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Why Parks Matter
Well-designed and well-cared for parks are important to the development of any healthy and balanced community. For this reason the planning, design and development of urban parks has been a long standing tradition in the United States. Since the 1800s, urban designers and city planners in this country have made the case that parks provide respite from the stresses of urban living. Today, most Americans support this notion and believe that urban parks are an indispensible part of our cities and towns.

The City of Charlottesville is no exception. Its citizens believe that parks are instrumental in making Charlottesville a more vital, livable, and beautiful city. An excellent system of parks is therefore invaluable.

The Parks Tradition
Park design and planning in this country is as old as the founding of the first cities and towns. Early European settlements such as Philadelphia and Savannah were organized around public squares. Smaller towns maintained a central green, often utilitarian in character, that served as the focus of a community's economic and social life. Over time, urban park design has evolved from these first models to accommodate the changing needs of a growing nation and its expanding cities and towns.

Large scale planning and design of urban parks began in earnest in the mid 1800s. New York City and Philadelphia were among the earliest sites for large urban parks in America, and New York City's Central Park, Brooklyn's Prospect Park, and Philadelphia's Fairmount Park were landmarks of planning and design. Created in the so-called "pastoral style" inherited from England, these parks were no mere imitation of the English landscape gardening tradition. Rather, these parks were symbolic of a new American landscape; the urban public park was to embody American ideals of democratic equality.

The renowned landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted and his partner Calvert Vaux, designed Central Park's open and expansive meadows, shady woods, exposed rock outcroppings, placid lakes, and winding paths and carriageways to soothe the spirit of city dwellers. Central Park was envisioned as a place where the citizenry could escape the stresses of urban living and restore themselves through the "natural" scenery of the park. More than this, Olmsted argued for a democratic space, a park not for the privileged few, but a space for all the citizens of New York to congregate. On the strength of these ideals, Central Park firmly established the large urban park as a prominent feature of American cities, and remains one of the most celebrated works of American landscape architecture.

By the end of the nineteenth century, as the population of cities swelled, park planning and design had become even more ambitious. American cities began to plan for whole systems of parks, and important metropolitan park systems emerged in cities such as Boston, Kansas City, and Minneapolis. The notable Boston park system began with Olmsted's "Emerald Necklace," a continuous promenade of public parks and corridors stringing from Boston Common to another large scale Olmsted masterpiece, Franklin Park. Under the leadership and planning of Charles Eliot, an Olmsted apprentice, the Metropolitan Park System of Boston eventually expanded to encompass the entire region.

A concern for health and hygiene prompted the development of many urban parks in the nineteenth century. Cities suffered from poor water quality and associated health problems. Parks were seen not only as a means of providing relief to city dwellers in the Olmstedian tradition, but were also regarded as healthy environments with a cleansing influence on polluted cities. However, parks were soon responding to new leisure time activities as well, meeting changing social and recreational needs.

Because of the growing demands on urban parks, it is not surprising that they evolved away from the pastoral design tradition. The City-Beautiful movement, inspired by the Chicago Exposition of 1893, restored
and influenced park design. Meanwhile, practical concerns for sports and recreation facilities prompted the inclusion of playgrounds, ballfields, swimming pools, and even skating rinks in many parks. The result was a new breed of smaller urban parks, exemplified by public squares and neighborhood playfields that contributed greatly to public park systems nationwide.

These traditions in urban planning and park design frequently find a place in contemporary practice, but once again, changing conditions require new and emerging roles for city parks. The environmental, historic preservation, and neighborhood conservation movements of recent decades have been especially influential. For instance, parks now occupy and celebrate wetlands that were previously considered unusable or even pestilential. Reclamation projects build parks on landfills and abandoned industrial sites. Revitalization programs in inner city neighborhoods have given new life to old parks.

Charlottesville's own tradition of public parks began under the influence of the City-Beautiful movement, and ever-widening demands for recreational opportunities. Lee and Jackson Parks were set aside as public squares in the heart of the City; Belmont and Washington Parks were initially segregated neighborhood parks that ran counter to Olmsted's notion of the urban park as democratic space. Today, these are among Charlottesville's twenty-five public parks and nine public school playgrounds and open space areas - a system solidly based on a foundation of neighborhood parks and schools.

**Why Plan for the Parks?**

Charlottesville is fortunate to possess a number of fine parks. Some highlight and protect the region's abundant vegetation and dramatic topography. Majestic oak groves, flowing streams, and rolling hills with commanding views are not uncommon. Some parks are imbued with local history and neighborhood character. Community festivals and neighborhood celebrations find a home in the parks. All the while, these same parks meet the recreational needs of the residents.

Walking, gardening, softball, basketball, picnicking, youth recreation programs...these are but a few of the many activities that rely on the City's parks.

But the region has grown, financial resources have diminished, and attitudes and values have changed. At the same time, the demands on City parks have increased. Parks require upkeep, and sometimes they need rehabilitation and improvement, and sometimes new park land must be found. How will Charlottesville meet these changing demands on its parks?

Simply put, Charlottesville requires a plan for the improvement and on-going maintenance of the park system. Moreover, the City needs citizens who know their parks and care deeply about them. This requires a commitment to the parks. The continued beauty and vitality of Charlottesville relies on an outstanding system of parks.

The City of Charlottesville Comprehensive Plan for the community makes a commitment to the parks in the first two of six major community goals:

- Promote and maintain a high quality of life for all residents.
- Protect and improve the quality of the environment.
New Demands
Rethinking Prior Planning Efforts
Planning for the City of Charlottesville's parks is not new. The 1972 document Parks and Open Spaces, Recommendations for Improvement, has for many years served as the primary source in setting direction for improvements to Charlottesville's park system. Viewed as a "systematic study" with design recommendations for "each park or open space land holding," the plan emphasizes schematic design proposals for the physical development of each park site.

This plan is now 25 years old. Meanwhile, Charlottesville and the surrounding region have changed. The region in particular is undergoing dramatic growth; although the population of the City is relatively stable, the population of the County is estimated to increase by just over 20,000 persons between 1990 and 2010. This growing population has and will continue to exert pressure on Charlottesville's parks. As more people move to the Charlottesville area, or visit Charlottesville for business, shopping, and recreation, greater demand is placed on the City's park space and recreation facilities. Recreation needs already outpace the capacity of Charlottesville's park facilities, and this trend is expected to continue.

With increasing urbanization, the parks have also come to represent a larger proportion of undeveloped land in Charlottesville. Correspondingly, people have grown increasingly attached to the natural and undeveloped areas of the City. People place greater value on these areas as they become rarer. Meanwhile, growth and development in and around Charlottesville create environmental problems which affect park land. We must understand these relationships and plan accordingly.

As an example, current development practices often result in the degradation of streams in Charlottesville's parks. This is the result of increased stormwater runoff, pollution, and flooding. But advances in environmental engineering can positively influence park planning and design; ecologically sensitive engineering applies new techniques to the restoration of streams. The stabilization of stream beds and the prevention of excessive stormwater runoff contribute to the restoration and revitalization of local creeks and rivers.

Other changes in development practices affect the planning and building of Charlottesville parks. Parks are responsible for meeting the accessibility standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Meeting ADA requirements means that any new construction in the parks must conform to accessibility codes, and that some old structures in the parks may need to be retrofitted.

The immediate need in the park planning and design process is to respond to these changing conditions, and address the issues relevant to Charlottesville, its neighborhoods, and its parks. There is a special need to reconsider the role of parks in the City, with a special concern for understanding the proper place of each neighborhood park and school. The basis of the earlier plan was "to maximize the recreation and open space value of these [park sites]." Certainly the community's understanding of, and the value it attaches to, the parks has changed in 25 years time.

Relevant Planning Documents
When past planning efforts are no longer adequate, it is because the context and conditions affecting Charlottesville have changed. New planning efforts must, as much as possible, understand these changes and modify or establish a new direction for development. There must be consistency among plans in establishing that direction, and they should inform and support one another. The following is a brief review of the established plans and policies critical to the development of the region and its park land.

City of Charlottesville Comprehensive Plan:
The most relevant document with regard to park planning is the City of Charlottesville Comprehensive Plan (July 1995). This document provides the framework and vision for the future development of Charlottesville, including the development of its parks. The Comprehensive Plan recognizes five goals for recreation and open space:
• Provide a high quality, quantity, and variety of recreational facilities throughout the City for the enjoyment and development of all residents.
• Make full use of all existing recreational facilities.
• Preserve, enhance and maintain certain natural features, historic qualities and natural terrain in the City’s parks and open spaces.
• Work toward providing access to parks and recreational activities for all residents.
• Attempt to link the Parks and Recreation facilities through a network of paths and trails.

Among the other goals of the Comprehensive Plan, those for the natural environment also deserve mention here:

• Enhance and protect the quality of the environment, with special emphasis on flood plains, slope management, water, air and vegetation.
• Educate citizens about the natural environment of the City, and encourage their participation in the planning and effective use of natural resources.

The Challenge

The design of a park system requires a balance between community needs and expectations, and the ability of Charlottesville to fulfill those needs. It also requires an understanding of both the limitations and the potential of the natural and cultural environments which support the park system.

The challenge is therefore to:

• Maintain an excellent system of parks for the City of Charlottesville, fulfilling the goals of the City’s Comprehensive Plan and related plans.
• Address the expectations of the citizens of the City of Charlottesville.
• Respond to the financial, programmatic and maintenance requirements of the City of Charlottesville’s park system.
• Protect and enhance the cultural and natural resources of the City of Charlottesville and the surrounding region.

It is necessary to approach the planning of the parks from a holistic point of view in order to address all of the issues and to meet all of the challenges. The intent is to structure Charlottesville’s parks as a sustainable system which meets the needs of its citizens and protects the environmental integrity of the area. The new plan must identify the connections between people and nature that contribute to a healthy community.

Principles of the Thomas Jefferson Sustainability Council:

Recognized and outlined in Charlottesville’s Comprehensive Plan as integral to its goals for the natural environment, the principles of the Thomas Jefferson Sustainability Council are intended to build and maintain both a healthy economy and a healthy environment. The Council’s “Principles of Sustainability” are identified as follows: 1) Individual Enterprise; 2) Community Decision Making; 3) Full Benefits/Cost Accounting; 4) Conservation; 5) Interdependence; 6) Stewardship/Long Term Focus; and 7) Finite Resources.

County of Albemarle Comprehensive Plan:

The County of Albemarle Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update (1996), identifies parks and greenways as a major link between development in the region. The City and County greenway and trail networks should be viewed as a unified whole, and the appropriate connections emphasized.
A Proposal - The City as a Park

The City of Charlottesville's public landscape is a patchwork of spaces located throughout the City. Boulevards, neighborhood parks, large community parks, schools, river corridors, and the Downtown Mall are all public lands. "The City as a Park" proposes to address these diverse public lands as an integrated system, rather than as a series of unrelated park sites designed on the basis of abstract standards.

This approach is based on the belief that good park design is difficult at best if Charlottesville undertakes the improvement of its parks in piecemeal fashion without a plan. The planning of the park system requires broad knowledge of the entire City and region, including both its cultural and natural environments. At the same time, it demands an understanding of those conditions which are unique to each park in the system; every park is a unique place reflecting the distinct qualities of the City, neighborhood, and site.

Therefore, the design of each park site should respect individual character, as well as remember connections to the whole system. With this in mind, the Parks Master Plan should provide concepts and principles for the development of the park system and all future design work in the parks.

Planning Ideals

Three connected aims and ideals guide the idea of "The City as a Park." These are vision, sustainability, and maintenance.

Vision:

Vision recognizes the parks as a system; it also acknowledges that which is special in each park. To this end, it is important to uncover all of the qualities which give Charlottesville and its neighborhoods a unique "sense of place." A knowledge and understanding of the cultural and natural history and environment of Charlottesville benefits this process. Learning about the geography of the area, its plants and water systems, as well as its human history, is all part of the discovery. And soliciting community input is no less a part of this process.

It is clear then, that the design of public space should be more than just an exercise in organizing programmed functions according to conventional site planning rules. Design has the power to articulate shared values through built form. A vision communicates citizens' values and desires, and uses those values to guide development.

Sustainability:

Charlottesville's citizens are inextricably connected to the environment of the region. Every house, business, road, parking lot, and park ultimately connects with our region's natural systems. In other words, the motor oil that washes from the parking lot, down the storm drain and through the City's stormwater infrastructure, eventually pollutes the Rivanna River, and communities and ecosystems downstream. It is thus the responsibility of every citizen to understand that the health of the regional environment lies in their hands. Clean water and air, and unpolluted soils are public resources shared by all persons.

This interconnectedness necessarily has implications for the parks. The park system must be regarded as an integral part of a sustainable community. The "Principles of Sustainability" drafted by the Thomas Jefferson Sustainability Council provide guidance. One of these principles bears repeating here: "In a sustainable community, the integrity of the natural systems will be maintained or improved."

Maintenance:

Sustainable parks absorb less of Charlottesville's diminishing resources. This point is critical. The day-to-day maintenance of the parks is perhaps one of the most difficult challenges facing Charlottesville's park system. The City now hires fewer than one person per park for maintenance, and takes in only twenty nine dollars per capita for the park system per year. The demands, however, far outweigh these scarce resources in income and staffing.

The regular upkeep of the parks is considerable; mowing, weeding, watering, and planting are daily requirements throughout the parks. Playgrounds and athletic fields, in particular, require constant
maintenance and upkeep. In the first place, play equipment must comply with strict standards, including the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and consumer safety requirements. Additionally, playgrounds require constant inspection, repair, resurfacing, painting, and construction to ensure that they are always safe for children. Athletic fields need irrigation, turf maintenance, mowing, fertilizing, and seeding to remain in working condition under heavy use.

People sometimes forget that maintenance responsibilities run deeper than mowing the lawns. Although we may notice light standards and drinking fountains, we are often unaware of the utility pipes and transmission lines hidden well below the surface. Most parks rely on public utilities, and park funds support electrical and water services. Parks funds also pay for utility repairs.

Given all these needs, parks funds are spread thin. Fortunately, there are sensible and sustainable means of reducing the cost of parks maintenance. For instance, the parks system could look to reduce the proportion of land devoted to turf. By replacing turf with native plants, the City at once reduces demands on maintenance staff for mowing, reduces expenses on mowing equipment and gasoline, and rejuvenates the parks with plants that thrive under local conditions.

Meeting the Challenge

The challenge of the Parks Master Plan is to describe a path to the best design, the best facilities, and the best service possible for Charlottesville’s parks. In order to do this, it has been necessary to examine the history of the City’s parks, the needs of the citizens, and the physical characteristics of the parks and their facilities. These are the building blocks for a park system that is sustainable, well-designed, well-maintained, and that expresses Charlottesville’s sense of place.
Charlottesville's Parks and Schools

Of the City of Charlottesville's 6,942 acres (10.486 sq. miles), approximately 714 acres (10 percent) are in designated parks or school properties. This park and school land is divided between twenty-five parks and nine public school playgrounds and open space areas. Charlottesville classifies its parks as follows:

Civic Parks:
There are four Civic Parks totaling approximately 1.7 acres: Central Place on the Mall, Jackson, Lee, and Rothwell.

