale grocers.

Beginning in the 1890s many of the large lots were again subdivided and the process of infill development with smaller and more modest homes was initiated. By the turn of the century many households in and around the University rented rooms to tourists and university students.

**Post-War Expansion**

The third period of Fayetteville’s transition in growth occurred following World War II. This period of expansion was fueled by the federal government through low interest loans guaranteed by the G. I. Bill. This was also a time when building practices became standardized and the construction industry began to mass produce housing. The post-war era was additionally shaped by increased automobile ownership. This changed the economics of residential land development, allowing for growth further from the City’s center in a lower density and more suburban land development pattern. Many of the residential neighborhoods surrounding the central core of the city were developed and/or infilled during this period.

Fayetteville’s commercial development patterns also shifted in the post-war years. New businesses located along the expanding arterial roadways. Commercial development patterns in these newly expanding commercial corridors emphasized parking lots along the street frontage with buildings located in the rear. The first strip malls and fast food restaurants took hold along College Avenue and Martin Luther King Boulevard, then known as 6th Street.

Fayetteville’s industrial base also continued to expand during this period. Industrial goods began to be transported by truck, thereby rendering railroad access less important than in the past. Wholesalers, bakeries, hatcheries, repair services, building supplies, and other traditional commercial enterprises began to scatter to larger sites better served by the expanding street and highway systems.

**University Expansion**

The fourth major transition in growth occurred between 1960 and 1970 with the growth and expansion of the University...
of Arkansas. From 1960 to 1965, the University doubled in enrollment creating an unanticipated demand for dormitories, classrooms, apartments and small houses in and around the campus. During this period, the first large scale apartment complexes were primarily built in the residential neighborhoods north of campus. The initial market reaction to this unprecedented growth also resulted in numerous conversions of older homes and garages near campus into boarding houses and apartments.

The increased enrollment, and the development of additional residential dwelling units, created new demands for commercial services. This continued the post-war trend to locate new commercial businesses in strip commercial centers along the major streets. Some of the major commercial convenience shopping centers were created in this expansion period, including the Evelyn Hills shopping center and the Oak Hills shopping center on College and Garland Avenues respectively.

Late 20th Century

Between 1970 and 1990 Fayetteville maintained a steady 1.6 to 1.9 percent rate of growth per year. Between 1990 and 2000 this growth rate increased to 3.2 percent per year. Residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial uses all experienced significant increases. Much of the developed area on the existing City’s periphery was developed during this time. The Fullbright expressway, now part of Interstate 49, was constructed along the City’s western edge providing a bypass for through-traffic traveling along the Highway 71B corridor. The Northwest Arkansas Mall and adjacent lands were developed into large, single-use regional commercial centers. The “new” development patterns began to negatively impact the commercial desirability of the traditional commercial core of downtown Fayetteville, with many businesses choosing to relocate to more “car friendly” areas of town.

In this period of steady growth, residential development continued apace and the City expanded incrementally through annexation petitions. The residential growth patterns of the late 20th century primarily resulted in homogenous, sprawling, and disconnected neighborhoods, characterized by single use residential development and dead-end cul-de-sacs.

The University of Arkansas also experienced significant growth from the 1970’s through 2000. Increased enrollment continued to drive economic growth and population expansion with additional students, faculty and staff, service, and professional workers.
The New Millennium

Beginning in the early 2000s the City began to acknowledge the shortcomings of the development patterns that defined the second half of the 20th century. Major long-range planning processes were undertaken such as the creation of the Downtown Master Plan in 2004 and the adoption of City Plan 2025 in 2006. These projects were a paradigm shift in thinking about how to structure, organize, develop, and redevelop Fayetteville. The Downtown Master Plan introduced form-based zoning districts that valued the placement of buildings at the street with parking to the rear or side and a de-emphasis on separating residential and commercial land uses. The Downtown Master Plan encouraged infill development, redevelopment of surface parking lots, investments in pedestrian infrastructure such as sidewalks and trails, and the importance of adding dense housing to drive the reemergence of commercial businesses in the downtown.

Similarly, the adoption of City Plan 2025 set the stage for rethinking the development of the larger city. The six goals outlined in City Plan 2025 provided a blueprint for how the community can address the shortcomings of the past and ensure that future development is appropriately sited and scaled. The six City Plan goals are:

1. We will make appropriate infill and revitalization our highest priority.
2. We will discourage suburban sprawl.
3. We will make traditional town form the standard.
4. We will grow a livable transportation network.
5. We will assemble an enduring green network.
6. We will create opportunities for attainable housing.

In the ensuing years since the adoption of City Plan 2030, the City has seen the impact of the plan in how, where and what is being built. For instance, aging commercial development along Martin Luther King Boulevard began to redevelop, new residential subdivisions were required to provide street connectivity to surrounding properties, infill development increased, and redevelopment of surface parking lots were encouraged. Dense residential multi-family dwellings have been constructed in Fayetteville’s core and more impressively moving to the City year after year. Ultimately, the growth of the University provided a stable and reliable economic engine that drove the Fayetteville’s development in the late 20th century.
in the uptown area. Active transportation systems such as the trail network were planned, designed and constructed, and vast natural areas and parks areas were purchased and developed. The adoption of this plan, City Plan 2040, will seek to advance the progress made in the last two decades.

### 4.4 Regional Growth Patterns and Transitions

Historically, the smaller communities within Washington County and Northwest Arkansas have served as semi-autonomous jurisdictions, providing for their residents’ basic needs. Fayetteville, with 37 percent of the total population of Washington County, has traditionally served as the governmental, economic, and cultural center of the area. Fayetteville’s dominance in the region began to shift between the 1970s and 1990s as Springdale, and later Rogers and Bentonville, began to build regional economic draws based on Fortune 500 companies and newly emerging tourism opportunities.

**Fayetteville-Springdale Transition**

Beginning in the 1970s and extending into the 1980’s Washington County experienced significant employment and population growth. This is mostly attributed to the emergence of the poultry industry in Springdale. Between 1970 and 1980 Springdale added 3,700 jobs. Fayetteville, the much larger city, added 4,600 jobs during this same time. Fayetteville’s jobs were primarily attributed to growth at the University and the associated service economy but the development of a new industrial park in south Fayetteville also added many of these jobs. This period marks the inception of a twin-cities economy that persists in many ways to this day.

Population growth during the same period showed a similar pattern. Springdale increased its share of the County’s population from 18% to 23% with the addition of 5,994 people. Fayetteville’s increase, while impressive at 5,430 people, still led to a slight decrease in its overall percentage of Washington County’s residents from 36% down to 35%. The U.S. Census Bureau recognized this new status when it identified the two cities as the Fayetteville-Springdale Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) in 1980. Much of this growth was made possible by the completion of Beaver Lake in 1966 which provided a clean and stable drinking water source for the region.
Northwest Arkansas Regional Transition

The second major change in the area began in the 1990’s with the regionalization and specialization of commerce and industry amongst the communities in Washington and Benton County. During this period, the region became a more diversified and integrated economic unit through the expansion of major businesses, including Walmart, J.B. Hunt Trucking, and Tyson Foods. These businesses drew secondary suppliers and associated service industries to the region. Between 1990 and 2000 Washington County’s population increased by 39.1%, or 44,306 people, while Benton County grew by 57.3%, or 55,907 people. In 1990, the U.S. Census Bureau expanded the Fayetteville-Springdale MSA to include the City of Rogers. Notable projects that helped to grow and connect the region during this time include the opening of the Walton Arts Center in Fayetteville in 1992, the opening of the XNA Regional Airport in 1998, and the completion of the I-540 corridor from Fort Smith to Bella Vista in 1999.

The growing recognition of the economic importance of the region gave rise to the establishment of the Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission (NWARPC) in 1966 as the regional planning authority. The NWARPC grew to become the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in 1983 responsible for transportation planning under U.S. DOT regulations. This regional planning role has expanded to involve the NWARPC in providing guidance on additional important regional issues including; the NWA Razorback Regional Greenway, Regional Transit Planning, Regional Open Space Planning and more recently the coordination of the NWA Regional Housing Report. As part of this regional planning responsibility the NWARPC has undertaken numerous studies and made planning and policy recommendations to its membership. The 2040 City Plan has incorporated selected Regional Planning Commission recommendations, thereby taking a leadership role in supporting regional cooperation and coordination for the benefit of all its fellow members.

21st Century Regionalism

The post 2000 era has seen a period of unprecedented growth for the region even through the recessionary period of 2008-2011. For the first time the resident population of the NWA MSA increased to over 500,000 people with an estimated regional population of 525,032 people in 2016 per the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey. This growth has brought
unprecedented challenges for the region’s transportation systems, housing availability and affordability, and job growth with the four major cities of the region scrambling to provide services to their growing urban populations.

Positively, the continued regionalization of the two-county area has encouraged cities within the region to become partners in attracting economic growth opportunities, while at the same time becoming competitors for developing the amenities that residents and new arrivals to the region seek. Having achieved the threshold level of a major economic center due to their joint size and resources, each city is now a catalyst for the others’ development. Whereas larger industries may have previously looked at labor force indicators and the production resources of the individual cities as limited, the now combined resources are attracting national attention.

Notable regional projects that have been completed since the year 2000 include the opening of the Arvest Ballpark in Springdale in 2008, the opening of Crystal Bridges Museum of American Art in Bentonville in 2011, the completion of the 36-mile long Razorback Regional Greenway multi-use trail network connecting Fayetteville to Bella Vista in 2015, the opening of the Scott Family Amazeum in Rogers in 2015, the expansion of the Walton Arts Center in Fayetteville in 2016, and the development of hundreds of miles of mountain bike trails on public lands throughout the region including the Slaughter Pen Trail in Bentonville and Kessler Mountain Trails in Fayetteville.

As Northwest Arkansas continues to develop as a regional entity it will become more important than ever for the major cities of the region to continue to diversify their economic base and find niche markets in which to thrive. Fayetteville is poised to lead the region with our offerings of high quality of life, low cost of living and ever expanding job and commerce opportunities.
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5.1 Population Trends

Historically, population growth in Fayetteville has been sporadic. This can be primarily attributed to major annexations in the 1950s and 1970s and the significant growth that happened in the late 1990s and early 2000s. As Table 5.0 shows, the greatest period of growth was between 1940 and 1950 with a growth increase of 107 percent. Between 1950 and 1960, the growth rate declined to 19.1 percent. Between 1960 and 1970 the growth rate experienced another surge at 51.6 percent. Between 1970 and 1990 the growth rate remained relatively steady, varying between 15 and 19 percent. The last major population growth jump happened between 1990 and 2000 with a population increase of 37 percent.

The 2010 Census found that Fayetteville’s population had increased to 73,580 people. This represented a 27 percent increase over the 2000 Census. Estimates from the American Community Survey in 2016 approximates the current population of Fayetteville at 83,826, a 14 percent increase over 2010.

Much of Fayetteville’s growth since 2000 can be attributed to the growth of the University of Arkansas during this period. In the fall of 2004 the University had total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fayetteville Population</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>(Washington &amp; Benton Counties) Population</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Arkansas Population</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>8,212</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>17,017</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>49,979</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>20,274</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>55,797</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>30,729</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>77,370</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>36,608</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>100,494</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>42,247</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>210,908</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>58,047</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>311,121</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>73,580</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>424,404</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>83,826</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>498,296</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enrollment of 17,269 students, by the fall of 2017 total enrollment had increased to 27,558 students. This represents a 37 percent increase in enrollment over this 13-year period. As the student population increased, so have the number of faculty and staff needed to support the University’s growth. This has been a major driver of the population increases the City of Fayetteville has experienced over the last decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester - Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Non-Degree Other</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13,124</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>17,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13,654</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>17,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13,876</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>17,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14,442</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>18,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14,861</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>3,192</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>19,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>15,347</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>3,407</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>19,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16,794</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>3,569</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>21,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>19,027</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>3,759</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20,350</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>3,777</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>21,009</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>21,836</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>22,159</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22,548</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>23,044</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Gender

Census data shows that both the City of Fayetteville and the State of Arkansas are almost evenly split when it comes to gender. In 2016, the City of Fayetteville had slightly more women, 50.3 percent, then men, 49.7 percent. This roughly mirrors the gender split at the State level of 50.9 percent women to 49.1 percent men.

Figure 5.0 - Gender
5.3 Ethnic Origin

Census data over the last two decades shows that Fayetteville is slowly, but gradually becoming more racially diverse. In the year 2000, 86.5 percent of residents identified themselves as white, by the year 2016 this number has decreased to 85.1 percent. Almost every other ethnic group has increased in population numbers as a percent of the overall population with African Americans seeing the largest increase, from 6 percent in 2000 to 7.3 percent by 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68,557</td>
<td>61,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5,883</td>
<td>4,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut</td>
<td>2,037</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islands</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>2,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin of any group</td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic Group</td>
<td>3,655</td>
<td>2,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census

Table 5.2 - Ethnic Origin
5.4 Age

Fayetteville Age Characteristics

The City of Fayetteville has a median age of 27. Median age is often used as an indicator of the vitality of a population, representing the “middle”, not the average age of the population. Half of the population is older than the median age and half is younger than the median age. Fayetteville’s median age of 27 can be largely attributed to the presence of the University of Arkansas with Arkansas’ median age at 37.7. The largest percentage of Fayetteville’s population, at approximately 37 percent, falls between the ages of 20 and 34.

Much like the rest of the nation, Fayetteville is also experiencing increasing numbers of older people aged 60 and above. In 2016 this age group consisted of 10,134 individuals, representing a 7.1 percent increase over the 9,411 individuals of this age in the year 2010.

Interestingly, the number of children under the age of 10 has seen a decrease in their percentage of the overall population since 2010. In 2010 this cohort made up 11.3 percent of the population, while in 2016 it fell to just 10.7 percent of the overall population. This may be attributed to adults in the Millennial generation having fewer children, or putting off having children due to broader factors in society such as the 2008 economic downturn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>4,718</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>8,643</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7,203</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5,844</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>15,368</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>14,020</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10,912</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>14,218</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13,686</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>10,049</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8,131</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,305</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>7,430</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7,240</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64</td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3,659</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 - Age

Median Age 27.3 Median Age = 27.2 Median Age = 26.9
Generations

- The Lost Generation also known as the Generation of 1914 in Europe, is a term originating with Gertrude Stein to describe those who fought in World War I. The members of the lost generation were typically born between 1883 and 1900. All members of this generation are now deceased.

- The Greatest Generation which was once better known as the “G.I. Generation,” are those who include the veterans who fought in World War II. They were born from around 1901 to 1927 and came of age during the Great Depression.

- The Silent Generation also known as the Lucky Few, were born from approximately 1925 to 1942. It includes some who fought in World War II, most of those who fought the Korean War and many during the Vietnam war.

- The Baby Boomers are the generation that were born mostly following World War II, typically born from 1946 to 1964. Increased birth rates were observed during the post–World War II baby boom making them a relatively large demographic cohort.

- Generation X, commonly abbreviated to Gen X, is the generation following the baby boomers. Demographers and researchers typically use starting birth years ranging from the early-to-mid 1960s and ending birth years in the early 1980s. The term has also been used in different times and places for several different subcultures or counter-cultures since the 1950s.

- Millennials, also known as Generation Y, are the cohort of people following Generation X. Demographers and researchers typically use the early 1980s as starting birth years and the mid-1990s to early 2000s as ending birth years. According to Pew Research in 2019, the Millennials will surpass the Baby Boomers in size in the U.S., with 72 million Boomers and 73 million Millennials.

- Generation Z is the cohort of people born after the Millennials. Demographers and researchers typically use the mid-1990s to early-2000s as starting birth years.

Information from Wikipedia.
5.5 Households

The U. S. Census defines a household as all the people who occupy a housing unit. Households are categorized as family and non-family. Family households include a householder and one or more people living in the same household who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. A non-family household is a householder living alone or with non-relatives only.

Fayetteville has some unique household characteristic’s when compared to the rest of the State of Arkansas. As of 2016, Fayetteville had a total of 33,528 households. This is an increase of 8.4 percent over the 30,726 households that were reported in the 2010 Census and a 29 percent increase over the 23,798 households reported in the year 2000. Not surprisingly given the large number of unrelated college students sharing housing units, Fayetteville had a slightly higher percentage of non-family households (53 percent) then family households (47 percent) in 2010. By comparison, the non-family to family households statewide in 2010 was split with only 32 percent of households being non-family, and 68 percent being family.
**Family Households.** In 2010, married couples represented the largest share of Fayetteville’s total households at 33 percent. Of the households classified as family versus non-family 71 percent are married couples. This is compared with Arkansas as a whole where 49.5 percent of households are married coupled.

**Female-Headed Households.** Female-headed households with no husband present comprised 10 percent of Fayetteville’s family households in 2010. This number has held steady since the 2000 Census when female-headed family-households also comprised 10 percent of all family-households. Fayetteville’s percentage of female-headed, family-households has consistently remained less than the State of Arkansas where 13 percent of all family-households are female-headed.

**Non-Family Households.** In 2010, the total number of non-family households in Fayetteville was 16,152, or 53 percent, of which the number of persons living alone comprised 11,202, totaling just over 35 percent of the non-family households. Both numbers have remained consistent with previous Census data. Similarly to the overall household data, this is likely a result of the large student population associated with the University of Arkansas.

**Household and Family Size.** Compared to the 2.6 person average household size for Washington County and the State of Arkansas, Fayetteville had a smaller average household size in 2010, at 2.2 people. Household and family size has remained relatively consistent for Fayetteville, Washington County, and the State of Arkansas since 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fayetteville</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Household Size</strong></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Family Size</strong></td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census and American Fact Finder ACS 2016 5-Year Estimates*
## Educational Attainment

Educational attainment is relatively high in Fayetteville and Washington County when compared to the State of Arkansas. Fully 92% percent of residents in Fayetteville and Washington County have a high school diploma compared to just 86 percent of residents in the State. The percentage of residents that have attained a bachelor’s degree is also high in Fayetteville compared to both Washington County and the State. In 2016 fully 49 percent of Fayetteville residents had bachelor’s degrees or higher, while only 12 percent of Washington County and 7 percent of overall State residents had the same.

### Figure 5.2 - Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No Degree</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Bachelors or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7  Population Projections

The Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission (NWARPC) uses building permit data to develop future population estimates for the City of Fayetteville and it’s planning area. This data is published in the NWARPC 2040 Northwest Arkansas Metropolitan Transportation Plan. For the purposes of this discussion, Northwest Arkansas represents Washington and Benton Counties.

Northwest Arkansas as a region has grown at an annual rate of 3.15 percent from Census 2000 to 2010. This represents an annual population increase of 11,328 people in Northwest Arkansas. This, in turn, translates into an increase in total population from 311,121 people in 2000 to 424,404 in 2010. Washington County itself grew from 157,715 in 2000, to 203,065 in 2010. Fayetteville added 15,533 people over this same period for a total population of 73,580 people in 2010, a 21 percent increase. Further, the U.S. Census American Community Survey estimates Fayetteville’s 2017 population at 83,826 people, a 12% increase over 2010.

As noted above, the NWARPC uses building permit data and average household size to develop future population estimates. Northwest Arkansas, the two-county area, is projected to grow from 424,404 to 803,372 by 2040, an increase of 47 percent. More specifically, Washington County is projected to grow from 203,065 in 2010 to 397,636 by 2040, an increase of 49 percent. And finally, Fayetteville is projected to grow to 142,496 people by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fayetteville</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990 (Census)</td>
<td>42,099</td>
<td>113,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 (Census)</td>
<td>58,047</td>
<td>157,715</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (Census)</td>
<td>73,580</td>
<td>203,065</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 (Projection)</td>
<td>90,993</td>
<td>252,532</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 (Projection)</td>
<td>113,734</td>
<td>316,885</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 (Projection)</td>
<td>142,496</td>
<td>397,636</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 - Population Projections

Source: U.S. Census and NWARPC Regional Planning Commission
the year 2040. This represents a population increase of 41 percent from the 2017 population estimate of 83,826.

2040 Population Projections and Land Availability in Fayetteville and its Surroundings:
The Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission projects that by the year 2040 the population in Fayetteville will be approximately 142,496, an increase of 58,670 residents. To determine the carrying capacity of the City of Fayetteville to accommodate this growth, staff analyzed the amount of land suitable for development within City limits and outside the City within the Planning Area. The analysis evaluated the suitability of undeveloped land for urban growth, excluding lands with un-suitable soils, floodplains, and steep slopes, etc. It also excluded vacant land owned by public entities such as the Fayetteville School District, University of Arkansas, City of Fayetteville, and Washington County. The formula then excluded approximately 45 percent of the land for non-residential uses, based on existing development patterns in the Fayetteville. The analysis did not account for infill and redevelopment of existing developed properties, such as parking lots, or tearing down a single-family house and re-developing the property with multiple homes, which is occurring in many city neighborhoods.

The analysis concluded that if the additional 50,000 people projected to move to Fayetteville by 2040 are accommodated on existing vacant land in the city limits, the housing density would need to be approximately eight dwelling units per acre. Going further, the analysis concluded that if all land in the Fayetteville Planning Area, totaling approximately 35.3 square miles, were annexed and suitable land developed, the housing density would need to be approximately four dwelling units per acre. When compared with Fayetteville’s current overall density of approximately two dwelling units per acre without accounting for development suitability, a scenario where no land was annexed would necessitate a significant increase in overall density, while complete Planning Area annexation will see an approximate doubling of density. While this increase would not likely be spread evenly across the entire City, just as Fayetteville’s current density is not uniform citywide, areas of the City would experience significant, relative densification in order to house new residents.
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6.1 Housing Occupancy and Tenure

**Occupancy**

Fayetteville has historically had a larger percentage of rental housing units than owner-occupied housing units. This is mainly attributable to the large student population. Per the 2016 American Community Survey data, the total number of occupied housing units increased by 10 percent from 2010 to 2016, adding 3,497 housing units. This is reflected in the increase of both owner-occupied housing, 4% increase, and renter-occupied housing, 14%.

**Vacancy**

Fayetteville’s vacancy rate has decreased dramatically since 2010. The number of vacant housing units in 2010 stood at 4,537 units. By 2016, the number of vacant units had decreased to 2,533 units. This represents a 44% reduction in the number of vacant units available for rental and home-ownership. This vacancy rate change is largely attributable to the number of excess housing units that were built prior to the recession beginning in 2008. As the economy turned around these units have become occupied and Fayetteville’s housing market has tightened.

6.2 Housing Types

Table 6.1 provides information on residential housing by type. For the purposes of this analysis, duplex units were included with the multi-family units. Between 2011 and 2018 Fayetteville has added 4,386 duplex and multi-family units to its’ existing housing stock for a total of 42,421 dwelling units. This represents a 20% increase in the last seven years. Over the same time-period the City has only added 376 single family dwelling units, representing a 2% increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.0 - Housing Occupancy and Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.1 - Housing Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex and Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Age of Housing

Fayetteville has a relatively young housing stock with 80% of the existing housing stock being constructed since 1970, and just over 50% of it being built in the last three decades. Historically, the period with the most housing units created was the decade of the 1990’s, followed by the 2000’s. Fayetteville is currently on pace this decade to equal the percentage of total housing units constructed in the 1990’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Units Built</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2017</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2009</td>
<td>6,825</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>8,984</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>5,683</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>4,737</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>2,838</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or Earlier</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40,464</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Gross Rent

In 2017, the American Community Survey estimates that the monthly median rent in Fayetteville was $734, compared to $725 for Washington County, and $689 for the State of Arkansas. The City’s median rent has increased by 13% from 2009 when it was $639. Washington County’s median rent is on par with the City going from $644 in 2009 to $725 in 2017, an 11% increase. The median rent in the State of Arkansas also increased by 13% over this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fayetteville</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$639</td>
<td>$644</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$734</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 Housing Concerns

One way to measure housing affordability is to compare changes in median house value and median household income over time. The median price of a house increased dramatically in Fayetteville between 2000 and 2009, 41%. During the same period the median household income increased by just 23%. Between 2009 and 2016 house values increased at a more modest rate of 8%, however, median household incomes decreased by 1.6%. This comparison illustrates how the increase in home values over the last fifteen years has significantly outpaced median household incomes. Rising home values combined with relatively flat household income growth negatively impacts the ability of many potential home buyers to purchase a home, and the ability of people to afford the homes that they have purchased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.4 - Housing Cost Change and Median Household Income*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median House Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The traditional measure of housing affordability recommends that housing cost no more than 30% of household income. However, this benchmark fails to consider transportation costs which are typically a household’s second-largest expenditure. An alternative way to view housing affordability is through an analysis of the combined housing and transportation costs for the average household. The Center for Neighborhood Technology has analyzed the combined housing and transportation costs at the Census Block level for City’s across the nation. This analysis identifies Census Blocks where the combined housing and transportation costs exceed 45%, indicating cost burdened households. In this analysis, the average Fayetteville household has an overall housing cost burden of 23%, and a transportation cost burden of 24%, for an overall housing and transportation cost burden of 46%. Some Census Blocks are below this average, and some exceed the average. The important factor to understand is that on average Fayetteville is right at the upper limits of housing affordability when you factor in household transportation costs. To view Fayetteville’s Housing and Transportation Index data, visit the interactive map published by the Center for Neighborhood Technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.5 - Housing Cost Burden at Different Income Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Median Income (AMI) - 1 Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$61,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Housing Strategies

An affordable community can only exist if we make sure that the people who work or go to school here, at all income levels, can afford to live here. Through incentives and regional partnerships, Fayetteville can encourage more affordable housing to be distributed throughout the City. New mixed-use areas as envisioned on the City Plan 2040 Growth Concept Map can meet the need for more affordably priced housing that is walkable, bikeable, and linked by transit to jobs and other centers. This can provide Fayetteville residents the opportunity to reduce the costs of car ownership and meet the needs of Fayetteville’s increasingly diverse households. Healthy and affordable communities depend on easy, safe access to walking, biking, and recreation, healthy and nutritious food, quality healthcare, schools, public safety, and other community services.

Rising housing and related costs, such as transportation and utilities, are a major issue facing Fayetteville’s residents. Low-income, fixed-income, and, increasingly, middle-class households struggle to find housing they can afford, especially in neighborhoods close to downtown and the University of Arkansas. Often, the only housing they can afford is not close to work or schools and is far removed from daily necessities such as services, shopping, entertainment, recreation, and dining. Better-located housing is often too expensive or does not meet the needs of many families with children. As Fayetteville implements its Welcoming Plan and becomes more diverse—with a growing retired and senior populations, an increasing number of smaller households, and others interested in alternatives to suburban living—the single-family homes typical of our central neighborhoods may not be affordable or suit their needs.

More significantly, high real estate prices increasingly preclude the possibility of purchasing or renting a house in close-in Fayetteville neighborhoods. To meet the market demand of our growing and diversifying population, the range of available housing choices must expand throughout the city. Alternatives to the typical larger-lot single family homes and garden-style apartments that characterize much of Fayetteville’s housing stock are needed, including a greater variety of starter and move-up homes. The introduction and expansion into the market of housing types such as row houses, courtyard apartments, bungalow courts, small lot single-family, accessory dwelling units, and live/work units can help meet this emerging demand.
The demand for market-rate housing can and should be met by the private sector. The City of Fayetteville can work with private developers and foundations, non-profits, state and federal governments, and other local governments in Northwest Arkansas to help those individuals and families not able to afford market-rate housing, including seniors on a fixed income, people with disabilities, and low-wage workers. Often assistance from the City may come in ways not generally associated with rent or mortgage costs. For instance, much of the City’s existing housing stock may have attributes that contribute to housing unaffordability. Utility bills can often be reduced by improving how we use water, electricity, and natural gas. Land use regulations can be used to direct the development of housing units in proximity to multi-modal transportation networks. Housing ultimately can be made more affordable by reducing the transportation costs associated with getting to work, school, or meeting other daily household needs.

Therefore, a comprehensive approach is needed to define and provide household affordability for residents of Fayetteville. Such an approach must take into consideration transportation, utilities, and access to daily and weekly needs as essential and inter-related components of household affordability.

The City is addressing many of these issues through some of our recently developed master plans, including: the Fayetteville Mobility Plan, Welcoming Fayetteville, Workforce Development, Economic Development, and Energy Action. The following identified action steps can be implemented in an integrated fashion to reduce the cost of living in Fayetteville:

**Actions**

- Fayetteville should actively participate and engage in the regional dialogues and initiatives as outlined in the report completed by the Northwest Housing Regional Planning Commission entitled “Our Housing Future- A Call to Action for Northwest Arkansas”.

- Fayetteville should identify gaps in affordability throughout the city and set numerical targets for housing that is affordable to a variety of households, including workforce, supportive, low-income, families with children, and senior housing.

“While I fully support infill development to help with housing, this housing is often unaffordable to residents who work and previously lived in many of these neighborhoods. Gentrification is forcing many of the local population out of these neighborhoods.” - Survey Respondent
• Promote long-term affordability by:
  - Supporting a local or regional community land trust and other shared equity approaches;
  - Targeting the use of public funds for the lowest-income households, including those who are homeless, at risk of homelessness, or who have other special needs; and
  - Developing new goals, targets, and strategies to promote the distribution of affordable housing in all parts of the city, including incentives for affordable housing in new developments and for the preservation of existing rental units.

• Identify new or expand existing dedicated revenue sources for affordable housing.

• Examine potential regulatory barriers and policies that impede the provision of household affordability, including: infrastructure costs, the costs and benefits of development ordinances on housing development, and how the City’s fees and requirements impact the cost of living for households in Fayetteville.

• Develop a community educational campaign to address the issue of affordability such as; the loss of existing affordable housing, rising utility and transportation costs, and the need to maintain affordability as a part of Fayetteville’s quality of life.

• Identify opportunities for the creation of affordable housing on publicly-owned land and develop partnerships with developers to provide flexible, affordable work space and housing.

• Support the creation of a “real-time” database of available affordable housing units, services, resources, and incentives to strengthen the process of connecting qualified buyers and renters with affordable housing to comprehensively lower monthly household expenses.

“It takes forever to get anywhere. Looking for a different housing option for my growing family is becoming harder as Fayetteville is outpricing us. I don’t want to move to Prairie Grove like a lot of my co-workers.” - Survey Respondent
Homelessness

In 1995, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) began requiring communities to submit a single application for homeless assistance grants. As a part of this, Continuum of Care groups were created to act as planning bodies to coordinate housing and service funding for homeless families and individuals. The City of Fayetteville belongs to the Northwest Arkansas Continuum of Care (NWACoC) which includes members from regional service providers, the Fayetteville Housing Authority, and Fayetteville Public Schools.

Among their activities, one of most important performed by NWACoC is the Point-in-Time (PIT) count. PIT counts provide one-night estimates of both sheltered and unsheltered homelessness, including estimates of the number of people experiencing chronic homelessness, as well as homelessness among individuals, Veterans, families with children, and youth. PIT counts are a critical source of data on the number and characteristics of people who are homeless in Northwest Arkansas. This information provides a basis for determining the needs of the homeless population and is utilized in acquiring funding for service delivery.

In 2019, the NWACoC PIT count identified 529 people experiencing homelessness in the Continuum of Care’s service area, of which 242 were in Fayetteville. This represents a regional increase of 55 individuals, with 40 in Fayetteville alone. Of these, 23 were Veterans, with 17 unsheltered. As an active member of the NWACoC the City of Fayetteville is committed to reaching functional zero for all homeless groups. Functional zero is assessed at any point in time as the number of people experiencing sheltered or unsheltered homelessness being no greater than the current monthly housing placement rate for people experiencing homelessness. In addition to playing an active role in the NWACoC, the City of Fayetteville has also provided financial support to local service providers, including Seven Hills Homeless Center, a local organization that offers meals, clothing, showers, connections to other needed services, rapid re-housing, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing. Additional private, non-profit, and faith-based organizations provide resources for individuals and families facing homelessness in our community. Services and resources for the homeless are extensive and varied in the community with many different organizations performing specific tasks according to their mission and purpose. Overnight shelter is largely provided by the Salvation Army and day shelter is largely provided by 7hills. Food is primarily accessed through food pantries and by churches providing meals. The NWA Continuum of Care leads the collaborative effort to end homelessness by bringing together local service providers, organizations, and other stakeholders to develop strategies to coordinate and increase housing programs and support services such as legal issues, case management, childcare, substance abuse, mental health, rent and utilities, medical services and employment.
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7.1 Fayetteville Establishments and Employment

Data derived from the American Community Survey shows that Fayetteville’s largest sector of employment, at 32 percent, is the education and health services sector which employs nearly 13,000 people. This employment is primarily driven by the University of Arkansas and Washington Regional Medical System and sets Fayetteville apart from the rest of the region as well as the State, with Arkansas as a whole seeing 24 percent of employees in the education and health service sector. The next largest groups by sector each employ between 10 to 14 percent of the labor market, and include professional and scientific management (11 percent), retail trade (13 percent), and arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services (14 percent).

