







MEMO

October 4, 2007

TO: Willow Road Enhancement Steering Committee
FR: Scott Freres, Lakota
RE: **Workshop #1 Summary – Visual Preference Survey**

The following is the summary of the Visual Preference Survey results from the September 19, 2007 workshop. 83 ballots were collected and tabulated from the attendees of the workshop. The following pages include the average score generated for each image, as well as any comments made on the ballot. Additionally, the highest rated image for each category has been highlighted in green, and the lowest rated image in orange. In general, a score from 0.1 to 0.5 is fair, 0.51 to 1.0 is good, and above 1.0 is excellent. Conversely, a score from -0.1 to -0.5 is poor, -0.5 to -1.0 is very poor, and below -1.0 is bad. The positively rated images will be used as guidance in preparing imagery for the second public workshop.

Image**Rating****Comments**

<p>Road Edge Char. 1</p> 	<p>-1.38</p>	<p>Uneven surface. Rural feeling. Needs a curb. Unfinished, dangerous. Depressing Willow. UGLY.</p>
<p>Road Edge Char. 2</p> 	<p>0.29</p>	<p>No path. I like the rise of ground. Where's the sidewalk?</p>
<p>Road Edge Char. 3</p> 	<p>0.15</p>	<p>Too close. Rural feel. Too narrow. Nice trees.</p>
<p>Road Edge Char. 4</p> 	<p>-0.89</p>	<p>Walk close to road. Not safe. Sidewalk too close to road.</p>
<p>Road Edge Char. 5</p> 	<p>1.54</p>	<p>Safe, spacious, green. On the left. Many problems.</p>
<p>Road Edge Char. 6</p> 	<p>0.53</p>	<p>No sidewalk. Rural feel. Asphalt preferred over concrete (noise reasons).</p>

Image

Rating

Comments

Road Edge Char. 7









-0.07

On the left.
Sidewalk too close to street.
A little too close.
Not safe.

Image

Rating

Comments

<p>Road Median 1</p> 	<p>0.54</p>	<p>Just makes the road wider! Too industrial.</p>
<p>Road Median 2</p> 	<p>0.13</p>	
<p>Road Median 3</p> 	<p>0.67</p>	<p>Industrial looking. Attractive. Too big.</p>
<p>Road Median 4</p> 	<p>0.65</p>	<p>Industrial looking.</p>
<p>Road Median 5</p> 	<p>0.22</p>	
<p>Road Median 6</p> 	<p>-1.08</p>	<p>Looks dangerous. No- horrible. Too wide for Northfield.</p>

Image

Rating

Comments



0.18

Not feasible- why suggest?



0.30

Too urban.

Image

Rating

Comments

Image	Rating	Comments
<p>Pedestrian Path 1</p> 	<p>1.16</p>	<p>Safer. Vegetation overgrown.</p>
<p>Pedestrian Path 2</p> 	<p>-0.98</p>	<p>Not safe or wide. Too close to road.</p>
<p>Pedestrian Path 3</p> 	<p>0.98</p>	<p>Not as safe. Small trees.</p>
<p>Pedestrian Path 4</p> 	<p>0.74</p>	
<p>Pedestrian Path 5</p> 	<p>0.54</p>	<p>Too urban.</p>

Image

Rating

Comments

Pedestrian Path 6



-0.53

Too close to road.

Pedestrian Path 7








1.11

Image

Rating

Comments

Ped. Enhancements 1	<p>0.58</p>	Ugly- invites derelicts.	
			
Ped. Enhancements 2	<p>-0.31</p>		
		Ped. Enhancements 3	<p>0.22</p>
	Ped. Enhancements 4	<p>0.05</p>	
	Ped. Enhancements 5		<p>0.76</p>
			

Image

Rating



Comments

<p>Ped. Enhancements 6</p> 	<p>0.66</p>	<p>Not feasible.</p>
<p>Ped. Enhancements 7</p> 	<p>0.65</p>	<p>Tough for bikes.</p>
<p>Ped. Enhancements 8</p> 	<p>-0.64</p>	<p>Not enough room.</p>
<p>Ped. Enhancements 9</p> 	<p>0.66</p>	<p>Safe. Too urban.</p>
<p>Ped. Enhancements 10</p> 	<p>0.00</p>	
<p>Ped. Enhancements 11</p> 	<p>0.61</p>	

Image

Rating

Comments




<p>Ped. Enhancements 12</p> 	<p>0.57</p>	
<p>Ped. Enhancements 13</p> 	<p>0.37</p>	<p>Safe, could look better. No buffer.</p>

Image

Rating

Comments




Image	Rating	Comments
<p>Bike Trail 1</p> 	<p>1.45</p>	<p>Safe, wide, smooth.</p>
<p>Bike Trail 2</p> 	<p>1.09</p>	<p>Bridge is ugly.</p>
<p>Bike Trail 3</p> 	<p>0.83</p>	<p>Safe.</p>
<p>Bike Trail 4</p> 	<p>-0.24</p>	<p>Not feasible. Ugly.</p>
<p>Bike Trail 5</p> 	<p>0.94</p>	<p>Don't like crossing.</p>

Image	Rating	Comments
<p>Bike Trail 6</p> 	<p>0.10</p>	<p>Ugly.</p>
<p>Bike Trail 7</p> 	<p>0.05</p>	<p>Not feasible.</p>
<p>Bike Trail 8</p> 	<p>-0.27</p>	<p>Too close to road.</p>
<p>Bike Trail 9</p> 	<p>0.88</p>	<p>Wide on bridge is good. Good separation. Too industrial feeling.</p>
<p>Bike Trail 10</p> 	<p>1.41</p>	<p>Good distance from road and cars!</p>

Image

Rating

Comments

<p>Bike Trail 11</p> 	<p>-1.34</p>	<p>I <u>love</u> separating the bikes from the pedestrians!</p>
<p>Bike Trail 12</p> 	<p>0.34</p>	<p>Don't like crossing.</p>
<p>Bike Trail 13</p> 	<p>-1.17</p>	<p>Car doors swing out. Too close to road. Don't trust cars. Dangerous.</p>

Image

Rating




Comments

Landscape Enhance. 1	<p>0.23</p>	Sidewalk next to road.
		
Landscape Enhance. 2	<p>0.52</p>	
		
Landscape Enhance. 3	<p>1.33</p>	Berm is a good idea. I want <u>huge</u> berms! Nicely designed. Nice, no protection.
		
Landscape Enhance. 4	<p>0.20</p>	
		
Landscape Enhance. 5	<p>-1.14</p>	
		
Landscape Enhance. 6	<p>0.55</p>	I want <u>huge</u> berms! No buffering.
		

Image

Rating

Comments

<p>Landscape Enhance. 7</p> 	<p>-0.05</p>	<p>Fence? No.</p>
<p>Landscape Enhance. 8</p> 	<p>0.33</p>	<p>What am I looking at?</p>
<p>Landscape Enhance. 9</p> 	<p>1.07</p>	<p>Not feasible- not enough land available.</p>