Neighborhood Mini-Parks:
There are four Neighborhood Mini-Parks totaling approximately 2.5 acres: Fifeville, Starr Hill, McGuffey, and Bailey.

Neighborhood Parks:
There are ten Neighborhood Parks totaling 81.8 acres, with considerable range in size: Azalea (23.0 acres), Belmont (3.1 acres), Forest Hills (7.6 acres), Greenleaf (14.0 acres), Jordan (3.1 acres), Meade (5.2 acres), Northeast (4.8 acres), Rives (4.3 acres), Tonsler (7.4 acres), and Washington (9.3 acres).

Community Parks:
There are four Community Parks totaling approximately 82.4 acres: Greenbrier (28.3 acres), Quarry (7.5 acres), Meadow Creek (20.0 acres), and Riverview (26.6 acres).

Major Parks:
There are three Major Parks: Darden Tower (111 acres, a joint City-County development), McIntire (135.4 acres), and Pen (266 acres). In addition, the City participated in the development of the Ivy Creek Natural Area (215.1 acres) located outside the City boundaries.

School Property:
Nine School Properties are available for recreational use, totaling approximately 143 acres: Burnley-Moran (10.6 acres), Clark (3.0 acres), Greenbrier (10.3 acres), Jackson-Via (17.5 acres), Johnson (17.4 acres), Venable (7.1 acres), Buford Middle (18.1 acres), Walker Middle (16.4 acres), and Charlottesville High (43.0 acres).

The Planning and Design Process

The Parks Master Plan was initially pursued as a guide to the allocation of funds for the rehabilitation and development of public parks. But through a process of historical research, community involvement and well considered planning and design it was decided that the Parks Master Plan take a more comprehensive view, the idea of "The City as a Park."

To develop this idea, many local citizens, consultants, and community groups were involved from the earliest stages and continued to contribute throughout the project. Together, these people searched for answers to some of the most basic questions facing the park system: How did the parks evolve over time and what is their role today? What resources already exist in the parks, and what additional resources might be necessary for the future? How do we make the parks and schools vital public spaces?

Essential to the process of answering these questions was an investigation of seven park and school sites. Intended as case studies, these sites were chosen by Charlottesville's Parks Advisory Board because they represent a diversity of park conditions. In addition, many of these sites have a pressing need for rehabilitation. The purpose of the case studies was to develop, test, and refine a series of design principles applicable to all of Charlottesville's parks, as well as to recommend strategies for the improvement of each of the seven sites.

Community meetings were the forum used to test these design precepts and to arrive at recommendations for the parks. Public participation in the planning and design process was encouraged for the simple reason that the observations, concerns, and values of community residents demand a voice. This input was coupled with research into the history of Charlottesville's parks, and an inventory and assessment of the park system. A close look was given to the existing conditions at each of the seven sites, and key issues facing these parks and schools were determined. With the story of the parks, both past and present, in progress, it was possible to develop the vision for the future.
The immediate results are a series of design principles applicable to the park system, and design recommendations and schematic plans for each of the seven case study sites. As funding becomes available for the design and rehabilitation of specific park and school sites, detailed designs generated by landscape architects should augment the principles and design recommendations outlined in the Parks Master Plan. Thus, the process is on-going.

Community Involvement
The citizens of Charlottesville have expressed their desires and concerns for the City's parks. This process began with the preparation of Charlottesville's Comprehensive Plan, and should continue through the design and rehabilitation of specific parks and schools. The process of preparing the Parks Master Plan itself accumulated citizen responses to individual parks and the park system through a year-long series of community meetings.

Consequently, planning for the parks is more than an exercise in responding to demographic change with programmatic corrections based on abstract formulae. Good planning begins with the issues that matter most to the residents of the City, and while the programming of the parks is a significant concern, matters of security, circulation and access, maintenance and the environment are important as well. A list of citizen concerns reveals that there are many attributes and problems common to Charlottesville's parks.

Programming and Use:
- There is a pressing need to consider parks programming within the context of the County park system. Moreover, there is a critical need for regional cooperation in providing recreational services.
- There is a pressing need to consider the role of each park within the wider parks system. It should be determined whether a specific park is better suited as a neighborhood park or a community park.
- There is a pressing need to balance competing uses; the demand is especially high for land-intensive athletic facilities. The following are all desired:
  - Large sports fields for organized play.
  - Open fields with unprogrammed play space.
- Shade and picnic areas.
- Multi-purpose spaces.
- Community pools, garden plots, and playgrounds are regarded with special appreciation.
- There is considerable concern for the protection of existing natural areas.

Security:
- Security is an important concern; people want to feel safe in the parks.
- Automobile circulation and parking need to be clearly separated from playgrounds and children's play areas.

Access and Circulation:
- There is a strong desire to build connections between parks through a greenbelt and trails system.
- Safe connections between parks and adjacent neighborhoods are seen as a necessity; there is a need to provide suitable pedestrian access for local residents.
- Handicapped accessibility is a concern throughout the park system; many parks fail to meet ADA standards.
- Vehicular and pedestrian entrances to the parks are often unclear and poorly defined.
- The provision of suitable parking is an issue at many parks; there is a need to balance parking with other programmatic elements.

Environment:
- The natural qualities of parks are valued.
- There is interest in providing a diversity of plantings for environmental education.
- Access to the streams is valued.
- Stormwater runoff and drainage is a problem at many parks.
- Bank erosion is a common problem for many streams; there is a need to stabilize stream banks throughout the City.

Maintenance:
- There is a concern for the maintenance of play and sportsfields.
- There is a need to provide up-to-date play equipment.
Purpose of the Master Plan
The Parks Master Plan represents a critical step in the City of Charlottesville's efforts to improve its parks and build a unified system. Yet it is only one step in a planning process that began with the Comprehensive Plan, and will continue through detailed design and construction for each of the parks.

As such, the Parks Master Plan must refine the goals and objectives for recreation and open space found in the Comprehensive Plan, but it must also set a sound direction for the development of the park system and the rehabilitation of the grounds of individual parks and schools. To this end, the aforementioned case studies are presented not only as a series of recommendations for the seven chosen sites, but as a model process for the design and rehabilitation of all of Charlottesville's park and school sites.

This process suggests ways for any neighborhood to participate in the improvement of their local park. It involves designers, researchers, City staff, and most importantly, citizens. It asks these persons to articulate what they value about the parks and to translate their ideas and values into designs for the parks.

For this reason, the Parks Master Plan is also seen as an educational tool. It discusses the issues most important to all of Charlottesville's parks, and offers guidance in the form of design principles. Remembering history, conserving neighborhoods, protecting native plants and water systems, and providing for park facilities which balance use with space are themes all of the City's residents need to be familiar with if they desire to fulfill the commitment to the parks. Therefore, the Parks Master Plan is titled "A Citizens' Guide to Charlottesville Parks."

The Guide
The guide is organized into three sections:
- Historical Overview.
- Major Themes.
- Case Studies • Seven Park Sites.

The first section is an historical overview of Charlottesville's park system. It presents the stories and addresses those issues which are unique to the development of Charlottesville and its parks. It affords a better understanding of the parks, and therefore, contributes to the vision for the future.

The second section, Major Themes, is a discussion of those concepts most applicable to the design of Charlottesville's park system. It presents seven important themes: 1) history; 2) plants; 3) program; 4) neighborhood identity; 5) accessibility; 6) trails and connections; and 7) stormwater and drainage. Each theme provides a number of "Design Principles." These principles establish conceptual guidelines for the development of the park system.

The final section offers case studies of specific park and school sites. Case studies apply the design principles and ideas outlined in the Major Themes section to the schematic design of seven sites. These sites include four neighborhood parks and three public schools:
- Washington Park
- Azalea Park
- Meade Park
- Forest Hills Park
- Venable School
- Greenbrier School
- Charlottesville High School

Each Case Study includes a history of the park site, a brief description and analysis of the site, and a list of the key issues facing the park. Included are diagrams of each site as it exists, identifying the trees found on-site. Finally, a list of design recommendations accompanies drawings of a schematic design proposal for each park and school site.
Goals

- A vision for the City of Charlottesville's parks must include proposals for both the cultural and natural environments.
- The parks should give physical form to the goals and objectives of the City of Charlottesville's Comprehensive Plan.
- The parks should give physical form to the principles of sustainable design as identified by the Thomas Jefferson Sustainability Council.
- The City of Charlottesville's public lands should be developed as a system.
- A sustainable park system should contribute to the improved maintenance of the City of Charlottesville's parks, a critical concern in a time of diminishing financial resources.
- Each park in the system should convey that which is unique to the City of Charlottesville, the particular neighborhood in which it is located, and the particular park site.
- Park sites should be both a recreational and an educational resource for the citizens of Charlottesville.

Methods

- Build upon the overriding idea of "The City as a Park," by embracing the three ideals of vision, sustainability and maintenance for the City of Charlottesville's park system.
- Support the goals and objectives of the City of Charlottesville's Comprehensive Plan.
- Support the Thomas Jefferson Sustainability Council principles for sustainable design.
- Encompass the expectations and concerns of the City of Charlottesville's residents.
- Create a framework for addressing the problems common to the City of Charlottesville's school and park sites, while also acknowledging the context and issues specific to each park and school site.
- Develop goals and design principles for the City of Charlottesville's park system, and in turn, direct the physical design of specific park and school sites.
Seven Sites

Top, left to right
- Washington Park
- Azalea Park
- Meade Park
- Forest Hills Park

Bottom, left to right
- Venable School
- Greenbrier School
- Charlottesville High School
Charlottesville Parks: An Historical Overview

Introduction

In the context of Charlottesville, Virginia's long history, public parks are a relatively recent development. Founded in 1762, Charlottesville grew from a town into a small city after the Civil War and received its first parks at the close of World War I. By this time, however, developers, entertainers and club owners had been providing white residents with recreation for decades. Early parks symbolized Charlottesville's new-found urbanity but did not constitute a comprehensive or highly inclusive response to the deficiencies of the private sector. Only with the end of segregation and the 1973 establishment of the Parks and Recreation Department did the City acquire a true park system. The following report traces this progression, providing a brief overview of how parks and park planning have evolved in Charlottesville.

Early History

By the year 1850, the population of Albemarle County had reached 25,800 and Charlottesville, the County seat, remained a mid-sized town with an economy firmly rooted in grain and tobacco. During the following decade, two railroads were brought into the town, accelerating its growth as a regional commercial center but hardly weakening its agricultural foundations. The Civil War and the end of slavery led to a more profound restructuring of the local economy. Charlottesville's hopes turned toward manufacturing and boosters shifted their efforts accordingly. Their campaign was partially successful at best; while new industries arrived and some older ones continued to grow, few, if any, achieved the scale or longevity of Henry Clay Marchant's Charlottesville Woolen Mills. But the climate of optimism proved profitable in other respects, particularly in the realm of land transaction.

Charlottesville's incorporation as a city in 1888 sent a wave of real estate speculation through the nearby countryside. Prospective developers focused their attention on outlying farms and estates - properties which, after repeated subdivision, would one day provide sites for many of Charlottesville's public parks. Prior to incorporation, these vast rural tracts had remained essentially intact. As W.W. Waddell later recounted:

The town was surrounded by about half a dozen large farms. On the Northeast the Sinclair Estate ran up to High Street and down to the river, the section now known as Locust Grove. On the East Captain Thomas Farish's farm came up close to High Street. On the Southeast and the South the Brenner Estate and Mr. Slaughter Ficklin's ran to the C. & O. Depot. On the Southwest was the Fife Estate which... ran up to the Southern Railroad. The Colonel T. L. Preston and Andrew J. Craven farms were on the Northwest and the North and extended to the line of the Old Southern Railroad.

Transportation and Subdivision

Real estate speculation had been part of Charlottesville's economy since the eighteenth century, but it assumed a new and more organized form starting in the late 1880s. The prospect of industrialization, the growing number of wealthy "outsiders" who settled in the area and, above all, the advent of the streetcar provided impetus for this transformation. The Charlottesville and University Street Railway went into operation in 1887, and over the next few years this company and its successors effectively expanded the scale of the City. Cars powered by horses and mules, and later by steam and electricity, connected the downtown area to the University of Virginia and to several newly platted suburbs.

Closely tied to these streetcar ventures were some half dozen "land companies," founded
for the purpose of developing tracts like those Waddell described. First came the Charlottesville Industrial and Land Improvement Company, formed in March of 1889. Four similar enterprises were established the following year, and a period of consolidation ensued. By late 1890, all competitors of the Jefferson Park Hotel and Land Improvement Company had merged to form the Charlottesville Land Company.5

Local entrepreneurs often joined capitalists from other parts of the country to promote these schemes. Occasionally, the land that local subdividers were subdividing had belonged to their families. Such was the case when S. E. Craven and R. H. Fife sought to develop the Rose Hill and Oak Lawn estates, the future sites of Washington and Forest Hills parks. Those who speculated in real estate and streetcars might also be one in the same; S. P. Maury, R. P. Valentine and T. O. Troy played central roles in both fields. Overlapping interests did not guarantee success. While worker housing and a factory were built at Rose Hill, streetcar service never reached the Charlottesville Land Company’s property, “The Farm,” and service reached the Belmont subdivision only for a very brief period.6

Predecessors of the Public Parks
Streetcar service was only one of several incentives developers used to sell their suburban land. Living up to its name, the Jefferson Park Hotel and Land Improvement Company laid out a 20-acre park around Fry’s Spring and erected a massive resort hotel nearby. The Charlottesville Land Company attempted to emulate this model in Belmont, establishing a small “Park Reservation” and retaining the right to build a hotel there. Communal park spaces like these had been included in the nation’s earliest planned suburbs. The Olinda subdivision (now Forest Hills) contained a space known as Prospect Park, suggesting that the developers also wished to associate their project with larger urban parks of the era.7

Starting in the mid 1890s, the Jefferson Park complex grew larger. Long a destination of health and leisure seekers, Fry’s Spring now offered entertainment facilities as a way of increasing streetcar ridership. The Albemarle Horse Show Association established its grounds on the site in 1905 and was soon joined by a full-fledged amusement park called Wonderland.

Meanwhile, riding and hunt clubs provided an increasing range of recreational activities for Charlottesville’s elite. Members of the Keswick Hunt Club, for instance, engaged in diverse sports such as shooting, bicycling and tennis. Country clubs were on the rise too, and in 1917 the Charlottesville Country Club usurped some of Fry’s Springs entertainment functions. Real-estate developers were aware of these trends, and the package of incentives offered to house-lot shoppers grew still larger. As the focus of suburban development activity shifted north and west of the City, the managers of Preston Heights prepared to construct a country club on their property. On the other side of town, a subdivision that contained the future site of Meade Park provided residents with a golf course.8

Paul McIntire and the City Beautiful Movement
Private and semi-public venues for amusement and athletics were plentiful in World War I-era Charlottesville, but formal civic spaces were conspicuously absent. Local government was ill prepared to underwrite such projects and fragments of open land still existed in the downtown area—circumstances conducive to philanthropy. Seizing the opportunity, wealthy businessman and Charlottesville native Paul Goodloe McIntire donated Lee Park to the City in the summer of 1918. He wished
the park to memorialize both his parents and Robert E. Lee, and specified his intention to erect a statue of the latter when deeding the property to the City. Situated at the corner of Market and Second Streets, Lee Park consisted of land that McIntire's emissary, William O. Watson, had acquired from university professor Charles S. Venable the previous year. Considerable demolition had to occur before the site could be used in the way McIntire planned.