7.2 Fayetteville Occupations

In 2016, the total employment in Fayetteville was 44,321. The largest employer continues to be the University of Arkansas, which is followed by Washington Regional Hospital, Walmart Company, Fayetteville Public Schools, and the Veteran’s Administration Hospital. The list of the City’s largest employers has changed dramatically since 2009, with an increase in the number of employers with between 300 and 500 workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th># of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>5,300+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Regional Medical System</td>
<td>2,200+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart Company</td>
<td>1,650+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville Public Schools</td>
<td>1,200+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Veterans Administration</td>
<td>1,500+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fayetteville</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAC Central Inc.</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Foods</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyson Fayetteville Complex</td>
<td>500+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>500+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvest Bank</td>
<td>500+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANA</td>
<td>500+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaseStack and Supply Pike</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Civilian Labor Force

The labor force growth of the Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers MSA continues to outpace the State and the nation. In 2017, the MSA’s labor force was 260,799, an increase of 17 percent from 2009. Similarly, the labor force in Washington County increased by 19 percent and by 17 percent in Benton County between 2009 and 2017. These growth rates are significantly higher than the 6 percent growth in Arkansas and 12 percent growth in the nation.

At the City level, the growth of Fayetteville’s civilian labor force outpaced both the MSA and the State. From 2009 to 2017, the labor force grew by 22 percent in Fayetteville and 17 percent in the MSA, whereas Arkansas grew by only 8 percent. Additionally, the number of people unemployed has decreased. At the peak of the recession in 2009, Fayetteville’s unemployment rate was 6.6 percent. By January of 2017 the unemployment rate has decreased to 2.9 percent. Fayetteville’s labor force participation rate also increased during this period, rising from 94 percent to 97 percent.

Fayetteville’s civilian labor force is also highly educated, with 48 percent of the population over 25 years old holding a Bachelor’s Degree or higher compared to the 22 percent statewide.

Additional discussion on Fayetteville’s labor market and trends is found in Chapter 11: Economic Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Civilian Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>44,925</td>
<td>46,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWA MSA</td>
<td>8,47</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>259,112</td>
<td>267,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>57,895</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>1,268,400</td>
<td>1,326,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8.1 Geological History

The City of Fayetteville is located on the northwestern edge of the Boston Mountains along the southeastern rim of the Springfield Plateau with elevations ranging from 1,100 to 1,500 feet above sea level. The eastern and southern portions of the City are characterized by hilly uplands and river bottoms while the northern and western portions are gently rolling and consist of deeper soils. Most of Fayetteville sits upon a base of shale and limestone formations from the Mississippian and Morrowien age. These rock formations are dense and resistant to weathering. Where exposed at the surface it can create some prominent and interesting natural features. Fayetteville also lies upon two fault lines. The Fayetteville Fault dissects the City diagonally from the southwest to the northeast and the White River Fault runs generally west to east along the Fayetteville and Springdale City limit boundaries. No seismic activity has been experienced in either of these faults in recorded history.

8.2 Soils

Fayetteville is located on the divide between the White River watershed and the Illinois River Watershed. The soils of the White River watershed in the east and southern part of the City were mostly derived from base materials of the Boston Mountains plateau and the soils of the western and northern parts of the City were formed from the Springfield plateau. The valleys in both of these eroded plateaus are floodplains consisting of gently terraced soils. The soil associations of the Boston Mountains formed under hardwood forests and are underlain by acidic sandstone, siltstone and shale, or by alluvium derived from these rocks. The soils of the Springfield plateau were also formed under hardwood forests and are underlain by silty deposits and cherty limestone.

Soil characteristics are an important factor when considering land use. Steep slopes and floodplains are less suitable for more urban forms of development and may require special treatment. Ideally, these areas should be reserved for open space, recreation, conservation and agriculture. Where more intensive development in these areas is permitted performance, standards should be utilized in mitigating impacts to the environment. Soils with high water tables and poor percolative ability greatly increase the cost of on-site sewage treatment facilities such as septic tanks and community sewerage systems. Edaphic conditions can also
lead to increased stormwater infiltration and streets may stress the capacity of wastewater facilities. Soils also dictate engineering requirements for many industrial uses and traffic ways. Many of the soils in and around the Fayetteville urbanized area are stony and rocky, have high shrink-swell potential, or have low load-bearing or traffic-supporting capacity.

Most of the land in the Fayetteville Planning Area has some degree of restriction for urban development. The Soil Suitability for Development map groups soils series by degree of suitability for urban development. The Map can be summarized by a description of the four major areas where soil limitations are most restrictive:

- Southwest quadrant of the Planning Area: Almost the entire quadrant is covered by the most restrictive soils for development. Moderately restrictive soils occupy the area between Wedington Road and U. S. Highway 62 west of Interstate 49.

- Southeast extreme of the planning Area: Included are pockets of the most restrictive soils around the country club hill area and along the West Fork of the White River.

- Eastern edge of the existing city limits: A large mass of the most restrictive soils is located between Mission Boulevard and

Enders Soils Map

It is important to analyze topography in order to understand and illustrate the diversity of hillsides so that the City, the public, and developers know which areas require more scrutiny and which hillsides allow more development freedom. Much of the Fayetteville area is located on shale strata containing swelling clays referred to as the Enders series of soils. The nature of these soils with their swelling and shrinking can cause heaving, cracking, water seepage, and rotting of wood building components. Although there are many solutions to these problems, including engineered foundations and slip foundations, they can be costly to install and remediate after construction.
Crossover Road. This area is partially developed with residences. Northeast edge of the older city center: Pockets of the most and some moderately restrictive soils are located between Mission Blvd. and Crossover Road. This area is primarily developed with residences.

Generally, the western and extreme northeastern portions of the planning area contain soils with the least restrictive development potential. These soils are generally sufficiently permeable to be suitable for septic tank drain-fields. However, areas with perched water tables are more frequent on the extreme western and eastern edges of the City limits which may limit development potential.

Topography and suitability of the underlying soil layers have historically influenced the pattern of development in the Fayetteville. The predominate north to south road and rail patterns were developed along the valley floors with shorter east-west road segments built over the hills and steeper grades. This pattern, established by early settlers, of building houses on the hills and farming the creek bottoms still prevails, with residential areas primarily located on and along the slopes and commercial development along the lower lying highways.

From a pure soil suitability standpoint, urban development is best suited for areas west of I-49 and northeast of Crossover Road where the soil limitations are the least restrictive.

"Infill development helps combat the trend of sprawl which is not sustainable. Making better use of already developed land is much better than continuing to develop natural land."

"Maintenance of nature in the area is critical to making Fayetteville livable. Trails contribute without taking away the beauty, so too should any infill solution."

Survey Respondents

**Soils-related definitions**

**Alluvium** is a loose, unconsolidated soil or sediment that has been eroded, reshaped by water in some form, and redeposited in a non-marine setting. It is typically made up of a variety of materials, including fine particles of silt and clay and larger particles of sand and gravel.

An **aquifer** is an underground layer of water-bearing permeable rock, rock fractures or unconsolidated materials.

**Floodplains** are areas of land adjacent to a stream or river which stretch from the banks of its channel to the base of the enclosing valley walls, and which experience flooding during periods of high discharges.

A **perched water table** is an aquifer that occurs above the regional water table. This occurs when there is an impermeable layer of rock or sediment above the main water table/aquifer but below the land surface. If a perched water tables flow intersects the surface the water is discharged as a spring.
In light of the ongoing effects of climate change, trees and their associated canopy have innumerable benefits and an urban forest plays a role in carbon sequestration, mitigating stormwater issues, filtering pollutants, increasing property values, improving public health, and reducing the heat island impacts associated with urban areas. A healthy urban tree canopy can address the three major weather events that are anticipated to affect Northwest Arkansas: unpredictable but more impactful rain events, drought, and heat waves. Even before broad acknowledgement of climate change, Fayetteville and its residents placed a high value on the City’s tree canopy, particularly with the formation of the Tree and Landscape Advisory Committee in 1993 and the subsequent adoption of a Tree Preservation ordinance regulating tree removal associated with development.

In conjunction with enforcing the tree preservation ordinances, the City’s urban foresters are also tasked with documenting Fayetteville’s urban forest and tracking its citywide coverage. Various tools are utilized for this, including aerial imagery, development records, and Geographic Information System data for tree canopy, water, buildings, roads, and various classes of vegetation. The methodology of these analyses varies from year to year with the availability of new data and improved technology, providing increasingly precise estimates of canopy. Despite requirements for mitigation tree plantings alongside new development, there is concern that a gap remains between the projected tree canopy gained from plantings, and that lost. With recent access to imagery from the National Agricultural Imagery Program, the urban foresters have new tool, which may be used to identify areas in the City that will benefit from tree plantings. With many programs already existing and others are in the pilot stage, the City needs to continue pursuing additional tree planting on both public and private properties to address the known impacts of climate change.
8.4 Slopes and Hillsides

Slope is a critical factor in determining a soil’s suitability for supporting development. The development of severe slopes involving soils not capable of providing sufficient foundational support may result in extensive cutting and filling to stabilize them. When compounded by the removal of existing vegetation, the excavation and fill of soil can result in severe erosion, slumping and shearing.

In Fayetteville, areas of severe slope are characterized by soils less suitable for development. Shallow depth to bedrock conditions are compound problems in these areas. There are several identified beds of cherty limestone, acid sandstone, siltstone and shale that have shown faulting and folding at steeper locations.

Of the 58,037 acres of land within the City and its Planning Area, approximately 16%, or 8,900 acres have slopes of 15 percent or greater. With some notable exceptions such as Mount Sequoyah, these slopes have previously remained largely undeveloped. More recent trends indicate that development on hillsides and hilltops is increasing. The passage of the Hillside/Hilltop Development Overlay District in 2006 provided additional development

Hillside-Hilltop Map

The Hillside/Hilltop maps identifies areas where steep slopes and hilltops exist:

- Southwest quadrant of the Planning Area paralleling both sides of U.S. 71. Almost the entire quadrant is restricted. Some of the highest elevations in the Planning Area are found here.
- Southeast extreme of the Planning Area. This area is blocked by a solid line of severe slopes. Pockets are found around the Fayetteville Country Club.
- Northeast quadrant of the Planning Area paralleling, and to the east of, Old Wire Road. The steeper slopes are generally confined to a narrow line that terminates on the southern end with Mount Sequoyah.
8.5 Watershed System

Fayetteville is located along a watershed division line that splits the city from the southwest to the northeast. The White River watershed basin drains approximately 40% of the city’s area and flows to the southeast. The Illinois River watershed within the city limits is the smaller basin draining primarily to the north and west. The White River flows into Beaver Lake which is the drinking water source for the region. The Illinois River watershed eventually drains into Oklahoma.

While The Beaver Lake watershed is particularly critical given its role as the primary drinking water source for Fayetteville, the Illinois watershed has been the subject of protracted litigation between the states of Oklahoma and Arkansas. Since 2003 however, the two states have sought to work cooperatively to improve water quality and reduce the negative impacts of nutrient pollution that have triggered large algal blooms downstream in Tenkiller Ferry Lake.

Many smaller streams spread out in a dendric pattern in the upper and middle portions of the watershed, comprising a protections on slopes that are 15 percent and greater and the flatter, bench-like hilltops.
natural surface drainage system. Stream physiography such as grade, velocity and volume are largely determined by the underlying topography, geology and soils. However, urban development can, and has, altered many of these natural drainage systems which can create drainage, storage and flooding hazards during heavy or extended duration storm events.

8.6 Flooding

As with many municipalities, Fayetteville has challenges regarding flooding throughout our community. These challenges include, but are not limited to, public safety, public and private property damage and access for emergency services during flood events. To help mitigate these issues, Fayetteville joined the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) in January of 1982 by adopting our first flood insurance rate map (FIRM). This program began to formally identify areas that are at risk of flooding, implement regulations to help mitigate those risks and made federal flood insurance available to the citizens of Fayetteville. While the National Flood Insurance Program has evolved over time, the concepts and many of the regulations remain the same as they were in 1982.

Flooding and floodplains are regulated at local, state and federal level for each community that participates in the NFIP. In general Chapter 168, flood damage prevention, of the Unified Development Code (UDC) and 44 Code of Federal Regulations (44CFR) are utilized in conjunction with the latest Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) to determine which properties may be at risk and in need of additional regulation to limit flood losses. These regulations extend to the area defined as “Special Flood Hazard Areas” located on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps. These areas are also commonly referred to as the floodplain or 100-year floodplain but are more accurately described as the 1% annual chance flood area. As the name states, there is a 1% chance in any given year of a flood event of that magnitude occurring or put another way, a 1 in 4 chance of flooding
during a 30-year mortgage for high risk areas.

Flooding also brings challenges associated with water quality. Rising flood waters can be contaminated by, among other things, oil and grease, household chemicals, fuels, sanitary sewer overflows, and soils/sediment. One major contributor of soil/sediment and the associated nutrients such as phosphorus is stream bank erosion. As flood waters rise, the velocity of the water increases and can damage stream banks causing both pollution issues and property loss. All of these items can damage the natural ecosystem and potentially harm drinking water sources. Beaver Lake is the drinking water source for all of Northwest Arkansas and approximately 40% of Fayetteville currently drains into this watershed. The remainder drains into the Illinois River Watershed which also has its challenges with regard to pollutants.

While these issues have solutions, most are extremely expensive. This is one reason that the City Council has begun investigating sustainable funding sources to deal with flooding and many challenges related to stormwater throughout the City. In 2018, Fayetteville contracted with Jacobs Engineering to study the City’s existing stormwater infrastructure and the capital and operational needs to address shortfalls. Stemming from this, the consultant also addressed the costs associated with making stormwater improvements and the options for generating the necessary funding. More recently, in 2019, Council broadened the scope of the study to include an evaluation of a stormwater credit program and potential to amend existing ordinances to align the City’s goal for attainable housing with development thresholds.
8.7 Groundwater

Fayetteville’s groundwater level is generally about 80-300 feet below the ground surface depending on the surface elevation. The groundwater supply is normally dependable and of good quality, although traces of iron is present in some places. Few ground wells are active within the City limits, however, many residences in the Planning Area rely on groundwater wells for their potable water source.

8.8 Surface Water Quality

Surface water quality in and around Fayetteville is generally high, although urbanization has led to increasing sedimentation and turbidity levels in Beaver Lake. Generally, the upper ends of the White and Illinois River watersheds have relatively high water quality with progressively diminishing water quality as you go downstream. Major sources of pollutants and particulates that enter the watershed are generated from agricultural run-off, construction, urbanization and litter.

8.9 Drinking Water

Fayetteville gets its drinking water from Beaver Lake provided by the Beaver Water District which was established in 1959. The District and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers agreed for storage of water supply in Beaver Lake sufficient to provide 120 million gallons a day average. The District has water rights agreements with Fayetteville, Springdale, Rogers and Bentonville to store and supply sufficient drinking water for these communities. As of October 1, 2017, Beaver Water District sells water at the wholesale rate of $1.34/1000 gallons, about 1/10th of a cent per gallon, and supplies this water to over 330,000 customers. The average daily water demand for the region is about 51 million gallons per day (mgd) and on a peak day in the summer may reach as high as 90 mgd.
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9.1 Fayetteville Mobility Plan

In 2016 the City undertook the development of a Fayetteville Mobility Plan in consultation with Nelson-Nygard Transportation Consultants. The Fayetteville Mobility Plan is an invaluable resource that provides a higher level of detail than is found in this chapter of City Pan 2040 and should be referenced for specific transportation data, analysis, and recommendations. The [Fayetteville Mobility Plan](#) can be accessed on the City of Fayetteville website.

The project began with a thorough review of existing transportation data and current planning and policy documents to provide a basis of understanding of transportation in Fayetteville, as well as its challenges and opportunities. Transportation data from a variety of sources was organized and synthesized to create spatial and systemic contexts for the plan. An understanding of the City’s current policies and goals was examined to align with long-term strategic infrastructure investments. An extensive public input process was utilized throughout the development of the Mobility Plan to help guide and provide feedback loops as the plan progressed. Public input opportunities were many and in a variety of formats including on-line surveys, community events, workshops, and mobile workshop pop-ups at places like the Senior Center and Farmers Market. The findings from the analysis and public input sections were used to identify and prioritize needs for all transportation modes: cars, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. The City’s street network was examined and recommendations for improvements to the overall system and specific street segments were identified along with an analysis of the impacts of those changes.

9.2 Transportation Context and Street Network

Fayetteville was originally laid out on a compact, gridded street pattern centered first around the town square. The town grid appears in Washington County’s General Land Survey of 1831. Starting in the 1880s, Fayetteville also became the crossroads of several railroads, including the St. Louis and San Francisco and the Pacific and Great Eastern. These railroads established depots on the edge of town at what is now Dickson Street. Through the middle of the 19th century, the City’s development patterns grew out from the center, maintaining a pattern of small, walkable blocks with a mix of commercial and residential uses. Like most
American cities however, Fayetteville’s street and development patterns became more auto-oriented and less connected in the post-World War II era, with land use patterns based on the idea that residential, commercial, and industrial uses should be separated from one another. This post-War conventional development pattern continued in Fayetteville until a recent paradigm shift in thinking as the planning, engineering, economics, and health professions began to recognize the unintended fiscal, social, and environmental impacts of sprawling, auto-oriented development patterns.

In 2018, Fayetteville operates and maintains an extensive street network that comprises approximately 521 miles of streets covering 55.4 square miles of City. Roadways range from limited access interstate highways and five-lane arterials down to the smallest residential streets and alleys. Roadways are typically classified by a functional hierarchy. Ranging from largest to smallest: Interstate Highway, State Highway, Major Arterial, Minor Arterial, Collector, Residential, and Local. The larger roadways are managed and maintained by the U.S. Highway Department, as is the case of Interstate 49, or by the State of Arkansas with State Highways, 16, 45, 62, 112, and 265. In most cases a State Highway will also be classified as an arterial street in the City’s Master Street Plan and include a local street name, such as U.S. Highway 71B which is alternatively known as College Ave.

One of the primary goals of the City’s Energy Action Plan is to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to reduce the community’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Currently transportation accounts for 27% of Fayetteville’s GHG emissions. Reducing transportation related emissions is directly tied to making smart growth decisions and investments in our transportation systems. As we work towards the realization of the six goals in City Plan 2040, many of the actions identified will directly impact and reduce the community’s VMT and future transportation-related GHG’s. The two primary goals of the Energy Action Plan as it relates to transportation related GHG emissions are to:

• Reduce the per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to 2010 levels by the year 2030, and
• Achieve a 25% walk/bike/transit mode share by the year 2030.

For a more detailed analysis of how transportation is tied to greenhouse gas emission reductions and climate change initiatives please visit the City’s Energy Action Plan located on the City of Fayetteville website.
9.3 Primary Vehicular Access

Fayetteville has five major north to south oriented arterial roadways that carry varying levels of daily traffic.

In 1999, Interstate 49, then I-540, was extended northward from Fort Smith to Fayetteville and Springdale. The interstate was extended onward to the north to Bentonville in 2001. I-540 had originally served as a bypass of Fayetteville to relieve traffic from U.S. 71B which bisects the city. Highway 112/Razorback Ave-Garland Ave. serves as the transportation spine that bisects the University of Arkansas. Gregg Ave. through the center of town also carries significant north/south oriented traffic between the downtown area and the hospital and mall areas. To the east, State Highway 265/Crossover Road similarly serves to bypass through-traffic on the east side of the city. And finally, Highway 71B/College Avenue continues to carry significant through-traffic and serves as a commercial corridor with extensive service, office, and employment businesses and institutions along its length.

These five north-south corridors have varying levels of access and vehicular throughput. For instance, the interstate has limited access, high speeds, and large traffic volumes, Highway 265 has limited access with a 45 mile per hour speed limit, and Highway 71B has virtually unlimited access with numerous curb cuts and street intersections along its’ length.

Fayetteville has two major east-west highways connecting through-traffic across the City to the wider region: State Highway 45/Mission Boulevard and State Highway 16/Huntsville Road/Wedington Drive. Other notable east-to-west connections include Joyce Avenue, Poplar Street, Sycamore Street, North Street and Dickson Street, although many of these streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic - 2018</th>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 49</td>
<td>39,000-91,000</td>
<td>60-70 MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 112/Garland Ave.</td>
<td>7,800-21,000</td>
<td>25-45 MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Ave.</td>
<td>4,900-22,000</td>
<td>35-40 MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 71B/College Ave.</td>
<td>11,000-39,000</td>
<td>35-40 MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 265/Crossover Rd.</td>
<td>19,000-28,000</td>
<td>45 MPH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I’m mostly concerned about traffic. It sounds simple to fill unused space with housing to accommodate population growth, but what will be done to roads to accommodate an increased number of cars on the road?” - Survey Respondent
The Fayetteville Mobility Plan identified and evaluated seven major corridors for detailed analysis based on a wide range of criteria, including:

- Concerns from residents collected during the public input process.
- Existing conditions analysis of citywide transportation networks including traffic collision concentrations, traffic congestion, oversized streets, and gaps in the active transportation network.
- Input from City staff.

The seven street corridors analyzed in the study were: Martin Luther King Junior Boulevard, College Avenue, Archibald Yell Boulevard, North Street/Mission Boulevard, Dickson Street, Wedington Drive, and Gregg Avenue. These major roadways provide the backbone and throughways of the City’s street system with many of them in a state of redevelopment. Components of the analysis included site visits, current and future traffic volumes, operation analysis, and recommendations for improvements. Several scenarios were then devised for each corridor based on current conditions, a no-build scenario projected at 2037 traffic volumes, a build scenario based on roadway improvements and the projected 2037 traffic volumes. A quick breakdown of the recommendations for each follow:

- **Martin Luther King Junior Boulevard:** This corridor carries 26,000-30,000 vehicles daily on average. Recommendations include development of an access management plan, conversion of the center left turn lane into a median with dedicated left turn pockets, and sidewalk and pedestrian crossing improvements.

- **North College Avenue:** This section of College Avenue carries 32,000-37,000 vehicle daily on average. Improvements include reconfiguring left turn movements.
at the intersection with Joyce Boulevard, convert College Avenue to a grand, multi-way boulevard with slip lanes to access adjacent properties, accommodate parking and transit as needed, and extend and widen sidewalks.

- **Archibald Yell Boulevard:** This four-lane street cross-section carries 12,000-26,000 vehicles daily on average. Improvements would consist of new traffic signals and pedestrian crossings at the intersections of South Street and Rock Street, a road diet converting the street from 4 lanes to 3 lanes with a median and left turn pockets where appropriate, a new shared-use side-path, and improved sidewalks with adequate buffers between moving traffic and pedestrians.

- **North Street/Mission Boulevard:** Annual average daily traffic counts range from 7,000-20,000 with a street cross-section that varies from two to four lanes. Improvements such as pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure are proposed to make this corridor more walkable.

- **Dickson Street:** The recommendations are specifically for the segment from College Avenue to Arkansas Avenue, which carries 9,000 vehicles on average per day. Proposed improvements include restricting left turns at Dickson’s intersection with West Avenue.

- **Wedington Drive:** This street segment is characterized by high crash densities and high traffic volumes of 20,000 to 34,000 vehicles on average per day. Recommendation for this street segment include creating and implementing an access management plan and closing some current access points, increasing sidewalk widths and adding bicycle facilities, providing additional access through parallel streets, and study of the impact of a new traffic signal at the intersection with Golf Drive.

- **Gregg Avenue:** Annual average daily traffic counts are below 21,000 vehicles per day. Recommendations include a road diet from 4 lanes to 3 and exploration of transit opportunities.
9.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility

Fayetteville places high value on creating and maintaining pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to serve all residents of the City. Bicycle and pedestrian (bike/ped) infrastructure varies widely and is sensitive to the context adjacent streets and land use. Bike/ped infrastructure includes sidewalks, shared-use trails for both bicycles and pedestrians, and a wide variety of on-street and adjacent to the street bicycle treatments.

Fayetteville first adopted the Fayetteville Alternative Transportation and Trails (FATT) Plan in 2001 and it was updated in 2009. In 2015, the City developed a new plan that updated and replaced the FATT plan. The new alternative transportation plan is titled the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and its framework is based upon six goals:

• Strive to create an inclusive multi-modal transportation system.
• Endeavor to build a trail connection with on-half mile of every residence.
• Increase the active transportation commuting mode share to 15% by 2020.
• Work to identify and correct missing bicycle and pedestrian linkages.
• Partner with advocates to address bicycle and pedestrian needs.

Implementation is designed to reach the ATP pedestrian and bicycle goals and objectives through a series of specific action items. Pedestrian actions fall into planning, engineering, safety and encouragement, and street cross-section recommendations. A brief list of pedestrian recommendations includes conducting baseline sidewalk gap analysis and mapping, making street intersections and trail crossings safer and comfortable for pedestrians, emphasis on future east-west trail connections, and separate pedestrians and bicycle facilities where the combined active transportation network causes conflict among users. For a thorough understanding of the Fayetteville Active Transportation Plan please visit the City of Fayetteville website.
9.5 Transit

The Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission (NWARPC) is the region’s designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). MPOs are federally-mandated and federally-funded organizations that serve primarily to ensure regional transportation planning and cooperation, including public transit. NWARPC is the designated MPO for the Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers AR-MO urbanized area and the recipient of Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Formula Grants.

Fayetteville is served by two public transit agencies – Razorback Transit and Ozark Regional Transit (ORT). Ozark Regional Transit began operations in Northwest Arkansas in 1979 under the direction of Community Resources Group (CRG), a local non-profit organization. In 2001, after CRG ceased providing service, mayors from Fayetteville, Springdale, and Rogers, as well as County Judges from Benton, Carroll, Madison, and Washington Counties formed a Board for managing ORT services. Currently, ORT receives funding from the FTA for both rural and urban services. Additionally, these funds are matched with a State of Arkansas tax on rental cars and a local match from the cities and counties that it serves. ORT also provides fixed route and demand response services in areas of Washington, Benton, and Madison Counties.

University of Arkansas’ Razorback Transit (Razorback Transit) also originated in 1979 through the joint efforts of the University, the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department (AHTD, now ARDOT), and NWARPC. In July of 2004, Razorback Transit became a direct recipient of FTA funds. Razorback Transit provides fare-fee transportation service to on-campus locations and major off-campus living and shopping areas in Fayetteville.

More information about both transit agencies can be found in the NWA 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan on the Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commissions website.
Transit Development Plan: In 2010 a Northwest Arkansas Transit Development Plan (TDP) was developed to create a framework for expanding service in the NWA region. The TDP recommendations were based on a thorough analysis of the existing conditions and had extensive public input and survey components. In addition to the standard public outreach process, a transit Ridecheck Survey on all ORT and Razorback Transit fixed-route services (boardings and alightings by stop, trip, and route), and an On-board Survey for trip data (origin, destination, trip purpose) were conducted, as well as demographics analysis.

Northwest Arkansas Travel Demand Forecasting Model: a regional model based on the traditional four-step sequential modeling method (Trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice, and route assignment) with a feedback loop was developed in 2004 and has been updated several times. The most recent update was finalized in 2015 and added a mode choice model for vehicular travel as well as transit in the region. The newly-upgraded model has the capability of utilizing the travel time results from the model to aid local transit agencies in their route planning, evaluation, and needs assessment.

Northwest Arkansas Transportation Alternatives Analysis: a regional transportation alternatives analysis was completed in 2014. The study’s geography was the 40-mile, north-south Interstate 49 corridor in Washington and Benton Counties. To the greatest extent possible, the study approach followed the planning guidelines of the FTA, especially those that apply to New Starts and Major Capital Investment funding. The alternatives studied were light rail (new location in I-49 corridor), commuter rail (in the Arkansas & Missouri Railroad corridor), and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on Highway 71B.

Bus Rapid Transit Study (BRT): In 2018, the Walton Family Foundation is funding a study in collaboration with ORT to assess the potential of operating a higher level of bus service along U.S. Highway 71 or I-49 between Fayetteville and Bentonville. BRT is typically predicated on a number of features to be successful, including priority treatment at traffic signals to speed up travel time, special boarding platforms for rapid boarding, and a connected bus with no wait to your final destination. The results of the BRT study are not available at the time of this City Plan 2040 update.
The transit landscape in Fayetteville and the region is in a state of flux. In the summer of 2018, Fayetteville’s City Council approved a resolution to fund the share of Fayetteville’s ORT ridership fares for the remainder of the year to provide a free and seamless ridership experience in Fayetteville. Recent challenges and opportunities present the transit agencies, communities served, and board partnerships with the responsibility of making some far-reaching decisions. What is certain is that transit will be playing an active role in how people move throughout the NWA region in the future. Planning, designing, funding, and implementing an efficient and equitable regional transit system is imperative to maintaining a high quality of life for existing and future residents as the region continues to grow and develop.

9.6 Rail

Fayetteville is served by an active rail line, the Arkansas and Missouri Railroad, which divides the City in a north-south direction and stretches from Monett, Missouri to Fort Smith, Arkansas along 149 miles of track. Though primarily a freight line, the Railroad also operates a tourist passenger train, making trips originating in Springdale to local areas of interest. The Railroad has recently expressed interest in expanding freight services in the City and has been willing to discuss the potential for a commuter or special event passenger rail service in the future.

The Arkansas and Missouri Railroad has worked with the City to improve Fayetteville’s trails system and pedestrian streetscape. A 99-year lease was signed allowing for potential trail crossings, with a preference for grade separation where bicycle and pedestrian traffic travels over or under railroad tracks. In 2015, the Railroad cost-shared with the City to make improvements to the crossing on Dickson Street, an exceptionally high-traffic pedestrian area. These projects have all included a consideration for pedestrian safety and coordinated traffic signalization that fosters future cooperation between the City and Railroad.
9.7 Aviation

Fayetteville Executive Airport, Drake Field is a FAR Part 139 Class IV General Aviation airport located three miles south of downtown Fayetteville. The airport is adjacent to Highway 71 with easy access to I-49. Drake Field is the premiere general aviation airport in Northwest Arkansas and it serves the needs of both private and corporate aviation along with unscheduled charter of commercial aircraft in support of the University of Arkansas Athletics. There are eight T Hangar buildings with 94 individual units, and the fixed-base operator (FBO) hangar which can store up to 6 aircraft. An additional six corporate hangars are utilized by various corporations and the University of Arkansas. Aircraft maintenance and an avionics shop are housed in separate hangars. There are currently 111 aircraft based at the airport.

Currently the Terminal Building is leased at capacity with businesses including Skydive Fayetteville, Jett Aircraft, and the US Postal Service. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Facilities Maintenance also leases a building from the airport and the USDA Forest Service leases a large parcel from the airport for a Fire Fighting Base. The Airport can offer ground lease opportunities for owner-built hangars and typically there is aircraft storage space available.

The City of Fayetteville, as the FBO, provides personalized and professional customer, line, and fueling services for airport customers. Located on the airport grounds is the historic Arkansas Air Museum and the Ozark Military Museum which provide historic educational displays and vintage aircraft for people of all ages to view and enjoy.

Since 2013, aircraft operations (takeoffs and landings) have continued to fluctuate while aviation fuel sales have increased steadily. Much of this increase in jet fuel sales is due to the increase of corporate businesses traffic on the field.

What is a “General Aviation” airport?

Per the Federal Aviation Administration, a Class IV Airport is a facility that serves only unscheduled operations of large air carrier aircraft. Requirements associated with Class IV Airports include minimum maintenance, marking and lighting, hazardous material handling/storage, and safety standards.
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10.1 Historic Resources and Their Relationship to the Community

Fayetteville has a rich and diversified offering of historic resources. These include numerous historic neighborhoods, buildings and landscapes that provide architectural and cultural reminders of the historical past while contributing to the character of Fayetteville.

To the community’s credit, many historically significant structures have been preserved or restored and serve as functionally viable uses for present day residential and commercial business activity. This has been accomplished through both public and private efforts and it speaks to a community-based obligation to the preservation of Fayetteville’s historical past. Downtown Fayetteville, centered around the square, is a striking example of the community’s commitment to the integration of its historical past with the social and economic dynamics of the present.

The City of Fayetteville preserves a couple of significant historic structures; the City Administration building downtown, and White Hanger at Drake Field Airport. City government has also restored two historic bridges over the rail line downtown at Maple St. and Lafayette St. Many significant historic structures have non-profit or quasi-governmental ownership like the Walker Stone House, the Headquarters House, and the Clinton House. Additional historic structures are preserved on the University of Arkansas campus, including; Old Main, Ozark Hall, and the Chi Omega Greek Theatre. There are also many historic structures in private hands, such as; the Old Post Office, the Frisco Depot, and the Gunsinger Building, to name a few located on the downtown square. A complete listing and map of historic resources in Fayetteville can be found on the City of Fayetteville website.
10.2 National Historic Register

There are currently six established historic districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places: Washington-Willow, Mt. Nord, Wilson Park, Meadow-Spring, West Dickson Commercial District and a portion of the University of Arkansas campus. The Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) oversees the process for adding properties to the National Register of Historic Places. The first step is to file a determination of eligibility report. If deemed eligible, AHPP staff will conduct a site visit and document the property. Next a National Register Nominating Form shall be completed and presented to the State Review Board for approval. Once approved by the State Review Board, the property will be forwarded to the National Register office of the National Park Service (NPS) in Washington, DC. A NPS determination will be made within 45 days of the receipt of the nomination.
10.3 Recent Historic Preservation Efforts

Since the adoption of City Plan 2030 there have been several significant achievements, disappointments and community concerns related to historic preservation. Many of the community concerns relate to the demolition of old structures to make way for infill development in existing neighborhoods. High growth rates and a robust economic cycle has led to rising land and home values especially in the historic neighborhoods in and around downtown Fayetteville. This growth pressure compounded with one of the City’s adopted goals, “to make appropriate infill and revitalization our highest priority” has led to some teardowns of historically significant structures. Fortunately, recent development pressure has also brought an increased awareness to the public, appointed, and elected officials of the need and value for historic preservation in Fayetteville.

In response to the changing economic and development pressures evident in the City, the Fayetteville Historic District Commission (HDC) has taken a more active role in historic preservation education. The HDC has created an annual preservation award program that celebrates the City’s rich cultural heritage and commends projects, organizations, and individuals that have displayed an outstanding commitment to historic preservation in Fayetteville. The HDC and city staff have also worked closely with Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) to apply for, and receive, Certified Local Government grant funding on an annual basis. Grant funds have been utilized to accomplish a wide variety of historic preservation efforts including: creation of educational brochures and signage, researching and cataloguing historic structures and the creation a “storymap” website, repairing and installing an educational plaque for Oak Cemetery, and the creation of the Meadow and Spring Historic District. The Meadow and Spring Street Historic District was recently approved by the Arkansas State Review Board and is going to National Register Review Board in the fall of 2018. The Meadow Spring Street Historic District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in April 2019.

In 2018, staff and the HDC completed a neighborhood survey for the Washington-Willow historic district. The survey gauged public input for local historic preservation regulations for the neighborhoods and, at the time of this plan update, was in the process of hiring a consultant to work with the neighborhood to create design standards or a historic overlay
The Walton Arts Center

In the late 1980s the Walton Family, the University of Arkansas and the City of Fayetteville each individually realized the need for an auditorium or a community arts facility that could accommodate major touring shows, local and regional performing acts and even corporate meetings. As each group explored the options, it became apparent that there was potential to work together. In 1986 the first Walton Arts Center Council was formed. Made up of three university appointees and three city representatives, this group was charged with building the arts center. The Walton Family Foundation, the university and the city contributed $9 million to the cause. An additional $7 million was raised from the private sector. Wisely, $3 million was set-aside in an endowment that allowed for operations, including the hiring of staff and consultants. In 1992, the Walton Arts Center opened its’ doors to the public, the product of a six-year collaboration between City government, the University of Arkansas and private sector sponsors and philanthropists.

The organization has grown significantly over the last quarter of a century and now operates three facilities – the original Walton Arts Center, the neighboring Nadine Baum Studios and the Walmart Arkansas Music Pavilion (AMP) in Rogers. The Walton Arts Center completed a $23 million renovation and expansion of the original performing arts campus in November 2016. The expansion dramatically increased front of house and event space, production support space and administrative offices, adding more than 30,000 square feet and improving the operational capacity and visitor experience for both patrons and artists. Widely viewed as the project that ‘tuned around’ the Dickson St. Entertainment District after a period of decline, the Walton Arts Center is now the premiere live performance space in Northwest Arkansas.
The University of Arkansas

The university theater and music departments offer numerous opportunities for students, residents and visitors to experience student performances. In 2018 the Department of Theatre scheduled six productions and the Department of Music offers many performances including three choirs and four concert bands in addition to the Razorback Marching Band that performs for fans most weekends during the fall semester. The university sports programs offer Razorback fans live sporting events during all seasons in world class facilities such as the 76,000 seat Reynolds Razorback Stadium for football, the 20,000 seat Bud Walton Arena for basketball, and Baum Stadium for baseball. The university also attracts world-renowned political and literary figures to the campus, benefiting the entire Fayetteville community.

Fayetteville Parks and Recreation

The City of Fayetteville manages over 4,300 acres of public parkland, including 4 regional parks, 4 community parks, over 30 neighborhood parks and special interest areas, 18 natural areas, and 18 trails that connect parks and other destinations throughout the city. With over 80 miles of natural surface trails and boardwalks, 27 playgrounds, 7 tennis courts, 7 volleyball courts, 3 lakes, a swimming pool, new splashpad, skate park, and picnic facilities, plus many more recreational opportunities, residents and visitors have an abundance of outdoor recreation opportunities. The Parks and Recreation Department hosts the Gulley Park Summer Concert Series, and in 2018 hosted the Homegrown Music Festival at Kessler Mountain. Additionally, the many miles of mountain bike trails are increasingly being used to host mountain biking events.

Fayetteville Farmers Market

With the downtown square gardens as a backdrop, open-air vendors sell produce and handmade items from April 1st through mid-November. Plants, trees, herbs, vegetables, fruits, flowers, pottery, candles, jewelry, artwork and other items are regularly featured. The Fayetteville Farmers Market was voted the #5 farmers market in the U.S. through the American Farmlands Trust’s Favorite Farmers Market Contest in 2011.
Public Art

Fayetteville has a large amount of public visual art pieces on display throughout the community, much of it located on public property along the trail system and throughout the parks system. Public art can include sculptures, memorials, murals, integrated landscape or architectural work, light displays, digital media, community art, interactive pieces, performances, festivals, and more. Public art creates a destination, invites critique, inspires photographs, and initiates a memorable experience.

Fayetteville’s public art collection includes: permanent sculpture installations such as the Peace Globe Fountain at the Town Center and the Hoover Sculpture along the Razorback Regional Greenway at Center St., public murals on retaining walls, trail tunnels and buildings, and numerous temporary pieces such as storm drain art that is educational, or traffic signal and electric utility boxes which provide whimsical canvases to display local artists works.

Performance Space

Fayetteville is fortunate to have a thriving live performance culture. Live theater, dance, comedy, music and more is available to visitors and residents on an almost nightly basis. The Walton Arts Center is the most prominent venue in the City and region and it attracts local, national and international shows and performances. The local production company TheatreSquared started in 2005 in a space at the Nadine Baum Studios and it has grown into an award-winning professional theater company which is in the process of building a new 50,000 square foot facility on City-owned property at the intersection of Spring St. and West Ave. TheatreSquared is a leader in Arkansas for arts-in-education, access programing, and lifelong learning, and their programs reach 18,000 students and teachers each year. In 2011, TheatreSquared was recognized by the American Theatre Wing, founder of the Tony Awards, as one of the nation’s ten most promising emerging theatres.

There are many additional community facilities that are used for public performance space. The Fayetteville Town Center is a multi-use space operated by Experience Fayetteville (Fayetteville Advertising and Promotion Commission – A&P) and it is utilized as a performance space, most notably for Roots Festival. The Fayetteville Public Library (FPL) also utilizes its’ Walker Room for numerous musical and speaker events throughout the year. The FPL expansion project is in the construction phase at the time of this plan update and it will include a 600 seat multi-purpose public space in its’ 70,000 square foot expansion. The University has recently renovated the auditorium space at the UofA Global Campus building on the Fayetteville Square into a black box theater where they will be producing shows in addition to the shows held at the University Theater on the main campus. A variety of scheduled and impromptu performances also take place at various City Parks throughout the year, such as the Gulley Park Concert Series, First Thursdays celebrations, and buskers performing during the farmers market on the Fayetteville Square.
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11.1 Growth Patterns

The pattern on which Fayetteville was originally laid out was a compact plan, using a standard street grid with the town square at the center. This “traditional” pattern of compact blocks continued as new additions to the City were platted and annexed up until the middle of the twentieth century. Traditional development patterns were also characterized by a wide variety of commercial and residential uses mixed and in proximity to each other. After World War II the City’s dominant development pattern became what we now consider “conventional”; auto oriented, disconnected and with rigid land use separations. Large areas of west, north and east Fayetteville were developed in this conventional pattern with cul-de-sac street designs and detached single-family homes. The commercial development in this era primarily concentrated in strip commercial centers located along ever-expanding arterial streets such as College Avenue and Martin Luther King Boulevard.

As a result, Fayetteville is a mix of both traditional and conventional development patterns that can in some ways be complementary, and in other ways be at odds. If the City is to grow in a sustainable manner, future development patterns are contingent upon finding appropriate locations to accommodate the projected population growth over the next 20 years.

11.2 Future Growth Projections

The Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission (NWARPC) estimates and publishes future population estimates in its’ NWARPC Metropolitan Transportation Plan. NWARPC estimates that Fayetteville will grow to a population of 142,496 by the year 2040. This will be an increase of an additional 58,670 people added to the most recent U.S. Census Bureau estimated population of 83,826 in 2017. Planning and anticipating the location, form, and function of land use and growth patterns enables the City and its’ existing residents to guide where and in what pattern this growth will occur. Through the public engagement efforts for the City Plan 2040 update, residents have expressed their desire to retain the goal to prioritize infill and revitalization, but at the same time many expressed a negative reaction to infill negative in their neighborhoods and citywide. Residents have expressed that new development should maintain and contribute to the character of existing neighborhoods and even increase access to amenities. The undeveloped and underdeveloped areas of the City
could theoretically accommodate the estimated future population within the existing footprint of the City through infill, redevelopment and vertical development. However, the feasibility of this is questionable as it would require the average population density to almost double over current development patterns. This will require the City to grow geographically to accommodate growth over the next 20 years. In an effort to make growth more planned and orderly as desired by residents, a Growth Concept Map is presented with this plan update. This will help guide varying tiers of growth throughout the City at identifiable areas.

11.3 Desired Development Patterns to Accommodate Future Population Growth

Current real estate trends both locally and nationally show that people are rethinking how they prioritize home buying decision factors. Factors such as commute times and transportation costs are being weighed against typical suburban development features such as expansive private yard space or three car garages. Generational housing preferences are also beginning to impact where and how future growth will occur. Both the Baby Boom and the Millennial generations are looking for mixed-use and walkable urban neighborhoods over single-use conventional suburban housing. Due to their large cohort size, these two generations will generally guide and determine the location and consumer housing preferences that will be built in the future.

The Growth Concept Map identifies general areas, mostly based on street intersections and along arterial roadways, for future mixed-use infill growth. Considerable land identified as the Tier 2 and 3 Centers and the High Activity and Transit Corridors remains undeveloped or underdeveloped. These locations typically have existing infrastructure in place such as streets, utilities, trails and sidewalks, and proximity to open space. Zoning adjustments should be made to facilitate creating these spaces as completely, compactly and connected as possible such that the anticipated future population and business growth can be accommodated in an efficient and livable manner.

This potential future development pattern is much like Fayetteville’s historic and highly regarded neighborhoods such as Wilson Park, Washington-Willow, or Walker Park that were built with a residential net density of 6 to 10 units per acre. The historic neighborhoods of Fayetteville share some common characteristics; highly connected street systems with small blocks, a mix of residential housing types, sizes and densities, proximity to commercial
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and retail uses and accessibility to meaningful open space. These basic characteristics are essential for residents to perform some of their daily functions without the use of an automobile. Good neighborhood design is also predicated on creating places and neighborhoods that have a rich variety of housing choices. The historic development pattern that exists Downtown illustrates a robust diversity of housing stock. Located within a single block may be single-family homes, condominiums, multi-family apartments, duplexes, live-work units, accessory dwelling units, and all other types of residential uses and many nonresidential uses. This variety allows people to remain in the same neighborhood as their housing needs change over time. This concept of “age in place” is possible in neighborhoods that have highly walkable street networks and that contain a large variety of housing choices at residential densities supportive of retail uses and transit.

11.4 Inefficiencies with Conventional Suburban Development Patterns

The trend towards efficient mixed use and walkable neighborhoods is encouraging because suburban development patterns are not financially sustainable over the long-term. In suburban development patterns, low-density retail, employment and services are auto-oriented, resulting in more strip development and auto-oriented centers. Strip development and high arterial traffic counts are not necessary to support retail and commercial activity if it is nearby to walkable neighborhoods with sufficient residential density. Closely clustered shops and services allow for sufficient aggregations of retail and services to achieve economic utility for consumers while encouraging walking by creating interesting destinations to meet people. Vehicle trips per household decline as fewer car trips are necessary for everyday needs. Suburban development patterns on the other hand, result in increased congestion because all activities undertaken outside the home will require car trips. Workforce housing is also less likely to be built because the cost of land development and services per unit is higher in less dense development. Given the higher cost per unit, developers often must seek to maximize land profit by building larger units that may be beyond the means of local workers such as University staff, service workers, firefighters, teachers, and police personnel.

Dispersed development can also yield a poor balance between tax revenue received versus cost of service provision. For instance, a development pattern at 7 units per acre with units priced at $180,000 will have a total value of $1.26 million. At three units per acre, with
housing valued at $300,000 per unit, total value would come to $900,000. But the cost of services for seven units on the same net acre is lower on a per unit basis than for the three units.

When multiplied over thousands of acres, this means that the cost of services in a lower density growth pattern is higher for a given change in population because many more acres are used: utility runs become longer, more road length is required, police and fire response is more expensive or requires extra facilities, etc. While revenue from sales tax would be the same in either scenario, given the average incomes and growth of 39,351 people over the next 20 years, the cost to the City of providing roads and improvements for auto-oriented retail and services is higher even though the return in taxes is constant. A further consideration is that housing options for seniors are typically more limited in dispersed development patterns. According to the National Association of Homebuilders, as people age they value proximity to retail services and medical facilities so that the use of the car is not an automatic necessity. As people live longer, a growing portion of the population will be unable to sustain an auto oriented lifestyle.

Employment Concentrations

The City has two major employment centers that mirror the two Tier 1 Centers identified in the Growth Concept Map; the NWA Mall area, commonly referred to as Uptown, and the Downtown and University of Arkansas areas. Secondary employment concentrations are in the Fayetteville Commerce Park, near the Fulbright Expressway, and around major street intersections throughout the City. The concentration of employment in the Uptown area is being driven by a concentration of services such as Washington Regional Medical Center, the Northwest Arkansas Mall, and numerous retail-oriented businesses located along Joyce Boulevard and Lake Fayetteville. Downtown represents the densest concentration of employment, with Dickson Street to Archibald Yell Boulevard comprising 4,379-6,839 jobs per square mile.
11.6 Labor Shed Analysis

A laborshed is defined as the area or region from which an employment center draws its workforce. Laborsheds show the distribution of the workforce irrespective of natural or geo-political boundaries.

The U.S. Census Bureau reports that 13,450 of all employed workers in Fayetteville both live and work within the City. A larger portion, totaling 20,667, live in Fayetteville, but are employed outside of the City. Just as large number of Fayetteville residents commute elsewhere for employment, many more, totaling 32,608 reside outside of Fayetteville and commute in for work. Of the workforce employed in Fayetteville (approximately 46,000 Full-Time Employees), 29% reside within Fayetteville, 13.2% are Springdale residents, 4.2% are Rogers residents, 2.5% are Farmington residents, and 2.4% travel from Bentonville.

Figure 11.1 - Laborshed Analysis
11.7 Economic Base Analysis

When performing economic analyses, the North American Industry Classification System, or NAICS, is used to classify industrial activities across the continent. NAICS codes include two digits to designate overarching business sections, with any additional digit giving greater degrees of detail about the business type.

The City of Fayetteville’s economy is comprised of over 3,800 different businesses as of October, 2018 which represents a net gain of over 200 businesses since December of 2017. The largest industry sector is NAICS 44-45, Retail Trade, which is made up of over 738 various businesses. When joined with the accomodation sector, classified as NAICS 72 and including hotels and motels, retail and restaurants make up 30% of Fayetteville’s economy.

Manufacturing, NAICS 31-33, is home to 105 different businesses. Healthcare and social assistance is another major industry sector for the City, with 358 different businesses. There are over 450 Professional, Scientific, and Technical companies operating in Fayetteville. The City’s targeted industry sectors for growth include corporate services, entrepreneurs and innovators, legacy manufacturers, retail trade, and specialized technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>Number of Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 11: Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 21: Mining, Oil, Gas Extraction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 23: Construction</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 31-33: Manufacturing</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 42: Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 44-45: Retail Trade</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 48-49: Transportation/Warehousing</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 51: Information</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 52: Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 53: Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 54: Professional, Scientific, and Technical</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 55: Management of Companies</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 56: Administrative Support/Wast Mgmt.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 61: Educational Services</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 62: Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 71: Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 72: Accomodation and Food</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 81: Other Services</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 92: Public Administration</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.0 - Businesses by NAICS Code
11.8 Retail Market Analysis

More than any other source, Fayetteville, like many cities in Arkansas, depends on sales tax revenue to support City services and projects. In 2018, Fayetteville’s total taxable sales peaked at $2.2 billion across all industry sectors, equating to over $22 million in sales tax revenue generated for the City’s General Fund. The primary contributors to the City’s sales tax revenue is retail trade, hotels and motels, and food services, which accounted for 70% of total sales tax revenue generated in 2018.

Retail Trade and Accommodation and Food Services equated to 57% ($1.328 billion) of total taxable sales. The strongest sub-sectors of retail trade included general merchandise stores, building materials and supplies, and grocery stores. Accommodation and Food Services combined accounted for 15% ($334 million) of total taxable sales. Of note, a particularly strong full-service restaurant sector was able to generate $171 million in sales. When taxable sales are tallied, retail trade contributes the most at 54% ($1,253,616,060.00), followed by wholesale trade at 7% ($160,606,394.50), and manufacturing at 4% ($95,114,001.00).
sales are compared on a per capita basis with the State of Arkansas, Fayetteville does 2.07 times as many sales. This number, often referred to as a “pull factor” is one of the many measures used to gauge Fayetteville’s draw as a shopping destination. A pull factor of one indicates capture of average expenditures of all the residents in the community, as compared to the State as a whole. A pull factor of less than one indicates leakage for the overall economy, or an economy that may be in poor health.

One important note when studying Fayetteville’s market is that the City hosts a large “retail trade area”. A retail trade area is defined as the geographic area from which a community generates most of its’ customers. Fayetteville’s trade area encompasses approximately 187,000 individuals. These individuals either live in Fayetteville itself, reside in its trade area, or are visiting the City. Fayetteville’s large trade area is shaped by the topography of the Ozark mountains, stretching into areas of Oklahoma due to the distance between the City of Fayetteville and the City of Fort Smith.

A more granular look at the retail market is included below, the largest sub-sector of retail trade is “other general merchandise stores” with $326M in sales for 2018. The second largest category was building materials with $158M in sales, followed by grocery stores with $103M in sales.

### Retail Sub-Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Sub-Sectors</th>
<th>2018 Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Dealers</td>
<td>$22,740,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Parts; Accessories; and Tire Stores</td>
<td>$28,038,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer; Wine; and Liquor Stores</td>
<td>$30,205,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Stores and News Dealers</td>
<td>$5,982,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material and Supplies Dealers</td>
<td>$158,013,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing Stores</td>
<td>$68,592,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Stores</td>
<td>$49,458,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Selling Establishments</td>
<td>$5,798,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Shopping and Mail-Order Houses</td>
<td>$41,591,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and Appliance Stores</td>
<td>$87,071,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florists</td>
<td>$1,935,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Stores</td>
<td>$24,779,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline Stations</td>
<td>$19,176,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>$103,374,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>$38,070,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishings Stores</td>
<td>$27,402,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry; Luggage; and Leather Goods Stores</td>
<td>$9,723,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn and Garden Equipment and Supplies Stores</td>
<td>$3,232,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies; Stationery; and Gift Stores</td>
<td>$21,724,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Merchandise Stores</td>
<td>$396,095,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Store Retailers</td>
<td>$25,323,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Motor Vehicle Dealers</td>
<td>$1,677,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe Stores</td>
<td>$17,633,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Food Stores</td>
<td>$9,042,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods; Hobby; and Musical Instrument Stores</td>
<td>$50,066,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Merchandise Stores</td>
<td>$6,674,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending Machine Operators</td>
<td>$190,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.2 - Retail Sales by Sub-sector
11.9 Growth Concept Oriented Economic Development

The City of Fayetteville has primarily seen recent and consistent economic growth in its’ two Tier 1 Centers; Downtown and Uptown. These areas make up most of the City’s employment, retail, and accommodation opportunities. Employment opportunities and the availability of goods and services are a key component of complete, compact, and connected neighborhoods. The City also has ample opportunity for concentrated economic development growth in the Tier 2 and Tier 3 Centers annotated on the Growth Concept Map. By focusing and targeting economic development into these areas, key businesses can serve as a catalyst for continued private sector investment in these areas, while discouraging continued urban sprawl.

Uptown Fayetteville, which not that long ago was primarily a retail center, has seen growth in the realm of housing and employment opportunities in recent years. However, as the availability the developable land in Downtown and Uptown continues become more challenging- the Tier 2 and Tier 3 Centers and the High Activity Corridors present an opportunity for continued expansion of the tax base, more affordable opportunities for small businesses, and the enhancement of resident’s quality of life through goods and services being readily available through alternatives modes of transportation.
12 Guiding Policies

12.1 Future Land Use Plan and Map
12.2 Master Transportation Plan
12.3 Annexation Plan
12.1 Future Land Use Plan

Introduction

The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) is utilized by City staff, appointed and elected officials, and the public to help guide the zoning and development process. The FLUM identifies and promotes the City’s preferred form-based development pattern that recognizes a sequence of built environments, from natural and very rural to densely urban. Form based development patterns emphasize mixed land uses at the neighborhood, block, and building level. The FLUM is the tool that the community can use to envision change over time regarding land use variety, intensity or density.

The FLUM is framed around a set of land use designations based upon current development patterns and the vision of future development patterns as expressed in City Plan 2040. The following designations are intended to provide general guidance for land use decisions that will shape development growth over the next twenty years:

- Natural Areas
- Rural Residential Areas
- Residential Neighborhood Areas
- City Neighborhood Areas
- Urban Center Areas
- Complete Neighborhood Plan Areas
- Civic and Private Open Space Areas/Parks
- Civic Institutional Areas
- Non-Municipal Government Areas
- Industrial Areas

Fayetteville Public Schools

Cities, policies, and priorities evolve between the adoption of new or updated comprehensive plans. Accordingly, plans and their associated future land use maps undergo periodic amendment to align the goals and policies of these documents with the vision of the community. In Fayetteville, as in many cities, one of the largest impacts on land use development is the construction of a new school. Just as the future land use map guides and informs land use policy, so should new schools inform the future land use map. Ongoing coordination between the Fayetteville Public School District and the City of Fayetteville is important to ensure school and land use planning are complimentary to the goals of all.

Photo 12.1 - Youth Civic Engagement
Future Land Use Map Designations

Natural Areas consist of lands approximating or reverting to a wilderness conditions, including those with limited development potential due to topography, hydrology, vegetation or value as an environmental resource. These resources can include stream and wildlife corridors, as well as natural hubs and cores, many of which are identified in the generalized enduring green network. A Natural Area designation would encourage a development pattern that requires conservation and preservation, prevents degradation of these areas, and would utilize the principles of low impact development stormwater infrastructure for all developments. Natural Areas are prime candidates for conservation subdivision design and/or clustered development patterns. The guiding policies for Natural Areas are:

1. Preserve a network of habitat and open space, thereby protecting biodiversity and enhancing the City’s quality of life.
2. Preserve native vegetation and meet the habitat needs of multiple species.
3. Encourage recreational and educational opportunities in appropriate areas to enhance appreciation of existing environmental resources.
4. Identify areas of environmental concern and protect and preserve environmental resources.
5. Conserve open space and protect areas of significant riparian benefit, tree canopy and other environmental resource through cluster development provisions, density controls, protective easements and/or other development tools.
Future Land Use Map Designations (contd.)

Rural Residential Areas recognize existing low-density large lot development but are identified to encourage the conservation and preservation of woodlands, grasslands, or agricultural lands that are sparsely settled. These areas may or may not have adequate street and water infrastructure or public services, such as police and fire protection to support urban or suburban densities and development patterns. City services should not be expanded to accommodate further growth unless they are in line with the following guiding principles:

1. Allow and encourage historical agricultural and related uses to continue to occur as permanent land uses within planned developments.
2. Proposed development should utilize alternative development patterns such as cluster or conservation subdivisions to achieve compatibility with surrounding rural areas.
3. Foster a culture that supports local food production on a variety of scales.
4. Encourage, preserve and protect viable agribusinesses such as orchards, berry farms and small-scale produce-yielding businesses that provide goods for the local market.
Future Land Use Map Designations (contd.)

Residential Neighborhood Areas are primarily residential in nature and support a wide variety of housing types of appropriate scale and context: single-family, duplexes, rowhouses, multifamily and accessory dwelling units. Residential Neighborhood encourages highly connected, compact blocks with gridded street patterns and reduced building setbacks. It also encourages traditional neighborhood development that incorporates low-intensity non-residential uses intended to serve the surrounding neighborhoods, such as retail and offices, on corners and along connecting corridors. This designation recognizes existing conventional subdivision developments which may have large blocks with conventional setbacks and development patterns that respond to features of the natural environment. Building setbacks may vary depending on the context of the existing neighborhood. The following guiding policies are designed to encourage future and existing residential neighborhoods to be or become more complete, compact and connected:

1. Encourage a block and street layout that promotes walkable and bicycle friendly road designs with slow vehicular design speeds.
2. Utilize principles of traditional residential urban design to create compatible, livable and accessible neighborhoods.
3. Eliminate designs elements that prohibit complete, compact and connected neighborhoods.
4. Protect and restore Fayetteville’s outstanding residential architecture of all periods and styles.
5. Encourage the scale of new development to be compatible in use and proportionality between a variety of residential and non-residential uses.
6. Site new residential areas accessible to roadways, sidewalks, trails, transit, parklands, schools, existing utilities, and retail commercial goods and services.
7. Minimize through traffic on minor residential streets, while providing connections between neighborhoods to encourage openness and neighborliness.
8. Continue to encourage context-sensitive streets, allowing for efficient access to commercial residential areas for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.
Guiding Policies

Photo 12.8 - Charleston Place

Photo 12.9 - Monterrey Apartments

Photo 12.10 - Brookhaven Subdivision

Photo 12.11 - Neighborhood Development

Photo 12.12 - Wilson Park
Guiding Policies

Future Land Use Map Designations (contd.)

City Neighborhood Areas are more densely developed than residential neighborhood areas and provide a mix of non-residential and residential uses. This designation supports the widest spectrum of uses and encourages density in all housing types, from single-family to multi-family. Non-residential and commercial uses are primarily located at street intersections and along major corridors. Ideally, commercial uses would have a residential component and vary in size, variety and intensity. The street network should have a high number of intersections creating a system of small blocks with a high level of connectivity between neighborhoods. Building setbacks and landscaping are urban in form with street trees typically being located within the sidewalk zone.

City Neighborhood Areas encourage complete, compact and connected neighborhoods and are intended to serve the residents of Fayetteville, rather than a regional population. While they encourage dense development patterns, they do recognize existing conventional strip commercial development and their potential for future redevelopment in a more efficient urban layout. The guiding policies for City Neighborhood Areas are:

1. Protect adjoining properties from the potential adverse impacts associated with non-residential uses adjacent to, and within, residential areas with proper mitigation measures that address scale, massing, traffic, noise, appearance, lighting, and drainage.
2. Provide non-residential uses that are accessible for the convenience of individuals living in residential districts and where compatibility with existing development patterns is desired.
3. Reduce the length and number of vehicle trips generated by residential development by enhancing the accessibility to these areas. Walkability should be integral to the design of the street and neighborhood shopping should be within a reasonable walking distance from residential uses.
4. Encourage developers to designate and plan for mixed-use corners at the time of approval to properly plan for accessibility to these areas.
5. Encourage pedestrian-friendly mixed-use buildings with transparent glass for commercial uses at street level and building entrances that address and connect to the street and sidewalk.
6. Encourage a block and street layout that promotes walkable, bicycle friendly street designs with slow design speeds.
7. Encourage mixed-use development that is sensitive to surrounding residential uses and allows for day and night utilization of available parking.
8. Utilize principles of traditional residential urban design to create compatible, livable and accessible neighborhoods.
9. Encourage properties to redevelop in an urban form utilizing form-based zoning designations.
10. Protect and restore Fayetteville’s outstanding residential architecture of all periods and styles.
11. Utilize the Master Street Plan and incorporate bike lanes, parkways and landscaped medians to preserve the character of the City and enhance the utilization of alternative modes of transportation.
12. Manage non-residential development within and adjoining residential neighborhoods to minimize nuisances.
13. Minimize through traffic on minor residential streets, while providing connections between neighborhoods to encourage openness and neighborliness.
Future Land Use Map Designations (contd.)

Urban Center Areas contain the most intense and dense development patterns within the City and allow for the tallest and greatest variety of buildings. Urban Center accommodates rowhouses, apartments, local and regional retail, hotels, clean technology industries and entertainment uses. These areas are typified by their location adjacent to major thoroughfares with high visibility. Although Urban Center Areas recognize the conventional big box and strip retail centers existing along major arterials, it is expected that vacant properties will be developed into traditional mixed-use centers, allowing people to live, work and shop in the same area. Additionally, infill of underperforming or undervalued existing big box and strip centers should be strongly encouraged since there is a greater return on investment for redevelopment of these areas that have existing public infrastructure such as streets, sidewalks, trails, water, sewer and parklands.
The guiding policies for Urban Center Areas are:

1. Encourage mixed-use development to allow for shared parking and day and night utilization of available parking.
2. Encourage intensive mixed-use development within on-quarter mile of public transit routes.
3. Provide enough retail business and service space to enable Fayetteville to realize its full potential as a regional market.
4. Encourage continuing improvements and expansion of regional shopping and entertainment attractions.
5. Require that large commercial sites be designed and landscaped in a manner that preserves the aesthetic character of their surroundings.
6. Direct new regional development into designated regional commercial centers.
7. Approve new regional commercial development as Planned Zoning Districts (e.g. shopping centers, business parks, medical parks, industrial parks and mixed-use developments) or complete neighborhood plans to assure the overall integration of design and use.
8. Utilize principles of traditional residential urban design to create compatible, livable and accessible neighborhoods.
9. Protect and restore Fayetteville’s outstanding residential architecture of all periods and styles.
10. Utilize the Master Street Plan and incorporate bike lanes, parkways and landscaped medians to preserve the character of the City and enhance the utilization of alternative modes of transportation.
11. Utilize open space by providing pocket parks and community green space, ensuring the connectivity of natural areas across the community.
12. Encourage the integration of clean technology industrial uses along with residential commercial uses.
Future Land Use Map Designations (contd.)

Civic and Private Open Space/Parklands are sites that are permanently dedicated to open space or parkland. Fayetteville is fortunate to have abundant parklands well positioned geographically across and throughout the City. Publicly accessible open space is essential for residents to have convenient access to outdoor amenities. Public open spaces can also serve as catalytic economic development opportunities to lure visitors to the City for special events. This is evident in the amount of use that the City has experienced with our many local multi-purpose paved trails and the increasing number of mountain bike facilities that have been constructed in our public parks. Additionally, the realization of the Kessler Mountain Regional Park has brought in many visitors to participate in local and regional sporting events. As the City fills in with new development the accessibility to, and variety of uses available within, our public open spaces becomes increasingly important. The guiding policies for Civic and Private Open Space/Parklands are:

1. Encourage parkland dedication and conservation easements for trails that support the City’s Active Transportation Plan, Parks Master Plan and the Enduring Green Network.
2. Provide an integrated network of open space areas throughout the City to serve local residents and visitors to the City.
3. Plan for the long-term preservation and enhancement of open space. This is especially relevant to identifying, preserving or enhancing undeveloped natural areas, utility corridors, and key scenic corridors or viewsheds.
4. Conserve open space within Fayetteville’s identified enduring green network through private acquisition and other acceptable conservation methods.
5. Encourage the creation of connected trails and walkways between community activity areas and neighborhoods and enhance with informational kiosks and rest stations.
6. Capture the inherent value of trails and open space by providing more opportunities for people to live and work on properties with direct frontage on these investments.
7. Encourage community-based “green infrastructure” such as rain gardens, vegetated drainages and bio-retention facilities.
8. Encourage pocket parks, especially in areas identified as Urban Center areas.
9. Encourage trail and open space design that incorporates the principals of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).
10. Encourage landscape and architectural design that physically defines open spaces and trails as places of shared use.
Guiding Policies

Future Land Use Map Designations (contd.)

**Civic Institutional Areas** are dedicated for building generally operated by not-for-profit organizations dedicated to culture, government, education or transit and municipal parking. The guiding policies for Civic Institutional Areas are:

1. Encourage the establishment of civic institutional areas in locations that would serve large numbers of Fayetteville citizens.

**Complete Neighborhood Plan Areas** are neighborhoods that have had a Master Development Plan created through a public input process that has been approved by the City Council and that include the elements necessary to the creation of complete, compact and connected neighborhoods. The guiding policies for Complete Neighborhood Plan Areas are:

1. Refer to the applicable master plan for the guiding policies specific to the neighborhood because each complete neighborhood plan has been adopted with specific goals, objectives and strategies for implementation. These master plans should be referred to first as a land use guide.

**Non-Municipal Government Areas** are those areas that do not fall within the City’s jurisdiction and are not subject to zoning or development regulations. These areas may include institutional campuses, county or state offices, etc. The guiding policies for Non-Municipal Government Areas are:

1. Encourage the integration and coordination of non-municipal government areas with planning and development in surrounding City-regulated areas.
2. Provide opportunities for integration of the areas into the City should the existing non-municipal government ever change, adding street and pedestrian connections and utilities.
Future Land Use Map Designations (contd.)