This problem surfaced again at Jackson Park which McIntire donated to the City in late 1918. Acting as McIntire's trustee, Watson had acquired the property from four separate parties, including prominent black landowner John West. The site's proximity to the County courthouse gave McIntire an opportunity to create a bona fide public plaza, but an old residential block named McKee's Row stood in the way. Again McIntire arranged the demolition work and set out to erect a monument befitting the park's name.

McIntire's actions on behalf of his town followed the example set earlier by such great capitalist-philanthropists as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller. Like these men, McIntire had made his fortune in the Gilded Age. After growing up in Charlottesville and briefly attending the University of Virginia, he moved to Chicago in 1880 and became a successful stockbroker. In 1901 he headed back east, acquired a seat on the New York Stock Exchange and began to display an avid interest in literature, art and architecture.

Whatever its extent, McIntire's awareness of contemporary civic philanthropy would have been coupled with some understanding of the related transformation of urban public space occurring at this time. He was living in Chicago when the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition graced that city with a display of neo-classical architecture and planning that launched the City-Beautiful movement. He was working in New York when such avid City-Beautiful disciples as the architects McKim, Mead and White were receiving major commissions there. And, returning to Charlottesville after World War I, he settled in a state where the lessons of the World's Fair had been used to memorialize the Confederate past along Richmond's Monument Avenue.

The most direct link between McIntire and the ideal of urban beautification that crystallized at the 1893 Exposition came in the form of four sculptures that he commissioned from members of the National Sculpture Society. Founded in the wake of the fair, the society was dedicated to the advancement of sculpture as a public art form through which the masses might learn about history, heroism and civic duty. McIntire shared these ideals, and in late 1919 presented Charlottesville with a bronze sculpture of the explorers Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. Designed by Charles Keck, the monument stood at the eastern end of Lee Park.
piece of public land that changing traffic patterns have virtually obliterated. The figures’ orientation was symbolic: they faced westward toward the Midway School and, ultimately, the Pacific Ocean.\textsuperscript{13}

McIntire’s next gift in this vein was an equestrian statue of Thomas (Stonewall) Jackson designed by Keck and installed in Jackson Park. Organized efforts to commemorate the Confederate cause originated in Charlottesville during the late 1880s, producing several memorial associations and a substantial monument at the University cemetery. The Jackson sculpture represented a continuation of these and similar activities throughout the South. McIntire presented it to the City amidst a 1921 Confederate reunion some two years after the erection of a Jackson monument in Richmond.\textsuperscript{14}

A statue of pioneer George R. Clark which McIntire commissioned from Robert Aitken was also completed in 1921. It stood on University property near the corner of Jefferson Park Avenue and West Main Street where it complemented Keck’s work on the same axis. Three years passed, and then the Jackson monument received its counterpart, too. This was an equestrian statue of Robert E. Lee executed by sculptors Leo Lentelli and Henry Shrady. In sponsoring the project, McIntire did for Lee Park what he had done for Jackson: the general and his horse were located at the center of a formally-arranged square and dedicated in the presence of aging Civil War veterans. Just as Jackson Park supplied the County courthouse with a plaza, Lee Park provided a monumental foreground for a public library that McIntire had donated to the City in 1919.\textsuperscript{15}

Public parks and a didactic sculptural program represented only one aspect of McIntire’s civic beneficence. A 1920 \textit{Washington Herald} article suggested the breadth of his philanthropic vision when it announced,

Paul G. McIntire... returns to home where spirit of Jefferson still governs and starts to make it the Athens of the South by donating $100,000 library, beautiful art works, marble statues and memorial parks and by establishing free book delivery service for Blue Ridge Mountain folk.\textsuperscript{16}

Nor did McIntire’s efforts stop here. Before his death in 1952 he provided the University of Virginia with Schools of Commerce and Fine Art (music, art and architecture), strengthened the University’s Medical School, gave Charlottesville its first public library and contributed large sums toward improving the County school system.\textsuperscript{17}

McIntire’s largess brought him into close contact with the like-minded Edwin A. Alderman, President of the University from 1904 until 1931. Firmly committed to improving public education in Virginia and the South, Alderman spoke of the University’s need to “extend its extramural activities and render greater service and leadership to the state.”\textsuperscript{18} When Alderman attended the unveiling of the Lewis and Clark statue he lauded McIntire’s public-spiritedness, implying that it ranked with Jefferson’s, and Lewis and Clark’s. The philanthropist and the University president believed they were participating in a “great missionary movement;” an obliging press described the two men as friends and collaborators in “the plans for the development of the ‘Athens of Dixie.’”\textsuperscript{19}
An early graduating class at McGuffey School. Photo courtesy of the Holsinger Studio Collection. UVA Library Special Collections.

This impulse to re-create Charlottesville and the University in the image of classical centers of learning could assume fairly literal form. The City-Beautiful movement and the Colonial Revival had established neo-classicism as the official architectural vocabulary of civic institutions and, in Charlottesville, Roman classicism was also associated with the legacy of Thomas Jefferson. These circumstances did much to determine the appearance of McIntire's library, parks and the large outdoor theater he donated to the University. The massive building campaign that occurred at the University during Alderman's tenure followed the same lead. It produced such monumental structures as Madison, Minor and Peabody halls, Lambeth Stadium and Memorial Gymnasium.20

Others collaborated and perhaps even competed in the effort to transform Charlottesville into Jefferson's City Beautiful. They included William Lambeth, the professor for whom Lambeth Stadium was named, and Fiske Kimball, Chairman of the McIntire School of Fine Arts and designer of McIntire Theater.21 Another key figure was Charlottesville School Superintendent James G. Johnson. Between 1909 and 1945 he orchestrated the selection of school sites and architects, leaving the City with an impressive group of buildings that harmonized with the work that McIntire and the University were commissioning in the same period.

Johnson's studies of Charlottesville's educational needs and his recommendations to the School Board resulted in the erection of five new schools under his superintendency. McGuffey School opened in 1916 near the downtown area and was followed by Venable (1925) and Clark (1930) which served the eastern and western sections of the City. These elementary schools accommodated white children only, and Johnson saw to it that Norfolk-based architect Charles J. Calrow was responsible for their design. Other architects received commissions for the centrally-located Jefferson School (1926), a combined grade school and high school for blacks, and Lane (1940), the nearby white high school. Johnson prided himself on his active participation in the design process, and was particularly pleased with the views his villa-like buildings had of Monticello. Aware of his role in the development of the City, he consulted McIntire and Alderman on matters of school history and naming.22

City Changes
By the 1920s, Charlottesville's physical make-up and self image had undergone several dramatic changes since the post-Civil War decades. On one hand, the City
had become more urban. Its population had increased and, thanks to McIntire, Johnson, Alderman and others, its public institutions had grown larger, less provincial and more monumental. On the other hand, Charlottesville's aspirations had, in a sense, become more rural. The heavy industry foreseen by nineteenth century boosters had failed to materialize—but more outsiders arrived than ever. The golden age of automotive tourism was at hand; visitors swept into town along heavily-paved roads, paid homage to Jefferson at Monticello (open to the public since 1923) and sometimes settled in the area permanently. History and natural beauty, not factories, now surfaced as the most promising bases for the local economy.23

Through governmental fiat, Charlottesville had also become rural in a more literal sense. In 1916 the City tripled in size when it annexed 1,676 acres of surrounding land from the County.24 This meant that the pastoral landscape described by W. W. Waddell now fell within City limits, and it was here that the next public parks appeared. Few of the 1890s “land company” subdivisions or their parks had ever made it past the drawing board. Fry’s Spring and Belmont were exceptions and, in the twentieth century, contained the only major reminders of pre-World War park planning efforts in the City. In 1921 McIntire acquired Belmont Park and transferred it from the private to the public sector.

Race and Public Land

In an era of segregation, race determined park visitation no less than school attendance. When the City accepted McIntire’s latest gift, the deed stated “that said property shall be forever maintained as a park and playground for white people.” The extent of McIntire’s involvement in this stipulation is unclear. As far back as 1891 the Charlottesville and Belmont Land Companies had reserved the right to ban “objectionable parties” from the space, and the 1921 restriction may simply have continued a tradition of excluding blacks under such pretexts.25

City government may also have wished to establish race covenants on public property. In October, 1925, City Council moved to establish a large park and playground in northern Charlottesville and resolved that only whites would receive admission. McIntire underwrote this project the following January, donating 92 acres of “the old Mason place.” This was the first of several adjoining tracts that McIntire conveyed to the City between 1926 and 1941, forming the present McIntire Park.26

If McIntire’s donations of all-white parks accorded with City plans, this does not appear to have been the case with Washington Park, the first such space reserved for black citizens. McIntire presented Charlottesville with Washington and McIntire parks simultaneously, and headlines of the day - “One for White and One for Colored” - suggested that the philanthropist was attempting to strike some sort of balance. The City had owned the Preston Avenue site since 1905 but expressed no intention of converting it into a park and playground; McIntire’s $1,000.00 “purchase” price changed only the use of the land, not the owner. In previous years, the property apparently served as the site of a dump and was planned as a shelter for people with contagious diseases. Recognizing the deficiencies of this tract and “the old Mason place,” McIntire offered to have a “landscape gardener” adapt both for park use on the condition that the City furnish the necessary topographical surveys.27
The First City Plan for Parks
Due largely to McIntire’s generosity, the
City of Charlottesville possessed over 113
acres of park land by 1930, creating a ratio
of one park acre for every 134 citizens.
City government had almost no hand in
obtaining this property and developed no
systematic strategy for managing or adding
to it. This began to change in 1931 when
“a city plan for Charlottesville included
recommendations for the development of a
park system.”28 No copies of this
document appear to survive, and its degree
of influence is unclear. Yet, by its mere
existence, the plan indicated that the City
was taking parts and park administration
more seriously. The establishment of a Park
Board was another such indicator. The
Board had come into existence by the early
1930s and presumably advised the Parks
and Cemeteries Division of the Public
Works Department.29

City government’s increased attention to
park development was related to growing
local and national interest in recreation.
Since the turn of the century, athletics had
come to play an important role in American
life - a trend that manifested itself in school
curriculums, club functions and the
formation of professional sports teams. Nor
was recreation limited to athletics. It
encompassed many “leisure-time” activities
ranging from church group events to annual
fairs, theatrical productions and various
forms of pageantry. In the nation’s
metropolises, efforts to promote recreation
were closely tied to the settlement-house,
kindergarten and playground movements.

Urban parks, schools and institutions such
as the Y.M.C.A. provided venues for
organized programs aimed at stimulating
body and mind.30

Charlottesville was home to one of the
oldest Y.M.C.A.s in the country, and, in the
late nineteenth century, local schools and
the University of Virginia began
implementing new athletic programs of
their own. The large athletic facilities
which Alderman and Lambeth helped to
establish were sometimes available for non-
University uses, and Lambeth Field was a
favorite spot for school field days, team
sports and townspeople’s games. Clubs like
Keswick and Farmington continued to
provide recreation for the local elite, while
those of lesser means might frequent Fry’s
Spring or the swimming pool and grounds
maintained by the generous eccentric John
Armstrong Chaloner. The latter’s Fourth-
of-July ceremonies were particularly
elaborate and popular.31

Whatever outlet one chose, recreation in
Charlottesville was an almost entirely
private concern until 1933. In that year, at
the instigation of the local Mothers Club,
the City established a Department of
Recreation. Ninzie O. Currier, the agency’s
Director until 1935, made many formative
decisions in conjunction with an unpaid
Recreation Board. The Board named Dr.
Dwight Chalmers as its Chairman, and he
served in that capacity for five years; he was
also the pastor of the Presbyterian church
that McIntire attended. A board member
himself, McIntire did not frequent the
organization’s meetings. Other “charter
members” included judges, university
professors, the University’s Superintendent
of Buildings and the wives of several
businessmen.32

Parks and Recreation Departments
The City’s decision to form recreation and
park departments was in keeping with a
larger trend toward professionalism in these
areas. Around the country, local
government had begun to assume the
responsibilities which philanthropists, social
workers and volunteers had shouldered
more or less independently. During this
transition the recreation movement lost
some of its sense of purpose. Perhaps for
this reason, Charlottesville’s Recreation
Board members were initially somewhat
vague about the nature of their duties.
They were, however, aware of their link to a
national profession, and after a period of
discussion decided that their “first task
[was] to undertake the program outlined by
the National Recreation Association in
staging the Musical Festival.”33

Although the Recreation Board did not
officially affiliate itself with the National
Recreation Association until 1941, it
managed to secure from the Association
“the services of a colored recreation leader”
named George L. Johnson. Johnson’s
assignment was to aid in “the development
of a community recreation program through music activities.” He appeared before the Board on December 5, 1933, expressed his confidence in the City’s “colored singers” and carried the Musical Festival off without a hitch several weeks later.34

Musical events were only one focus of the Board’s attention. A month after their first meeting, board members were serving on eight different “standing committees” devoted to Music and Drama, Arts and Crafts, Athletics, Parks and Playgrounds, Holiday Celebrations, Social Recreation, Training in Recreation, and Finance and Equipment. On a day-to-day basis the Recreation Department was preoccupied with maintaining adequate playground supervision. However, there was talk of sponsoring “Hikes and Nature Study Tours” and the Board managed to establish such long-lived Charlottesville institutions as the Easter Egg Hunt and the Halloween Parade.35

Beyond these achievements, the Recreation Department helped to secure small additions and improvements to the City’s public spaces. By 1935 Belmont Park’s equipment was in need of repair, but Washington Park had a large new recreation building. McIntire Park contained a wading pool and had boasted a municipal golf course since 1930. Negotiations with Superintendent Johnson also resulted in the School and Recreation departments sharing their facilities to a limited extent.36

Until 1941, Paul McIntire continued adding to the park that bore his name. His gifts constituted the only sizable park land which the City obtained in these years, indicating that the establishment of recreation and park departments was only a first step toward professionalizing local park administration. Using public funds, the Recreation Board paid the Director’s salary (initially $50.00 a month), provided her with one or two assistants and struggled to retain a handful of playground workers on a weekly or monthly basis. Other expenditures tended to be small and subject to much discussion. For major purchases such as playground equipment, the Board depended almost entirely on private philanthropy. Luckily, turning to McIntire was no longer the only recourse.37

Across the country, civic clubs had started to take on the sorts of projects initiated by individual businessmen in the era of City-Beautiful reform. Charlottesville was no exception. Following McIntire’s lead, the Lions, Kiwanis, Rotary and Mothers clubs donated money, equipment and volunteers toward the recreational cause. The Board moved to “ask [the] Rivanna and Albemarle Garden Clubs to take over the beautification of the parks” and eventually transferred responsibility for the Halloween Party to the Lions Club.38

The Recreation Board worked in close conjunction with other groups as well. It was in regular contact with the National Recreation Association, one of the only organizations calling recreationists’ attention to the needs of black Americans after the First World War. In all likelihood, it was the NRA’s Bureau of Colored Work that sent music director George Johnson to Charlottesville.39

Johnson’s contract was temporary, but, as a result of NRA recommendations or local initiative, the City had more lasting means of defending black recreational interests. In April, 1934, members of a newly formed Colored Recreation Board started attending many of the [white] Recreation Board’s meetings. The Chairman of the Colored Board was Jerome Brooks, who was also Superintendent of the Southern Aid Society of Virginia. Assisting Brooks were Vice-chairman Thomas Inge, a grocer, and Secretary William R. Strassner, Pastor of Mt. Zion Baptist Church. Several women
Tennis tournament champions in Washington Park. 1942. From Charlottesville and the University of Virginia: A Pictorial History by Fred T. Heblich and Mary Ann Elwood. 1982. Photo courtesy of The Donning Company/Publishers, Virginia Beach, VA.

sat on the Colored Board, along with wealthy dentist John. A. Jackson. Although not mentioned in the earliest minutes, Dr. Jackson had funded some small recreational projects by 1936 and been reimbursed by the board.  