**Industrial Areas** are those areas where buildings by their intrinsic functions, disposition or configuration, cannot conform to one of the other designated areas and/or its’ production process requires the area to be separated from other uses. The guiding policies of Industrial Areas are:

1. Noise, visual, air, water and other pollution shall be minimized through performance standards.
2. New industry shall be recruited and encouraged to locate within the existing industrial park unless rail access is necessary to the industry.
3. Industrial zones that are not consistent with the Future Land Use map should be rezoned to more appropriate uses.
4. Encourage the use of “green” technologies to minimize noise, air and water pollution.
12.2 Master Transportation Plan

The Master Transportation Plan is the guiding policy that the community, City Staff, the Planning Commission and the City Council utilize to proactively guide decisions regarding street classification, design, location, form and function. The Master Transportation Plan prescribes and plans for the development of a multi-modal transportation system in the form of streets, sidewalks, bicycle facilities, trails and transit. Multi-modal transportation system is vital to growing a livable transportation network. Consistent planning ensures that streets will efficiently circulate traffic within the community and connect Fayetteville to the rest of the regions. Special emphasis should be placed on multi-modal transportation infrastructure design, access management and traffic speed and volume considerations when planning new streets and redeveloping existing ones. The Fayetteville Mobility Plan can be found on the City of Fayetteville website.

The Master Transportation Plan contains three specific tools that are utilized to guide transportation infrastructure decision making: The Master Street Plan Map, Master Street Plan Cross-sections and the Active Transportation Plan Map.

Active Transportation Plan

The Fayetteville Active Transportation plan and associated Active Transportation Plan Map guide the planning and development of the City’s expanding shared-use paved trail system. Active Transportation Plan Map illustrates future trail alignments and street corridors for acquiring easements and right-of-way. As development occurs adjacent to future trail alignments, careful attention is paid to acquiring the necessary trail easements and for providing site development input during the development review process. Trail cross-sections that are integrated in Master Street Plan cross-sections will be utilized for the construction of active transportation facilities that accommodate users of all ages and abilities.

Beginning in 1978, the City of Fayetteville began exploring the potential for a bikeway system. In the years between 1978 and 2000, a Bikeways Plan was adopted, signage was installed, routes were designated, grant funding was awarded, and Jim Lindsey constructed the first section of the trail, totaling 0.22 miles along Mud Creek. Since then, Fayetteville committed itself fully to the implementation of a trail network, with the formation of citizen groups.
committees and advisory groups, dedication of public funds, and ongoing pursuit of partnerships to realize the planning and construction of nearly 50 miles of shared-use, paved trail. These trails have created the foundation for a larger network that has prompted development along routes. Businesses and residents alike are attracted to the benefits of trail access, whether it be to reduce vehicle dependence, entice trail traffic, for the convenience of patrons, or any number of other reasons.

Like many communities that have embraced shared-use, paved trail construction, Fayetteville has not formally assessed the benefits of a trail network to the local economy, connectivity, and resident equity, nor has it evaluated existing land uses along routes. Despite a trail master plan existing in the form of the Active Transportation Plan, and despite regular and comprehensive reviews of the plan, this document does not aspire to guide, direct, or promote trailside development. Additionally, no concerted or deliberate effort to encourage trailside development through zoning actions or ordinance amendments has been explored.

A trailside development plan can address this gap through a three-phase approach. Firstly, stakeholders, including residents at large, businesses, and property owners will be engaged to solicit input on their vision for development along the trail system and how the City can encourage its success. Secondly, a plan can identify areas of vacant or underutilized land near trails which may be rezoned to encourage development that compliments the City’s public investment. In conjunction with this, the plan can identify areas that may be adjacent to a trail but are inappropriate for development, such as floodplains or sensitive ecosystems. Lastly, the plan will evaluate existing ordinances for opportunities to promote trail-facing businesses and residences that activate the trail system. Taken in concert, these findings can be used to establish coherent and coordinated steps for City staff and officials to implement the plan.
Figure 12.6 - Active Transportation Plan Map
**Master Street Plan Map and Street Cross-sections**

Landowners, developers, and city staff should use the Master Street Plan Map to determine the classification of existing roadways and to account for unbuilt alignments of future street connections. Once the street classification is determined, right-of-way widths can be found on the corresponding Street Cross Section. The street sections are shown with the typical minimum right of way. However, developers and property owners should work with staff to discuss any additional right of way elements that may require wider rights of way. Each cross section lists these additions, including: on-street parking, frontage zones where buildings abut right of way, additional width for fire aerial apparatus access, and other features. In instances where lesser right-of-way dedication is appropriate, administrative approval from the Planning and Zoning Administrator shall be required.

**Low Impact Development:** The City encourages the use of Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater management strategies in street design and construction. Each of the street cross sections can be modified to incorporate LID best practices for stormwater management. Streets that include landscape strips or bump-outs are ideal for implementing LID strategies such as swales or infiltration basins. Developers and engineers should work closely with the City’s Development Services Department to plan and design appropriate stormwater management strategies and structures.

**Public Transportation:** The construction of bus benches, shelters and transit pull-offs is a critical part of a successful transportation system. However, the need for such facilities is ultimately determined by the transit providers. The City should consult with the transit providers prior to the design of any new street, or major street improvement project to determine if the need for new facilities exist.

**Streets in the University of Arkansas Campus:** The City of Fayetteville and the University of Arkansas will partner together in the planning, design, construction or re-construction of streets located within the University of Arkansas area. Streets identified on the Master Street Plan located within the University of Arkansas boundary are intended to be reviewed concurrently with the City and University staff prior to planning and design. These streets should be consistent with the policies of the Master Street Plan but may require alternative cross-sections due to physical constraints unique to the University.

**International Fire Code:** This document recognizes that street cross-sections may be modified to meet the current International Fire Code (IFC) requirements, as adopted by the State of Arkansas.

**Utilities:** In an effort to minimize the impacts of easements and associated grading, the City encourages utilities to be located within the public right-of-way wherever possible. Further, public utilities, i.e. water and sanitary sewer, should be placed under sidewalks rather than streets to avoid maintenance costs, and located at a sufficient depth to avoid conflicts with street tree plantings. Where underground utilities are installed inside or outside of the City’s rights-of-way, the City encourages ground-level utility equipment to be screened from public view where feasible or coherently organized to minimize visual impact on the streetscape.
Figure 12.7 - Master Street Plan Map
**Residential Link Street (Local)** - Design Service Volume: <4,000 vpd - Desired Operating Speed: 15-20 mph

The residential link street section is intended to be the standard in neighborhoods and low-volume areas outside of the downtown. Generous greenspace and a comfortable sidewalk are coupled with on-street parking to create a safe environment for all modes and abilities. Most residential link streets will have a design service volume <1,500 vpd allowing bicycles to intermix with traffic safely. On-street protected bike facilities should be considered where traffic volumes or speeds exceed thresholds for all ages and abilities. Residential links should be designed and proposed meeting block length, connectivity, and access management codes. Storm drainage infrastructure should have adequate depth or be offset to avoid conflicts with street tree plantings. Low-Impact Development (LID) features in green spaces are recommended best practices to incorporate alternative stormwater treatment techniques.

As determined by city staff, additional roadway elements may be required and include:
- An additional 2-ft frontage zone where buildings abut right-of-way. This may be accomplished with setbacks or additional right-of-way.
- Streets planned with on street bike facilities as shown on the Active Transportation Plan, shall accommodate one 10-ft sidewalk, as determined by the Zoning and Development Administrator, by increasing right-of-way by 4-ft.

Alternative design elements may be approved administratively and include:
- Removal of the 7-ft parking lane will be considered when adequate parking is provided elsewhere.

Minimum Right-of-Way: 45-feet
Maximum Right-of-Way: 52-feet
**Alternative Residential Link Street (Local)** - Desired Operating Speed: 15-20 mph

The alternative residential link street section is intended to reduce the footprint of the residential street scape while keeping a safe environment for all modes and abilities. Storm drainage infrastructure should have adequate depth or be offset to avoid conflicts with street tree plantings. Low-Impact Development (LID) features in green spaces are recommended best practices to incorporate alternative stormwater treatment techniques.

---

The alternative residential link street section shall require Planning Commission approval in areas other than the Hilltop-Hillside Overlay District and the following should be taken into consideration:

- Block lengths less than or equal to 400-feet
- Environmental reasons where no other section is applicable
- Historic streets for small infill projects
- Streets with less than 250 vehicles per day
- Alley-loaded development

As determined by city staff, additional roadway elements may be required and include:

- An additional 2-ft frontage zone where buildings abut right-of-way. This may be accomplished with setbacks or additional right-of-way.
- Streets planned with on street bike facilities as shown on the Active Transportation Plan, shall accommodate one 10-ft sidewalk by increasing right-of-way by 4-ft.

Alternative design elements may be approved administratively and include:

- Removal of the 7-ft parking lane will be considered when adequate parking is provided elsewhere.

Minimum Right-of-Way: 33-feet
Maximum Right-of-Way: 40-feet
**Downtown/Urban Street (Local)**
Design Service Volume: Varies - Desired Operating Speed: 20-25 mph

The downtown (or urban) street section is intended to be used in Fayetteville’s downtown core. Wide sidewalks, with separated furnishing/tree zones will be the standard. On-street parking is desirable and low-speed design should be encouraged to allow for maximum pedestrian comfort and utilization. Sight-lines at intersections should be protected from obstructions. Ideally, bicycles should be able to intermix with traffic safely and on-street protected bike facilities considered where traffic volumes or speeds exceed thresholds for all ages and abilities. Storm drainage infrastructure should have adequate depth or be offset to avoid conflicts with street tree plantings. Low-Impact Development (LID) features in green spaces are recommended best practices to incorporate alternative stormwater treatment techniques.

As determined by city staff, additional roadway elements may be required and include:

- An additional 2-ft frontage zone where buildings abut right-of-way. This may be accomplished with setbacks or additional right-of-way.
- If known or planned transit route, increase lane widths to 11-ft.

Alternative design elements may be approved administratively and include:

- Removal of the 8-ft parking lane or lanes to reduce the right-of-way by 16-ft will be considered when adequate parking is provided elsewhere.
- Sidewalk widths may be reduced to a minimum of 6-ft.
- Furniture zone may be reduced to 3-ft when determined appropriate by the Zoning and Development Administrator.
- Where bump-outs are used, the 4-ft furniture zone may be removed. Street trees may be planted behind sidewalk to meet requirements.
- Angled parking may be used with an additional amount of right-of-way as determined by the Zoning and Development Administrator. (79-ft Right-of-Way)

Example section (left) with parking on both sides.

Minimum Right-of-Way: 39-feet
Maximum Right-of-Way: 63-feet

*Figure 12.10 - Downtown/Urban Street*
**Neighborhood Link Street (Collector)**
Design Service Volume: <6,000 vpd - Desired Operating Speed: 25-30 mph

Neighborhood link streets are intended to bridge between local, low-volume streets and larger regional arterial streets. Larger greenspaces are provided for pedestrian comfort and cyclists are intended to be outside the roadway in a separated facility due to vehicular speeds and volumes. Special design consideration for cyclists at intersections is necessary to ensure intuitive safety for both drivers and riders of all skill levels. These streets may have on-street parking, center turn lanes, or wider lanes accommodating truck or transit vehicles where appropriate. Low-Impact Development (LID) features in green spaces are recommended best practices to incorporate alternative stormwater treatment techniques.

As determined by city staff, additional roadway elements may be required and include:
- An additional 2-ft frontage zone where buildings abut right-of-way. This may be accomplished with setbacks or additional right-of-way.
- Streets planned with on street bike facilities as shown on the Active Transportation Plan, shall accommodate one 10-ft sidewalk, as determined by the Zoning and Development Administrator, by reducing greenspaces.
- Where a dedicated turn-lane is warranted, 3-ft additional pavement may be necessary based on intersection design.

Alternative design elements may be approved administratively and include:
- Removal of the 10-ft parking lane will be considered when adequate parking is provided elsewhere.
- Sidewalk widths may be reduced to a minimum of 6-ft.
- Greenspace or parking may be modified intermittently to provide parking/delivery/loading lane or to provide an aerial fire apparatus access area.

Minimum Right-of-Way: 55-feet
Maximum Right-of-Way: 67-feet
Regional Link Street (Arterial)
Design Service volume: 17,600 vpd - Desired Operating Speed: 30-40 mph

Regional link streets carry local and regional multimodal traffic, serving low-density residential areas and open spaces. Similar to neighborhood link streets, larger greenspaces are provided for pedestrian comfort and cyclists are intended to be outside the roadway in a separated facility due to vehicular speeds and volumes. Special design consideration for cyclists at intersections is necessary to ensure intuitive safety for both drivers and riders of all skill levels. A center lane is reserved for use as a planted median, alternating left-turn lane, or continuous two-way-left-turn-lane. Storm drainage infrastructure should have adequate depth or offset to avoid conflicts with street tree plantings.

Low-Impact Development (LID) features in green spaces are recommended best practices to incorporate alternative stormwater treatment techniques.

As determined by city staff, additional roadway elements may be required and include:
- An additional 2-ft frontage zone where buildings abut right-of-way. This may be accomplished with setbacks or additional right-of-way.
- Where necessary and warranted, the center planting strip may be used for dedicated turn lanes.
- Streets planned with on street bike facilities as shown on the Active Transportation Plan, shall accommodate 10-ft sidewalks by reducing greenspaces.

Alternative design elements may be approved administratively and include:
- Greenspace or parking may be modified intermittently to provide parking/delivery/loading lane or to provide an aerial fire apparatus access area.

Minimum Right-of-Way: 92-feet
**Regional High-Activity Link Street (Arterial)**

Design Service volume: 17,600 vpd - Desired Operating Speed: 30-40 mph

Regional high activity link streets carry local and regional multimodal traffic through a variety of densities and land uses. This street may have on-street parking on one or both sides based on adjacent land-use and will have large sidewalks used also as multi-use shared paths for cyclists. Special design consideration for cyclists at intersections is necessary to ensure intuitive safety for both drivers and riders of all skill levels. A center lane is reserved for use as a planted median, alternating left-turn lane, or continuous two-way-left-turn-lane. Storm drainage infrastructure should have adequate depth or be offset to avoid conflicts with street tree plantings.

Low-Impact Development (LID) features in green spaces are recommended best practices to incorporate alternative stormwater treatment techniques.

As determined by city staff, additional roadway elements may be required and include:
- An additional 2-ft frontage zone where buildings abut right-of-way. This may be accomplished with setbacks or additional right-of-way.
- Where necessary and warranted, the center planting strip may be used for dedicated turn lanes.

Alternative design elements may be approved administratively and include:
- Greenspace or parking may be modified intermittently to provide parking/delivery/loading lane or to provide an aerial fire apparatus access area.

Streets designated as parkways on the Master Street Plan Map could have larger rights-of-way to incorporate wider medians and green spaces.

*(NOTE: A corresponding adjustment to zoning code could be required to facilitate a 50-foot setback along streets designated as parkways.)*

Minimum Right-of-Way: 96-feet
Alleys are used in conjunction with streets to provide rear access to properties, garages and off-street parking. Driveways connected to alleys should have sufficient depth to allow vehicles to park and not encroach into the alley right-of-way. When alleys intersect streets a commercial driveway shall be used.

Fire Department:
Alleys used in conjunction with single- and two-family units are not intended to serve as fire access roads when structures also adjoin a private or public street that provides the required fire access. Fire access roads shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by and approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. When an alley serves as the sole access, or when more than one access is required per the Arkansas Fire code, alleys shall be designed in accordance with the Arkansas Fire Code to support apparatus access, with approval from the Fire Marshall.
12.3 Annexation

Annexation is the inclusion of previously unincorporated lands within the City limits. Annexation has benefits to the residents of the annexed area as well as to the City. The residents gain access to urban services, such as enhanced police and fire protection and have a voice in city government. The City gains the ability to control development and extend boundaries in a logical manner.

The purpose of this planning element is to take a more active approach toward annexations by identifying potential annexations areas and establishing annexation policies. The annexation policies will guide evaluation of future annexation proposals. The policies are designed to ensure that public services, infrastructure, and utility extension is properly addressed in order to manage growth. The potential annexation areas may become part of the City when these annexation polices are met.

Figure 12.15 - Fayetteville Annexation Map
Annexation History and Trends

The original town was incorporated in 1870 with approximately 1,100 acres. Since incorporation, the City has made almost 200 annexations, totaling over 34,000 acres. Annexation activity was relatively slow until the 1940’s, when over 2,500 acres were annexed within 19 annexations. During the 1950’s, almost the same number of annexations took place, however, the total land area annexed was significantly smaller than in the 1940’s. By the 1960’s, annexation activity increased dramatically, with 42 annexations bringing over 18,000 acres into the city limits. Annexation numbers dropped in 1970 and stayed steady until the 1990’s, when the number of annexations tripled from the 1980’s. By 2000, the City contained 45 square miles and by 2018 the City contained approximately 55 square miles.

One indicator of the amount of developable land within the City is the number of people per acre. Prior to 1940 there were approximately 5.6 persons per acre. This era represents the time when Fayetteville was still relatively small and consisted primarily of what we would now consider the downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. By 1970, after numerous large annexations in the 1960’s, the persons per acre had been reduced to 1.3. The City’s population continued to increase dramatically through the 2000’s when we maintained just over 2 people per acre from 2000-2010. An annexation referendum in October of 2006 for a large area along Wedington Drive on the west side of town brought in an additional 1,400 acres of low density land for eventual development.

Figure 12.16 - Fayetteville Town Plat
State Statutes on Annexation

Title 14, Chapter 40 of the state statute discusses annexation. Annexations can be initiated by a municipality or by property owners.

A municipality can annex contiguous lands, lands surrounded by the municipality, unincorporated area that is completely bounded by two or more municipalities. If the municipality has the greater distance of city limits adjoining the area, and land contiguous and in adjacent counties to annex any contiguous lands, the governing body must adopt an ordinance, passed by two-thirds of the governing body and hold an election of the people. Those lands must meet one of the following criteria:

- Platted and held for sale or use as municipal lots;
- Whether platted or not, if the lands are held to be sold as suburban property;
- When the lands furnish the abode for a densely settled community or represent the actual growth of the municipality beyond its legal boundary;
- When the lands are needed for any proper municipal purposes such as for the extension of needed police regulation; or
- When they are valuable by reason of their adaptability for prospective municipal uses.

Contiguous lands must not be annexed if they meet either of the following criteria:

- Have a fair market value at the time of adoption of the ordinance of lands used only for agricultural or horticultural purposes and the highest and best use of the land is for agricultural or horticultural purposes; or
- Are lands upon which a new community is to be constructed with funds guaranteed in whole or in part by the federal government under Title IV of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 or under Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970.

To annex land surrounded by a municipality, the governing body can propose an ordinance to annex the property. Again, the lands must meet the criteria listed above. A public hearing must be held within 60 days of the proposed ordinance, A majority of the governing body must approve the annexation for it to become effective.
Potential Annexation Areas

The potential annexation areas should be identified by the City using the following criteria:

- Areas that are already urban in character.
- Areas that can be developed at urban densities.
- Immediate areas are those that are peninsulas or islands, where municipal services have already been extended.
- Vacant lands that are subject to development pressure.
- Areas where urban services are already provided.
- Areas where urban services are needed.

Annexation Guiding Policies

Boundaries

- Annex existing islands and peninsulas and do not annex areas that would create an island or peninsula.
- Proposed annexation area must be adjacent, or contiguous, to city limits.
- Areas should either include or exclude entire subdivisions or neighborhoods, not divide.
- Boundaries for annexed areas should follow natural corridors.
- The provision of services should be concurrent with development.

Environmentally Sensitive Areas

- Annex environmentally sensitive areas that could be impacted by development and utilize appropriate development regulations to protect those areas.

Emergency and Public Services

- Public services must be able to be provided efficiently in newly annexed areas.
- Annexed areas should receive the same level of service of areas already in the city limits.
- The ability to provide public services should be evaluated in terms of equipment, training of personnel, number of units and response time.
Infrastructure and Utilities
• Areas currently served by utilities and other public services should be annexed.
• Proposed annexation areas should not require the upgrading of utilities to meet the demands of development unless there is a threat to public safety.
• Phased annexation should be initiated by the City within the active annexation areas based on planned service extensions or availability of services.

Intergovernmental Relations
• Promote long-range planning with adjacent jurisdictions.
• Establish agreements to address regional concerns, such as water, stormwater and sewer.

Administration of Annexations
• Develop a land use plan for annexation initiated by the City.
• Designate zoning districts for property during the annexation process.
• An annexation study should be completed on all annexation proposals.
• Development proposals require a separate review from the annexation proposals.
• Residents should be fully informed of annexation activities.
• Encourage larger annexations to create acceptable boundaries.
• Conduct a fiscal impact assessment on large annexations.
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A  Online Survey Results

Question 1
How do you describe your current home?

Answered: 897
Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Responded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>71.91%</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row house or townhome</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex, triplex, or quadplex</td>
<td>5.46%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small apartment complex (5-19 units)</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large apartment complex (more than 20 units)</td>
<td>11.04%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2
Do you agree that enough housing options are available for your income level and family size?

Answered: 897
Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question 3

Do you agree that there are enough housing options in all areas of the City and in all neighborhoods?

Answered: 892
Skipped: 5

- Disagree: 30.72% (274)
- Somewhat disagree: 24.22% (216)
- Neither agree nor disagree: 11.66% (104)
- Somewhat agree: 16.82% (150)
- Agree: 16.59% (148)

157
Question 4
In general, how easy or difficult is it to pay your monthly living expenses?
Answered: 895
Skipped: 2

- Not applicable/have no rent or mortgage: 1.79% (16)
- Very difficult: 5.36% (48)
- Somewhat difficult: 22.01% (197)
- Neither easy nor difficult: 22.68% (203)
- Somewhat easy: 26.37% (236)
- Very Easy: 21.79% (195)
Question 5
How likely would you be willing to live in a small house, townhome or apartment if it meant you could easily walk to shops, restaurants, or parks

Answered: 896
Skipped: 1

- Very unlikely: 37.39% (335)
- Unlikely: 22.32% (200)
- Neither likely nor unlikely: 9.49% (85)
- Likely: 13.95% (125)
- Very likely: 16.85% (151)
Question 6
Based on the description of infill provided above, is there infill development occurring in your neighborhood?

Answered: 782
Skipped: 115

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.88%</td>
<td>55.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>351</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 7
What is your reaction to infill development in Fayetteville?
Answered: 784
Skipped: 113

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>In my Neighborhood</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>20.65%</td>
<td>31.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat positive</td>
<td>22.06%</td>
<td>32.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither positive nor negative</td>
<td>24.26%</td>
<td>12.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat negative</td>
<td>14.97%</td>
<td>14.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td>18.06%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 8
Based on your responses to Question 7, please explain your choice.
Answered: 603
Skipped: 294

See attached open-ended comments
Q8 Based on your responses to Question 7, please explain your choices:

Answered: 603   Skipped: 460

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>While I see infill as important I also see a sever shortage of first time buyer, single family houses with a yard. The city needs more 100-150k sfr, closer to the city core. More row houses shoved into pockets aren't affordable houseing</td>
<td>12/19/2018 12:58 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Infill is not occurring in my neighborhood. Unfortunately, infill housing options are too small and too expensive for my large family. It's a good option for many people and it's good for the city as a whole.</td>
<td>12/6/2018 11:36 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does nothing for property value in my neighborhood. Families buy homes in select school districts. No evidence of infill in desirable school districts.</td>
<td>11/28/2018 5:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>That TIF District fail is a black eye on the face of our City. What are the options?</td>
<td>11/28/2018 2:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We are very interested in infill, but it is usually cost prohibitive.</td>
<td>11/26/2018 9:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Housing options that are associated with infill are not affordable.</td>
<td>11/21/2018 5:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I appreciate the denser housing options available, especially in the downtown and mid areas, but wouldn't want those same developments in less urban areas like Wedington or along Crossover.</td>
<td>11/21/2018 9:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>There is no room at all for infill development in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>11/20/2018 2:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I enjoy the variety of housing that is currently being built to meet the needs of everyone.</td>
<td>11/20/2018 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Human beings were not meant to be crammed together like in some hellish landscape like New York. We need space. Where you see lack of space, crime and violence peak. This foolhardy quest to eliminate driving or large parcels of property will ultimately fail.</td>
<td>11/20/2018 10:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The infill that I am mostly aware of (South Fayetteville- old Jefferson School Neighborhood) is not in scale/style with the existing structures. But more importantly than that, it is far from &quot;affordable&quot;. This has always been an affordable neighborhood but that has changed as the area has gentrified. We need more truly affordable infill housing here, or anywhere for that matter, so that quickly/poorly built Rausch Coleman type homes are not the only option for low-mid income folks and young families.</td>
<td>11/20/2018 9:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Locating and accessing addresses is very difficult for emergency services in areas that are described above</td>
<td>11/20/2018 6:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Infill has the most positive effect for developers and landlords. Infill is not making housing more affordable and pushing poorer people to the periphery of the City or other Cities.</td>
<td>11/19/2018 1:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I live outside city limits, so this does not occur in my neighborhood. However, I have heard from various people that they don't like how many apartments the City is building.</td>
<td>11/19/2018 1:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I understand the need for infill, and I see its value. My issue with the infill going on in Fayetteville with infill housing is that the houses themselves are priced way out of your average Fayetteville family market. We need more affordable infill housing.</td>
<td>11/19/2018 11:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>the examples of parking infill, additional dwelling infill, and middle infill are good uses of space</td>
<td>11/19/2018 11:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I understand the need for infill development, but I don't like the idea of not having any yard or land of my own. Being in a &quot;house&quot; but also 10 ft. from a neighbor doesn't feel right.</td>
<td>11/19/2018 10:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I believe the infill we are currently encouraging is also raising crime rates in our area.</td>
<td>11/19/2018 10:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I view accessory dwelling units as a negative and the others as a positive.</td>
<td>11/19/2018 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I understand the need for infill to reduce urban sprawl and encourages non motorized transit. But I don't like the crowding of neighborhood lots with shoulder to shoulder houses. I feel infill takes away trees, green space and creates more non-permeable surfaces.</td>
<td>11/19/2018 9:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lack of parking options for both residents and visitors. Lack of outdoor entertainment space and privacy.</td>
<td>11/19/2018 8:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I love the infill but no one working in this city can afford those prices. Way too expensive!!! And they keep making them for large families, need to have smaller ones, for singles and empty nesters at least at 150.00/sq ft. Prices are out of reach for salaries in Fayetteville. Investors are picking this city off like buzzards and running folks inside the city out due to prices. This is the biggest issue this city is facing, how to align housing prices with average incomes, because they do not match.</td>
<td>11/19/2018 8:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I think that infill allows for more affordable housing. Not everyone wants a yard to maintain—or they want a community space like the parks where the neighbor kids and your kids can play together. Students can find affordable housing near the campus without the expensive bulky buildings that are Atmosphere, Sterling, etc. Most people cannot afford to live there anyway.</td>
<td>11/18/2018 8:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I do not have many infill examples in my neighborhood, but I do enjoy the infill that has been occurring throughout the city. My only concern about it is easing traffic congestion.</td>
<td>11/17/2018 3:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I would like to see more development in my neighborhood (along Joyce east of College) and I would love to see more mixed use buildings and density. I like the idea of preserving older, historic houses in certain districts but outside of those districts I would like to see more walkable, functional density.</td>
<td>11/17/2018 9:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Access to the infilled areas can be difficult. Narrow streets and access to parking or lack of.</td>
<td>11/17/2018 7:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>11/17/2018 7:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Infill houses too large for lot; architectural style does not fit with existing house. Drainage plans NOT adequate.</td>
<td>11/16/2018 11:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I live in south Fayetteville. I like the new housing going up to replace rundown properties. Infill is always preferable to sprawl.</td>
<td>11/16/2018 11:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Build away, or the city will die.</td>
<td>11/16/2018 9:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>My reaction is positive because I think it will benefit the city overall</td>
<td>11/16/2018 8:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Too crowded. Fix the affordability problem, not the amount of space problem.</td>
<td>11/16/2018 6:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Infill development is not always a win. The new housing options should not unduly impact current residents. That does not mean no impact, but they should not have to endure development that has many negatives. I do not like the large apartment complexes with internal focus and unfriendly connections to the street. More focus on the undeveloped areas of the city that are turning into residential is needed, as these areas are lacking too many positive qualities and are exhibiting the worst of sprawl.</td>
<td>11/16/2018 6:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Too much stuff in too small areas</td>
<td>11/16/2018 6:06 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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35 My neighborhood is in the woods on private property. In the woods behind our property a suburb has been built. While the need for housing is real, woods and precious habitat space should be protected. That is regarding green space and my neighborhood in particular. However, I love infill development for using need less parking lots for a more efficient and beautiful streetscape. I do enjoy looking at and having empty, grassy fields either in rural Fayetteville or urban areas. It calms the heart amidst the hustle and bustle.

36 I would never want to live in this type of dwelling. Commercially, it is fine.

37 Uses available space.

38 My neighborhood would not be a good candidate for infill, but it is a great idea for the City as a whole.

39 It serves a good purpose for additional housing. I'm just partial to open space, less crowding.

40 It makes sense to use existing in place services rather than expanding the maintenance of new infrastructure.

41 There is a lot of development in city as of late - but I do not perceive it as all positive. As of late there seem to be a lot of "affordable"(cheap) multi (cramped) unit development. Most of these units are then requesting rent, arguably, more expensive than they are inherently worth. A lot of the space, I would prefer, to be made into green space and a redevelopment of current buildings to be actually worth the cost they are asking.

42 My neighborhood is growing and infill doesn't seem to be an issue. Citywide, I believe it is good, especially commercial development.

43 If infill respects the surrounding home owners, it is good

44 I see positive and negative things about it.

45 I think infill has resulted in significant loss of tree canopy in our City. New duplexes are not required to comply with the tree preservation ordinance and it seems developers have taken advantage of this. Infill is important, and tree canopy is too.

46 Unused parking lots are unsightly. Finding better use for them is a positive thing. Residential infill will help prevent sprawl I would think. Seems to me this would help prevent operation costs from rising. Executing infill should be done on a parcel by parcel basis, with particular concern for the effect on established neighborhoods.

47 I see many underused areas and much empty space in the city that I believe could be used for housing. I feel positive about the steps the city is taking to build more efficiently.

48 I FEEL THAT WE DO NOT NEED TO USE EVERY INCH OF SPACE THAT IS AVAILABLE. AND SOMETIMES THERE IS GREEN SPACE LEFT WHERE IT DOES NOT SEEM LOGICAL AND INFILL DONE WHERE THERE SHOULD BE SPACE LEFT. THAT IS A SUBJECTIVE OPINION, I REALIZE.

49 Allowing infill can help fill a gap in rental needs but it needs to be regulated so in doesn't infringe on the quality of the neighborhood.

50 Currently unaffordable for many residents. High sales taxes and low mileage benefits investors not the average citizen's ability to afford a home in the city.

51 I like to have space (yard for kids, fire pit and a garden). I also want my kids to be able to play (bike, run, scoot) in the neighborhood, not near traffic. We chose our neighborhood because the houses aren't stacked on each other, we have a nice yard, mature trees and there isn't a lot of traffic. We live 6 miles from the interstate and we have some traffic noise, but that is due to a ton of trees being removed for new construction and expansion of stacked neighborhoods West of I-49.

52 Should be market driven not legislated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Too many people crammed into a small area and not enough proper roads or routes for traffic flow. Causing too much congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Some of the housing is not to my taste but makes the city better as a whole and fills housing options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Higher fire danger due to building in close proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I’m in favor of infill whenever and wherever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>This is the direction the city needs to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Infill development is absolutely necessary to keep Fayetteville from becoming a sprawling, car dependent city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Markham hill development is not good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Big empty lot right by me that just has some random trees and is fenced off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>I believe there are constant problems that arise from developing - namely parking and lighting. The city lacks enough parking in these infilled areas and these areas have consistently been underfunded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Infill should at least try to match the existing neighborhood. For instance, a multi-level dorm style apt complex ruins existing neighborhoods - causing community residents to move out and developers to move in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Using underused surfaces and turning them into something that can be used by the community is a wonderful idea. This could allow for more stores, restaurants, and office space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>I don’t want the traffic of infill on my current street when there is already some infill happening down the road that causes jams/difficult parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>It is becoming more difficult for residents to Fayetteville find adequate housing. Thus it seems the decisions to infill development will create more options. However from some of the infill productions already in place, the costs are over priced making it difficult for the college/post college students to want to live in these places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>The infill houses being built in my neighborhood are being sold for ridiculously high prices -- driving up my rental prices higher and higher by the year. It’s now to the point where I’m having to look for horribly taken care of properties because that’s all I can afford. Please stop building insanely expensive homes and apartments. You’re driving out the lower and working class citizens of this city. You think you’re helping, but your not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I feel that some of the infill is good, but not all people want to live smashed together. I would like space to park my vehicles and a trailer with no problems. Many of the new places are extremely expensive for how small they are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I like to see open spaces, I don’t want to drive around and only see clumped houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I think it’s an effective idea to have an infill project in place. The town is growing, and it puts the unused space towards a good purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>I love increasing the amount of housing that is walking distance to major areas. I love that this decreases the reliance on cars which helps the environment and saves me money on gas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Infill housing caters to high income people. Tearing down affordable housing in low-income areas to build expensive and inaccessible housing is harmful to neighborhoods. Gentrification is bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Good way to create more housing and reduce the need for cars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
73  I feel that it is a good idea for use of space. No reason to expand a city outward, when there is open space for development inward.  11/7/2018 1:54 PM

74  In my neighborhood, there isn't much potential for infill, but it's close to the university and MLK and could provide ample opportunity for walkable, livable communities. Citywide, it just needs to happen.  11/7/2018 12:56 PM

75  I miss the greenspace, but there does seem to be a lack of housing with how competitive the market is. Tough choice.  11/7/2018 12:51 PM

76  I like that my neighborhood doesn't have a lot of houses or attractions. It keeps it quiet.  11/7/2018 11:38 AM

77  No one can afford to live downtown when luxury units keep taking over affordable housing options/spaces for the people who actually work the businesses that draw luxury-dwellers here.  11/7/2018 11:30 AM

78  My neighborhood and myself are so disgusted that the city is rezoning single family lots into multifamily lots in our neighborhood. It lures in renters that don't have any regards to other people's property, so then the properties become trashy rentals in a nice neighborhood. There are many available rentals in my area, so more rentals are not needed  11/7/2018 11:30 AM

79  Good because it will provide more housing options especially good since the U of A campus continues to grow and grow.  11/7/2018 11:29 AM

80  I'd prefer to have land and not feel smashed together with homes. However parking lots in the city need to be better utilized.  11/7/2018 11:28 AM

81  I think the infill development should be used for parking garages.  11/7/2018 11:20 AM

82  Fayetteville is a desirable city to live in because of the lack of inappropriate housing such as infill housing or large apartment complexes. Loss of neighborhood open space is one of my biggest concerns because neighborhood open space is what makes Fayetteville so desirable. Replacing an "under-utilized" structure with infill housing means replacing landscaping and trees - again, taking away what makes Fayetteville such a desirable place to live. Typically, infill development does not match the infrastructure of the neighborhood around it - Fayetteville city council has done a horrible job at ensuring that infill housing has been built appropriately and responsibly (building brand new townhouses in the middle of lower income apartment neighborhoods). I would also like to add that Fayetteville's city council tends to make decisions for the residents already living in the neighborhood rather than listening to the residents' concerns.  11/7/2018 11:16 AM

83  As a female living in a town I didn't grow up in, safety is a very important factor I consider when choosing housing. Living in a residence in someone's backyard or living in a development so secluded yet crowded while not knowing the other residents would definitely be a terrifying experience.  11/7/2018 10:49 AM

84  On the outskirts of Fayetteville, we still value privacy and space between houses for a more quiet neighborhood. However, for those living in the heart of Fayetteville, the reaction may be more positive in that more space will be utilized so that more people will have easier access to schools, shops, etc. However, parking may become an issue (more on street parking) and there will be more clutter.  11/7/2018 10:47 AM

85  Infill development is positive for the residents and business  11/7/2018 10:45 AM

86  One of the things that drew us to our neighborhood is that it isn’t developed much and has the feel of living in the country. We’d prefer it to stay as is without destroying the natural habitat around through development  11/7/2018 10:39 AM

87  In my neighborhood at least, infill development limits parking for these smaller homes and so many cars park in the street, making it very dangerous to drive on them because it turns it into a one lane road.  11/7/2018 10:38 AM

88  I think it's good to use our space widely, but I also greatly value green space and have concerns about noise.  11/7/2018 10:36 AM

89  Honestly, I hate the influx of rich, white Texans and the ugly Dallas looking apartment complexes. Makes our cute town look like a common basic b. I only like infill when it's done in a thoughtful way. And no more corrugated metal. Played out.  11/6/2018 7:17 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live in a single-family home built in a new development that is only a few years old. Homes are large and lots are large by design of the developer. I'm sure that the POA, and the neighborhood at large, would not be happy with infill and there is currently no vacant or unused space in the neighborhood (Creek Meadow off of Dean Solomon Rd.).</td>
<td>11/6/2018 1:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all neighborhoods need to be crowded.</td>
<td>11/6/2018 11:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really really hate all of the giant apartment buildings that are going up (mostly Frisco, those ugly ones down by bordinos and the new ones by harps on wedington). They are ruining the gorgeous views and small town feel of Fayetteville. I love the idea of small-level infill development, like adding second small houses on the same property, or developing smaller areas with &quot;modern&quot; homes like on Huntsville road.</td>
<td>11/6/2018 9:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill housing seems too dense in certain areas.</td>
<td>11/8/2018 12:33 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing is a major issue in Fayetteville. I think any solution should be explored. Fayetteville has a large population of young people who are making less than $25,000 a year who would rather live in small apartments near entertainment and dining than in single family residences.</td>
<td>11/5/2018 9:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems like crowding, mainly due to traffic. Also the architecture styles of the new growth should be more environmental and is mostly not aesthetically pleasing to me.</td>
<td>11/4/2018 10:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the idea of using space more effectively.</td>
<td>11/4/2018 8:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in an apartment complex that is near a lot of amenities. I wish I lived closer to campus because then I would walk to campus. But affordable housing in my range wasn't available close to campus except for rundown apartment.</td>
<td>11/2/2018 7:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All infill is not &quot;good&quot; infill. Our City Council and Planning Commission are seriously misguided with regards to what the residents are asking for. Their quixotic quest to fill yards with &quot;affordable&quot; housing is going to adversely impact our older neighborhoods. That New Urbanism garbage really only works with major redevelopment or starting from scratch... they should stop trying to impose the tenets on older, established neighborhoods.</td>
<td>11/1/2018 10:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is a great idea.</td>
<td>10/31/2018 10:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the commercial infill in parking lots is great. The problem with multi family housing in single family areas is that renters in multifamily don't take care of the property the way owners do.</td>
<td>10/31/2018 9:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree there are lots of opportunities, especially commercially for parking lot redevelopments.</td>
<td>10/31/2018 9:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I haven't seen infill as described above in my neighborhood, all new homes have been single homes built on older vacant lots. City wide I see older neighborhoods under stress from development that doesn't fit with the homes that are there.</td>
<td>10/30/2018 3:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill makes for more neighbors more walkable streets and helps transit</td>
<td>10/30/2018 12:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not see a lot of infill in my neighborhood due to it being old fayetteville and off of major streets plus HHOD.</td>
<td>10/30/2018 11:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville is not Portland, you should not have to live outside the city in order to have privacy. There should be equal parts urban and rural</td>
<td>10/30/2018 11:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10/30/2018 11:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good idea for some</td>
<td>10/30/2018 10:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It doesn't fit the neighborhood, it's unattractive</td>
<td>10/30/2018 10:29 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No activity in my neighborhood. Infill brings positives (additional housing opportunities, economic development to serve additional residents, less cost to city for infrastructure and services) and negatives (construction, traffic, increased drainage) but positives outweigh negatives in my opinion.

I think we need more green spaces. If homes are built as infill, they should match more closely the styles of the surrounding homes. I think large scale apartment structures built right up to the road is too close. Massive apartment complexes smashed into residential areas is not welcomed. Try to save mature trees.

Except for traffic its good to see city grow.

Besides huge apartment buildings I love seeing all the new restaurants and businesses taking up empty parking lots and abandoned land.

Existing neighborhoods that are doing well should not be rezoned to make higher in density if the neighbors don’t want that for their neighborhood.

I think using space smartly and efficiently is a great way to build the city up. But in order to do so you must continue to take into consideration the parking that will be needed to meet the higher demands of the influx of people into our area.

We live on the outskirts of town (west side) and our “rural” area is being surrounded by subdivisions and homes. We don’t necessarily like the additional traffic and people, but it is what it is... we realize the city is growing.

I’m reluctant to say this but NWA seems to be more of a family community, this style of sardine living is not very appealing to families, basically people need privacy and room to grow.

I support filling the gaps to keep us from always consuming more at the edges, but also because it makes a nicer walk/drive to not have creepy, poorly maintained, and under-ill empty areas breaking up the streetscape.

I agree we need more homes and businesses and fewer sidewalks but I hope it does not come at the expense of trees and greenspace.

I love the idea of using the space to create more living areas. We have an odd idea in America that we all need our own, large personal space. I think more social connections will be made if we do not all try to spread out away from one another. I like putting more housing in areas and desperately want to have more areas where you can live and walk to the store and cafe.

Love compact neighborhoods with an assortment of land uses.

makes fayetteville more walkable—this is good.

I like walking places

I see no problem at all with different neighborhoods having different types of housing. Everywhere being mixed takes away from the diversity we value in Fayetteville. It looks ugly. We need more green space. If that means some sprawl, that’s okay. Controlled growth is important. Not zealous, hurtful, pushy growth.

I feel that is developing a lot around campus, but inefficiently in other areas due to the lack of a good public transportation system.

Fayetteville is not a town to be filled with concrete. Thanks

Because
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>I like the new houses but there is too much traffic and not enough parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Fayetteville has too many big useless parking lots. Why not cover them up with restaurants and houses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Not enough parking for all the renters and people are parking all over the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>We need more houses, right? What’s the debate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>We need to develop more sustainably and away from urban sprawl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>I am in favor of infill, but with consideration of keeping green space and parks which are also enjoyed by pedestrians. Perhaps parks with no parking lots associated with them!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Multiple small modern residences crammed on a lot which previously held a home with a sufficiently roomy yard are a hideous eyesore and only serve to attract more of the worst sorts of people to Fayetteville. Think of those of us who DO NOT WANT Fayetteville to become an overpopulated, “metropolitan” area!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>The road system in Fayetteville is struggling to keep up with the current traffic load. Infill is only going to increase the population density and thus the number of road users, which is going to make the already bad traffic exponentially worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Don’t know what to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Reducing the amount of viable yard space for responsible families with children is a terrible idea. Also, for a city interested in preserving our NATURAL beauty, replacing natural landscape with more housing is despicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>I’m not sure that I believe filling every available space is best for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Infill is great for those who choose to live in close proximity; however, there need to be options to access for those who prefer to live further apart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>I believe that one of the major draws of Fayetteville is our trees and natural landscapes. I’m seeing trees being bulldozed for the sake of humongous apartment complexes and row type housing. This to me will destroy one of the major aspects that makes Fayetteville a great place to live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>It would create a good atmosphere while cutting down on the horrendous travel times and traffic within the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>We need more housing options in desirable neighborhoods closer to shopping, parks, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>We live by the Fair Grounds, and it doesn’t seem like there’s any opportunity for infill development in our immediate area, but I could be wrong. It’s definitely a positive for the city as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>We moved here to live in a pleasant, private setting where prosperity—not poverty—is promoted and encouraged. We moved here to have services WITHOUT an urban environment. The City shouldn’t create one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>There is no need for infill currently in my neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>The rezoning of Markham Hill to maximize the number of living units way beyond the capacity of the current infrastructure, especially streets, ingress and egress. The current zoning should be kept, as is, in order for the scale of any development to fit the infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>It takes forever to get anywhere. Looking for a different housing option for my growing family is becoming harder as Fayetteville is outpricing us. I don’t want to move to Prairie Grove like a lot of my co-workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>I understand the need for new development, but parking in downtown Fayetteville and around campus is sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Uptown apartments is very near to my neighborhood. I call them the Shoebox apartments, and they’re extremely ugly!!!! Other “gentrification” houses seemingly all over town these days are a shame. They’ve torn down good houses that fit into that neighborhood and replaced them with houses that stand out as eyesores. Ugly eyesores at that. Houses for humans shouldn’t look like boxes stacked randomly. New houses should definitely fit into the neighborhood on which it’s built, such as next to the Upchurch house by the city park and the new houses along Garland. Other areas make Fayetteville look bad, and there are many of those places!!! It’s such a sad thing to see......... And the awful traffic circles are retarded. So are the ginormous speed walls (You call them bumps.). I’ve been from Fayetteville since 1959, and I’ve seen some recent things built that are really terribly bad and just wrong.

I currently live in a single-family home neighborhood that is still developing, but it only consists of one home per plot. I have seen a lot of infill projects started around the city though, and I think they will be helpful to attract college students to rather than established neighborhoods.

It’s a serious conflict of interest for a council member to champion and pass new, fadish city laws that benefits him and his business.

I appreciate the more efficient distribution of space.

Examples I have seen look over crowded and few trees

It seems that the infill is unbalanced toward favoring upscale and premium housing/services and against affordable options for local income levels.

The green space and urban forests are more important than infill because they affect our air and water quality, pollution, etc.

I don’t want to feel crammed in places. Too many houses or living areas on a single block will feel cramped and claustrophobic.

Of course, it benefits the community as there are more stores available, though it increases the probability of flooding from the poor runoff made by concrete/road decisions.

In my neighborhood: I don’t think there’s enough empty space for infill development. City-wide: I am in favor of a dense, walkable city.

as long as you are not going to tell me I have to use my property for infill then it’s ok. but in my neighborhood the houses are already close for infill.

The examples I have seen so far are aesthetically poor and architecturally discordant with the city’s ethos. Just creating tenements as far as can be seen.....

I think that there is a little too much infill happening and undeveloped property is taken away from the native flora and fauna that inhabit the areas. I would like to be able to have places that are just woods near housing and business areas. I wish the city would require buildings to match the flavor of the neighborhoods instead of building super modern next to shotgun houses. I’m for mixing it up a little, but not in established neighborhoods.

Along with infill, compatibility to large, existing neighborhood is equally important. Not all areas are suited for infill other than ADU’s. Infill does not solve all problems and in some instances creates large new ones - runoff, water pressure, traffic, noise, loss of tree canopy, etc.

Don’t currently live in Fayetteville, but really like what the City of Fayetteville is doing with infilling.

I personally would not want this to develop in my neighborhood, but city wide I could see where it could work.
Whether I'm for or against infill depends completely on how the laws about infill get set up. I chose my neighborhood because it is very quiet all day long, with no one broadcasting music even during the day or on weekends. In my experience, infill with less expensive dwellings attracts property owners who get around single-family laws by buying inexpensive property for their college-age son or daughter and a couple of his or her friends to live in. This living arrangement often leads to considerable noise. I had to move out of one house in west Fayetteville when that happened. Infill certainly makes sense in neighborhoods close to downtown, where the present property owners knew when they bought their property that there would be noise, but it's trickier in areas where the present property owners reasonably expected quiet when they bought their property. Please don't read the wrong subtext here: my street is racially quite mixed, and I love that. Indeed, I would love even more racial diversity in my neighborhood. But quiet is very, very important to me—and yes, property value is also important, now that I'm a homeowner. However, I might be okay with infill if it were accompanied not only by laws limiting rental to areas presently occupied by rentals but also if it were accompanied by laws limiting the occupancy of unrelated individuals to two. (Cops would need to be taken in order to avoid discrimination against unmarried partners with adopted children.) Noise laws alone don't work, since those laws tend to limit noise only after certain hours. Those of us who bought homes far from downtown often chose our leafy streets because they're quiet all the time, not just between 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.

I think these options revitalize living areas without cutting down trees on the outskirts of town that are hard to get to as a living area.

There needs to remain some green space in the city. There needs to be places for the rain water to be absorbed to prevent drainage problems. Infill means more traffic.

Zoning of properties for multi-use will work in some areas but will be a burden on others.

My neighborhood is fairly new, so infill development, if it does occur, won't be for a long time.

My neighborhood is exclusively residential, so infill types will vary compared to citywide, but overall I see it as positive, as long as it is done well.

I think we need more density. It is crazy to behave as though we still have unlimited space and resources for infrastructure.

It seems that "infill where appropriate," when interpreted by planning staff, planning commission, etc., pretty much means 'all infill at any scale or location' is judged as appropriate. There is little to no sensitivity to existing neighborhoods. Infill should be incremental in size and density, with deference to the context in which it is built.

I bought in my neighborhood because of the large lots and do not like the infill densification that is destroying what I have.

While I fully support infill development to help with housing, this housing is often unaffordable to residents who work and previous lived in many of these neighborhoods. Gentrification is forcing many of the local population out of these neighborhoods.

We will run out of space for necessary housing if more infill development is not done. However, people still enjoy having shared green space around their homes.

Destroying historic and beautiful natural areas for residential and commercial development.

Fayetteville is a great city with a small town feel, allowing developers to change green space and put developments in will over populate and ruin this city.

I believe that densifying the city center and focusing on walkability is the desired direction for future development.
Appendix

179 Infill is bringing more density. I'm supportive of it. Fayetteville city limits have some space to increase its density, but more streets/better streets should be developed (especially east-west). Traffic (and parking in some areas) is becoming unsustainable. A better infrastructure system would make everybody feeling more connected (e.g., to downtown) and would relieve pressure from houses in downtown, where prices are unhealthy high. Additionally, question 11 is way too generic. It is important, in my opinion, to preserve walkability and avoid gentrification, but additional main arteries need to be identified (e.g., widening Mission Blvd and/or Old Wire to 4 lanes in addition to the paved trails already planned. Huntsville Rd and MLK until S School Ave should be 4 lanes + paved trail on one side (instead of unsafe bike lane = 1 line on asphalt, where car speed is way too fast for current solution). Crossover should have a 1 paved trail running along instead of 2 bike lanes line on asphalt. Vegetation program would benefit from it, more people would use bikes and traffic would decrease. To sum up, it is my opinion that planning HOW Fayetteville will grow involves planning better infrastructure, for an increasing number of citizens.

9/24/2018 10:06 AM

180 There is way too much development and lack of oversight. It is changing our beautiful city to a Dallas. More control, more thought especially for thriving and existing neighborhoods and areas. Too much greed from Texas.

9/24/2018 9:58 AM

181 Too many houses reduces the wildlife... deforestation. If we are not simultaneously making plans to preserve them, then it is the European invasion from the 1800s, not caring about the native organisms and their resources.

9/24/2018 9:49 AM

182 I don't want mixed use housing in any neighborhood where I live. I live in a single family development. I want it to stay that way. EVERY inch of Fayetteville does NOT need to be filled in and built on. That's why Fayetteville is special and beautiful, the big lots, the tall trees. People who love what Fayetteville is and was appear to have forgotten what made them love it in the first place. Take for example, the Cardinal, the Vue or Freeco. What the HELL!!! Those places are horrible and nothing like what Fayetteville should be. They are cheap and ugly and take away from the beauty that is Fayetteville. And, that eyesore that is being built on Wedington drive, right behind the Arvest Bank. Can you at least make developers try to make their huge buildings blend into the landscape?

9/24/2018 9:45 AM

183 I like seeing the new apartments being built. They're really attractive. That has made a huge difference in my attitude towards new housing.

9/24/2018 9:38 AM

184 few options for lower income/fixed income families

9/24/2018 9:31 AM

185 More housing choices are great, but I would not choose to live in any of these dwelling choices.

9/24/2018 9:28 AM

186 Each zoning and type of residence should be considered on a case by case basis because not all housing types are appropriate for all areas. Fayetteville is growing is indicates more planning is needed, not haphazard growth.

9/24/2018 9:27 AM

187 Because it greatly increases concrete and greatly reduces green space.

9/24/2018 9:24 AM

188 I'm mostly concerned about traffic. It sounds simple to fill unused space with housing to accommodate population growth, but what will be done to roads to accommodate an increased number of cars on the road?

9/24/2018 9:15 AM

189 I wish we wouldn't try to cram everybody on top of each other, maybe expand more outward than upward for the city.

9/24/2018 9:07 AM

190 I think infill is an important way to provide more house and simultaneously remove ugly things such vacant lots or unused parking.

9/24/2018 8:55 AM

191 I like my little community but think it's good overall for the city to build modern housing. I just don't want to live in it.

9/24/2018 8:44 AM

192 I live in an older exclusively residential part of town and I am not seeing much infill happening. Would love to see more, particularly mixed residential/commercial.

9/24/2018 8:38 AM

193 Some developers do not seem to give consideration to aesthetics or the "Sense of community" aspect.

9/24/2018 8:37 AM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>A beautiful, verdant hillside that formerly harbored wildlife was bulldozed to the dirt and replaced with tacky Lindsey-esque apartment community and parking garage behind Harps on Garland. Not only was the loss of green space disappointing (not to mention I no longer come across deer or rabbits on my way home anymore), but also the addition of more of the same. If it were shops or services it would be different - its literally a way to pack more cars and people into a space with too many cars and people already.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 8:33 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Would like to see more local businesses, our family (and most of our friends) are far more likely to shop at independent restaurants and shops rather than the Dairy Queens, Pizza Huts, etc. that continue to pop up.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 8:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>I am fine with it.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 8:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>My neighborhood is residential but adjacent to dense infill projects. I like the progression but don't want my immediate neighborhood to change that drastically. I paid a premium to have space.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 8:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>I live on the northern side of town near Holcombe Elementary School; this area lies more on the outskirts of the city (some people think I live in Springdale) where single family homes are the only form of housing. I find this to be a peaceful side of town that works the way it is. However, I do agree that the more populated areas of Fayetteville should benefit from infilling.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 8:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>9/24/2018 8:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Helps to meet the needs of the citizens. Infill needs to be done correctly so the area doesn't look crowded or trashy.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 7:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>I don't see a lot of infill in my neighborhood, but I love the concept and what I see around town.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 7:46 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>I love the idea of a walkable city. I already love Fayetteville, and the infill makes it better. I would much rather use the empty space in the city than let the city limits grow. Especially for a college town.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 7:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>The students need housing but the full time residents need to be able to afford to live in the city and not be pushed out by rich Texans. The shopping/living situation gives them areas where they can increase rent and it doesn't effect locals as much, say as them renting out single houses along Sang.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 7:36 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>The tear down and increased density is horrid. It is adding to flooding events. Now we are going to be asked to pay for stormwater improvements due to this infill</td>
<td>9/24/2018 7:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>I think sprawl is a serious problem in all cities across America. Infill seems like a good method to combat that.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 7:26 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>The prices of rent are too high, the new apartments on Prairie street are 1000 a month. That is way too high for a one bedroom apartment. Way too high! That does not match income in this city. I think the U of A is a catalyst for the problem by not providing student housing and forcing kids to live on campus longer. They are messing up the market severely. Their parents can afford the rents that residents cannot. And they buy up the townhouses as investments and places for their kids. Residents do not make the same income as their parents.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 7:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>I don't think infills is going to solve the housing problem long term.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 6:53 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Not a lot going on in my neighborhood other than single family home construction and some duplexes. Could use more infill. Could also use more commercial.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 5:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>I moved from Portland after living there a short time where nearly all neighborhoods were walkable and infill/density was high. It was great for the health of the residents and the environment, and was enjoyable. There are number of areas a bit further out where those who want more land/space can obtain it. We need more density and mixed used developments near the city center (and preferably other close-in areas like midtown) to make our city more desirable and reduce traffic. More apartment buildings should have shops and restaurants on the first floor.</td>
<td>9/24/2018 2:48 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
210 It seems as though there is a lot of infill development happening around town, but it does not appear to serve multiple income groups. The rent is high in these new apartments and some areas appear to be starting to gentrify. I personally also like that there is green space around town and don't want to see apartments or multiple houses crammed into every open hole. 9/24/2018 2:04 AM

211 I think it a great idea, and it is being implemented well. 9/24/2018 1:20 AM

212 Housing options with yards are my priority. Infill near me not so great, but generally good. 9/24/2018 1:09 AM

213 Negative because it takes away from the beauty of nature. Takes away trees and grass areas. 9/24/2018 1:08 AM

214 Architecturally incompatible structures within neighborhoods are the complaint I hear the most, and I happen to agree. 9/23/2018 1:07 PM

215 love the city using existing empty/unused space to create jobs and opportunities 9/15/2018 11:27 AM

216 I live in a neighborhood with 1/2 acre lots and I don't think infill is appropriate there. 9/11/2018 9:51 PM

217 my neighborhood is very close to UoA campus consequently extreme pressure to turn large homes into apps. Sunset Dr was once a neighborhood drive. Now it's a raceway 24/7 for cars going hither and yon from Wedington to Cleveland. 9/11/2018 12:21 AM

218 There is no room for infill development in my neighborhood, so I have no issue with the lack thereof. I think the city is doing a good job with general infill throughout the city and should definitely continue their progress. 9/10/2018 4:57 PM

219 Nowhere to infill in the neighborhood, but seemingly lots of places in the city. 9/7/2018 4:20 PM

220 it's inevitable as we grow 9/7/2018 10:38 AM

221 I live in a fully developed neighborhood with no open space to build on. Its good to see infill where it can happen. 9/4/2018 9:14 PM

222 My neighborhood is an old one filled with single family homes. We are very close to an elementary school which means this neighborhood will always attract young families with kids. Citywide, NIMB seems to be the attitude. 9/4/2018 4:02 PM

223 There could be more AFFORDABLE "infill" housing, duplexes, condos, et al. for retirees, and low-income residents. 9/4/2018 3:49 PM

224 Infill makes it easier and prettier to get around. Any city can have a parking lot, and they all look the same. 9/4/2018 1:54 PM

225 Traffic has increased to an unpleasant level, and wooded areas are disappearing. 9/3/2018 2:21 PM

226 I live in a residential neighborhood, so infill development wouldn't match the aesthetic of the space. Within the city though, outside of residential neighborhoods, I think it's a great idea! 9/2/2018 8:53 AM

227 I am unclear what you are asking in question 7 as I answered question 6 with a no. If you are asking in questions 7 would I like to have infill development in my neighborhood and city my answer is a very positive YES! 9/1/2018 8:42 PM

228 Especially like the development around 6th street & 71B. 9/1/2018 8:55 AM

229 The city needs to ensure that the schools can accommodate the increase of housing in particular areas as well as making sure that traffic doesn't get congested due to the growth of housing in particular areas. It's been a growing problem where I live, which is off Salem. If I had known hold have been an issue, I probably would have bought a house elsewhere. 8/31/2018 7:56 AM

230 We purposefully purchased a house on a one acre lot surrounded by similar houses. I would like to stay in this type of planning. 8/30/2018 6:56 PM

231 I actually love infill as it makes best use of the shrinking amount of land that is available in the more central parts of town, I also like how it should help slow urban sprawl 8/30/2018 2:47 PM
I think that using city resources to develop underutilized property in the city is a waste of residents' money. In most cases, the ability to do this infill would require the use of eminent domain to acquire the property. I think that this is an inappropriate application of that doctrine of government authority.

It seems as though houses are being built too close together, and I wouldn't want to see clustered multi-story apartments that would create areas of overcrowding. People need "breathing room" and if they desire, space for their own gardens, even small patio gardening. P.S. Too many large murals make the city look cheap, and are distracting, especially on 71-B. Park buildings and other areas might be more appropriate for these large projects. Instead, eye-pleasing texture and tone of regular structures, and landscaping would be more desirable. Thank you.

On my street it’s nice, but a bit boxy. Citywide is a bit worse with the big student buildings. They are very out of proportion to the rest of downtown.

As long as there is also greenspace!!!

Housing infill in my neighborhood and as I glance around the city seems appropriate and fills a need.

I like the infill parking lot idea, but not the housing. I really don’t like how much green space is being taken away and housing on top of each other especially on Block street and the southern part of Gregg close to Wilson Park.

The housing options being constructed are FAR too expensive for most people. The university, who employs so many in Fayetteville, takes advantage of their employees by paying insultingly low wages (I am one of those). These overpriced houses are being purchased or rented by people with above adequate means, and often by out-of-state parents who put their adult college children, several at a time, into one nice home. That leaves the rest of us with unaffordable housing, and if we are lucky enough to live in one of the still-standing condemnable houses that has affordable rent, we have to live next to a house full of loud, partying college students. Gentrification has destroyed what Fayetteville used to be.

Sounds like overcrowding. I’m not for that.

Infill can provide dwellings for older generations who share responsibility for children. They can also be affordable choices for those who want to enter the housing market but have limited income or savings.

This would be a good choice for the elderly, students, and single people.

In my single family area, no accessory dwellings unless enough space. No duplex/multiplex.

I can see these types of houses as good choices for students, singles, and the elderly.

Many lots in our single home area don’t have space for accessory dwellings. If they have space, OK. No duplexes, multiplexes, etc.

Leads to overcrowding.

Overpriced condos being squeezed into older neighborhoods.

I want my neighborhood to remain the same. Not adding 2 homes per lot, or townhomes/apartments. I bought in my neighborhood for a reason, because I love it just the way it is.

There need to be more houses that are not so expensive. All of these hipster developers in South Fayetteville act like they have our interest at heart, but then build houses that an average Joe cannot possibly afford.

Would not want one in my neighborhood, but are fine for some people. Have no problem with them, but to put one in my neighborhood would mean a major overhaul of layout.
Some new buildings are nice and fit in, but more are too big and expensive. Is all we want in Fayetteville rich Texans? 8/29/2018 10:50 AM

No widening of streets: If widened, residents lose set-backs. Pool planning. Overbuilding without thought or consideration for proper improvements to existing sewers, plumbing, and widening roads. The future foresees gridlock and units abandoned by renters unless you are merely considering building for students. After the wave of returning to school dies down and university attendance dies down, again, you will have a lot of additional rentals vacant. Neighborhoods will diminish in aesthetic value. Sounds like a dim future for the city of Fayetteville. 8/29/2018 10:48 AM

Does not apply to me. 8/29/2018 10:42 AM

Our neighborhood is filled to capacity with single dwelling homes. Infill would not fit. 8/26/2018 7:38 AM

Our climate makes making things “walkable,” for even relatively short distances somewhat impractical, due to three to four hot months and frigid months year to year. As for infill, I think there are urban, near urban, and older neighborhoods where infill is desirable 1) to those who prefer that kind of neighborhood, and 2) such infill does indeed reclaim and exploit opportunity to create housing for those whose work/recreation make those space appealing by limiting green space to levels they cannot choose to maintain. However, I feel that imposing that kind of development in neighborhoods where the housing is already more homogenous planned is NOT desirable as it undermines why those who choose such areas have invested their lives and capital. 8/25/2018 12:05 AM

Rezoning in a residential neighborhood is my concern. 8/23/2018 4:55 PM

Property prices, taxes, insurance rates, communal bills (water, gas, electricity) are increasing, while salaries are decreasing or remain the same. Rent is more expensive than in some large cities (such as Chicago), with most rental properties being fully in control of ‘developers’ and real estate agencies. Most houses built between 1991 and 2005 in Fayetteville area are built against the code and have settling foundations. A number of neighborhoods including mine were built without any properly engineered drainage system for diverting storm water. Floods are common, yet standard insurance policies do not cover flood damage. In addition to infill development that can positively influence completely corporate rental/building market, I’d petition for an increase of city budget dedicated to flood issues. Question 9: an increase of taxes might be necessary, but what’s more important is making the builders and developers more responsible for the quality of their work. Increase regulations. Increase taxes. Double check the building code and buildings in progress. 8/23/2018 3:43 PM

Proposals are often incompatible. Green space can be an asset too. 8/23/2018 9:04 AM

Land gets put to the best use and not wasted because someone down the road wants to look at someone else’s trees. 8/23/2018 7:32 AM

Developers are not considering the home value of current residents in residential areas, not focusing on the immediate commercial needs of current residents in the surrounding neighborhoods 8/23/2018 6:29 AM

Infill needs to completely match surrounding properties in size, style, type. The exception to this would be parking lot infill. Commercial infill around neighborhoods should not exist unless neighborhood immediately adjacent to lot requests it. 8/22/2018 8:29 PM

I love that Fayetteville has great green spaces and while being a city still has an original rural feel as you drive around. Slowly these green spaces, even if small, are disappearing while there are vacant buildings all over town that need to be repurposed first. 8/22/2018 8:10 PM

I think that it is good to utilize and improve land within the heart of the city. That being said something has to be done in regard to development on the outskirts of Fayetteville. I am for annexing part of the area East of the city to Goshen. 8/22/2018 7:59 PM

I disagree with forcing infill that is not consistent with the surrounding area. Yet, this happens. Infill does not mean a variety of neighborhoods are not allowed. Many residents want a quiet neighborhood and do not want shops, etc in the neighborhood yet Fayetteville seems to want to get rid of these neighborhoods. 8/22/2018 7:57 PM
Appendix

264 It needs to fit the area and not overcrowd with traffic, nor lower property value. 8/22/2018 5:34 PM

265 More density, more mixed use development and creative reuse of existing spaces. Let's do it. 8/22/2018 5:21 PM

266 I believe that infill is good however, in my neighborhood it’s is Zoned RS4 and only single family homes on .25 to .5 acre lots. The infill and rezoning would allow for small commercial and retail. We do not want this in our neighborhood. If I did then I would have moved to a neighborhood that already had it. Given the proximity of our POAs club house and communal parks and ponds to the vacant lots, we are against it, we are against the noise, lights, additional traffic, etc. 8/22/2018 4:56 PM

267 I like the modern housing and how it cleans up older neighborhoods. The more and more developers keep knocking down older homes and putting multi family dwellings in the same lot, the more traffic grows. Roads are not efficient enough for as much as this type of development is happening. We need less bicycle lanes added and more traffic lanes added. 8/22/2018 3:12 PM

268 No infill development is happening in my neighborhood but I do appreciate most of the infill that is happening in the city. Only concern is that it is causing gentrification and that lower income people are being displaced. 8/22/2018 3:06 PM

269 I don't see infill development in my neighborhood, but it is what I want. 8/22/2018 10:05 AM

270 I think it's a great use of space, and adds to the town's character and feel, as long as it keeps in mind the surrounding landscape. Thus far, what I have seen does that and would like to see more. 8/17/2018 11:45 AM

271 Absolutely must be done correctly, professionally and consistently across the City—same standards across entire community over time. 8/12/2018 11:22 AM

272 No infill where I live. In the City it seems good to have more houses, but it seems to cause a lot of traffic and crowding. 8/9/2018 12:23 PM

273 The city needs to think about all the problems coming from people from out of town buying homes and renting them out to people who don’t care about the neighborhood. 8/9/2018 12:21 PM

274 University Heights, my neighborhood, is vulnerable to abuses of infill to capitalize on demand for student housing close to the U of A. Present ordinances that would control this abuse are not well enforced, maybe not enforceable. 8/9/2018 11:04 AM

275 I support infill development because it adds housing supply and choices in areas of Fayetteville that have existing infrastructure. Infill housing is more likely to be within walking/biking distance to frequent destinations like restaurants, grocery, schools, jobs and health care. It is more environmentally sustainable and promotes a higher quality of life versus the alternative, which is to accommodate housing demand by building sprawl. 8/5/2018 6:09 PM

276 The infill in my neighborhood places commercial and lower scale rentals beside $300K+ homes. Infill is appropriate in some areas, but not when they don’t match the current homes, and will cause the value to drop. I purchased in my neighborhood to be in an established neighborhood, and this will ruin it. 8/5/2018 4:39 PM

277 Well I am in favor of infill. I think it is important to consider the preservation of existing affordable options and historic properties. 8/4/2018 2:21 PM

278 In my neighborhood: I live on Juneway Terrace. Infill development is not occurring in my neighborhood. In fact, it is the opposite. A rare piece of forest in central Fayetteville was completely destroyed to place massive single family homes that house few. It’s devastating to my neighborhood and sad to see something that makes Fayetteville the beautiful city that it is go just to house a few of the wealthy. Citywide: As a homeowner with home value in mind, apartments concern me. They have a tendency to decrease the value of houses around them. At the same time, I do understand the need for affordable housing Out of the infill options available, apartments should be considered last or strategically placed such that they do not have a huge financial impact on the residents already in the area. Additionally more should be done to stop occurrences similar to the above mentioned in my neighborhood. 8/4/2018 6:43 AM

279 There are many places in the city where this would spruce up areas and provide housing or amenities 8/2/2018 4:51 PM
I am happy to see infill development happening in south Fayetteville but worry, probably like other people, about gentrification. Homes selling for 35k 15 years ago are now listing for 130+, and a good chunk of those are tear downs. I’m a single parent with a solid middle income, and couldn’t afford to buy in that neighborhood 6 years ago. This pushes folks to the outskirts of town, leaving walkability and all the quality of life aspects that go along with it to those who can afford it. Infill is good, yes, as long as there are other genuinely affordable, solid homes available in the same area.