Not surprisingly, the Colored Recreation Board concentrated its energies on improving Washington Park. McIntire's gift to "the colored people of Charlottesville" was an informal space intended to relieve some of the hardships of working-class life; its roots lay less in the City-Beautiful movement than in the "reform parks" that had arisen in American cities since the turn of the century. Located at the corner of Preston Avenue and Tenth Street, Washington Park fell near the northwestern end of "an irregular north-south band of black settlement [that] cut through the heart of the corporate area." A 1929 study described the neighborhood as one of "the old residence districts of the respectable colored" and noted of the park: "It is as yet undeveloped, but the people hope that they can soon develop it."  

By the summer of 1934, this goal was close at hand. The park's baseball diamond was being upgraded and work on new tennis courts had begun. But such amenities as a drinking fountain were still lacking and, faced with a small budget, the Colored Board wished to hold an indoor fundraiser. Although the white board used the City armory for such purposes, it denied the black board this privilege. The resulting "antagonism" accelerated plans for building a recreation hall in Washington Park. With money "raised by the colored people" and design advice from the City Engineer, the structure was completed by December, 1934, at a time when no more than 5 percent of these facilities were designated for black use nation-wide.  

Washington Park had become an indispensable institution by 1936, but not without some growing pains. Much to neighbors' dismay, the swings "were proving so popular that they were being used until two or three o'clock in the morning." As the park received heavier usage, more serious problems arose, too. While poison ivy and an abandoned car posed minor risks, there were also reports of snakes infesting the woods and a child being fatally bitten at the County Festival. Under these circumstances, white and black board members moved to have a chain gang clear the site.  

Civic and athletic clubs eventually came to Washington Park's rescue as well. During the late 1930s, the Garden Club and the Colored Mothers Club undertook a program of beautification at the park while the Colored Elks agreed to sponsor an enlargement of the baseball field. Civic clubs continued to extend their generosity to other parts of the City as well. Between 1938 to 1946 they contributed time, labor and over $5,000.00 toward recreation projects. Nor had individual philanthropists vanished. Dr. J. A. Jackson successfully lobbied the City to improve Washington Park's tennis courts and went so far as to provide black citizens with a pool and Boy-Scout campsite on his farm in Albemarle County.  

In late 1937, Nan Crow took office as Director of Recreation. It was a position she was to hold for the next thirty years. Early in her career, the Recreation Department went about business as usual, staging a characteristically eclectic set of events. Scheduled for the summer of 1940, "Boy and Girl Week" featured "a May Day at Lee Park, a boxing match, a Pet Parade, Young Peoples Interdenominational
Service,” and an awards ceremony known as “Recognition Night.” 47

It was not long, however, before World War II embroiled the United States and gave Director Crow a chance to show her organizational skills. Continuing to work for the Recreation Department, she chaired the Civilian Defense Council’s Recreation Committee that tended to the needs of draftees and servicemen before the local U.S.O. was officially established. Her skillful balancing of local and national interests was also apparent in her drive to remodel the white recreation center (in the older of Charlottesville’s two armories) so that it might better serve military and civilian needs. 48

Crow, her Recreation Department colleagues and others did their best to support the sorts of recreational activities that were overtaking the country. The Rivanna Garden Club joined the Recreation Department in sponsoring the Children’s Victory Garden Club, and Crow herself administered a Victory Garden on or near the present site of Quarry Park.

Meanwhile, Dr. J. A. Jackson led the Negro Boy Scouts and allowed them to till a garden on his land. They doubtless contributed to a 1944 Victory Garden show held at Washington Park in which “more than 200 exhibits of superb produce were displayed by Negro gardeners.” In that year Washington Park also hosted a war bond rally while the Virginia State Guard drilled in McIntire Park. 49

As Charlottesville returned to normalcy in the post-war era, little appeared to have changed in the City’s recreational life. Several citizens founded a Teen-Age Club in 1946, perhaps reflecting a continued interest in the sorts of activities the U.S.O. had sponsored. A “flower and vegetable show” occurred in Washington Park despite the end of Victory Gardening. In other respects the familiar routine resumed. Churches, social clubs and resorts continued to supplement the City’s recreational offerings; the Recreation Department still depended heavily on the generosity of black and white civic clubs; the National Recreation Association sent a representative to town; the Easter Egg Hunt went on. 50

These outward signs of continuity masked the long-term changes that were afoot. As far back as 1944, Nan Crow had consulted City Manager Seth Burnley about “post-war plans for a number of smaller City parks and community centers for Charlottesville.” Three years later, National Recreation Association District Representative Arthur H. Jones sent a forward-looking memorandum to the president of the local Community Improvement Council. The letter, which also went to Crow, recommended that Charlottesville form a...
unified park and recreation board, adopt a recreation master plan and decentralize its recreation program in order to concentrate on the needs of individual neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{51}

Most of what Jones proposed lay years ahead in the City's future, although some actually lay a bit in the past. By the time Jones wrote his letter, the Recreation Department had taken several steps toward establishing a neighborhood-based program. The Department could take no credit for obtaining Belmont, the City's first "neighborhood park," but it had been operating a playground in Fifeville since the mid 1930s and another on "Meade Field" prior to 1942. The City did not own these sites; it had merely arranged to use them.\textsuperscript{52}

At the end of World War II, the renaissance of the neighborhood park began. Land once belonging to the Charlottesville Land Company and the Albemarle Golf Club entered public hands in 1945 and became Meade Park. The following year, the City purchased property on Fifth Street, S.W., from Old Colonial Brick, Inc. and by 1948 the Colored Recreation Board had named this park after former Jefferson School Principal Benjamin E. Tonsler. Five trustees donated the diminutive Fifeville Park to the City in 1949, and during the early 1950s Rives and Forest Hills parks joined the list.\textsuperscript{53}

Major changes were also occurring in the recreation-related branches of City government, but fell short of what Jones envisioned. After receiving a proposal from the white board in the summer of 1949, City Council reorganized the City's system of recreation administration. A single Recreation Advisory Board replaced the white and black boards. It consisted of three black and seven white members, each appointed by the Mayor for a three-year term. Provisions for a (white) Superintendent of Recreation and a Director of Negro Recreation effectively perpetuated the imbalance of power that had existed between the white and black boards. The Advisory Board was to submit an itemized annual budget by early March and conform to similar government agency standards. Like other recreation bureaucracies of the day, Charlottesville's was now streamlined in the name of efficiency. An organization that had sprung from the civic-minded efforts of McIntire and the Mothers Club had become a service provider, carrying out a routine function of local government.\textsuperscript{54}

The 1954 Plan

Within this climate of administrative efficiency, the time was fast approaching to pursue District Representative Jones' third suggestion: a master plan for recreation. The Atlanta-based Charles M. Graves Organization produced this document in 1954. Inside was a strange combination of contemporary and older recreation philosophy. Stressing the reform-era notion that recreation counterbalances routine...
drudgery in an industrial society, the report announced “Recreation stabilizes the community, the worker, and generally increases the efficiency of the worker.” In the lingo of early-twentieth-century boosterism, the authors followed this economic rational further, explaining that recreation also promoted tourism and commerce.55

Elsewhere the plan offered little in the way of ideology. It focused instead on the need to systematize and standardize recreation in Charlottesville, and presented park planning as a form of science. An analysis of “Community Sociological Factors” ostensibly provided planners with broad design guidelines while fixed ratios determined the dimensions of a pool or the ideal distance between a home and a playground. Recommendations for specific parks had much in common. The program frequently included a shelter, a picnic area, a “paved area,” a wading or swimming pool and a baseball or softball field. Playground equipment might take the form of The Tunnels, The Playlogs, The Dodger and The Whatnot. Ironically, all this was preceded by a caveat to “avoid the stereotyped and unimaginative playground which can be found in so many cities.”56

The 1954 plan’s boldest proposals involved McIntire and Washington Parks. Both parks, the authors suggested, should be equipped with large “community centers,” each featuring an “auditorium-gymnasium-social room” accompanied by showers, locker rooms and other amenities. These buildings would replace the City’s outmoded recreation centers which operated out of the old armory and a building once used by the Jefferson School. Swimming pools were another feature the two parks were to have in common.

Here the similarities ended. New tennis courts and an outdoor theater were planned for Washington Park. The program for McIntire, on the other hand, derived from children’s amusement parks of the day, boasting a “scenic miniature railroad, miniature golf course, and pony circle.” If the black people’s park had “a few less facilities” than the white people’s, the authors reasoned that the imbalance would be corrected by establishing “a large, non-urban park for Negroes” southwest of the City.57

The 1954 Master Plan was a major step for planning in Charlottesville. It did not immediately transform the physical appearance of the City’s parks, and many of its suggested projects never came to pass. Rather, its significance lay in what it represented: the first major attempt since 1931 to create a park system out of Charlottesville’s public land, and the first attempt to coordinate that system with local recreation.

The next such foray came in 1958 when the City solicited a “Preliminary Report Upon Schools, Parks and Public Buildings” from Harland Bartholomew and Associates, also of Atlanta. Building on the Graves study, this one underscored the notion that all public facilities should be part of a plan. The authors discussed “parks, parkways and open spaces” in the same breath as housing density, school location and traffic patterns. For the purpose of analysis, existing and proposed parks were divided into four categories: ornamental parks, neighborhood parks, large parks and athletic fields. Jackson and Lee parks were the only ones in the “ornamental” category and the report...
did not propose others. It did, however, call for a second large park in the area where the Graves plan had placed McIntire's black counterpart.58

In keeping with contemporary urban planning, Bartholomew's report focused on the needs of neighborhoods, allotting each a proportionate quantity of municipal facilities. Compilers of the report held that "neighborhood parks should form the basis for the park system," and of the five proposed elementary schools that ringed the City, four appeared in conjunction with new neighborhood parks. Since the 1940s, the Recreation Department had turned increasing attention to school facilities and now, as much of the nation adopted "school-park plans," the Department saw some of its effort paying off.59

When the Bartholomew plan's authors mentioned "neighborhoods," more often than not they were speaking of recent or future suburbs. This emphasis highlights how dramatically the automobile had accelerated the City's outward growth over the previous decade. Many of the areas that land companies had subdivided at the turn of the century were now heavily developed for the first time. Cars had also altered park design and location. Parks were situated ever-further from the downtown and contained ever-larger parking lots; McIntire had even been bisected by a highway. Gone were the days when the Recreation Board Secretary could note, "Attendance at McIntire Park has been poor probably due to the distance from town."60

Indeed, planners who dealt with small-budgeted municipalities were starting to lose interest in establishing urban parks. Bartholomew's report stated plainly:

Because of the degree of existing development within the city and the expense involved in assembling new park properties no addition of park land is proposed within the present city limits. New park sites are distributed throughout the area of future urbanization.61

But land in the suburbs was not easy to procure either. As far back as 1948 the Recreation Board had asked the Planning Commission to "Include playgrounds and recreation space in future lay-out of sub-divisions."62 The Graves plan urged the same action and added that the City should encourage private land donation so long as the property in question was compatible with the report's recommendations.63

In practice, pragmatism often won out over planning principles. Like local governments in other parts of the country, Charlottesville tended to obtain park land when it was inexpensive or free, and sometimes this meant taking what was left over after subdivision had occurred. This was more or less the case when the City...
acquired suburban land that became Meadow Creek, Greenbrier, Azalea and Jordan parks between 1963 and 1971. At Quarry Park the scenario was somewhat different. The site had been public property for decades but had been occupied by a sewage treatment plant. By 1961 the plant was defunct and the Recreation Advisory Board moved to convert the land into a "first class ball field and picnic area."64

The Struggle for Equality
Park siting was not the only problem confronting the Recreation Department in the post-World War II era. Prior to the war, city government in Charlottesville and most other American cities had taken segregation of public facilities for granted. Nationwide, the percentage of recreation facilities open to blacks was also quite small; if anything, Charlottesville's black park and history of black involvement in recreation administration made the City somewhat unique in this regard. Segregation, however, died hard. By 1949 black golfers had gained one-day-a-week admission to the course in McIntire Park, marking the start of a long struggle for public parks that were not separate and were genuinely equal.65

Segregation was the norm in schools no less than in parks. As the City began to take an interest in school-park planning, the result was predictable: parks reserved for one race were coupled with similarly-restricted schools. Completed in 1951, Burley School was a case in point. The only black high school in town, it sat adjacent to Washington Park. Three years later, local members of the NAACP notified City Council that Burley's facilities were already "inferior to those found at Lane." Meanwhile, construction proceeded on two new white elementary schools, Johnson and Burnley-Moran.68

1954 was also the year in which the Supreme Court addressed issues of race and education at the national level. It was not long before Charlottesville felt the effects of the court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education and a tumultuous period in the City's history began. Facing federally-mandated desegregation in 1958, Governor Lindsay Almond closed down many of Virginia's schools, including Lane and Venable. Federal and state courts rejected this program of "massive resistance" the following year, and by the mid 1960s Buford and Walker junior high schools opened as integrated institutions.69

Change came slowly to the recreational sphere. The Recreation Department's 1960 summer schedule proclaimed "Playgrounds are for everybody," but segregation was still enforced. Home to one of two black playgrounds, Washington Park was to be the scene of a dramatic production entitled "The Melting Pot." That same summer, the City erected a recreation building in the park, replacing the crumbling structure that

Washington Park with recreation building in the background. 1963. From the Collection of Nan Crow. Photo courtesy of the Parks Division.
the Colored Recreation Board had built with so much effort in 1934. The new building signalled a turning point. It inaugurated a series of Washington Park projects that culminated on August 17, 1968, when the Daily Progress announced: "Municipal Pool Opens Tomorrow." This was no semi-public facility.\textsuperscript{70}

Continued Civic Club Involvement in City Parks

In the late 1960s, undertakings on the scale of Washington Park pool still presented a formidable financial challenge to the City. Luckily, civic clubs had increased their contributions fairly steadily over the last two decades. With advice from the Recreation Department, this philanthropy had also become more organized. A 1968 Daily Progress article reveals that each club had assumed financial responsibility for different parks. The Kiwanis Club handled Rives, the Rotary Club took on Forest Hills and Greenleaf and the Exchange Club sponsored Greenbrier and the Burnley-Moran school grounds. McIntire was so large that members of both the Thomas Jefferson Club and the Lions Club committed themselves to it.\textsuperscript{71}