Good to have more houses 7/31/2018 8:07 AM

Mostly small houses in my neighborhood but too big buildings other places 7/31/2018 8:05 AM

The City seems to concentrate on building housing for single people aged 18 through 24 and ignoring families, seniors, and handicapped. 7/30/2018 7:02 PM

If historically significant buildings and/or houses are being torn down, I am opposed to infill development. Such was the case close to our neighborhood where a large farmhouse was torn down to make way for multi-story duplexes and fourplexes. 7/26/2018 2:34 PM

Fayetteville is for diversity which means we need to make sure not all neighborhoods are infilled. Many people prefer low density and a lot of trees. Let this remain an important part of our diversity. Ask the neighborhood what type they prefer to be. 7/24/2018 10:10 AM

Infill means more accessibility via walking and bike riding. Hopefully it also means more trees and less over sized parking lots with no shade. 7/23/2018 7:40 PM

Infill may be good in general. There is no real location for the kind of infill above in my neighborhood. 7/22/2018 8:54 PM

I like it the way it is. 7/22/2018 3:50 PM

Infill should reflect the existing area and not be shoved in just because. Especially if it requires a zoning change. Existing residents should take priority to any infill desires. 7/22/2018 2:40 PM

It is great and needs to happen, but I wish you would require new homes to not look like boxes. 7/19/2018 11:27 AM

We need more houses but you build too many big apartments and there just being filled with students that are loud. 7/19/2018 9:59 AM

If we get more houses, I would like more sidewalks please. 7/19/2018 9:41 AM

I like the new homes. They need to be affordable to existing residents. 7/19/2018 9:30 AM

Good to see old, bad houses pulled down. 7/19/2018 9:28 AM

We need more houses, but you are overbuilding neighborhoods with no thought for flooding, sidewalks, traffic, and trees! 7/19/2018 9:26 AM

I like new neighbors and houses around where I live, but some new buildings are too big. Big apartments downtown look awful. 7/19/2018 9:24 AM

We need more houses, but they should look good and stop tearing down old beautiful homes for new boxy ones. 7/19/2018 9:21 AM

Where I live new buildings are mostly houses, and are a good size. In other places they are gigantic apartment buildings that dwarf anything around them. 7/19/2018 9:19 AM

I live on the outskirts of Fayetteville, but work in Fayetteville. 7/19/2018 7:54 AM

Neighborhoods are being degraded by ugly, thoughtless infill projects done for the sake of increasing property tax revenues. For every decent example of infill, there are many more that have hurt the quality of life/property values of adjacent property owners. 7/17/2018 11:59 AM

Choose not to answer 7/17/2018 11:52 AM

Great space saver, clean appearance for neighborhood. 7/17/2018 11:31 AM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>On the whole for the city, it's a great thing. But when it comes to the neighborhood I live, it depends if the infill is done right - is inline with the surrounding homes and area and keeps home values equal or better than before.</td>
<td>7/17/2018 8:53 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>When infill doesn't completely change the character of a good neighborhood, I think it is a good thing. A lot of the infill seems to be intent on milking every last penny out of a lot, without designing carefully and tastefully. Aesthetically, I am not fond of some of the designs being utilized in infill development. There seems to be a fondness for random &quot;boxes-on-boxes&quot; or &quot;fake old&quot;. Also, some of this infill is driving home prices beyond the reach of ordinary folks. Middle and lower income people need to be able to live downtown, too.</td>
<td>7/16/2018 10:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Maintaining the current quality of neighborhoods is of utmost importance. Putting dwellings in back yards and apartment buildings on random vacant lots is a major degradation to neighborhoods. New planned unit developments built in areas zoned for high density development is a good goal. Just don't destroy existing single family subdivisions.</td>
<td>7/16/2018 3:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>I live in the edge of town so it isn't as important. I do think it is important in the rest of the city though</td>
<td>7/16/2018 1:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Infill can work, but is often done in such a way that doesn't take into account parking, utilities, drainage, and access. This is what I say happening all over Fayetteville now. In addition, many of the &quot;infill&quot; housing developments are highly expensive (&gt;125/sq foot). What is needed in Fayetteville is AFFORDABLE housing (</td>
<td>7/16/2018 9:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Infill development helps combat the trend of sprawl which is not sustainable. Making better use of already developed land is much better than continuing to develop natural land.</td>
<td>7/16/2018 9:14 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>I despise the idea of infill being a city goal. I find it truly gross and absurd. A city like Fayetteville's primary goal should be preservation of character and environment. Certain instances may be unavoidable as they might be private business ventures, but I strongly disagree with making it a goal of the city's government. As a citizen my entire life I do not want it. I don't want new giant apartment complexes anywhere in the city, and I certainly don't want woods cut down to make it happen. Like I said, I know that private landowners doing what they are legally permitted to do is a different matter, but there is a huge difference between that and the city pursuing it as a goal. It is 100% my honest opinion that we have absolutely no reason as a city to have infill as a goal to accommodate hypothetical future citizens. Our lives should not be affected because Bob in Oregon might want to move to Fayetteville in 20 years and we need to make sure there is an apartment waiting for him. Maybe we keep those woods instead and Bob can't find an apartment in 20 years and doesn't move to Fayetteville.</td>
<td>7/15/2018 7:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>These survey questions are already stacked in a biased favor to justify an acceptance of an agenda. The level of obvious corruption in this survey very profound.</td>
<td>7/15/2018 2:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>It represents appropriate use of space to prevent urban sprawl</td>
<td>7/13/2018 9:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Fayetteville needs to stop development and make conserving greenery the focus.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 6:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Fayetteville should provide something for everyone. I believe the residents who want neighborhoods of single-family homes without business in-fill are disfavored by the Planning Commission. &quot;in-fill&quot; should not be used to justify sticking businesses in neighborhoods. Neighborhood concerns of safety, light pollution, noise pollution, and litter pollution should be respected. Raising children near other homes and yards is very different from raising children next door to a restaurant. I love that my children are free to wander to neighbors' yards and climb trees in unfenced yards. If &quot;in-fill&quot; were to insert restaurants in the empty lot in our neighborhood our children's precious freedoms would be infringed as much more adult supervision would be required. Also, their sleep would be disturbed by noise and bright parking lot lights. I live between Crossover/College. If businesses are planted in my neighborhood, I can see a good reason to move out into the neighborhoods on Hiway 45. Thus, increasing sprawl as demand increases for true neighborhoods without businesses pushed into inappropriate settings.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 4:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Infill is appropriate in certain districts or areas, but it should not be forced upon developers by city staff or city council in every scenario. I live on a very large lot so that my children have plenty of room to play outdoors (basketball, baseball, zip lines, etc) right outside their backdoor and not a 15 minute walk to a city park. I feel it is very important for a city to also promote that form of lifestyle choice, and not prioritize density and infill citywide.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>I think it all depends on neighborhood. I am all for making use of unused lake to curb the urban sprawl and expansion of subdivision. The fear I have of these is developers running wild and making this happen every. I wouldn’t want to destroy the vibe of an older historic neighborhood to fill space.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Infill development so far has been disproportionately high cost compared to average housing in the immediate area.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 1:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Depends on the context of the infill. Some instances perceived as negative and some instance perceived as positive.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 1:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>I like the shapes of them.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 1:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Infill is great.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 12:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Loving the density that infill development is creating.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 12:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>The need is great</td>
<td>7/13/2018 12:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Buildings are out of scale and ignore neighbors need for sun and privacy.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 12:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>More houses means cheaper housing</td>
<td>7/13/2018 12:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>I am not opposed to infill, but what can frustrate me is how unattainable new construction is to many existing families in Fayetteville.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 12:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Love the idea of utilizing underutilized land</td>
<td>7/13/2018 12:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>My neighborhood is not walkable to any services</td>
<td>7/13/2018 12:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>I encourage more neighbors and higher densities. This will result in more amenities/services and support transit as an option.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 12:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Many trees and other natural areas have been decimated to &quot;create empty lots&quot; taking away beautiful green areas in our city. Creating nothing but empty mud spaces.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 11:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Infill is fine is higher income neighborhoods but it is pushing poor people out of low income neighborhoods. If they build infill housing it needs to be comparable in rent to what was previously there.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 11:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7/13/2018 11:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Infill development increases walkability, lessons transportation costs, and I believe, increases community connection.</td>
<td>7/13/2018 11:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Many feel will decrease value</td>
<td>7/13/2018 11:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>We need more houses</td>
<td>7/13/2018 11:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Too noisy crowded and expensive</td>
<td>7/13/2018 10:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>&quot;IF* the city actually followed the definition given of &quot;infill&quot; (i.e., ... the development or redevelopment of vacant, mostly vacant, and developed property) then it would not be so bad. HOWEVER, older neighborhoods that are full but have larger-than-currently-typical lot sizes are being bought by DEVELOPERS for their own profit motives and so the character of neighborhood changes without need and the city looses a single-family dwelling with greenspace (yard) is reduced. What the developer wants is what typically wins in this city. Screw the neighborhood character or resident's wishes. The BoA grants waivers because the majority of the board (if not all, in some years) have a connection to construction/real estate and that's a back-door to getting what they want if the city's planning ofc or council rejects re-zoning requests. The Planning Commission is worse than the BoA for the same reasons regarding membership's income affiliations/loyalties. I participated in the first charrette the city did. But it was a nasty surprise to me when I discovered that was an exercise in futility because city zoning is not respected or upheld; e.g., a person KNOWINGLY buys a lot zoned single family residential and then goes through the process of getting approval to demolish a perfectly GOOD s-f house on a nice-sized lot and squeezing in a double townhouse or more. It's happened more than once in my neighborhood. NOT EVERYONE WANTS TO LIVE LIKE A BLOODY SARDINE! Loss of a nice sized yard hurts mental well-being, property values, character of neighborhood, wildlife habit and overall environment that was previously in-place. Respect the zoning. Let's see developers try the same thing in the $300k neighborhoods -- the process is the same but the residents have more money, connections, and clout and it would never happen. But those of us in the older neighborhoods with decent-sized lots are only seen as an opportunity and the city has nothing in place that protects us. It's always about the developer. Again, the city's decisions do NOT follow the definition of infill given!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 336  | Creating multi-family housing is a efficient use of space and a way to foster community. However, housing complexes can quickly destroy urban space if not approached with carefuly. I only caution that development not come before the accessibilty of the city.
| 337  | I'm not sure where this would occur in my neighborhood. |
| 338  | Look around, getting very crowded with apartments |
| 339  | My neighborhood was left undeveloped after the original builder filed for bankruptcy. The new homes being built are nice, but the common area looks terrible. |
| 340  | Don't be elitest and force your views on areas that have been built under the 2030 plan, and before a new plan it actually developed, the city council decides to enforce their will on that neighborhood and not support the original plan--as they did with the Stonewood and and Copper Creek subdivisions. Let the market and the current city plan play out as written, without changing midstream. |
| 341  | I understand infrastructure needs to be maintained, but it makes me worry we'll just look like every other city. |
| 342  | What is affordable housing? Infill is an attempt to provide housing options at different (lower) price ranges than the surrounding properties. I think the commercial application is a welcomed improvement in streetscapes but I think sometimes the focus on infill makes the planning commission try to put a round peg in square hole. Great example is the parcel of land by Boardwalk, which is less than 2 acres, that Lamb is trying to wedge a bunch of stuff that doesn't match or belong on that piece of property. This is the kind of project that gives infill a bad name. |
| 343  | Infill of multifamily or significantly smaller houses is inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Creating such neighborhoods adjacent makes more sense. |
| 344  | I don't believe my neighborhood utilizes it, but think it is a good idea in the city |
| 345  | Too crowded, uses up green space and animal habitat, cutting down mature trees, buildings/homes that do not fit neighborhoods, noise level, not enough parking (parking on streets is making roads impassable), drainage problems, causing flooding issues and water damage for existing homes, contributing to global warming, building too close to existing homes, setbacks have become non-existent, current property owners have no input, landscaping doesn't use native plants/grass |
Need to consider water runoff increases, traffic congestion, and parking congestion associated with infill.  
Infill destroys property values when placed too close to larger single family homes.  
We enjoy the mission and aesthetic, but the mass amount of people it would bring to my neighbor which is a quiet street on the park.  
Density makes our city more interesting, compact and walkable. I support infill in my neighborhood and in the city as a whole.  
Building of office space, and rezoning of land so it can be developed for restaurant/retail has, has not been as advertised. City leaders should do a better job of understanding the needs of the neighbors who aren’t proponents of certain infill projects. Infill projects around the city are good, but not in my neighborhood.  
I think the issue is we differ strongly in opinion on what “appropriate” infill is…  
Too many large apartment complexes going in.  
I think this creates more affordable housing for those that can’t afford traditional homes. But it’s not an arrangement that we would want to live in.  
We have a type of Patio homes on Zion and they are nice and add to the neighborhood  
BRING PEOPLE FURTHER OUT FROM DOWNTOWN AREA FOR NICE HOME SUBDIVISIONS  
My neighborhood has residential office on the outside of the neighborhood with single family homes inside the neighborhood.  
In the late ’90s when our subdivision was developed, adjacent property that fronts Crossover, zoned residential, was priced beyond the developer’s ability to acquire it for inclusion in the subdivision. Presently, efforts or in progress to change the zoning to allow commercial development, literally in the backyards of for private homeowners in our neighborhood. Despite the city manager’s recommendation that this NOT be rezoned, in the most recent Planning Commission Meeting, that body seems to be quite in favor of a proposed plan to move forward. No doubt, this will be pleasing to those seeking the change who will benefit financially, but to those of us (and others who have spoken in opposition from nearby neighborhoods) who will have a lighted parking lot, commercial dumpster, and an amazing scale of traffic added to an already difficult to access major thoroughfare. We’ve invested in our homes, knowing that an adjacent property was zoned residential, only to have the prospect of a pizza parlor, hair salon, deli/bakery, and SEVEN townhouse crammed in the midst of an established single dwelling neighborhood. I can’t imagine that anyone, in any part of town, would appreciate a similar scenario being thrust into their lives in the name of “infill.” NO ONE WHO VALUES THEIR LIVES AND SAFETY will walk on either side of Crossover Road to patronize these businesses in our backyards. They will park in the proposed 75 parking spaces planned for a footprint entirely too small for that volume of traffic.  
Greater density in the city is a positive, the city should grow denser and higher rather than sprawling out.  
Have like the build down on Dickson street including the WAC and Theatre Squared. My children live at Uptown, it’s been a great addition.  
I don’t see much infill, and what construction I do see is either for more student housing or way too expensive. I would love to see more housing options geared more to the lower middle class families.  
First, I do not live in Fayetteville but in Harrison where there are not infill developments, which is a shame. I live outside the city limits and infill is not possible. I would support Harrison’s efforts if inner city development were possible.  
I’m not sure what the prices are for places like this, so I cannot speak to whether I feel they are beneficial or not  
As long as the homes or businesses are NOT disruptive (like JJ’s Brew Garden), I have no problem with any of them.
I would love to see more appropriate infill around Fayetteville, specifically catering to low-income households. 7/11/2018 6:57 PM

Re-use of an underutilized or vacant lot is the best way to provide solutions for our growing region while maintaining quality of life and walkable, sustainable neighborhoods. 7/11/2018 6:56 PM

If the layout matches the existing neighborhood then that is fine. If you have a neighborhood that already has multiple small dwellings per lot, then definitely use that vacant lot to provide more. If you have a neighborhood that has one single family home per lot then the vacant property should match the surrounding neighborhood and remain single homes. 7/11/2018 6:55 PM

They are wanting to put a restaurant on a vacant lot which would cause traffic problems. 7/11/2018 6:26 PM

Way too many apartments! 7/11/2018 6:12 PM

There seems to be a good balance of infill and housing developments. This is Arkansas and some people just don’t want to live in an infill environment. That’s not going to change. 7/11/2018 5:36 PM

My neighborhood already consists of small houses with moderate to large yards. Most properties have dense foliage I would hate to see go, but Accessory Dwelling Units would definitely be welcome. 7/11/2018 5:09 PM

Done right it is Okay. I think there is too much "flavor of the month" run amok and it can get and be RIDICULOUS fast! 7/11/2018 3:53 PM

The open property directly affects our well established neighborhood. It is in the middle of the subdivision with backyards against this property including the issue of being directly against our clubhouse and pool area. Homes comparable with the existing homes surrounding this area are what is currently in the zoning of the property area. This has been challenged as to a Rezoning which is totally unacceptable for our neighborhood. The front of this property exits/entrances directly on to Crossover Road which is already a traffic issue even though it has been widened. With this kind of issue, it seems to be a future College Ave. which is now having to retool the area toward the square to be more people/pedestrian friendly. Perhaps this is the time to stop some of that expansion rather than have to correct it later. 7/11/2018 3:48 PM

Infill in my neighborhood is mostly out of scale and out of character, and not affordable for small family working for the current wage base or university salary. 7/11/2018 3:45 PM

Loss of wood areas, increased traffic noise in my neighborhood. Larger lots that allow for wildlife or domestic animals being split into small lots that are bulldozed with no mature trees. 7/11/2018 3:45 PM

There is a vacant lot that a builder wants to build townhouses and a restaurant, bakery, and a salon that would back up to our neighborhood. I am opposed to the commercial building because of noise, smells, and garbage but not the condos. 7/11/2018 3:36 PM

Brooks ave Townhomes, Great infill on a vacant lot. Too bad they rezoned it. 7/11/2018 3:09 PM

I support infill development because it prevents sprawl and the over extension of utilities and the over use of a car and traffic in general. If you live closer to the things you do, you drive less, bike and walk more. 7/11/2018 3:08 PM

I pay not to live in an city setting. If someone would like to do so that is great. 7/11/2018 3:01 PM

Not seeing enough 7/11/2018 2:51 PM
In theory I love the idea of developing underused property. I live near uptown in the neighborhood behind JBGB. I’ve really appreciated having a new coffee shop (Puritan) and shops like Juice Palm within walking distance. But JBGB has been a huge problem with the noise and the congestion that happens any time they have live music. I want people to have the ability to build and develop new things inside city limits but one business has made more of a splash than hundreds of people moving into the new apartments going up all around my neighborhood. More housing is a positive, loud entertainment venues outside in the middle of tons of housing is a problem.

I live very close to downtown, so infill has been going on for a while now, which is great; however, it is incredibly expensive to build anything in Fayetteville right now. Construction rates are ridiculously inflated; so I’m not sure how much infill will be done city wide.

Not seeing enough

Infill is necessary for successful and vibrant cities

City council approves everything they think will increase taxes to the city. They do NOT care at all what the residents want

Not everyone wants to live in a tightly packed area or want to talk everywhere.

In my neighborhood, vacant lots and small homes past their prime are seeing new construction. This helps the neighborhood, which was a bit run down ten years ago. The down side is that property values have shot up, so even small, older homes in need of repair are quite expensive.

Some infill is well done and blends with the neighborhood. Some poorly done looking out of place, poor design, detracting from the neighborhood.

I recently moved to a subdivision out Huntsville Road because I couldn’t afford to live in Central Fayetteville, where I have lived for most of my life. I am glad that the city is designing infill within Central Fayetteville but I haven’t seen the infill so far help affordability in our downtown/historic neighborhoods, where I grew up.

I fully agree with the idea of infill, however it would be helpful in steeply sloped areas (that aren’t included in an overlay district) to have better design standards to control how (or if) design/construction teams address the street and slope appropriately.

My property taxes have gone up, and I could never afford to move from where I am now into most all of the recent infill development in my neighborhood, no matter how positive having infill is.

I’m near college ave, and the more huge parking lots we can fill with useable space, the better!

I see a lot of infill but what is being built isn’t. In my experience affordable housing. It is great for college students that split housing costs but for a family with one income it is almost impossible to rent any of the newly constructed homes, apartments or condos.

My reaction to infill in Fayetteville is ‘very positive’ because I believe people and communities are healthier when they can walk to destinations (grocery, work, entertainment, friends houses, etc...). I am lucky to live somewhere that I can do that, and because of new infill development in my neighborhood (South Fayetteville), others will be able to do the same. Also, I think it saves everyone money: less utilities on the outskirts of town, less road to be laid, less cars on the road...
In past city plans, maintaining neighborhood integrity was a primary goal. Over the past five years the city has rezoned in a way that is virtually guaranteed to redefine Washington-Willow. NO plans have been communicated with regard to East West traffic through the neighborhood. Additionally height restrictions have been removed in favor of 'stories'; ensuring that structures will overwhelm adjacent properties. Noise levels will increase. There is really no reason that commercial development between Lafayette and North cannot/should not be limited more than areas North of North street. The Planning commission has used imagery that suggests something like what Block street looks like to support the suggestion that this is what will happen in this stretch. The excuse for not having zoning that truly respects the situation in areas that have defined Fayetteville for over a century is, "we can't have to many zoning types/exceptions. Doing so makes it hard for developers." I understand and appreciate the need for investment, but there is really no reason adequate control cannot be put in place - MANAGE. Regarding question #8: reduced regulations, city taxes and fees ignore the needs of existing property owners; once again in favor of commercial interests. We don't need to "buy" investment. Certain developers and indeed developments in the College corridor prove that.

My experience has been that infill is a buzz word to justify allowing developers to build more housing units per acre in order to make more money. It does nothing to create "walkability" or "affordable housing." The Planning Commission and City Council - most of whom are members of the development community - are not genuinely interested in citizens' concerns. This survey is merely a means for the city to claim that the 2030 Plan was "based on public input" when, in reality, the City Council will adopt whatever it pleases.

We live in a planned neighborhood where very few options exist for infill examples cited.

I believe that infill is especially important closer to downtown Fayetteville and other parts of the city where it makes sense.

A more economic use of space will help to reduce urban sprawl, increase the amount of available housing (thus decreasing cost), and expand the variety of businesses and attractions that can be easily accessed on foot. An increase in foot traffic will help to promote a larger feeling of community, in my opinion.

We'll never get affordable housing without this option.

Infill could be helpful and a great solution for the city in general, however in my neighborhood/area, it would not be ideal for all areas and would certainly be problematic for flooding issues. It should only be considered case by case and not multiple units in any area outside of city center areas.

I'm a big proponent of infill development in my neighborhood, Washington-Willow. It creates activity, provides more housing options close to large employers, improves property values if well done, etc.

I believe infill is great, but it should fit with a neighborhood. I think if infill creates a need for broad thoroughfare roads it defeats the purpose of walkability. I think the expansion of accessory dwelling units is an amazing step (we have been pondering a home with a mother-in-law suite and that market is extremely underdeveloped). Great example of infill that I like is the new housing options popping up near the university (though, to be sure, cheaper options would help underserved communities a lot). But recently there was a rezone petition on the winding, obscured north-south portion of Sycamore for a small lot to go NC, and that seemed really extreme and not fitting with the road or the visibility or the neighborhood. I also think infill is naturally more beneficial to those of means and to the developers of those properties, because the land value will already be high in dense urban zones, and will demand a high price per square foot to justify development. So, I do think the goals of promoting infill and promoting affordable housing are somewhat fundamentally opposed in more dense urban areas. That being said, walkability and vibrant urban cores are extremely valuable to a community. So, to me, a demand for infill also creates a demand for subsidized housing options in any infill plan, and that's the hard part. The live/work/space development from the Artspace project is a good example of an attempt to balance these forces. I'd like to see those projects proposed and even funded at the city level.

Houses are too close, forcing people to park on the street. Closeness of the houses is a fire hazard. Little or no yards increase runoff and the likelihood of increased flooding. Privacy is less due to the closeness of houses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Traffic has already increased, with speeding. Not good. Need much more mixed housing -- low income mixed with high income mixed with middle income.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 12:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>I think our city can only grow sustainability (financially, socially, and environmentally) by continuing to prioritize infill development. Some infill projects have been higher quality than others, sure, but that's the case for new development on the edges too. I'd like to see the city be more determined to make infill development easier and cheaper than development on the edges of town.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 11:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>I graduated the U of A with a degree in landscape architecture and a minor in urban planning, so I understand many of the benefits of infill development (reduced maintenance cost, improved walkability, sustainable development, mitigation of sprawl, etc.). It is good design.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 11:12 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>It’s great to see new improvements in housing &amp; landscaping, improvements on buildings!</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Not a lot of opportunity for infill in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>I’m all for maximizing the land we have versus the sprawl (west side of town).</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>It seems most of the development is aimed at a demographic other than mine.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Infill development is expensive and Planning's focus on forcing infrastructure improvements into the property owner's budget whenever they renovate or build infill drives up not only the cost of redevelopment, but rents, etc. This drives out local home-grown business which is replaced by franchises and multi-national corporations. Ultimately planning's good intentions are headed the same direction as Seattle, Portland, San Francisco and Austin. They are driving out the people that made this city desirable in the first place, and replacing them with expensive, generic filler. Reduction in engineering and planning requirements for absurd infrastructure reconstruction as and obligation of the property owner to end. Similarly the forced forfeiture of private property through &quot;right-of-way&quot; requirements (completely decided by the city) in order to utilize your property has to stop. If the city wants to acquire more property for their infrastructure, they should purchase it like every other entity in this country.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>We live on the City edge where there is little development. I do own a house in South Fayetteville, and the City has been encouraging in developing smaller lots. I believe NC zoning should consider smaller lot sizes if we are to see more homes built there. There are large swaths of existing NC zoning that could be well served with more density. It would be wonderful if the city would designate more streets like Block Street for urban development. It was unfortunate the north end was built with more residences and not commercial. The massive parking lot across from the Walton Arts Center needs to be a park on the corner of Dickson and West. Then, south of the park there needs to a multi-story building we shops that front the park, a parking garage behind and below that. Residences would exist on the remaining stories. One of the top ten most valuable properties in Fayetteville is a parking lot.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Infill development is critical to the revitalization of the city. However, Fayetteville seems to be solely focused on infill. Currently there is virtually no middle to upper income housing available in the city. Not all development on the fringes of the city is &quot;sprawl&quot;.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>In my neighborhood: I live in a subdivision on the outskirts of town. No infill development has or probably will occur. Citywide: Some of it is nice, but the open space is nice, too.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Most infill is a positive. Some infill takes away from neighborhood character and community by bringing in students to otherwise local residential areas.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Fayetteville needs more affordable housing. Plain and simple.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 10:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>No regard for the character of the city.</td>
<td>7/10/2018 1:08 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wish the style of new construction was more compatible with our neighborhood. I don’t mind the new buildings & people, but wish the new places didn’t look like generic, Anytown, USA.

7/9/2018 3:06 PM

annoying to navigate town

7/7/2018 3:27 PM

I would love to have more housing options and be able to walk to the grocery store, restaurants, etc.

7/7/2018 10:43 AM

That type of development is not likely in my current neighborhood.

7/6/2018 7:43 PM

less urban sprawl and a diverse housing market will provided aesthetic and economic benefits for the citizens of fayetville.

7/6/2018 1:24 PM

It looks like people are just cram packing a place to live in any little area of land available. They don't look like they will last a long time and the ones finished in my neighborhood are still sitting empty over a year after they were completed.

7/6/2018 10:31 AM

I'm for it.

7/6/2018 9:22 AM

I am in favor of increasing density and creating a walkable stimulating streetscape across the city where citizens can socialize, shop, and enjoy nature, even if that comes as expense of some privacy. Where I live in south Fayetteville there has been a trend of residential infill development, but I would like to see more small scale commercial mixed in such as coffee/ice cream shops. Also considering the recent pickup in growth there and an upcoming surge of residents due to Willow bend and other development I believe the city should renovate and allocate resources to some blighted public spaces such as Jefferson Park and surrounding sidewalks/benches, to bring the area aesthetically in line with quality of Wilson Park for example. Doing so will encourage an economically diverse group of citizens to use these spaces and make the area need small scale commercial development faster.

7/6/2018 1:31 AM

This development is good if the houses keep with the character of the neighborhood. This isn’t the case in South Fayetteville, where “modern” architecture lies beside historic homes.

7/5/2018 9:00 PM

We need more houses with yards for kids. Not more housing for college students or single people.

7/5/2018 7:38 PM

Single family homes with yards for kids to play in safely with the need to go to a park are needed, and infill does not provide that.

7/5/2018 7:34 PM

It would provide different housing for all different types of families and incomes

7/5/2018 6:36 PM

Home owners are more hesitant, but students love having more options

7/5/2018 6:35 PM

When the architecture matches the character of the existing neighborhood it’s a good thing. When not, it’s not.

7/5/2018 6:03 PM

Progressive diverse eclectic

7/5/2018 5:40 PM

My neighborhood is mostly settled families with some duplexes, the duplexes are underutilizing their lot space but the settled families are fine

7/5/2018 5:36 PM

Fayetteville doesn’t need more high density residential areas. Our roads can’t handle it. Traffic is terrible and frustrating. Our schools can’t handle it. 7 kindergarten classes in one school is too many. The infill as described seems claustrophobic.

7/5/2018 5:01 PM

I’d be curious as to how this could be used in a traditional single-family neighborhood such as Clabber Creek on the west side of town.

7/5/2018 4:56 PM

I believe 100% that Fayetteville needs more infill in lieu of annexation. We should improve services and property value in the city limits. It makes our community stronger and healthier.

7/5/2018 2:45 PM
437 My neighborhood is very suburban (East Fayetteville) and residential in nature. I would prioritize infill development where you might get the least negative community input by focusing on heavier-traffic corridors rather than low-residential areas like suburban neighborhoods. 7/5/2018 9:16 AM

438 I think it is important to create affordable housing options, but we must also take care not to push out lower income people in the process. 7/4/2018 1:23 PM

439 I support infill and the public infrastructure projects it necessitates. I do not support my landlord’s property value jumping each time a new off-campus housing project breaks ground. I don’t want my family to be priced out of our home. My partner and I survive on about 2,500/month. We are making it, but no one should have to spend 1/3 of their income on rent. I know that many have it much, much worse. Especially since, as an Arkansas resident, tenants are not afforded any rights of due recourse. If the city wants to lose it's working class, it's creative class, to more welcoming communities, it is well on its way. 7/4/2018 10:01 AM

440 I welcome just about any infill, as it can help lead the city to lowering/maintaining the low price of housing. I also support increasing density for the city at large. 7/2/2018 2:26 PM

441 There’s no infill space in my neighborhood and I think many citizens don’t understand the benefit of this and/or are fearful that it will create overpriced housing for the neighborhood. 6/29/2018 9:00 PM

442 There has been very little infill in my immediate neighborhood but the one project was very disruptive to my property. Infill in general is great and it will help the Fayetteville to be more livable. 6/29/2018 4:12 PM

443 I like infill. It promises to create a density that is healthy and pleasurable for residents and encourages a variety of businesses and activities. HOWEVER, based upon my experience with an infill project, I think the City should somehow connect with owners of properties surrounding infill projects. Perhaps the City could simply distribute a statement telling adjoining owners that the developer has an absolute right to proceed with the project as designed and that it conforms with the the community’s long-range vision. And, nonetheless, the City cares about the impact on neighbors. In this way a neighbor would not feel all alone. 6/26/2018 9:54 AM

444 Whatever is built needs to be built with quality. New low cost infill housing is great as long as it doesn’t fall apart within a few years like those row houses off of Rupple Rd across from the boys and girls club. 6/25/2018 8:38 AM

445 there is no infill development in my neighborhood and that is fine with me. we have 3 small children and will always drive cars. if others want to live in denser neighborhoods that allow more walking to destinations, that is fine as well. 6/25/2018 7:29 AM

446 I WANT infill. However, it often feels like the infill in Fayetteville isn’t leading to mixed-use developments. I want housing infilled into business zones and business infilled into residential. The goal would be increased walkability. 6/24/2018 3:06 PM

447 Infill development is an excellent idea but it must be accompanied by greenspace, mixed zoning, entertainment, trails, public transportation, and a multitude of other amenities. 6/24/2018 2:27 PM

448 I am very pleased to see "eye sore" sites being re-developed into productive businesses and am also pleased to see us growing "in" rather than "out" 6/23/2018 1:43 PM

449 I fill increases values and that increases taxes which is necessary long term as the university takes more and more city lots out of tax base. 6/23/2018 9:22 AM

450 I think several of the Infill development examples I have seen are often unsuccessful in offering affordable, private living options for residents. They tend to waste space to create personal homes with yards too small to offer any benefit or privacy to homeowner. I want to see more accessory dwelling units. I also enjoy the Airbnb model one a low scale ( not several units by same owners). 6/23/2018 9:09 AM
I live in the Wilson Park Neighborhood, which is already pretty dense. The negative reaction comes from Wilson Park being run over with college student housing. There are already parking issues around the Wilson Park Neighborhoods and increasing density without addressing the parking issue could be problematic. Overall I think infill is a positive move. We need more affordable housing. I had to move back in with my parents for my graduate schooling because I could not find housing that was within my budget, or if it was it was basically in a "dorm" like the cardinal where there is a shared living space where you rent a bedroom. As someone in their late 20's this is not ideal.

The west side of Fayetteville is monotonous. It looks like the city is ignoring this side of town.

These homes are attractive and make the city feel more active by allowing business such as coffee shops and pubs to start in central areas. I like to see Fayetteville filling in and building up, rather than spreading/sprawling out. Keep it up!!

Ours is an established residential, primarily single-family neighborhood developed over many decades and with a mix of architect-designed, farmhouse, modest single-family and other houses that is constantly impinged upon by University growth and the demand for student rentals. It is too hilly to lend itself easily to infill and residents do not wish to change its charming and unique historic character. That said, I do think there are areas of the city that benefit from infill, and I am concerned about the dearth of affordable housing.

I live outside of city limits on 3 acres and the rural landscape is very important to me. I do not want to see pasture and farmland developed into housing. However, I very much support infill development within the city.

I'm generally in favor of development that reduces sprawl and decreases the community's environmental footprint. If done correctly, it also increases our sense of community.

Currently, we live just outside of city limits on a few acres, so having this style of housing nearby is not undesired but unlikely. It would, however, be great if we were a part of the city for a few reasons. The connection to the trails, sidewalks, city amenities within walking distance would be very welcomed. We're located on Wyman road just past the intersection of Starr. There are families that live on the outskirts that would thrive off of a more communal culture.

My neighborhood isn't zoned for allowable change at this time. I am a major proponent of infill development in general. I think one of the major cultural roadblocks is the proper planning for pets—particularly dogs—and the requisite safety of greenspace in relation to proximity and traffic flow.

We need to balance the protection of natural resources and green infrastructure while also creating infill and a variety of housing types. Make sure to plant green roofs, landscaping requirements, stronger tree ordinances. It saves money for the community in the long run to do this.

Bringing people together around the services they use, in intended and unintended intersection with each others' lives, creates community and reduces systemic inequity.

I live on Mt. Sequoyah and infill development would be costly and ineffective in that area. But, it would revitalize other neighborhoods.

I want a yard. City is soon obsessed with infill

Established neighborhoods do not want to loose the charm that has brought its residents to it. Large lots, large mature trees, room to live and not feel like you are sitting on top of your neighbors.

Old established neighborhoods are not wanting infill in order to keep the charm of their neighborhood drawing them to the area in the first place.
Appendix

465 My immediate neighborhood has limited "underutilized" land ripe for infill. The surrounding area that is seeing development is largely green-field. I support the filling of holes throughout the city to avoid consuming these green-field lands, and to close the experience gaps along walking routes.

466 Infill produces more crowded neighborhoods. I also feel we have entirely too many apartment buildings being squeezed in citywide.

467 Green space is what makes our city charming. I want to maintain the small town feel rather than all available space being developed into town houses even it means our town spreads out.

468 Needs tight regulations to ensure infill is tasteful and not negative for the neighborhood.

469 In the neighborhood, I believe that it helps building a sense of community and closeness from one person to another, but Citywide, I am weary of it meaning that every single square inch of underused space must be productively used.

470 It makes spaces more walkable. It's frustrating to have to drive through a large, empty parking lot to get to a storefront. It makes one feel exposed as a pedestrian as well. I love the new infill developments because it seems like a better use of space.

471 I understand the need to create more housing closer to downtown Fayetteville by using infill development, but I feel that rampant infill will cause Fayetteville to lose it's charming character. I am currently living next to someone who is moving sheds on to his property, without running water, electric, or sewage, and claiming that they're tiny houses. What passes for appropriate infill should be carefully and considerably moderated.

472 It's good if done correctly and in the spirit of the neighborhood.

473 Infilling is better than suburban sprawl around the city and an huge increase in housing developments, but I'm still feeling somewhat ambiguous about "empty" space being perceived as an inherent negative. I'm also wary that the infilling imperative will lead to over-packed spaces.

474 I own a home in a small neighborhood, I bought this house in part because of the large lot. Not feeling boxed in by my neighbors. This infill, talking of fourplexes, the additional people renting instead of owning, 4 times the traffic..... This is exactly why I did not buy in other cities around and you are now making that here. Not listening to what the home owners want or why they bought, in what has been the best city in NWA....but with what I have seen lately, well that is changing with all this infill. Why don't you give incentives for rebuilding homes that are run down or falling down. Let the open wooded areas...if they have to be built on to stay single family homes with large lots. Where families can buy a nice house instead of renting in a multi family housing design. If you are not careful the infill will make homeowners leave this city (I believe at one of the meetings someone on the stage even said in short, if you do not like-move) I thought the plan was for more homeowners...that is not what infill will get you. I always thought my vote mattered....but now I think the only votes that matter are the ones with the most money or influence.

475 The infill is great but the developers charge and arm and a leg for it. $1000.00 a month for a one bedroom apartment, or $200 a Square foot, those are so over priced. The income level of a single person this city does not match these price points. They are gentrifying the neighborhoods and saying they are building the missing middle, however pricing out the middle class.

476 I live in an older neighborhood developed in the 70s and all the houses are on 2-4 acre lots. Infill would not be appropriate or allowed. We do eventually plan on moving to a more dense section of the city.

477 Accessory dwelling units can improve options and quality of life for owners. Increasing density overall makes walkability more likely.

478 Still want to preserve green space, and older homes if possible.
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479 I worry that increased density will make already busy traffic unbearable. Driving across town inn Bentonville even during non-rush hours is a nightmare. Infill development threatens the same fate for our town. Also, I moved out of apartment living for a reason. I don’t want to be forced to live near that type of housing. 6/2/2018 9:58 PM

480 Truly affordable housing is desperately needed. I like it best as part of existing neighborhoods, not segregated. It needs to be near transit and shopping. I would love to see more mixed use in my neighborhood. However, too many apartments tend to get fillled by students. Then noise and trash can be a problem. This is not as bad as the fact that students are transient and uninterested in the neighborhood. Students per se are fine; a preponderance is not. 6/2/2018 2:53 PM

481 Infill is being encouraged at a scale that ignores current zoning. Neighborhoods and neighborhood streets are generally incapable of absorbing the increase in residents and traffic. Maximizing profit for developers has come at the expense of current homeowners. Commercial development inside residential areas threatens security by introducing a flow of people and traffic counter to neighborhood values and norms. 6/1/2018 7:30 PM

482 More houses are good but not enough parking. 6/1/2018 2:56 PM

483 More houses of many types near work is good for choice. 6/1/2018 2:54 PM

484 More single-family residential in the core good. Replacing dilapidated houses good. 6/1/2018 2:51 PM

485 It is good for the most part, but a lot of it seems to cause awful flooding issues. 6/1/2018 2:48 PM

486 Our neighborhood is fully-developed. 6/1/2018 2:09 PM

487 I like that its mostly houses, because we need more. 6/1/2018 2:01 PM

488 I think longtime residents in neighborhoods should have a say in whether infill occurs in their neighborhood or not. Our neighborhood wants to remain low density and woodsy. To have diverse neighborhoods in Fayetteville, they cannot all be infilled. We want low density neighborhoods and higher density neighborhoods. We want woods and parks within the city. My neighborhood does not want the UofA or the City infilling our residential, woodsy neighborhood. 6/1/2018 10:22 AM

489 They’re building unaffordable, physically inaccessible apartment buildings made cheaply. 6/1/2018 10:03 AM

490 Longtime residents in neighborhoods should be able to decide if they want their neighborhood to become higher density or not. Higher density feels like they are living in a big city and lower density feels like they are living in a smaller town or more rural area as well as it preserves more trees and parks. The latter is what my neighborhood prefers. If we want various living situations in Fayetteville, we need to allow for this type of neighborhood diversity. 6/1/2018 8:43 AM

491 Some of the infill is nice and fits in with existing neighborhoods, while some is completely out of place and frankly looks thrown together and terrible. The increased development around West and Prairie is an example of the latter. I don’t mind the infill idea, but there are many developers taking great advantage of how easy it is to get permits and are throwing up buildings which will be a scourge in a matter of years. Please consider those of us who have invested not only time, but also a lot of money to live in a relatively small, beautiful community, coexisting with wildlife established long before we came along. There needs to be some consideration of those who have been here 30+ years and want our children to enjoy the environment we established. Again, I don’t mind change. It should just come with a little more thought, please. 6/1/2018 7:52 AM

492 We need more places we can walk and bike to. Less car-focused amenities. This can much more easily happen with infill 6/1/2018 5:32 AM

493 Not too crazy about some of the giant student housing blocks. Too much of an ant hill feeling around Dickson area. I do like some of the more architecturally interesting town homes going up. Also like having shops on the first level and living spaces above. 5/31/2018 10:22 PM

494 It’s foolish to assume that we, at this time, know the best use for existing underused space in our city. 5/31/2018 9:56 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>I wish it were happening more in my neighborhood -- I think it makes it more attractive.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 9:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>There are some really ugly really tall new apartments that are ruining the beauty of Fayetteville.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 8:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>I live in south Fayetteville where gentrification is pushing people like us out. If we lost our affordable ($500+utilities) apartment we could not replace it.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 8:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Condensed housing welcomes problems. Fayetteville doesn’t have enough employment opportunities to support these residences.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 8:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>I have seen some but would like to see more</td>
<td>5/31/2018 7:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>I purchased my house based on its location on the edge of town.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 7:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>We feel that the execution was done poorly with small lots (whispering point) (our neighborhood) but we wouldn’t mind being able to infill ourselves (citywide)</td>
<td>5/31/2018 7:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>I love what is happening with infill. Very thoughtful planning and design.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 7:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Affordable housing (small homes) are being torn down and replaced with 4-bedroom houses (that all look the same) that are not affordable to individuals or families.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 7:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Not enough infill</td>
<td>5/31/2018 7:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>I agree completely with the goal of infill development, and, overall, we should liberalize our zoning codes to allow it. We should especially encourage smaller infill projects, which will always tend to diversify and strengthen the fabric of a neighborhood. Conversely, we should treat block-sized single-developer, single-owner projects with skepticism. Part of Fayetteville’s unique character is both our natural &amp; agricultural heritage and our cosmopolitan, college-town atmosphere. I was thrilled with the preservation of Kessler Mountain and Millap Mountain, and I love that the UA Agri Farm remains in the heart of town to this day. There are many smaller pockets of remnant farmland and forest scattered throughout town, and I am saddened to see these places lost to development–while, elsewhere, there are urban, suburban, and commercial sites begging to be redeveloped. I would like to see us embrace both aspects of our identity by allowing denser, more urban development to coexist with a patchwork of more rural and natural neighborhoods and properties–rather than the concentric circles of urban, suburban, and rural that exists everywhere else. Some of the new developments I see going up have started making every place start to look the same, and I have a lot of sympathy for those who oppose infill. It’s not across the board, but too often, what passes for infill seems to sacrifice the sorts of oddball, mismatched places that give Fayetteville character. At its best, though, infill developments can lean into those quirks and enhance them, and that’s the sort we should be encouraging an embracing.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 7:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>I live on the edge of town. I like to see the infill in town.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 7:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>I value having a slightly larger lot. However, I feel like citizens should have the option to capitalize on tastefully, thoughtfully designed accessory dwellings that help increase population density.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Infill creates more walkable, vibrant neighborhoods, especially with mixed-use zoning that allows for corner shops or townhomes/condos above streetside shops.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Too many condos, high rises, not enough smaller family homes</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>I don’t want green spaces crammed full of cheap houses or apartments</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Call it whatever you want, it’s gentrification and you have to be affluent to be accessible. Its shit. And since there is no open-ended response to Question 9, I’ll put it here: We all know who “infill” is valuable to - the city, the developer and the person who just bought a $350k pre-fab shit box next to someone like me who sits and licks their chops waiting to scoop it up.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Good use of empty space</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>The poor have no where to live. The homes keep increasing in cost while the options for purchase are diminishing. No one wants to rent overpriced junk.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Neighborhoods and rural neighborhoods need to give the open space but city living is giving up the space convenience.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Infill can be good, but needs to be balanced with exiting needs and lost or gain of green and community spaces.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Infill has to happen as a city grows. I appreciate the thought taken on almost all recent infill, except in a few areas. I do not like the frisco student housing infill and similar large apt blocks.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Infill is pivotal for our city.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 6:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Infill development seems to only mean one type of building in practice: duplexes. They have too many people in them and not as much parking as they need.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 5:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Infill is not appropriate in interior established neighborhoods. There are also not enough job to create employment for the new expensive housing and rent</td>
<td>5/31/2018 2:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>I live in the Meadowlands neighborhood off weddington. Currently there is a diverse property market ranging from standard nsf-4 single family homes to duplex units and more dense townhomes south of my neighborhood. There is very little, if any room for infill in my neighborhood, however, there is potential for more mixed used and commercial development along weddington, and i would rather see developments build vertically rather than horizontally along weddington to reduce the urban sprawl.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 1:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>The question was ambiguous, but no, there is not enough infill. And yes, please encourage more infill.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 12:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Quality of current infill designs does not reflect the character of Fayetteville. Such structures should reflect &quot;charm&quot;, with a storybook or more historic appearance, as if they had always been there instead of &quot;boxes&quot; plopped down.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 12:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>We bought our house due to the current neighborhood, not a neighborhood with increased traffic or apartment buildings, but small family homes. To infill in established neighborhoods only benefits the bottom line. Adding more people to smaller spaces only increases crime, traffic, and trash.</td>
<td>5/31/2018 10:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Across the highway was one house, torn down and in it's place, are 6 units. They are new and very nice. Where do they park? This is happening all over South Fayetteenam. How can you replace a one family quarter acre with all those people and cars?</td>
<td>5/31/2018 7:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Too much traffic, too much crime, too much noise. Infill without planning for consequences hurts residents. Tired of accidents and since People in Arkansas I won't give up their cars it doesn't seem to be achieving the goals</td>
<td>5/30/2018 9:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>I experience the negative consequences. More traffic more crime more noise. People do not give up their cars and it creates havoc instead.</td>
<td>5/30/2018 9:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>I think it is a great solution to sprawl.</td>
<td>5/30/2018 9:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Maintenance of nature in the area is critical to making Fayetteville livable. Trails contribute without taking away the beauty, so too should any infill solution.</td>
<td>5/30/2018 8:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Infill and density should continue to be the top priority of city planners.</td>
<td>5/30/2018 8:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>My neighborhood is a subdivision so I don't see where infill can occur. Citywide I believe it is a positive thing.</td>
<td>5/30/2018 7:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>I believe it creates more housing and it's a positive look for the community.</td>
<td>5/30/2018 7:24 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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532 I want to keep Fayetteville Funky. I don’t like all the gentrification and infill. It is not affordable housing that’s being built. And I feel like we are losing a lot of the charm of Fayetteville. 5/30/2018 7:14 PM

533 Rentals are either lower income or high income. Not much in between. I would love places that don’t include college students - adults only. 5/30/2018 7:08 PM

534 I do not like infill anywhere. Fayetteville exists charmingly enough without infill. Infill is intrusive and ugly, imo. INFILTRATED. 5/30/2018 7:04 PM

535 As a single woman, I would like an apartment, cottage, small house in a neighborhood designed for adults, not college students, that’s affordable for lower or fixed income citizens. 5/30/2018 7:00 PM

536 I would be more positive about it if our city made more of an effort to protect our green spaces! 5/30/2018 5:42 PM

537 In general, traffic in areas where infill is occurring is becoming increasingly dense, dangerous, and stressful to navigate. 5/30/2018 5:36 PM

538 In my neighborhood, the city is attempting to take away natural green space to create infill. I’m against this. I am in favor of parking lot infill or any other infill that does not take down a bunch of trees and wildlife habitat. I also think it’s possible to do too much infill. Expanding on the outskirts of the city is a good alternative to infill. I do not think that the city is taking already overcrowded schools into consideration when considering where to infill. 5/30/2018 5:23 PM

539 One of the things that makes Fayetteville a lovely place to live is that we are not all on top of our neighbors. Some degree of infill development is great - utilizing under-utilized spaces is definitely a positive, however, it shouldn’t be too hard to find single-family homes with nice backyards. 5/30/2018 4:59 PM

540 Existing neighborhood supported by young elementary families should NOT have apartment/townhouse developed on top of them! 5/30/2018 4:12 PM

541 Appropriate infill is one of the major ways in which the city can maintain it’s moderately cheap housing. I welcome almost any development that is going to increase the density and housing stock of Fayetteville and NWA as a whole 5/30/2018 3:20 PM

542 We have no infill in my neighborhood so can’t assess. 5/30/2018 2:22 PM

543 My neighborhood is RS4 and is a very established neighborhood with tall trees. Infill in this type of neighborhood demeans the character of the city as a whole. Once we lose green spaces we can’t get them back. There are certainly areas of the city where infill makes sense. There’s also large areas of the city that are completely undeveloped at all and aren’t home to forested greenspaces that could be used to develop new properties. 5/30/2018 2:14 PM

544 Citywide infill has yet to become the norm 5/30/2018 1:42 PM

545 Infill needs to completely fit in with existing neighborhoods. Commercial development (via any means) should not happen in existing neighborhoods unless it fits within the 2030 City Plan. 5/30/2018 1:04 PM

546 Streets should be wider to accommodate parking 5/30/2018 12:50 PM

547 Not sure it makes sense for most of the lots in my neighborhood. 5/30/2018 12:49 PM

548 Infill increases walk-ability and creates a better sense of place, target fiesta square and west ave, parking lot 5/30/2018 12:12 PM

549 Existing neighborhoods with their existing density should be protected from mashed up density pushed by the new infill developers which overload existing infrastructure without building or increasing the capacity of the infrastructure. Developers make a bigger profit by jamming infill development into existing neighborhoods rather than having to build streets and water/sewer mains to serve new neighborhoods. Vacant pastures and areas within the city limits should be allowed to develop more traditionally which is pejoratively referred to as sprawl by persons who do not like yards for children and pets. Quarter acre lots should still be allowed for persons who want this lifestyle as opposed to urban, tiny lot, few trees or grass development. 5/30/2018 12:11 PM
The cookie cutter houses/apartments suck so bad.

Infill development is a good way to build the density needed to attract and locate the commercial amenities that make urban living appealing.

Loosey builders are scamming us with substandard construction, design and implementation. No city standard for student parking where students load housing at two cars per bedroom - leading to parking problems for all in the neighborhood.

Infill and high density housing makes sense near downtown, Dickson, and College. It is not appropriate everywhere as families with kids want space, trees, and yards.

Wise to use space on large lots in the city so people would be able to walk. Maybe reducing traffic.

In theory infill is important, and I agree with all efforts to increase the efficiency of our city. However, SO MANY development projects have been approved that in no way match the current neighborhood they're building in. Instead of infill, it feels like we have a patchwork of structures that doesn't give cohesion to a neighborhood, and in fact, degrades the flavor and culture of a neighborhood. The building is fine. Just make things match more closely the context the new building is going into.

You are trying to cram more housing in and increase the density. Just kills our property values.

Granny flats would work well in my neighborhood. I like offering the option all over town, but not trying to force anyone in it.

Infill will naturally happen due to economics. Land prices dictate this more than anything. The city can foster this mindset but it ultimately comes down to economics. There is a balance, though, because when you are strict about not extending infrastructure past existing limits you actually raise the land prices where there is currently infrastructure available. Affordable housing thus becomes harder to achieve.

Appropriate infill can help revitalize neighborhoods.

Infill is not done well in Fayetteville if it is driven by developers, builders, architects and realtors who've managed to get into positions of influence in city planning. Anyone who raises a question or fights against this 'infill' is deemed afraid of change and progress. I'm not even sure the Mayor stands in the way of this now. But I guarantee that's why he soundly beat his opponent in last election!!!

Not a lot of infill occurring in my neighborhood.

Two story houses ok for young couples.

I used to not like seeing tons of houses crowded together on lots but now that I'm learning more about why it's done, I'm open. However, I wish the houses I saw going up felt more affordable.

The Fayetteville I fell in love with was funky, woody, & had winding streets. This version of Fayetteville (in-ville) is mass produced, gimmicky, and benefits wealthy developers because all the infill Fayetteville has experienced so far has been top dollar infill.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>I'm all for infill development until it approaches a density that requires expanding or widening existing roads, or adding new major thoroughfares by existing neighborhoods. We should be CALMING traffic, not inducing it, when we make any changes to the city. Neighborhood connector streets should be used!</td>
<td>5/30/2018 5:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Don’t see any progress in more affluent neighborhoods on far East side of Fayetteville. Not referencing area off Rolling Hills.</td>
<td>5/30/2018 2:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>It puts an additional strain on our schools and infrastructure. The projection study paid for by the school district is incorrect.</td>
<td>5/29/2018 10:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>The City should place a greater focus upon maintaining traditional RSF4 zoning within existing neighborhoods.</td>
<td>5/29/2018 10:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>I believe in infill where it makes sense, but the city doesn’t seem to be taking into account resources such as schools, existing drainage issues, or roads.</td>
<td>5/29/2018 9:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Our neighborhood is very clearly residential with certain size lots. It wouldn’t work there.</td>
<td>5/29/2018 9:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>It’s looking nice city-wide. My neighbourhood has no opportunities for infill as it’s a very new neighbourhood, but I wish it had a higher walkability-easier access to stores, shops (coffee shops), transportation, but we bought in our neighbourhood because of affordability and space, even though it’s not convenient with easy access.</td>
<td>5/29/2018 8:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Site specific viewpoints</td>
<td>5/29/2018 8:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>We can do a better job at matching infill to our historic neighborhoods and not destroy them or price out people who already live there.</td>
<td>5/29/2018 8:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>I want more housing options and would love to trade my difficult-to-maintain yard in for a nice condo with a patio. I need better space to expand my business but there are no viable options within easy walking or biking distance.</td>
<td>5/29/2018 11:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>New homes often look nothing like the homes already in a neighborhood. In a bad way.</td>
<td>5/14/2018 7:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>Few options for infill in the area in which I live.</td>
<td>5/12/2018 10:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>I'm not sure if we’re doing that in my neighborhood but it would be nice. However, I am worried about being priced out of my apartment.</td>
<td>5/12/2018 9:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Much of the infill is putting too many houses too close together.</td>
<td>5/12/2018 9:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Most instances of infill I have seen meet the goal of increasing housing options in the City’s developed center, but at the same time several examples are contextually-deaf (too tall, too modern, completely different style).</td>
<td>5/11/2018 7:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>No thanks</td>
<td>4/20/2018 1:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Middle infill</td>
<td>4/20/2018 1:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>I like the housing options but also miss the grass</td>
<td>4/20/2018 1:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>South Fayetteville is neglected</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>I think it's good to use land that no one wants to</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>It seems efficient. I'm game</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>The only worry I would have is the further decrease in hydrological permeativity of the avg lot</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>So much construction everywhere</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>I love this neighborhood</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Date and Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>I'm into the idea, but costs are always a problem</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>I love that there are more options for places to live. I would be nice to find places that are more affordable for students but also in 'good' areas of town.</td>
<td>4/20/2018 12:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>I don't have a strong opinion or feelings about infill development in general. I might have one about a certain project in a particular place if given more detail. Under utilized is rather subjective.</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>A grassy park space has been bought to replace with a building</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>Good to have locals businesses</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>I feel like it should be monitored but I like the idea</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>Space needs to be used.</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:20 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>There probably weren't apartments for students where I live ten years ago</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:14 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:12 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>I hate to see the green spaces go but I like it better than extending around town</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Apartment complexes are too large</td>
<td>4/20/2018 11:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>I think the examples given in pictures should be associated with the correct Street names and of course the owners of this potential areas for development. Because by law all elected officials cannot benefit from changes made this was put in the books in 2017. I don't feel the survey represents a random areas because if it was just a choice of any 2 lots you could have used many more pictures and examples from all over just to gather opinions or that it benefits but does not justifies what has already been decided by city planning with outside influences. Who designed this survey was it an outside objective party who's business is to be impartial?</td>
<td>4/20/2018 10:56 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 9
How valuable do you think it is for the city to encourage infill development through reduced regulations, taxes, and fees.
Answered: 777
Skipped: 120

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely valuable</td>
<td>21.36%</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very valuable</td>
<td>23.29%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat valuable</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so valuable</td>
<td>14.67%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all valuable</td>
<td>12.10%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 10 A
In order to better define "appropriate infill", please help the City understand which of the following characteristics of development you agree should be prioritized.

A single building type in every neighborhood (only single-family, only multi-familty, etc.)
Answered: 780
Skipped: 117

Very unimportant 20.15% 157
Important 23.88% 186
Neither important or unimportant 22.08% 172
Unimportant 18.10% 141
Very unimportant 15.79% 123
Question 10 B
In order to better define “appropriate infill”, please help the City understand which of the following characteristics of development you agree should be prioritized.

Building design, height, and mass that is similar with existing neighborhood structures.

- Answered: 780
- Skipped: 117

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither important or unimportant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35.38% 276
40.38% 315
12.44% 97
8.59% 67
3.21% 25
Question 10 C
In order to better define “appropriate infill”, please help the City understand which of the following characteristics of development you agree should be prioritized.

Inclusion of well-designed landscaping, trees, and open space.

Answered: 780
Skipped: 117

- Very unimportant
- Unimportant
- Neither important or unimportant
- Important
- Very important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>64.23%</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>26.41%</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither important or unimportant</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 10 D
In order to better define "appropriate infill", please help the City understand which of the following characteristics of development you agree should be prioritized.

Preservation of historic structures.
Answered: 780
Skipped: 117

- Very unimportant
- Unimportant
- Neither important or unimportant
- Important
- Very important

Very important: 59.36% (463)
Important: 26.28% (205)
Neither important or unimportant: 8.85% (69)
Unimportant: 3.33% (26)
Very unimportant: 2.18% (17)
Question 10 E

In order to better define "appropriate infill", please help the City understand which of the following characteristics of development you agree should be prioritized.

Preservation of mature trees.

Answered: 780
Skipped: 117

- Very important: 68.59% (535)
- Important: 22.05% (172)
- Neither important nor unimportant: 6.28% (49)
- Unimportant: 1.67% (13)
- Very unimportant: 1.41% (11)
Question 11 A
As a follow-up to the previous question, please help the City understand which of the following amenities, characteristics, or public improvements should be prioritized in association with infill.

Existing residents continue to find the neighborhood a place they want to live in and can afford.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither important or unimportant</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>70.51%</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>23.97%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 11 B
As a follow-up to the previous question, please help the City understand which of the following amenities, characteristics, or public improvements should be prioritized in association with infill.

A project is friendly to pedestrians and improves the ability to walk in a neighborhood.

Answered: 780
Skipped: 117

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>60.26%</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>28.59%</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither important or unimportant</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 11 C

As a follow-up to the previous question, please help the City understand which of the following amenities, characteristics, or public improvements should be prioritized in association with infill.

Public amenities, such as traffic calming, pathways, and open spaces.

Answered: 777
Skipped: 120

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>57.53%</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>32.69%</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither important or unimportant</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 11 D
As a follow-up to the previous question, please help the City understand which of the following amenities, characteristics, or public improvements should be prioritized in association with infill.

Existing residents can find the same quality of on-street parking.

Answered: 777
Skipped: 120

- Very unimportant: 5.79% (45)
- Unimportant: 9.01% (70)
- Neither important or unimportant: 19.31% (150)
- Important: 29.09% (226)
- Very important: 36.81% (286)
Question 12
What is your gender?
Answered: 739
Skipped: 158

- Female: 52.77% (390)
- Male: 43.17% (319)
- Prefer not to disclose: 3.52% (26)
- Prefer to self-identify: 0.54% (4)
Question 14
What is your ethnic background?

Answered: 734
Skipped: 163

- White/Caucasian: 80.25% (589)
- Prefer not to answer: 8.99% (66)
- Other (please specify): 1.77% (13)
- Black or African American: 3.13% (23)
- Hispanic or Latino: 2.32% (17)
- Native American or Alaska Native: 1.00% (8)
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 0.27% (2)

There are 734 responses in total.
Question 15
How much do you anticipate your household income will be before taxes in 2018?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>11.51%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $100,000</td>
<td>8.08%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-$100,000</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$75,000</td>
<td>12.05%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001-$50,000</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001-$35,000</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,001-$25,000</td>
<td>24.52%</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered: 730
Skipped: 167
Question 16
Do you rent or own your home?
Answered: 736
Skipped: 161

- Home: 63.32% (466)
- Rent: 36.68% (270)
Question 17
What is an estimate of your monthly rent or mortgage payment?

Answered: 724
Skipped: 173

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>10.00%</th>
<th>20.00%</th>
<th>30.00%</th>
<th>40.00%</th>
<th>50.00%</th>
<th>60.00%</th>
<th>70.00%</th>
<th>80.00%</th>
<th>90.00%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No rent or mortgage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000-$2,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500-$1,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000-$1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800-$999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500-$799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300-$499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $300</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300-$499</td>
<td>8.84%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500-$799</td>
<td>26.10%</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800-$999</td>
<td>13.81%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000-$1,499</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500-$1,999</td>
<td>10.22%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000-$2,499</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 or more</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rent or mortgage</td>
<td>11.05%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question 18
What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree (e.g. BS, BA, AB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates degree (e.g. AA, AS, vocational school, certificate program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some technical school, no degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate or GED</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade or less, no diploma</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12th grade or less, no diploma: 1.09% (8 people)
High school graduate or GED: 5.17% (36 people)
Some college, no degree: 20.68% (152 people)
Some technical school, no degree: 0.54% (4 people)
Associates degree (e.g. AA, AS, vocational school, certificate program): 4.90% (36 people)
Bachelor's degree (e.g. BS, BA, AB): 31.97% (235 people)
Graduate or professional degree: 35.65% (262 people)
Question 19
Which of the following best describes you?

Answered: 737
Skipped: 160

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time (35 hours a week or more)</td>
<td>60.24%</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student, not working</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student, working part-time</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student, working full-time</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay-at-home spouse/partner/parent</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired and work part- or full-time</td>
<td>3.93%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired and don't work</td>
<td>8.41%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 20
What area of Fayetteville do you live? (City map provided broken down by wards and subwards)
Answered: 732
Skipped: 165

- I do not know: 3.14% (23)
- I live outside the city limits: 8.20% (60)
- Ward 1: 25.02% (183)
- Ward 2: 22.54% (165)
- Ward 3: 22.26% (163)
- Ward 4: 18.85% (138)
**B Historic Structures**

**University of Arkansas, Fayetteville Campus - Old Main.** The University Hall building was built from 1872-74 and modeled after the main building of the University of Illinois. The building itself is a demonstration of architectural ingenuity and perseverance. At the time of construction, there was no railroad within 150 miles of Fayetteville; thus, bricks were made on the campus. Iron and glass were transported via the Arkansas River and hauled over mountains by teams of ox. Lumber and additional building stone came from within the surrounding area. After an extensive renovation, Old Main was rededicated in September 1991. Old Main was listed in the National Register in 1970. Graduates of the University have their names imprinted in concrete along “Senior Walk” beginning from the door of Old Main and extending across the campus. This tradition began in 1876 and continues today.