The Rotary Club took particular interest in local recreation. During the 1950s and 1960s, Rotarians donated upwards of $23,000.00 in an era when $5000.00 bought Forest Hills a new wading pool. Other organizations were generous with their time. Members of the Beautification Commission, the Council of Garden Clubs and the Monticello Garden Club all attended community meetings to discuss 1966 remodeling plans for Jackson Park. If there was any drawback to the considerable influence of such groups, it was the lack of unified control over park management.\textsuperscript{72}

Without individual and group philanthropy, Charlottesville could never have amassed the park land it possessed by 1970, nor equipped it with so many facilities. Yet the City's dependency on private generosity seriously limited its ability to guide park acquisition and development. This administrative fragmentation was aggravated by the division of park-related bureaucracy within City government. The Recreation Department and its board dealt primarily with playgrounds while the Parks and Cemeteries Division of Public Works was charged with landscaping, major construction and the like. The two agencies had similar administrative structures, and in such crucial areas as "development and maintenance" their functions overlapped.\textsuperscript{73}

Consolidation of the two agencies was inevitable. Arthur Jones had suggested it in 1947 and Graves' Recreation Master Plan had repeated the recommendation in 1954. The final impetus came when national associations of park and recreation professionals merged in the 1960s. Charlottesville City Manager Cole Hendrix was aware of this trend and set out to emulate it locally. In January, 1973, the City established a Department of Parks and Recreation. The new agency's director was Eugene M. German, former Superintendent of Forestry and Landscaping in Kansas City, Missouri. The 30-person staff included many of the earlier department's employees. John Rimel stayed on as Superintendent of Parks while Joseph Hicks rose to the equivalent position in Recreation. Gone was the Recreation Advisory Board, though in recent years the City has established a similar body.\textsuperscript{74}

The 1972 Plan

The start of Eugene German's administration coincided with the arrival of a new master plan. In 1971, the City had commissioned Harry W. Porter and his
In many respects, Porter's work constituted a reaction to the park planning philosophy underlying the 1954 Graves report. Where the latter had tended toward segregation and standardization, the new plan stressed inclusion and an attention to the specific. This ideology manifested itself on a number of levels. Rather than making passing reference to "sociological factors," the compilers of the Parks and Open Spaces report strove for social inclusiveness. There were sections devoted to the park-related needs of the disabled and the elderly while racial minorities were intentionally not treated as an isolated group with special requirements. Perhaps most importantly, Porter's firm adopted the recent planning doctrine of community involvement. Many of the report's recommendations were based on the results of neighborhood opinion-gathering meetings.76

As its title implied, the 1972 plan also presented an inclusive approach to space. Echoing other urban planners of the day, Porter and his colleagues promoted "a city-wide system of open spaces which becomes an integral part of the public system of street rights-of-way, open spaces and utility corridors." Hayland Bartholomew had emphasized the importance of viewing parks as part of a system that included other municipal facilities. Land Planning and Design Associates suggested broadening the definition of parks to include not only streets and school grounds but also what later planners would term "greenways." Indeed, virtually any publicly accessible open area was now a potential park.77

Another salient characteristic of the Parks and Open Spaces plan was its attention to individual site requirements and its related concern for the environment. Making the most of "the special and unique features of each individual land parcel" was one of several guiding principles that the report's authors claimed to have adopted in their work. By the early 1970s, rising national interest in ecology influenced mainstream planning practice, and the authors' credo often led them to insist that certain components of the natural landscape remain untouched. They were also quick to point out that segments of the local populace were equally conservation-minded. In one instance, the results of a neighborhood meeting allowed the planners to state with confidence: "The MARSH in Greenbrier Park is thought to be the LARGEST natural marsh in the region. PROTECT IT!!"78

Ironically, planners and the public were now starting to value land for the same reasons developers had disposed of it. And while marshes, steep slopes and stands of large trees fit easily enough into...
conventional conceptions of park design, other leftover landscapes were thought to be useful even if they retained few natural features. Porter and his associates observed that property around Jackson-Via Elementary School contained “an important segment of a potential bicycle path and pedestrian walkway system which would follow the alignment of the proposed Moore's Creek trunk sewer easement.” Environmentally innocuous transportation could take over when the environment itself had been compromised.79

A Major Program of Improvement
As Land Planning and Design Associates prepared its report for the nascent Parks and Recreation Department, Charlottesville’s park history was at a turning point. Despite previous attempts, the City had never been able to acquire or develop park sites in a systematic manner. Philanthropy had brought land and equipment into public hands but the resultant “hodgepodge” could not meet current or future City needs. Porter and his colleagues were aware of this predicament. They acknowledged the “very commendable job” of local civic clubs, but expressed frustration at the legacy of uncoordinated development, reporting, “the equipment and apparatus within [Belmont] park [is] scattered in a random and disorganized fashion.” Ultimately, the planners concluded, the City had no choice but to undertake “a major program of parks and open space improvements.”80

Porter’s plan and the Parks and Recreation merger did much to make such a program possible. Massive federal funding cleared the remaining obstacles. Five years after instating Eugene German’s administration, the City had received $800,000.00 in federal Community Development Block Grant money. Another $700,000.00 came from the Department of the Interior’s Land and Water Conservation Fund, while the Commerce Department’s Economic Development Administration provided additional support. Civic club contributions continued as well, but constituted only a small percentage of the Parks and Recreation Department’s revenue.81

When Eugene German and his co-workers began their new jobs in 1973, they inherited the task of completing several projects already approved by City Hall. These included construction of swimming pools at Meade Park, Buford School and Walker School. A more formidable responsibility was the development of a new “large park” along the banks of the Rivanna River. Federal money helped realize the latter ambition, and in five years Pen Park offered visitors “a golf course and clubhouse, four tennis courts, four picnic shelters, playground areas and a nature trail.”82

By 1974 the Parks and Recreation Department had found its footing and began to lay out some long-term goals of its own. Recreation staff continued to administer crafts, drama and music programs but placed increasing emphasis on “the areas of nature and ecology.” German spoke of spending $1.7 million on new facilities for McIntire Park and assigned the name Riverview Park to a 26-acre tract given to the City by the Riverview Cemetery Company. Various agencies were also examining ways to acquire more land after a group of citizens petitioned City Council to establish a park in their neighborhood. Aided by Community Development Block Grant funds, this initiative led to the opening of Northeast Park in 1978. By then, Parks and Recreation had upgraded facilities in many other neighborhood parks as well.83

Such activities resembled those sponsored by the Parks and Recreation Department’s predecessors in previous years. Elsewhere, however, the Department began applying the new planning philosophy embodied in...
Harry Porter's report. Few park-related decisions proceeded in the 1970s without benefiting from "citizen input," and defenders of ecology met with particular success. Riverview Park not only escaped development, it also serves as the starting point for a Greenbelt that travelled along the bank of the Rivanna River. These were lesser achievements compared to the Ivy Creek Natural Area. A product of interagency cooperation, non-profit activism and private concern, it joined the public domain in 1978.84

Nor was City government oblivious to the sort of urbanism that informed the 1972 master plan. Eugene German paid indirect homage to the City-Beautiful movement by initiating a campaign to transform thoroughfares like Preston Avenue and Emmet Street into "linear parks." Many of the plantings that created this effect were raised in a greenhouse operated by Parks and Recreation staff members. The Department thus demonstrated its ability to manage Charlottesville's appearance, and by the 1980s it had received responsibility for maintaining school grounds and the Downtown Mall. It also oversaw the operation of public garden plots in Pen, Azalea and Meadow Creek parks, and a City farmers' market.85

Compared to previous decades, the 1980s represented a period of relative calm in the history of Charlottesville's parks. Controversy occasionally flared up over specific events or proposals. Concerts or softball games in Washington Park, a suggestion to close one of two new recreation centers, programmatic changes to McIntire Park: all were ephemeral sources of contention. Viewed from another perspective, the debates over these issues were simply healthy manifestations of citizen participation in decision-making processes.86

Formidable Challenges Ahead
As the Parks and Recreation Department nears its twenty-fifth anniversary and prepares to receive another master plan, changes in the history of local parks and park planning appear increasingly monumental. The City has had public parks for eighty years, integrated parks for thirty years and a planned park system for twenty-five years. The present mechanism for administering parks operates with a bureaucratic smoothness that suggests it has always been in place. But this appearance belies the seriousness of issues which still confront park planners and administrators in Charlottesville. Balancing neighborhood, City and County needs presents a constant struggle. Cutsbacks in federal funding force local government to make difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions. And if the time has finally arrived publicly to commemorate the history of local parks and their sites, what are the best media for interpretation? The rate of change in Charlottesville park history may have slowed somewhat, but the formidable challenges ahead demand that those who deal with parks remain as dynamic in the future as they have been in the past.

Notes begin on page 185.
MAJOR THEMES
Major Themes: History

City Building
History is evident in the physical form of every city. Buildings and landscapes provide a record of events in the history of a city: farming practices and land development patterns, engineering projects and architectural styles all add up to tell a story about a place.

When a city experiences periods of prosperity, land development accelerates. City builders engage in major road building campaigns and extend the infrastructure of the city. New building technologies and styles tend to dominate the architecture of the city. And once speculative land development projects emerge as distinct neighborhoods or districts. But in times of economic depression, development is sluggish and cities change at a slower pace. These periods of boom and bust leave their mark on the landscape.

By way of example, many neighborhoods in Charlottesville, such as Belmont, were built when the large farm holdings of the earlier, agrarian decades began to wane. The landholders divided their farms into parcels, and new neighborhoods were born. Due in part to the location and timing of development, each of Charlottesville's neighborhoods tends to have a unique composition - a particular mix of street size and width, parcel size and shape, house size and orientation, and architectural style and planting.

While most people consider development to be consistently beneficial to a city, there are times when land development can erase the architectural traces of a city's history. Urban renewal practices in the 1950s and 1960s destroyed many neighborhoods in cities all over the country. Charlottesville lost its Vinegar Hill neighborhood to this kind of development. Residents were displaced and the economic and social vitality of the community was lost. Whole sections of a city, and therefore its history and community, are too often erased through new development which does not consider these cultural and social costs.

Charlottesville is fortunate to have much of its architectural heritage preserved. Major institutions such as the University of Virginia's Lawn and Monticello remain in excellent condition. But the survival of a city depends not only on the preservation of its institutional landmarks, but also on the conservation of its urban fabric: houses, churches, businesses, streets, yards, and parks. People depend on the continued maintenance and improvement of their day-to-day environment, without haphazard and ill-considered development or change. In other words, Charlottesville's neighborhoods rely on continuity with the past.

Parks Development
To understand the relationship between Charlottesville's neighborhoods and their parks, it is helpful to learn from the history of parks development in the City. A few factors in particular have affected the timing and construction of Charlottesville's parks: social attitudes toward the value of parks, philanthropy, land speculation, and local topography.

In the early decades of the 1900s, parks were considered essential components of a city. The City-Beautiful movement of this era argued for well-designed and attractive public spaces as a way of generating unity and beauty in an otherwise disorganized city plan. Not surprisingly, the City-Beautiful movement influenced the design of Charlottesville's first parks, and coincided with a time of growing need for city-wide recreation programs and facilities. During this period, several City parks emerged as gifts from Paul Goodloe McIntire, a local benefactor. His donations of Lee Park (1917), Jackson Park (1919), Belmont Park (1921), McIntire Park (1926) and Washington Park (1926) were Charlottesville's first public parks.

Land speculation and local topography have influenced parks development as well; some sites were difficult to develop because of steep slopes, flooding, rocky soils and the like. Land owners consistently avoided building in these places and so historically they remained in a relatively natural condition. Fortunately, these places are often the obvious choice for park sites. For instance, unbuilt stream beds can forge a valuable link between a region's park lands and its watershed.
However, there are times when a city’s most prominently “buildable” sites are also designated for park use. Charlottesville’s civic parks are outstanding examples of this notion. Jackson Park is situated in a prime building location next to the County Courthouse. Yet, the dedication of this land as a public park supports the claim that park land is important to the image and workings of the City.

**Uncovering History**

Charlottesville is steeped in history, and history is to be found in each of Charlottesville’s park and school sites. Some park histories are richer and more readily accessible; some histories need to be uncovered. Nonetheless, the design process must reveal and respect history. Design might even celebrate the richest stories.

The continuous relationship between a neighborhood and its park is especially important. Over time, residents come to value particular attributes of their park. Cherished features are doggedly retained; some are lost. All of these add up to a unique history and contribute to the neighborhood’s “sense of place.”

Washington Park provides a valuable case study, underscoring the value of history as it relates to park design and development. Its story is among the most interesting of the City’s parks. Donated by Paul G. McIntire in 1926, as a “public park and playland for the colored people of the City of Charlottesville,” Washington Park has traditionally been a place of gathering for the City’s African-American neighborhoods. It was a social center for the community, and locals fondly recall the days of “The Grove” and “The Barn.” “The Barn” was once a focus of African-American life in Charlottesville; this building served as a basketball gymnasium, music venue, and meeting place.

A new design for Washington Park must acknowledge the historic role of the park; the history of the community is intertwined with the park’s evolution. For instance, memories of “The Grove” and “The Barn” might inspire new ideas for making vital communal space. In the end, Washington Park will become a more meaningful place for the effort.

**Design Principles**

- The planning and design of Charlottesville’s parks and schools should recognize the history and character of the City, its neighborhoods, its environment, and its people.
- Understand that no park site should be considered a “blank slate.” Most sites have a human history, as well as a natural history.
- Avoid haphazard building and land development that erases the history of Charlottesville.
1875 Charlottesville's original street grid was typical of many Virginia court house towns. Three Notched Road and the railroad were two of the main entrances into town, although other roads also led to outlying farms. These farms, such as Belmont, Roschill, and Rugby, created a ring of agricultural land around the growing City.

1906 Charlottesville had extended its limits with new roads and neighborhoods. During this period, many of the privately held farms were sold and subdivided into residential areas.
Much of the farmland immediately surrounding Charlottesville had been converted to residential streets and lots. Some of the leftover spaces, too difficult to develop as neighborhoods, were designated as park land. Flood plains, steep slopes, and garbage dumps all made their way into the park system because they were thought to be unusable for anything else.

Present Charlottesville as it exists today. Development has extended to Moore’s and Meadow Creeks, the Rivanna River, Interstate 64, and the 250 Bypass. The network of “undevelopable” land now contributes to the City’s park system, and we have learned to value these places as neighborhood parks, streams and wetlands, and as part of the urban forest.
Plants and the Piedmont

Plants - trees, shrubs, grasses, vines, and flowers - are abundant in Charlottesville's parks. They are also indispensable. Proper planning, design and maintenance requires a thorough knowledge of the region's plants. In this regard, it is most important to identify typical plant species and plant associations for the Piedmont and Charlottesville region, in both natural settings and designed gardens and parks.

The whole Piedmont area enjoys a large variety of plant species, both native and introduced, which can flourish here due to Charlottesville's mild climate and steady rainfall throughout the year. Early plants records, especially Thomas Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia are an excellent resource for information on this region's native species. But even in Jefferson's era, plantmen, farmers, and gardeners were actively involved in the importation of foreign plants to the area. Many of these plants were garden ornaments, and varieties still grow in our parks today.

Plants in the wild tend to grow in what are referred to as plant communities or associations. This means that certain trees, shrubs, or flowers prefer similar growing conditions and can often be found thriving in the same place. One way of classifying these plant associations is by the degree of wetness or dryness they can tolerate. A species which prefers dry soils is known as a xeric species, one which prefers wet soils is hydric, and the species which grow in well-drained soils are referred to as mesic. The Piedmont region has all three types of plant groups that grow from the lowest flood planes (hydric) to the top of the nearby mountains (xeric). While not all plants belong exclusively to one category, they do tend to favor certain growing conditions.

Beyond these broad categories of xeric, hydric, and mesic, there are other types of growing conditions which help determine plant associations. Some plants are shade-loving, and others grow only in full, direct sun. Taller trees which typically need more sun provide shade for the understory trees and shrubs which require less light. This dependence of the smaller species on the taller species helps explain a plant association.

A knowledge and understanding of plant associations is critical, and should influence development of the urban forest. These plant associations, however, are only part of the planting design equation for our public parks. While some plants, such as oaks and hickories or maples and beeches grow together naturally, their arrangement in most park settings is determined by design.

The Urban Forest

The urban forest is the sum of all trees and wooded vegetation in and around the City, and a regional resource. Through park plantings, street plantings and "green corridors" of unbuilt land, Charlottesville is linked to the entire region. Development of this urban forest allows parks well within the interior of the City to be connected to the parks and trails that encircle Charlottesville. Significantly, the expansion of the urban forest also forges connections between residents, and the local and regional watershed. Streams and stream corridors are natural sites for the placement of parks and trails.

The continued planting of Charlottesville's trail corridors, parks and schools is important to the health of the community. Stream corridors protect our waterways; plants stabilize streams and reduce the effect of runoff pollutants. Trees and shrubs cut down on urban pollution by filtering sulfur dioxide and hydrogen fluoride, common city pollutants, from the air. Tree leaves also reduce dust, pollen, ash and smoke. Their shade cools the city, lowering temperatures in an otherwise hot, asphalt environment. Planting and maintaining the urban forest encourages the survival of birds and other wildlife; plants provide shelter and food for many urban and wild animals. The diversity of wildlife contributes to the overall health of the environment.

The urban forest is also an educational resource. Plants teach people about their environment, because by learning about plants, they understand more about the land. People learn about geology and soils, climate and hydrology. Parks and schools can be considered as environmental...
laboratories in which students study ecosystems, plant associations, biology, and forest ecology. As a specific example, schools could embark on gardening programs that explain the processes of plant succession or food production. When park and school grounds are part of the learning experience, if they function as outdoor laboratories, people become more attentive to their city and the natural environment.

**Planting Design**

Planting design is one of the most important means to creating meaningful places. Design organizes plants, both native and introduced species, into useful and beautiful spaces which complement Charlottesville's structure of neighborhoods, streets, and buildings. Plants shape space and create “outdoor rooms.” Their ornamental characteristics enliven these spaces with color, fragrance, and texture.

Plants display disparate forms and habits that allow equally diverse treatment. Canopy trees, understory trees, shrubs, and groundcovers all belong to the designer's palette. For example, some species are best grouped to define a hedge or “green wall,” and some plants are best reserved as the “specimen” focus of a garden. There are canopy trees that make especially good street trees, and certain flowering trees that will trace a woodland edge. Using plants in different and appropriate ways highlights the beauty and variety of plant species in the Charlottesville and Piedmont areas.

There are many different planting design precedents for municipal parks. Civic parks, small neighborhood parks, large community parks, and schools all suggest different planting typologies that help define their character. Charlottesville's civic parks reveal a classical, beaux-arts design influence. On the other hand, large community and regional parks often recall the pastoral style of the famous Olmsted parks, such as New York City's Central Park.

But planting traditions must adjust to changing demands on parks. Today, parks devote an increasing amount of land area to large, single use athletic facilities and the associated parking. As a result, many of Charlottesville's parks lack a coherent planting strategy. It is no less important, however, that plants clearly structure and define these park spaces. Planting design must accommodate a park's specific and changing role in the community.

Too often people forget that purposefully designed plantings in Charlottesville's parks require maintenance. Plants are living organisms which need water, soil, and light. Urban contexts are sometimes difficult environments because many of them cannot tolerate compacted soils, or too much or too little water and light. Attention and maintenance can keep plants alive in these otherwise difficult growing situations. More importantly, a proper understanding of plant associations and growth requirements can reduce maintenance needs.

**Design Principles**

- Create an inventory of the plant resources in Charlottesville's parks; use plants to reinforce the identity of the region, as well as each park or school.
- In general, use native plants species. Native plants are accustomed to the conditions of the Piedmont region and often require less maintenance than introduced species.
- Develop the “urban forest.” Plant and maintain vegetated stream corridors. Planted stream corridors provide paths for wildlife and people and protect the environment.
- Diversify plantings in and among the parks and schools; respond to neighborhood and individual park characteristics.
- Rely on planting strategies that define outdoor spaces, create educational opportunities, and protect the natural environment.
- Reduce the overwhelming mowing demands on Charlottesville's parks by substituting other plantings for turf.
Programming the Parks

Charlottesville’s park system must play two roles: it must serve the community of Charlottesville as a local institution, yet satisfy in part County-wide requirements. This breadth of demand on the park system stretches the capabilities of the City’s facilities. To balance the demands of small neighborhoods with the needs of a County-wide population requires careful programming of facilities and land. The programming of the parks is thus crucial.

Currently, the parks are categorized into different types according to the communities and needs they serve. Neighborhood parks are intended for the needs of the people in their immediate locality. Azalea, Belmont, Forest Hills, Greenleaf, Jordan, Meade, Northeast, Rives, Tonsler, and Washington Parks are all designated neighborhood parks, and their facilities are typically designed to fulfill the more limited needs of fewer people, especially local families. They feature playground equipment, picnic areas, and benches for sitting. On the other hand, major parks, such as Darden Towe, McIntire, and Pen serve much larger communities, and require more numerous facilities. Here, one finds the facilities that require substantial amounts of land such as tennis courts and golf courses.

Because of the increasing demands of a diverse and growing number of park users and their associated activities, the programming of individual parks has become increasingly complex. The facilities at many neighborhood parks are more and more required to meet the demands of the larger community. Furthermore, while all of the neighborhood parks have some programming requirements in common, each one is also unique and needs additional services and facilities to meet those distinct requirements. For instance, five neighborhood parks, Belmont, Forest Hills, Tonsler, Riverview, and Washington, benefit from supervised playgrounds.

The programming of the park system is perhaps most difficult when it addresses the demands of organized sports. Although the above neighborhood parks could never support the extensive trail systems present in McIntire and Pen Parks, they are being asked to shoulder the burden of certain athletic facilities used for competitive sports. Washington Park currently features two competitive softball fields, but at the expense of more neighborhood-oriented uses.

This is a difficult matter to resolve. The park system must provide athletic fields for competitive sports, yet also maintain open playfields for unprogrammed activities. Organized sports facilities, such as those used for soccer, football, basketball, baseball and softball all have extensive and very specific dimensional and material requirements. The scheduling demands of athletic programs often requires use of competitive fields three seasons out of the year, and the fields suffer. Meanwhile, the high demand for competitive sports fields continues to push out the multiple use playfields used for more casual activities such as frisbee, “pick-up” games, and other general use. In the end, it is necessary for the park system to strike a balance between the desires of neighborhood residents to keep their parks locally based and the demands of the region for more extensive athletic facilities.

Limiting the Program in Neighborhood Parks

Programming of the park system must protect the neighborhood parks from overuse by the City and regional population. Neighborhood parks are intended to serve specific people from particular localities. Especially problematic are those neighborhood parks which house facilities such as community gardens and public pools not found in most other parks. Washington Park, with its public pool, is an example of this situation. The scarcity of this kind of facility places heavy community and even region-wide demand on a neighborhood space that is otherwise intended to serve local residents.

Heavy use of neighborhood parks greatly increases maintenance needs. As a result, these parks fail to receive adequate upkeep. One solution is to shift intensive-use activities to major parks, and thereby relieve the pressures on smaller neighborhood parks. Most neighborhood parks are ill
equipped to handle all but local activity. Programming of regionally based activities should instead take place in the larger City and County parks which are able to withstand the heavy traffic and use.

Similarly, limiting the number and type of programmed uses in neighborhood parks preserves their scale, quality, and character. Many of these neighborhood parks are already filled with all of the program they can maintain, although sometimes this programming restraint is defined more by park character than by park size. While some parks are large enough to withstand increased parking or added facilities, to include more development would compromise the neighborhood feel of these parks.

Another way for the Charlottesville park system to combat overuse is to implement greater use of school sites as park facilities for the City. The Comprehensive Plan advocates the use of schools to meet neighborhood recreational needs. Greenbrier Park and School together provide almost thirty acres of public park land in close proximity to one another. Greenbrier Park features Meadow Creek, as well as meadows and marshlands. Greenbrier School offers playground equipment, playfields, and a basketball court. These facilities all serve the Greenbrier area as a neighborhood park and could act as a prototype for the programming and development of other school sites.

### Programs: A Comparison

#### Neighborhood Parks:
- garden plots
- multipurpose fields
- picnic grounds
- picnic shelters
- playgrounds
- stream access

#### Community or regional parks:
- athletic fields
- athletic courts
- natural areas
- pools
- walking and bike trails

### Design Principles

- Program Charlottesville's parks according to the role that each park plays in the system; maintain the distinction between Charlottesville's neighborhood parks and community and major parks.
- Public schools should help meet the community's recreational needs; for instance, a primary school might fulfill the role of a neighborhood park.
- Protect neighborhood parks from overuse. As far as feasible, limit the program to facilities serving the immediate neighborhood.
- Discourage inappropriate uses by limiting on-site parking at neighborhood parks.
- Provide multiple use play spaces in neighborhood parks.
- Maintain unprogrammed and open park land.
Neighborhood Voices
The process of preparing the Parks Master Plan encouraged citizens to express their ideas and concerns for the design of Charlottesville's parks because the design of public places works best when a community has the opportunity to articulate its values and needs. The people who live and work in a neighborhood understand best what is required of their neighborhood park or school. Now the continuing process of park design and renovation must necessarily occur with citizen involvement.

Although Charlottesville is not a large city, it maintains twenty-nine distinct neighborhoods, with diverse characteristics and people:

North
- Barracks-Rugby
- Greenbrier
- Greenleaf Terrace
- Meadowbrook Heights
- Meadow Creek
- Rose Hill
- The Meadows

Northeast
- Burley-Moran
- Downtown
- Harris Street
- Locust Grove
- North Downtown

Southeast
- Belmont Northeast
- Belmont South
- Meade Avenue

South
- Fifeville
- Forest Hills-Prospect
- Garrett-6th Streets
- Ridge Street

Southwest
- Fry's Springs
- Jefferson Park Avenue
- JPA South
- Johnson's Village

Northwest
- Barracks Road
- Lewis Mountain-Alderman Road
- Starr Hill
- Tenth and Page
- University Circle
- Venable

Neighborhood Evolution
Beginning in 1818, Charlottesville annexed increasingly large areas of land. With annexation came growth, and more and more neighborhoods appeared within Charlottesville's expanding boundaries. But growth did not occur all at once. Each neighborhood emerged within a distinct time and place, and each matured under the influence of a different population. Neighborhoods respond to local history and geography. Not surprisingly, Charlottesville's neighborhoods differ from one another.

Perhaps the most noticeable difference between neighborhoods is in their spatial structure; areas of Charlottesville look different. Variations in lot size, house size, building style, street width, street trees and other plantings, etc., distinguish areas of Charlottesville. Some neighborhoods, such as those closest to downtown, are older and have a more "urban" appearance. There is a denser building pattern, with smaller yards, shorter building setbacks, and sometimes no street trees. Districts of more recent development, such as Greenbrier, often have wider streets, more generous lots, and are dominated by single-family houses. These characteristics tend to last with time, although neighborhoods are susceptible to change. For better or worse, they all add to the personality of a neighborhood.

It is impossible to ignore the social and economic factors that have influenced Charlottesville's growth and differentiation. Many neighborhoods were the product of speculative land development practices. The Belmont neighborhood eventually grew out of a 1,500 lot subdivision proposed by the Belmont Land Co. As part of the proposal, land was set aside for a park located at a high point on the property, and through the efforts of Paul G. McIntire, this site was dedicated to the City as Belmont Park in 1921. It was initially restricted, however, to white residents of Charlottesville.

Certainly racial and economic segregation were powerful determinants in the development of the City. Their effects are still evident in some neighborhoods. Washington Park, for example, was...
established in 1926 as a public park for Charlottesville’s African-American residents, and it continues to be a center of activity for the surrounding African-American community.

That Charlottesville’s neighborhoods possess unique qualities should be seen as an asset to build upon. Certainly, the segregation of past decades is not to be advocated. By contrast, however, recognizable physical characteristics and strong social networks give a neighborhood its identity. Favorable qualities should be identified and preserved.

It follows that a collection of identifiable neighborhoods contributes to Charlottesville’s identity and well-being. Many communities suffer from uncontrolled and sprawling development that diminishes the unique character of different neighborhoods and locales. When homogeneity overwhelms the individual attributes of a place, its identity is lost.

The Future of Neighborhood Parks

Many of Charlottesville’s parks and schools are the center and focus of their neighborhoods. They are an integral part of their neighborhoods’ identity and are valued for many reasons. Many parks provide a link to the past; there is a historical connection to the community. Washington Park has already been presented as an example. Many parks also have memorable physical attributes, especially their plantings. One’s image of Forest Hills Park is dominated by its majestic oaks. All of the parks and schools meet recreational needs in some respect; programs should be primarily directed toward neighborhood residents for all but the largest parks.

Neighborhood character also extends into the parks, and should continue to do so. Many parks maintain the same scale, plantings, and architectural character of their surroundings, and it is important to recognize these continuities. The connection between park and locale is strengthened, and each park becomes specific to the place. To treat each park as a “blank slate” and erase these attributes does no service to the City, the neighborhood, or the park.

Promoting a feeling of community ownership is another key to the support of neighborhood parks and schools. As public places, they are resources for the people they serve. Park and school grounds meet social, recreational and educational needs. But residents need to identify with their parks. They also need to know that their vision for the parks matters, and that they will affect change. For this reason, the Parks Master Plan makes a commitment to community participation in park planning and design. It recommends a forum for citizens to exchange ideas, compromise and prioritize their needs. As the design process elicits suggestions, concerns, and ideas, each park will come to embody local values and fulfill local needs and desires.

Design Principles

- Preserve neighborhoods, and their parks and schools, by maintaining the appropriate scale and character.
- Protect neighborhood parks from overuse. As far as feasible, limit the program to facilities serving the immediate neighborhood.
- Discourage driving to neighborhood parks by limiting on-site parking.
- Neighborhood parks should be located within convenient walking distance of the majority of residents served.
- Reinforce and build new path connections between a park or school and its neighborhood.
- Engage neighborhood residents in the design and renovation of Charlottesville’s parks and schools; promote a feeling of ownership.