**Chi Omega Sorority** was founded on the campus in 1895. In 1930, the National Chi Omega Foundation erected the Chi Omega Theater as a memorial to the sorority’s founding. A bronze plaque on the foundation of the theater’s south pylon pays tribute to the University.

**Carnall Hall** is located at the northeast corner of campus at Arkansas Avenue and Maple Street. Constructed in 1895 by Charles L. Thompson, as the first women’s dorm, the building was named after Professor Ella Carnall. The structure is built of brick with a native stone foundation. Thompson is the architect who built the Washington County Courthouse.

**Headquarters House** - 118 E. Dickson. Over 100 years ago, Jonas M. Tebbetts, a Fayetteville lawyer built what is often referred to as the “most beautiful antebellum house in Arkansas.” The house served as the headquarters of the union commander during the Battle of Fayetteville on April 18, 1863. Across the street (corner of College Avenue and Dickson Street) is a bronze marker giving the date of the battle and names of the opposing commanders, Confederate W.L. Cabell and Union Colonel M. Larue Harrison. The site presently houses the Washington County Historical Society. The Headquarters House has been on the National Register since 1971.

**Ridge House** - Northeast corner of Center and Locust. Constructed in 1854, the Ridge House is Fayetteville’s oldest home site on record. The original log structure was built by John Ridge, a Cherokee leader instrumental in bringing the Cherokee to the southwest. Original logs are encased in the two-story clapboard structure. The Ridge House is presently
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The Walker-Stone House - West Mountain and 207 West Center Street. The Walker-Stone house is two separate brick structures constructed by Judge David Walker, Supreme Court Judge and Chairman of Arkansas Secession Convention. The first home was built on East Mountain and provides a commanding view of Fayetteville. The second home (Center Street) once housed the internationally acclaimed architect, Edward Durrell Stone. The later building has been restored for professional use by the law firm of Kincaid, Horne & Trumbo. The Walker-Stone House obtained National Register status in 1970.

Gregg House - Southwest corner of Lafayette and Gregg. This house was constructed in 1871 by Arkansas Supreme Court Justice Lafayette Gregg and still functions as a private residence. Justice Lafayette Gregg was responsible for preparation of the legislative bill that located the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville and supervision of Old Main’s construction. In 1974 the Gregg house was approved for National Register status.

Walker-Kneer Williams House - Kneer Road. Located on the south slope of Mt. Sequoyah. Listed on the National Register as of 1975. The structure is a T-shaped brick Georgian structure with Victorian trim constructed between 1870-1880 of brick, stone, and wood. Other than the enclosing of the south gallery and the addition of a back stair, the structure is original and in excellent condition. Built by W. Z. Marges, the red brick was locally produced from the same clay deposits as the Gregg home.

Washington County Courthouse - Located on North College Avenue (State Highway 471) at the east end of Center Street, this building has been the subject of numerous restoration efforts. It has recently been identified as a historic landmark. (Exact date of construction unknown). The County courthouse has been on the National Register since 1972.

Washington County Jail - Located on North College (U.S. 71) at the east end of Mountain Street (Exact date of construction unknown). The County jail has been on the National Register since 1978.

Old Post Office - The Old Post Office is located in the center of Fayetteville Square. This building is listed on the National Register and has been restored to serve as restaurant and private club. Nomination of the old Post Office for listing on the Register was approved in
1974.

**Frisco Depot** - 550 W. Dickson. Erected in 1887 after the first station burned. The original building was remodeled and enlarged in 1925. The depot was transformed with a Spanish influence. It is the only vintage depot standing on the former Frisco line between Missouri and Van Buren. The last regular passenger train passed through Fayetteville on September 18, 1965.


**Hemingway House and Barn** - Two story wood frame house covered in clapboards and shingles, rests on short stone piers. Built in 1907 for attorney Wilson Elwin Hemingway. Charles L. Thompson designed the house and barn. It is now the residence of the original owners’ granddaughter. It was designed as a summer dwelling of Dutch Colonial influence which is in contrast to Thompson’s usual strong classical influence within the Colonial Revival styles.

**Wilson, Pittman, Campbell-Gregory House** - 405 East Dickson. The original two-story brick structure was built in 1866 with an addition in 1913. Built by J. H. Wilson but purchased before completion by James Pittman, a Confederate Colonel during the Civil War. The exterior has had a few cosmetic alterations but the interior of the house is remarkably unaltered.

**Magnolia Filling Station** - 429 W. LaFayette. Built by Earl Byrd in 1925 it is the only known surviving structure of the Magnolia Company. It is an outstanding example of the drive-in type structure.

**Troy Gordon House** - 9 East Township Road. Constructed in 1851 in the Greek Revival style. The structure has been recycled and is now used for office space. This is one of the few antebellum houses remaining in the state.

**Jackson House** - Built in 1872. Bricks made on property.

**Routh-Bailey House** - Old Wire Road. Constructed in 1848 entirely by slaves. The 20
slaves were owned by Benjamin Routh. They dug and burned clay and limestone on the farm to make bricks and mortar to build the brick structure.

**Guisinger Building** - Built in 1886 by William Crenshaw, an early Fayetteville hardware merchant. The brick building is typical of late 19th century commercial style buildings. The building was refurbished retaining all the architectural flavor of the interior including the pressed tin ceilings. It currently houses a law firm.

**Villa Rosa** - 617 W. LaFayette. The Villa Rosa is a two-story frame residence with a beige brick facing built in the Italian Renaissance style in 1932. Named for Rosa Marinoni, a former Arkansas poet laureate and an important figure in the state’s cultural history. Rosa designed the home herself, after her father’s summer home, Villa Rosa, in Bologna.

**Johnson Barn** - Cato Springs Road north of Round Top Mountain. A 1933 two-story, balloon frame, gambrel roof agricultural building. It is supported by a fieldstone foundation, sheathed in wood weatherboard siding, and constructed with solid walnut columns on the first floor and long, unspliced truss members that frame the gambrel roof. Designed with a side drive plan by Ben F. Johnson, III, a Harvard University landscape architect graduate, after an extensive study of Northwest Arkansas barn types. He took the best design features and incorporated them into an ideal barn structure.

**National Cemetery** - The National Cemetery is the burial site of over 1,600 U.S. soldiers who fought in both World War I, World War II and Korea, Vietnam and the Persian Gulf. The cemetery is maintained by the U.S. Government and is located at the south end of Government Avenue.

**Arkansas College** - On College Avenue where the First Christian Church now stands was the site of the Arkansas College, the first chartered college to grant Bachelor degrees (1860-1862). In 1928 when Fayetteville celebrated its centennial birthday, this site became an historical marker and is recognized by the placement of a bronze plaque on the front of the church. The plaque commemorates the old Arkansas College which was destroyed by fire during the Civil War.

**Fayetteville Female Seminary** - The Female Seminary, built in 1839 was located on Mountain Street, one block west of Fayetteville Square. It was begun as a school for Indian girls from the Cherokee Nation and became widely renowned as being the best school for
girls in the southwest. The seminary was destroyed by fire during the Civil War and is commemorated now by a bronze plaque on a stone pillar on West Mountain Street.

**Confederate Cemetery** - Located at the east end of Rock Street, this cemetery is the burial grounds for Confederate Soldiers from Texas, Missouri, Louisiana and Arkansas.

**Eason Building** - The Bank of Fayetteville and the First National Bank merged in 1915 and were originally housed in the Eason Building.

**St. Paul’s Episcopal Church** - The cornerstone for the St. Paul Episcopal Church was laid in this location in 1872. This church was built by W.Z. Mayes who also built Old Main.

**Rieff House / Moores Funeral Home** - Built in 1857 it is very similar in design to the Walker/Stone House which also uses Federalist Style Architecture.

**A.F. Wolf Building** - Originally built in 1906 by A.F. Wolf the building now houses Fayetteville City Hall and Administration offices.

**Ozark Theatre Building** - Built in 1905 by the Knights of Pythias it became known as the Ozark Theatre.

**Bank of Fayetteville** - This building has been in the Lewis family since 1912 and for many years it housed the Lewis Brothers hardware store. Its exterior was used in the filming of the television series Evening Shade.

**Mrs. Young Building** - Possibly the oldest building on the Square, the façade of the “Mrs. Young 1887” building is typical of the late Victorian era and has undergone little alteration.
C Infill Assessment Map

The Infill Assessment Map is a map-based tool for objectively assessing and quantifying a specific property’s appropriateness for infill. This is achieved through a matrix of values assigned to elements of the built and natural environment, ranging from proximity to water and sewer lines to the density of street intersections. Similarly to the Growth Concept Map, the Infill Assessment Map may act to advise staff, appointed and elected officials, residents on a range of matters including but not limited to viability of a rezoning request, the constraints to a property’s development, or even the marketability of land. These tools are intended to both synthesize existing considerations and fill a gap in the array of maps, data, and plans that guide decision-making.
Fire Department 4-Minute Response Time

The provision of emergency services is one of the most critical functions of a municipal government. The ability to provide these services is largely constrained by the costs associated with building, equipping, and staffing new fire stations. Accordingly, and to ensure ongoing, effective emergency service, infill development ought to be encouraged within those areas already served by Fayetteville’s Fire Department and within adequate response times.
A fundamental prerequisite to urban development is access to safe, clean water and adequate sanitation. In Fayetteville, this is reflected by the requirement for each property to have access to public water or sanitary service before development. For properties without access to water or sanitary sewer, policy requires main extensions when within 300 feet. Given the investment of public money in maintaining public water and sewer infrastructure, and the costs associated with lengthy main extensions, infill development with access to existing water and sewer may represent a more economically sustainable alternative to greenfield development.
Access to healthy food options is critical to community well-being. As land uses separated in the 20th century, “food deserts” developed. Residents became separated from affordable and nutritious food by increasing distances that could only be overcome by vehicle ownership. Although impermanent given the ebb and flow of the market economy, a grocery store’s presence within walking distance is an important element when Fayetteville directs infill through zoning and development actions.
Public Schools (1/2 Mile)

Public schools have been a key element in neighborhood character and stability for decades. Just as Fayetteville directs or responds to development through capital investment in streets and fire stations, so too does Fayetteville Public School District through school construction. With consideration for capacities, encouraging infill near schools promotes walkability and maximizes the return on the school district’s facilities.
University of Arkansas (1/2 mile)

As the City’s largest single destination of residents and principal employer, the University of Arkansas’ main campus rightly represents an anchor in Fayetteville. As such, encouraging infill development near the University can afford residents the opportunity to walk to work, classes, and events.
Parks & Trails (1/2 mile)

Fayetteville boasts a robust network of parks and trails. Each park and trail represents an amenity for residents to commute and recreate. Furthermore, promoting access to these facilities for all ages and abilities is the underpinning of the City’s Active Transportation Plan. Deliberately encouraging infill near Fayetteville’s parks and trails can have the manifold impacts of offering alternative transportation options to residents, promoting public health, and maximizing the City’s ongoing investment in open spaces.
Fayetteville’s Future Land Use Map is based on the SmartCode transects, with the Urban Center Area and City Neighborhood Area designations anticipated to be the most urban and most appropriate for infill. During the drafting of Fayetteville’s neighborhood plans, illustrative master plans were concurrently created that call-out undeveloped properties for infill opportunities that can serve to revive, compliment, and strengthen the neighborhood character.
Street Intersection Density greater than 140/Square Mile

A robust street grid has numerous benefits, including connectivity, an in-built capacity to disperse traffic congestion, and the flexibility to handle road closures. Areas of early development in Fayetteville established this grid throughout downtown and immediately surrounding neighborhoods. With the characteristic abilities to handle increased traffic and offer realistic alternatives to vehicle transportation, these areas of complete and connected street network are ideally suited to infill development.
Transit Stop (1/2 Mile)

Fayetteville is supported by two transit providers: Ozark Regional Transit and Razorback Transit. While their services overlap and compliment in areas, the former is tasked with serving the larger region while the latter supports the University of Arkansas. For either service to be effective, an approximate density of eight units per acre is necessary. While achieving this in existing, low-density neighborhoods may be difficult, connecting residents with transit is critical to developing an livable transportation network. Encouraging infill within walking distance of transit stops will increase job and housing opportunities at locations where vehicle dependence is not necessary.
Slopes Greater than 15%

Fayetteville is characterized by steep terrain and areas that are sensitive to development. While ordinances are in-place to ensure more robust construction design and the preservation of tree canopy with associated topsoil, the steepest slopes are not always ideal for the potential increase in density and intensity that is associated with infill.
Floodplain

Floodways and floodplains within Fayetteville are determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Although development is permitted within areas of the 100-year floodplain, it is not a best practice and can damage riparian corridors and property downstream. These consequences make floodplains a generally inappropriate location to encourage infill development.
### Fayetteville Planning Commission weighting recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infill Development Criteria</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Total</th>
<th>Old Post Office</th>
<th>Penguin’s Ed - West</th>
<th>Fiesta Square (Varies)</th>
<th>Harps - Wedington</th>
<th>Harps - Mission/Crossover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Weighted Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Weighted Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department 4 Minute Response Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Main (300’)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Main (300’)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Store (1/2 Mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School (1/2 Mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Main Campus (1/2 Mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks and Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park (1/2 Mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail (1/2 Mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozark Transit (1/2 Mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razorback Transit (1/2 Mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Land Use Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Neighborhood Area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center Area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Master Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette Junction Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Park Master Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedington Corridor Master Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71B Corridor Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Density</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 140 intersections/square mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater-than-15% slope*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Substitute 100-year floodplain for >15% slope

Scoring: 1 through 5
Highest Score: 17
Lowest Score: -1.5
E  Future Land Use Map by Quadrant
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E Resources; Website URLs

Resources

7hills Homeless Center
https://7hillscenter.org/
To develop and implement collaborative, local solutions that foster hope, opportunity, and stability for people experiencing homelessness.

American Institute of Architects
www.aia.org
This AIA site includes access to job listings, continuing education, media updates, and a search engine for contacts.

American Planning Association
www.planning.org
The American Planning Association is a nonprofit public interest and research organization representing 37,000 practicing planners, officials, and citizens involved with urban and rural planning issues.

American Society of Landscape Architects
www.asla.org
The American Society of Landscape Architects is a professional organization that promotes the profession through advocacy, education and communication.

Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) (Under Department of Arkansas Heritage)
http://www.arkansaspreservation.com/
The AHPP’s mission is to fulfill the objectives of the National Historic Preservation Act through the identification, preservation, and protections of the cultural heritage of the State of Arkansas.

Builder Online
www.builderonline.com
Builder magazine and Builder Online are professional resources for the home building industry. Read about home building news, trends and projects around the country.
Resources (contd.)

**Center for Transit-Oriented Development**
Seeks to use transit investments to spur a new wave of development that improves housing affordability and choice, revitalizes downtowns and neighborhoods, and provides value capture and recapture for individuals, communities, and transportation agencies.

**Congress for the New Urbanism**
www.cnu.org
CNU advocates the restructuring of public policy and development practices to support the restoration of existing urban centers and towns within coherent metropolitan regions.

**Dover Kohl and Partners**
www.doverkohl.com
Design is the key to livable communities. The Dover, Kohl and Partners team is focused on revitalizing traditional towns, growing neighborhoods, and fixing sprawl - by design.

**Drake Field**
https://www.fayetteville-ar.gov/1375/Airport
The City of Fayetteville Aviation Division is responsible for the development, operation and maintenance of the municipal airport. Management is supported by the Airport Board and a committee of citizens who assist the City Council in planning and decisions pertaining to the airport. Their mission is to provide Fayetteville and Northwest Arkansas with strategic and innovative aviation services and solutions designed to foster economic growth and commerce in an ever changing environment.

**Fayetteville Public Library**
https://www.faylib.org/
The Fayetteville Public Library is committed to its vision to be powerfully relevant and completely accessible.

**Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) (Under U.S. Department of Transportation)**
https://www.faa.gov/
FAA’s continuing mission is to provide the safest, most efficient aerospace system in the world.

**Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (Under U.S. Department of Transportation)**
https://www.transit.dot.gov/
The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provides financial and technical assistance to local public transit systems, including buses,
subways, light rail, commuter rail, trolleys and ferries. FTA also oversees safety measures and helps develop next-generation technology research.

**Mayors’ Institute on City Design**
www.arts.endow.gov/partner/Mayors2.html
Details of this NEA-sponsored workshop, the main goal of which is to ‘help mayors develop an appreciation for the importance of their role as designers of their own cities.’

**National Register of Historic Places (Via National Park Service, Under U.S. Department of the Interior)**
https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/index.htm
The National Register of Historic Places is the official list of the Nation’s historic places worthy of preservation. Authorized by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Park Service’s National Register of Historic Places is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect America’s historic and archeological resources.

**National Trust for Historic Preservation**
www.nationaltrust.org
Non-profit organization dedicated to providing leadership, education, and advocacy to save America’s diverse historic places and revitalize communities.

**New Urban News**
www.newurbannews.com
New Urban News is a professional newsletter for planners, developers, architects, builders, public officials and others who are interested in the creation of human-scale communities.

**Northwest Arkansas Continuum of Care**
https://nwacoc.com/
Coordinating a community response to end homelessness in Northwest Arkansas.

**Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission (NWARPC)**
http://nwarpc.org/
As the Metropolitan Planning Organization for all of Northwest Arkansas, the NWARPC provides the framework for joint cooperation and decision-making in the planning and prioritization of transportation system improvements.
Resources (contd.)

**Ozark Regional Transit**  
https://www.ozark.org/  
Ozark Regional Transit is dedicated to providing safe, reliable and affordable public transportation to both the rural and urban residents of the four county area (Benton, Carroll, Madison, and Washington) within our jurisdiction.

**Planetizen**  
www.planetizen.com  
Planetizen is a public-interest information exchange provided by Urban Insight for the urban planning, design and development community.

**Razorback Transit (Under University of Arkansas)**  
https://parking.uark.edu/transit-services/transit-operations/

**Resource for Urban Design Information**  
www.rudi.net  
RUDI is the one-stop portal to all key information sources for everyone involved in urban design. Highlights of RUDI include news, events, case studies, examples of best practices, design guides, book reviews and a bookshop.

**Smart Growth Online**  
www.smartgrowth.org  
A service of the smart growth network this website offers resources, news, and links to smart growth issues around the country.

**Urban Land Institute**  
www.uli.org  
The mission of the Urban Land Institute is to provide responsible leadership in the use of land in order to enhance the total environment.

**U.S. Census Bureau**  
https://www.census.gov/en.html  
The Census Bureau’s mission is to serve as the nation’s leading provider of quality data about its people and economy.

**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)**  
https://www.hud.gov/
Website URLs

Fayetteville Energy Action Plan

Fayetteville Mobility Plan

Fayetteville Active Transportation Plan
http://www.fayetteville-ar.gov/DocumentCenter/View/8891/Final-Active-Transportation-Plan

NWA 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan
http://nwarpc.org/transportation/metropolitan-transportation-plan/

GIS Historic Resources Map
https://maps.fayetteville-ar.gov/HistoricSites/

Housing and Transportation Index, Center for Neighborhood Technology
https://htaindex.cnt.org/
https://htaindex.cnt.org/map/
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Glossary

**Accessory dwelling unit:** A separate, complete housekeeping unit with a separate entrance, kitchen, sleeping area, and full bathroom facilities, which is an attached or detached extension to an existing single-family structure.

**Adaptive reuse:** The conversion of obsolescent or historic buildings from their original or most recent use to a new use. For example, the conversion of former hospital or school buildings to residential use, or the conversion of an historic single-family home to office use.

**Antebellum era:** A period in the history of the Southern United States, from the late 18th century until the start of the American Civil War in 1861, marked by the economic growth of the South.

**Arterial:** Includes freeways, multilane highways, and other important roadways that supplement the Interstate System. They connect, as directly as practicable, the Nation’s principal urbanized areas, cities, and industrial centers. Land access is limited. Posted speed limits on arterials usually range between 50 and 70 mi/h.

**As of right development:** Development that complies with the provisions of the zoning regulations and may be approved administratively.

**Brownfield:** An area previously used primarily as an industrial site.

**Built environment:** The elements of the environment [...] that are generally built or made by people as contrasted with natural processes.

**Bus Rapid Transit (BRT):** A high-quality bus-based transit system that delivers fast and efficient service that may include dedicated lanes, busways, traffic signal priority, off-board fare collection, elevated platforms, and enhanced stations.

**Capital investments:** Any building or infrastructure project that will be owned by a governmental unit and purchased or built with direct appropriations from the governmental Sources Include:

- SmartCode and Manual, including SmartCode version 8.0 & 9.2, Article 7
- Planners Dictionary
- Missing Middle Housing, https://missingmiddlehousing.com/
- University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point college of Natural Resources, www.uwsp.edu/cnr
- Randall Arendt, www.greenerprospects.com
- Community Change, Housing Trust Fund Project, https://housingtrustfundproject.org/
- Wikipedia
- U.S. Census Bureau
- Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation
- Arkansas Historic Preservation Program
- Study.com
- Federal Highway Administration/U.S. Department of Transportation
unit, or with bonds backed by its full faith and credit, or, in whole or in part, with federal or other public funds, or in any combination thereof. A project may include construction, installation, project management or supervision, project planning, engineering, or design, and the purchase of land or interests in land.

**Certified Local Government (CLG):** An Arkansas city or county is eligible to participate in the CLG program if it has appointed a Historic District Commission (HDC) and has passed a local preservation ordinance designating one or more local historic districts, according to applicable state law.

**Charrette:** The word charrette can refer to any collaborative session in which a group of designers drafts a solution to a design problem. While the structure of a charrette varies depending on the design problem and the individuals in the group, charrettes often take place in multiple sessions in which the group divides into sub-groups. Each sub-group then presents its work to the full group as material for future dialogue. Such charrettes serve as a way of quickly generating a design solution while integrating the aptitudes and interests of a diverse group of people.

**Collector:** Major and minor roads that connect local roads and streets with arterials. Collectors provide less mobility than arterials at lower speeds and for shorter distances. They balance mobility with land access. The posted speed limit on collectors is usually between 35 and 55 mi/h.

**Conditional use:** A use that, because of special requirements or characteristics, may be allowed in a particular zoning district only after review by the commission and granting of conditional use approval imposing such conditions as necessary to make the use compatible with other uses permitted in the same zone or vicinity. Conditional uses are issued for uses of land and may be transferable from one owner of the land to another.

**Conservation Subdivision:** A subdivision with a significant percentage of buildable lands (generally around 40% or more) permanently protected to create interconnected networks of conservation lands. Conservation subdivisions are specifically designed around each site’s most significant natural and cultural resources, with their open space networks being the first element to be “green-lined” in the design process. These conservation lands may provide open space and recreation for the neighborhood and may also serve as local building blocks in a community-wide open space network. Conservation subdivisions are generally density neutral, meaning that the overall number of dwellings built is not different from that done under the current zoning and subdivision regulations.

**Context:** Surroundings made up of the particular combination of elements that create specific habitat.

**Corridor:** A lineal geographic system incorporating transportation and/or greenway trajectories. A transportation corridor may be a lineal urban Transect Zone.
**Cottage/Cluster Housing Development**: A cluster of detached single family homes, restricted in size and of high architectural quality, oriented around common open space.

**Density (residential)**: The number of dwelling units within a standard measure of land area,

**Easement**: A right to use another person’s real property for certain limited purposes.

**Enduring Green Network**: A linear park, trail corridor, or open space conservation area that provides passive recreational opportunities, alternative transportation options and/or the conservation of open space or natural areas.

**Floodplain**: For a given flood event, that area of land that is temporarily covered by water and that adjoins a watercourse. In FEMA regulated, or established floodplains, the floodplains shall mean the area subject to inundation from any source during the regulatory event.

**Form-Based Code**: A form-based code is a land development regulatory tool that places primary emphasis on the physical form of the built environment with the end goal of producing a specific type of “place”.

**G.I. Bill**: A law that provided a range of benefits for returning World War II veterans (commonly referred to as G.I.s). Benefits included low-cost mortgages, low-interest loans to start a business, one year of unemployment compensation, and dedicated payments of tuition and living expenses to attend high school, college, or vocational school.

**GIS (Geographic Information System)**: A computerized program in widespread municipal use that organizes data on maps.

**Greenfield**: An area that consists of open or wooded land or farmland that has not been previously developed.

**Greyfield**: Previously developed properties that are not contaminated. They are usually, but not exclusively, former commercial properties that may be underutilized, derelict or vacant.

**Historic district**: A district or zone designated by a local authority or state or federal government within which buildings, structures, appurtenances, and places are of basic and vital importance because of their association with history; or because of their unique architectural style and scale, including color, proportion, form, and architectural detail; or because of their being a part of or related to a square, park, or area the design or general arrangement of which should be preserved or developed according to a fixed plan based on cultural, historical, or architectural motives or purposes.

**Housing Trust Fund**: Housing trust funds are distinct funds established by city, county or state governments that receive ongoing dedicated sources of public funding to support the preservation and production of affordable housing and increase opportunities for families and
individuals to access decent affordable homes. Housing trust funds systemically shift affordable housing funding from annual budget allocations to the commitment of dedicated public revenue. While housing trust funds can also be a repository for private donations, they are not public/private partnerships, nor are they endowed funds operating from interest and other earnings.

**Human Scale:** The proportional relationship of the physical environment to human dimensions, acceptable to public perception and comprehension in terms of the size, height, bulk, and/or massing of buildings or other features of the built environment.

**Impact Fee:** A charge on new development to pay for the construction or expansion of off-site capital improvements that are necessitated by and benefit the new development.

**Infill:** Development occurring on vacant or partially developed land in established areas of the city that has infrastructure and public services in the immediate vicinity, and is surrounded by areas that are substantially developed.

**Interstate:** the highest classification of roadways in the United States. These arterial roads provide the highest level of mobility and the highest speeds over the longest uninterrupted distance. Interstates nationwide usually have posted speeds between 55 and 75 mi/h.

**Intensity (non-residential):** The number of square feet of development per acre by land use type with respect to non-residential land uses.

**Land banking:** Land is purchased and reserved for later use or development. Land could be leased for immediate use (agriculture or an athletic field). Banked lands have been used for development of low- and moderate-income housing, expansion of parks, and development of industrial and commercial centers.

**Land-grant university:** An institution of higher education in the United States designated by a state to receive the benefits of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The Morrill Acts funded educational institutions by granting federally controlled land to the states for them to sell, to raise funds, to establish and endow “land-grant” colleges. Most land-grant colleges became large public universities that today offer a full spectrum of educational opportunities.

**Local:** Smaller roads that provide limited mobility and are the primary access to residential areas, businesses, farms, and other local areas. Local roads, with posted speed limits usually between 20 and 45 mi/h, are the majority of roads in the U.S.

**Leapfrog development:** Development that occurs well beyond the existing limits of development and thus leaves intervening vacant land behind. This bypassing of the next-in-line lands at the urban fringe results in the haphazard shotgun pattern of urbanization known as “sprawl.”
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*Glossary (contd.)*

**Metropolitan planning organization (MPO):** A local governmental unit that has legal jurisdiction over a geographic area for government service planning such as transportation and land-use planning.

**Metropolitan statistical area (MSA):** An MSA consists of one or more counties that contain a city of 50,000 or more inhabitants, or contain a Census Bureau-defined urbanized area (UA) and have a total population of at least 100,000. Counties containing the principal concentration of population—the largest city and surrounding densely settled area—are components of the MSA. Additional counties qualify to be included by meeting a specified level of commuting to the counties containing the population concentration and by meeting certain other requirements of metropolitan character, such as a specified minimum population density or percentage of the population that is urban.

**Minipark (pocket park):** Small neighborhood park of approximately one acre or less.

**Missing Middle Housing:** House-scale buildings with multiple units in walkable neighborhoods.

**Mixed Use:** Multiple functions within the same building or multiple buildings, most commonly comprised of residential and nonresidential uses.

**North American Industry Classification System (NAICS):** A system for classifying establishments by the type of economic activity in which they are engaged.

**Pedestrian-oriented development:** Development designed with an emphasis primarily on the street sidewalk and on pedestrian access to the site and building, rather than on auto access and parking areas. The building is generally placed close to the street and the main entrance is oriented to the street sidewalk. There are generally windows or display cases along building facades which face the street. Typically, buildings cover a large portion of the site. Although parking areas may be provided, they are generally limited in size and they are not emphasized by the design of the site.

**Pedestrian Shed:** An area, approximately circular, that is centered on a Common Destination. A Standard Pedestrian Shed is 1/4 mile radius or 1320 feet, about the distance of a five-minute walk at a leisurely pace. A pedestrian shed is often used as a unit of neighborhood measurement for planning analysis such as; land use, development density or intensity, accessibility to open space or parks, walkability, etc. It has been shown that provided with a pedestrian environment, most people will walk this distance rather than drive.

**Recreation, active:** Those recreational pursuits which require physical alteration to the area in which they are performed. Such areas are intensively used and include but are not limited to playgrounds, ball courts, golf courses, and swimming pools.

**Recreation, passive:** Those recreational pursuits which can be carried out with little alteration or disruption to the area in which they are
performed. Such uses include but are not limited to hiking and picnicking.

**Retail trade area:** A retail trade area is the geographic area that a retail store draws from, or the longest drive a customer is willing to make.

**Riparian habitat:** Riparian lands are comprised of the vegetative and wildlife areas, either surface or subsurface, adjacent to stream, spring, lake, watercourse, river, creek, or other body of water. Riparian areas are delineated by the existence of plant species normally found near freshwater.

**Spot zoning:** An arbitrary zoning or rezoning of a small tract of land, usually surrounded by other uses or zoning categories that are of a markedly or substantially different intensity, that is not consistent with the comprehensive land use plan, and that primarily promotes the private interest of the owner rather than the general welfare.

**Sprawl:** Low-density land-use patterns that are automobile-dependent, energy and land consumptive, and require a very high ratio of road surface to development served. Characteristics of sprawl include: a scattered development pattern that leaves large tracts of undeveloped land between developments; commercial strip centers along major streets, and large expanses of single-use development. (adapted from Michigan State Planning Officials, Patterns on the Land, Trend Future Project, final report, September 1995)

**Streetscape:** The urban element that establishes the major part of the public realm. The streetscape is composed of thoroughfares (travel lanes for vehicles and bicycles, parking lanes for cars, and sidewalks or paths for pedestrians) as well as the visible private frontages (building facades and elevations, porches, yards, fences, awnings, etc.), and the amenities of the public frontages (street trees and plantings, benches, streetlights, etc.).

**Sustainable:** The finite capacity of any place or activity to support humans and their activities, given a set of impacts that those activities have on the place. Once capacity is reached, the impacts of additional growth or activities harm the integrity of the place and impair its ability to function as intended. The result of said actions may jeopardize the ability of future generations to live and prosper.

**Transfer of Development Rights (TDR):** A method of relocating existing zoning rights from areas to be preserved as open space (“sending areas”) to areas to be more densely urbanized (“receiving areas”).

**Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND):** Developments that provide: a variety of housing types and prices; prominently sited village squares or greens; civic, community or educational buildings; and retail/offices/workplaces to provide a balanced mix of activities. These types of neighborhoods have interconnected streets, alleys and sidewalks in a grid or modified grid pattern with buildings oriented to the street and a high level of pedestrian activity.
Glossary (contd.)

**Transit-Oriented Development (TOD):** Moderate and high-density housing concentrated in mixed-use developments located along transit routes. . . . The location, design, and mix of uses in a TOD emphasize pedestrian-oriented environments and encourage the use of public transportation. (Community Green Line Planning Project, “Putting Neighborhoods on the Right Track,” Chicago)

**Transect:** A cross-section of the environment showing a range of different habitats. The rural-urban Transect of the human environment used in the SmartCode template is divided into six Transect Zones. These zones describe the physical form and character of a place, according to the Density and intensity of its land use and Urbanism.

**Transect Zone (T-Zone):** One of several areas on a Zoning Map regulated by the SmartCode. Transect Zones are administratively similar to the land use zones in conventional codes, except that in addition to the usual building use, Density, height, and Setback requirements, other elements of the intended habitat are integrated, including those of the private Lot and building and Public Frontage.

**Village:** A Village is usually a TND Community Type standing isolated in the countryside, but with a stronger center than a hamlet due to its proximity to a transportation corridor. See: TND.

**Walkable Neighborhood/Walkability:** Development pattern that is identifiable for its short block lengths and complete street attributes such as sidewalks, bicycle facilities, on-street parking, and slow vehicular speeds. Pedestrian sheds that include commercial, civic, school, open space and residential uses within or adjacent to walkable neighborhoods provide the most efficient use of land and environmental resources.

**Zoning:** A police power measure in which the community is divided into districts or zones within which permitted and special uses are established as are regulations governing lot size, building bulk, placement, density, intensity, and other development standards.
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