A neighborhood function at Belmont Park.
Accessible Parks

Charlottesville's citizens must give widespread support to the notion that public places shall be accessible to all members of the community. This is certainly true for the City's public parks and schools, and it implies that they are to be safe and widely usable. Accessibility is defined in part by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). ADA also sets standards and guidelines for accessibility in public places. But "universal" access should not be a goal strictly because the law requires it. Rather, Charlottesville values universal access to all of its public parks and schools.

Unfortunately, the park system is not fully accessible to Charlottesville's residents. Some neighborhood parks are simply not safe to walk to due to vehicular traffic. Other parks are considered unsafe upon entrance because residents are fearful that they harbor crime. These problems affect the physically able and disabled alike.

A number of Charlottesville's parks do not adequately serve the disabled. Worse, people with disabilities are too often handicapped by the design of the environment, and therefore, barred from participating in many of the activities others take for granted. For example, park entrances are sometimes accessible only by steps or steep grades, inhibiting the mobility-impaired from even entering the parks. These and other barriers restrict access to spaces and facilities within the parks, and any number of impediments discourage a full range of use by disabled persons. Remember, playground equipment is not accessible to a child unless it is also usable by that child.

Accessibility Standards and Guidelines

The solution begins when accessibility becomes integral to park planning and design. For parks and school grounds about to undergo renovation, accessibility issues must be addressed early in the design process, if they are to be dealt with effectively and elegantly.

For children walking to parks and schools, safe and identifiable paths and clearly marked crosswalks are essential. In today's society, visibility into and throughout park and school grounds are requisite design objectives. Careful planting design and proper lighting aid park security.

Access for the disabled should be a special concern. ADA provides standards and guidelines for access to public spaces and buildings, and Charlottesville is obligated under the law to comply. The requirements for public buildings are specific; those for school and park grounds are less clearly defined. Still, a number of standards and widely accepted practices are available to designers.

The considerations are many. There are reserved parking stalls and curb ramps to reach the parks. There are accessible routes of travel in and around the parks: walks, ramps, and stairways all must conform to specified standards. Parks also require accessible site furniture including picnic tables, benches and seating areas, bleachers, garbage cans, drinking fountains and telephones. Some standards for park furniture are specific, other less so.

ADA standards and guidelines for recreational and sports facilities are even less clearly defined. The design of sports and game areas must consider the ability level of potential users. On the other hand, playgrounds and play equipment should provide all children with access to the play opportunities that are present. Swimming pools require a method for assisting persons with disabilities into the water.

Nonetheless, recreational areas should be adjacent to an accessible path of travel, one that is smooth, level, stable, and slip resistant.

Thus, there are critical points of transfer that must be designed to support disabled access. For example, there are points of transfer between reserved parking and accessible routes, such as access aisles. There are also transfer platforms which allow the exchange between a wheelchair and play equipment. Signs support full accessibility as well, and for these many standards apply. Finally, recreation and other park buildings must have ADA-
compliant architectural elements such as doors, corridors and aisles, and restrooms, to name a few.

Because wheelchair access typically requires the most design considerations, it often seems that ADA standards and guidelines are intended for persons utilizing wheelchairs. This is only a partial view of accessibility. It must also be remembered that disabilities may be visual, auditory, emotional, as well as mobility-related. Yet, the benefits of mobility-related improvements tend to be broad based. For instance, the mobility-impaired also includes individuals who use walkers and braces, and many of the elderly benefit from these improvements.

A Range of Accessibility
Admittedly, achieving full access for the mobility-impaired, or otherwise disabled, is difficult in this hilly Piedmont community. Charlottesville's Tonsler and Washington Parks are but two examples of parks with steep grade changes separating one area of the park from another. A properly graded ramp between the two levels of Washington Park is essentially an impossible task. Even if it were possible, one suspects that few would accept the challenge of making the long steady climb. It is feasible, however, to provide accessible parking spaces and facilities at each level of the park.

The lesson learned is that ultimately accessibility cannot guarantee that every feature and facility at every park and school will be usable by every individual. But there is a guiding rule: accessibility does require that like opportunities and experiences be provided for persons of varying abilities. This is an especially important concept for the design of children's playgrounds.

Trails are one feature of the park system that will vary considerably in their accessibility for the disabled. For this reason, it is fundamentally important to publicize the accessibility of each segment of the trail system. Signs displaying universal symbols provide such information, and thereby support public education and safety. These signs rate trails by their degree of difficulty; trails are rated easy, moderate, difficult, or more difficult, depending on a variety of factors. Information about trail grade, cross slope, width, surface, obstacles, and distance are also provided. Individuals may then choose for themselves if a trail is suitable for their use.

Signs potentially convey valuable accessibility information for other recreation and park facilities. Charlottesville should utilize these and other means of educating its citizens to issues of universal access and accessibility in its parks.

Design Principles
- Identify barriers to accessibility in each of Charlottesville's parks and schools. Address accessibility issues early on and throughout the design process.
- Make park and school grounds and recreational facilities as accessible as possible to all persons.
- The parks should provide a full range of recreational facilities, opportunities and experiences for disabled citizens.
- Comply with ADA standards and guidelines to the fullest extent possible. Even so, understand that there is a range of accessible places. Not every place will be accessible to all persons and at all times.
- Develop safe and identifiable paths to public parks.
- Allow visibility into and throughout park and school grounds through careful planting design and proper lighting.
- As appropriate, use signs to direct Charlottesville's citizens to recreation facilities and trails suitable to their capabilities.
- Publish a trails map that rates trail accessibility for each segment of the trail system.

Grade change at Venable School lacking an accessible route.
A Trail System

Many of the largest parks reach beyond the limits of Charlottesville to outlying forests and river corridors. Smaller neighborhood parks and schools tend to be embedded within the more densely populated areas of the City. A plan for the park system necessarily addresses the physical connections between these two places. Therefore, a component of the park system should be a system of trails.

Trails joining Charlottesville's most urban neighborhoods to the region's most rural areas would undoubtedly be a fine achievement for a City surrounded by such beautiful countryside. Similarly, neighborhood parks should be linked to other local parks and schools along convenient paths, allowing for shared facilities and expanding programming options. This all requires that parks and trails be planned for in a comprehensive manner.

Greenbrier Park and School demonstrate the trail system's potential. A short trail and sidewalk connection brings the two sites together. From Greenbrier Park, one then imagines following a trail along Meadow Creek to the larger McIntire Park and Charlottesville High School. Continuing along Meadow Creek one eventually reaches the Rivanna River, and Pen and Darden Towe Parks. And the trail need not end there, but ideally would continue as a regional network of trails and paths. In fact, the Rivanna Trails Foundation maintains trails from Greenbrier Park to the Rivanna River, unfortunately interrupted by the Southern Railroad.

Green Threads

There are many trails in and around Charlottesville already built and in use, and the idea of a comprehensive trail system is certainly not new. The Urban Design Plan (1988) prepared by Carr, Lynch Associates advised connecting parks along greenbelt trails. This report suggested that the trails follow the three major waterways that drain Charlottesville: Meadow Creek, Moore's Creek, and the Rivanna River. The approximately two miles of the Rivanna Greenbelt trail is the first City developed segment of the proposed “Greenbelt.”

Here we see the potential of stream corridors to structure a system of paths and trails that encircles Charlottesville and connects the City's parks. Like many cities in the Piedmont, Charlottesville is built on high ground, along ridges, generally leaving stream beds and flood plains free of development. Hence, the relatively undeveloped character of Meadow and Moore's Creeks and the Rivanna River flood plain. This leaves open the possibility of an extensive trail system.

Building trails along creeks and rivers has many advantages. The benefits include access to the more remote and wild places of Charlottesville and the surrounding region. People enjoy walks through cool stream valleys and along creeks and rivers because of the dense and colorful plant life, the glimpses of wildlife, the sounds of running water, and the sense of distance from urban activity. The educational possibilities for school and trail groups are also apparent. A trail network connecting ridges and high points to flood plains and stream valleys would showcase the entire range of native plant species.

It should be remembered that rivers in this area were once active transportation corridors and appeared quite different from the more bucolic scenes one encounters today. Historic railroads, bridges, locks, and dams dot the Rivanna River from above Charlottesville all the way to the confluence of the Rivanna and James Rivers. This only profits the network of trails. Connections between these landscape remnants and Charlottesville's historic districts and landmarks (Monticello, the Academical Village, the Courthouse Square) bring together the story of Charlottesville's past.

The above ideas then suggest a broad system that begins with rivers and streams and threads its way throughout the community. A more extensive system would promote walking and bicycling as a way of linking residential neighborhoods with places of work, shopping and play. In this way, walking and bicycling can become rights of citizenship to the landscape.
Building Trails and Connections

In fact, there are a range of trail types and trail users to consider. As we have seen, trails through forests and along creeks offer recreational opportunities. These and other trails might also link historic and cultural landmarks. Some paths should provide for daily movement in and around Charlottesville.

Trail layout, design and surface materials must be decided upon for each segment of this system. For instance, it might prove necessary to designate some sidewalks as urban "trails." Special paving or plantings could signify an urban segment of the trail system. Nonetheless, dirt trails are the norm, and most trails should retain a rustic appearance.

Numerous trails should accommodate disabled citizens, although in some areas this may not be feasible. Many trails should allow bicycles. Several might be exclusively pedestrian, and some might be exclusively for cyclists. Although the character of the surrounding area should influence trail design, there is no stock answer. Therefore, community members should participate in decisions relative to trail layout and design, as with all aspects of park system planning and design.

But trails also require on-going involvement. Security is an issue. Remote trails are difficult to police and to illuminate; they simply cannot be patrolled at all times. Careful design, however, can improve security by providing adequate lighting where feasible and by minimizing potential hiding places. Maintenance is no less a challenge, particularly for trails located along stream corridors. Trails along creeks and rivers are subject to flooding during storms. Sand and debris cover trails, and trees and branches fall, blocking trails. During severe storms, trails can even wash out altogether. The commitment to maintain trails must accompany the desire to build, utilize and take pleasure in them.

Commitment to the trails begins with cooperation. Numerous landholdings, land owners, and institutions need to be involved in the development of a comprehensive trail system. The City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, the University of Virginia, and independent trails groups, such as the Rivanna Trails Foundation, all own or control land requisite to successful completion of the Greenbelt encircling the City. Coordination between these and other parties is critical. When natural systems and cultural landmarks are united through a network of trails, when residents can walk from their urban neighborhoods to the most rural and undeveloped areas on interconnected paths, then it is correct to describe “The City as a Park.”

Design Principles

- Create a continuous system of paths and trails that encircles the City, and follows the major waterways: Meadow and Moore's Creeks, and the Rivanna River.
- Extend the trail system to connect Charlottesville's parks and schools, with neighborhoods and workplaces. Reduce automobile dependence.
- Consider the trail system a recreational and educational resource. Link natural and cultural resources through the system of trails and paths.
- The trail system should include a continuous walk from Jefferson's Monticello to The Lawn at the University of Virginia.
- Accommodate a variety of trail users: recreational walkers, bikers, runners, commuters, and others. Provide trails that meet ADA standards.
- Provide a range of trail types, from urban sidewalks to natural river walks, that reflect the character of an area. The community should be involved in decisions about the design and location of trails.
- Develop trail construction, lighting and security guidelines, and planting recommendations.
- Pursue cooperative arrangements for financing, maintaining and policing the trails. Public land, as well as easements across private property, will be required to construct the trail network.
Conceptual Trail through UVA Property
Existing Greenbelt Trail

Proposed Trail

Existing Greenbelt Trail

Proposed Trail
Drainage and Development: the Problem

Charlottesville, like many cities, suffers from problems associated with excess stormwater runoff and drainage. These problems include increased flooding, erosion, and unstable river and streambanks. Consequently, the region’s rivers and streams suffer degradation. The cost is significant both in terms of harm to the environment and damage to the infrastructure of the City. The park system also suffers.

It is generally understood that in times of heavy or extended rainfall, soils become saturated and can no longer absorb water. When this occurs, stormwater runs across the surface of the land. This overland flow then collects into gullies, streams, creeks, and rivers, resulting in erosion and flooding. The heavier the storm, the more saturated the soils, and the more critical the stormwater runoff problem.

Stormwater and drainage issues are especially problematic in Charlottesville, where clay soils slow the percolation of stormwater into the ground, adding to the overland flow. Water then tends to cut through the clay soils and concentrate its erosive force. Finally, eroded streambanks spill more soil into rivers and streams, silting the water with ever greater quantities of clay, especially during sudden storms. The red color of the Rivanna River during a flood provides evidence of this phenomenon.

The real difficulty begins, however, with new building construction and land development which paves over soils, forests, and fields. Additional acres of roofing, parking lots, and roads dramatically decrease water infiltration, far more so than the clay soils. Impermeable surfaces replace permeable ones, inhibit water infiltration and greatly increase stormwater runoff. Besides adding to the amount of overland flow, impermeable surfaces speed the rate of flow. Hastened stormwater flow worsens erosion and flooding. Erosion and flooding in turn degrade streamside vegetation, further exacerbating the problem. The more urban and developed an area becomes, the more damaging and dangerous its flooding, and the worse the river and stream degradation.

As water flows over developed areas, it also picks up pollutants and trash. Motor oil, antifreeze, pesticides, and garbage washes away from parking lots, streets, driveways, and yards, and are eventually deposited in nearby water bodies. This deposition and concentration of pollutants and chemicals degrades water quality, contaminates entire watersheds, and taints water for people downstream from urban centers.

The environmental damage being done to our rivers and streams is certainly more than cause for alarm. However, these problems also limit recreational options. Extreme erosion along Moore’s Creek necessarily limits access to the stream at Azalea Park. At this park, severely eroded streambanks pose a safety hazard, and chain link fencing has been installed as a barrier to access. Ideally, a solution will restore environmental health and recreational value to Charlottesville’s drainage system. Paved trails, verdant streamside vegetation, wildlife presence, and unpolluted waters are not unreasonable expectations for Charlottesville’s urban streams and the region’s waterways.

Checking the Flow

Clean, free-flowing waterways and abundant streamside vegetation are signs of a healthy local environment. Moreover, healthy streams, creeks, and rivers are an attribute to any park system. People enjoy swimming, boating and fishing, and clean rivers and streams are necessary for these pursuits. They also enjoy hiking and bicycling along natural waterways. Therefore, it is imperative that we repair the damage already done to the local watershed and shield it from future damage.

Fortunately, protective and healing measures are available. Ecologically sensitive stream restoration practices that balance human needs are an option, combining engineering, planning and design to ameliorate stormwater and drainage problems. A more thorough discussion of restoration strategies...
An effective way to minimize soil and streambank erosion is to increase and protect streamside vegetation. Stream corridors are vital to the task. Optimally, stream corridors will accommodate the entire 100-year floodplain and severely restrict development. In any case, a corridor extending from the top of the bank landward should be planted with native, hydric species. The ecological benefits of this approach are many. Plants slow the overland flow of water and arrest the loss of soil. They mitigate streambank erosion and reestablish stability. Their presence filters pollutants and contributes to cleaner, healthier water bodies. Finally, plants support wildlife.

The establishment of vegetated stream corridors not only protects water resources, but it also supports community-wide education and recreation. Some potential recreational activities have already been mentioned. In particular, the coincidence of vegetated stream corridors and trails is discussed under “Trails and Connections.” Their value as educational resources is also noted. In this the park system achieves more than recreational value, but also works to maintain the ecological integrity of the Charlottesville's parks, as well as the local and regional environment.

The Big Picture

The solutions described above, namely the establishment of stream corridors and the use of proper streambank stabilization techniques, are suitably implemented at the scale of individual parks and trail corridors. This approach, however, does not preclude the necessity of large-scale watershed planning and management. Only efforts of this magnitude can successfully address the stormwater and drainage problems attributed to urban development. Recommendations in this regard are added to the “Design Principles” listed below.

Design Principles

- Adopt watershed master plans for the Rivanna River, Meadow Creek, and Moore's Creek. Identify regional stream restoration and stormwater detention basin needs.
- Adopt a local program, modeled after the State Stormwater Management Regulations, to protect local waterways from erosion, water quality degradation, and flood plain encroachment.
- Establish requirements for stream corridors. Corridors are recommended along all waterways to protect streambanks and floodplains from degradation and to allow waterways to recover between heavy rainfalls.
- Stream corridors should be integrated with a City- and County-wide trail system, and opportunities to integrate environmental education should be pursued.
Major Themes: Stormwater and Drainage
The History of Washington Park

Washington Park occupies land that was once part of a 400-acre tract known as the Rose Hill plantation. The estate was one of several large farms that surrounded Charlottesville in the years prior to the Civil War. John H. Craven, a prosperous farmer who came to Albemarle County in 1800 to manage Thomas Jefferson's 540-acre Tufton farm, bought Rose Hill in 1820. The property included a farmhouse that had been built and occupied 25 years earlier by William Wirt, U.S. Attorney General under Presidents James Madison and John Quincy Adams.

After the Civil War, land use patterns around Charlottesville began to change. Without access to slave labor, once-wealthy landowners like the Cravens could no longer afford to cultivate large tracts of land. At the same time, Charlottesville was outgrowing its boundaries and promoting the growth of local industry. Newly established real-estate development companies divided up farmland for industrial and residential usage. By 1890, most of the estates that ringed Charlottesville no longer belonged to individual farmers but to companies such as the Charlottesville Industrial and Land Improvement Company. In fact, this company owned all but 50-60 acres of the Rose Hill land.

John Craven’s descendants continued to live in the Rose Hill house and to farm the surrounding 35 acres. There was only one part of the former estate that the Improvement Company did not control. This was a strip of land along Barracks Road (today Preston Avenue) that the Craven family had subdivided into 23 lots. A handful of African-American families settled upon the upper portion of this strip after the Civil War, establishing mini-neighborhoods that are now known as Kelleytown and Tinsleytown. Further south, lots 16 and 17, together identified as the Grove Lot, remained in the hands of the Cravens and their in-laws, the Wills family, until 1904. James Hayden bought the land at this time and sold it to the City of Charlottesville a few months later.

By the 1900s, Preston Avenue had become a corridor of African-American settlement in Charlottesville. Although the area was still rural in character, there were fewer and fewer large tracts of open land.

Encompassing 9.5 acres, the Grove Lot (or “Pest House property,” as it was known in the early twentieth century) caught the eye of wealthy philanthropist Paul Goodloe McIntire. Starting in the 1910s he had given the City three parks, a library and a number of outdoor sculptures. In early 1926 he bought the Grove Lot from the City and donated it back as “a public park and playground for the colored people of the City of Charlottesville.” Belmont and McIntire Parks, also McIntire gifts, were restricted to white usage only.

According to one informal City record, the park on Preston Avenue was named after Booker T. Washington. It is unclear when this name was assigned, but other records indicate that it was in use by about 1930. Early plans of Washington Park show it equipped with a field house (which locals remember as “The Barn”) and tennis courts. The City built both facilities in 1934 and appears to have improved or added to the courts in 1942. The latter work occurred following the appeals of a dentist named Dr. J. A. Jackson who actively encouraged African-American recreation in the Charlottesville area. He had gone so far as to build a pool and a campsite on his own land in Albemarle County, and when the new tennis courts opened, he sponsored a tournament there. The fieldhouse was demolished in the winter of 1960-61 after new recreation facilities were constructed in the park. Seven years later, the park became the site of the City’s first public swimming pool.
Sources:
- "Additions or Subdivisions in or on the Immediate Suburbs to Charlottesville, VA, 1763 - Dec. 31, 1935," [a bound manuscript in the Albemarle County Historical Society's collections].

- Deeds:
  City: D.B. 52, p. 343-44.


Survey of Washington Park showing the future (?) site of "The Barn" and tennis courts. Dated 1926. Courtesy of the City of Charlottesville.
Site Attributes:
- Central urban setting.
- Landmark setting along Preston Avenue.
- Views to Brown's Mountain.
- Mature oak trees.

Important Site Features:
- Basketball courts.
- Playground.
- Swimming Pool.

Key Issues
The issues relative to Washington Park are as numerous and complex as any at the park sites studied. Defining the role of the park for the local neighborhood and for the wider community is central to the debate, and therefore programmatic issues are important. Many local residents believe the competitive ballfields limit the recreational options of the neighborhood youth, and cite the historic role of the park as justification for a neighborhood focus. Even so, there remains an understanding among local residents that given the size of the park, limited community-wide facilities are acceptable. In particular, the community pool is frequently cited as a valuable asset.

History:
- The history of the park and surrounding neighborhoods is important to the area's residents and needs to be recognized.
- The park has long been a centerpiece for the local neighborhoods.
- The park is historically attached to the African-American community.
- "The Grove" and "The Barn" are cherished, but lost features.

Plants:
- The community values the existing mature trees.
- There is an opportunity to restore "The Grove."

Program:
- Local residents wish to emphasize the role of neighborhood park.
- The competitive ballfields are generally regarded as limiting neighborhood use of the lower park level.
- Most local residents favor open playfields and/or a multi-purpose field for the lower park level.
The swimming pool is of major importance to the local neighborhood and larger community; structural deficiencies require its reconstruction.

- There is no suitable outdoor gathering space for special events and community activities.
- The "sledding hill" is a popular feature.
- More nature/walking trails are desired.

**Neighborhood Identity:**
- The surrounding neighborhoods feel a strong sense of ownership for Washington Park.
- Local residents believe the park should primarily serve their neighborhoods, and especially the local youth.

**Accessibility:**
- Many people do not feel secure within the park.
- Pedestrian access from adjacent neighborhoods is somewhat dangerous due to automotive traffic.
- The appropriate level of on-site parking is in dispute.

**Trails and Connections:**
- There is an opportunity to build stronger connections to the adjacent school grounds (Burley School).
- The upper and lower park levels are disconnected.

**Stormwater and Drainage:**
- A stormwater summary is provided on page 178.
Case Study: Washington Park

View Down Sledding Hill to Preston Avenue

Recreation Building and Playground
Case Study: Washington Park

View from Preston Avenue to Lower Ballfields

View of Sledding Hill from Preston Avenue
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>Ailanthus altissima</td>
<td>Tree of Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aj</td>
<td>Albizia julibrissin</td>
<td>Mimosa Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An</td>
<td>Acer negundo</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>Catalpa bignonioides</td>
<td>Catalpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf</td>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>Carya tomentosa</td>
<td>Mockernut Hickory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Fraxinus americana</td>
<td>White Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fg</td>
<td>Fagus grandifolia</td>
<td>American Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fp</td>
<td>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</td>
<td>Green Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>Juglans nigra</td>
<td>Black Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo</td>
<td>Ligustrum ovalifolium</td>
<td>California Privet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Morus rubra</td>
<td>Red Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Platanus occidentalis</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pse</td>
<td>Prunus serotina</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>Paulownia tomentosa</td>
<td>Royal Paulownia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qa</td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qb</td>
<td>Quercus borealis</td>
<td>Northern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qc</td>
<td>Quercus coccinea</td>
<td>Scarlet Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qf</td>
<td>Quercus falcata</td>
<td>Southern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qi</td>
<td>Quercus ilicifolia</td>
<td>Bear Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qs</td>
<td>Quercus stellata</td>
<td>Post Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>Cortaderia selloana</td>
<td>Pampas Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De</td>
<td>Deutzia x lemoinei</td>
<td>Lemoine Deutzia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu</td>
<td>Euonymous alatus</td>
<td>Winged Euonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>Forsythia x intermedia</td>
<td>Forsythia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nandina domestica</td>
<td>Heavenly Bamboo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vs</td>
<td>Viburnum speciosum</td>
<td>Viburnum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Recommendations

History:
- Design to recall the importance of the park to the African-American community of Charlottesville.
- Rename the park after its old name: Booker T. Washington Park.
- Create an historic walking trail detailing the park's history.
  1. Mark the locations of:
     - The Grove.
     - The Barn.

Plants:
- Replant the Oak Grove.
- Add native plants to the existing woods.
- Use plants to define an outdoor gathering space.
- Line 10th Street with new trees.
- Establish landscape thresholds to clarify park entrances.

Program:
- Replace the existing competitive softball fields with a multiple-use field and youth sports fields.
- Reconstruct the swimming pool.
- Provide a new playground and children's gardens.
- Construct a new community building with restrooms.
- Rebuild the basketball courts.

Neighborhood Identity:
- Balance the park's role as a neighborhood park with some wider community use (the swimming pool).
- Design for the diverse community of neighborhoods surrounding the park.

Accessibility:
- Redesign the lower level parking area.
- Reserve handicap parking stalls at the upper and lower levels of the park.
- Provide ADA compliant walks at the upper and lower levels of the park.

Trails and Connections:
- Make trail connections beyond the site to Kelleytown and from Preston Avenue to Rosehill Drive.
- Create a historic trail and nature walk with a connection to Burley Middle School.
- Remove the chain link fence separating the lower field area from Burley School.
- Connect the upper and lower portions of the park with walks. (These walks may not be ADA compliant due to excessive grades.)

Stormwater and Drainage:
- Restore the streambanks of the channel parallel Madison Avenue and widen the channel corridor.
- Provide stilling basins and energy dissipators at outfall pipes to reduce water velocity; remove or repair existing weir structures in the channel.
- Regrade playfields for improved drainage.
Case Study: Washington Park
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History of Azalea Park

Land that now makes up Azalea Park is a small piece of an estate known as Azalea Hall or simply Azalea. In 1839 Nelson Barksdale gave his son-in-law James Francis Fry about 300 acres along Moore's Creek. Some time later, Fry built a large brick house on the property.

The Azalea mansion is the subject of many stories: the slate for its roof was supposedly imported from England...it had gold tipped lightning rods...its butler hid in a barrel partly filled with molasses during the Civil War...etc. Some of these anecdotes are more believable than others and relate to the history of the landscape. For instance, the building's bricks are said to have been made by Fry's slaves using clay from a pit that was visible on the site for many years. Other prominent landscape features included Mr. Fry's apple orchards, vegetable gardens and tobacco fields. There were also two cemeteries at Azalea, one for the Frys and the other for their slaves. A 1950s map shows the Fry burial ground clearly, but the slave cemetery would require more documentary research, and maybe even archaeology, to locate.

In 1876, Captain James Archer Harris bought Azalea, by then reduced to about 175 acres. Archer had been an officer in Queen Victoria's Army and apparently had a taste for fanfare. A few days after he bought the estate, the Albemarle County Jockey Club held what is thought to be the County's first steeple chase there.

By the time the steeple chase occurred at Azalea, the area was well on its way to becoming Charlottesville's recreational hot-spot. Since the 1850s, people had come to drink from nearby Fry's Spring, renowned for the health-giving properties of its water. A steam railway line led to the spring by the early 1890s and visitors could stay at the Jefferson Park Hotel. This massive, 100-room structure was built in 1892 by the Jefferson Park Company which had acquired much land around Captain Harris' estate. Later in the 1890s, an electric trolley replaced the steam railroad and Fry's Spring became more of an amusement park. A dance pavilion, theater and various rides were set up, exotic animals were featured in a separate park known as Wonderland, and outdoor movies were eventually shown.

Captain Harris died in 1904 and his wife Mary soon began trying to sell off Azalea. County Court records from this time indicate that there was some controversy over how to settle the Captain's estate. In 1906 a County official appointed to resolve the question decided that selling Azalea best served the interests of Harris' children, grandchildren and people to whom he was indebted. Parts of the property were gradually sold off, but in 1919 a group of Harris heirs bought the house and the remaining 63 acres. By 1946 the only surviving member of this group was Captain Harris' daughter Zella. The other Harrises willed her their shares of the estate, leaving her with land that she sold over the next two decades.

Although Azalea became the focus of intense real estate speculation during the 1950s and the 1960s, the process had started much earlier. In the year of his death, Captain Harris sold the western half of his land to a man named J.R. Hayden, and by World War I this property was in the hands of Robert L. McElroy. McElroy set to work laying out what he called the Monte Vista subdivision and selling off lots within it. By 1965 two development corporations had done what they could with the property, and the City of Charlottesville managed to acquire some 14 undeveloped acres along Moore's Creek. This formed the western section of Azalea Park.

Meanwhile, Zella Harris had sold much of her land, reserving a small plot around the Azalea mansion. She died in 1962, and the house was demolished the following year. In 1965, eight acres which she had sold a few years earlier became the eastern section of Azalea Park (technically the first Azalea Park, because the City purchased it several months before the western section).

Unique as this story may seem, the circumstances underlying the formation of Azalea Park are practically the same as those that underlie many of the City's parks.
Forest Hills and Washington Parks were both carved from large plantations that once ringed Charlottesville. After the Civil War these plantations began to shrink, and by the 1890s real estate speculation was booming, fueled by the rise of the streetcar and small-scale industrialization. During the twentieth century, the land which speculators had been unable to develop provided the basis for a growing City's parks system.

Sources:
- "Additions or Subdivisions in or on the Immediate Suburbs to Charlottesville, VA, 1763 - Dec. 31, 1935," [a bound manuscript in the Albemarle County Historical Society's collections].
- Albemarle County Chancery Order Book 22, p. 369.
- Azalea File, Albemarle County Historical Society.
- Azalea File, Special Collections, University of Virginia.
- Deeds:
Site Reading

At 23.02 acres, Azalea Park is one of the City's largest parks. Azalea Park is located at the southern edge of the City, near the I-64 interchange at 5th Street, off Old Lynchburg Road. Its location is in the Fry's Spring neighborhood in the Southwest Sector of the City. It is classified by the City as a neighborhood park, although it serves community-wide functions. Azalea has become a favorite place of recreational sports participants, dog walkers, and the gardeners who participate in the garden plot program. The park is located along Moore's Creek, and its presence is key to understanding the site's character, as well as its design issues and possibilities.

The northern side of the park is bounded by a wooded hillside separating the park from neighboring residential areas. Moore's Creek forms the southern boundary of the park and is often hidden by thick vegetation. Between these two boundaries are rather expansive flat areas of land formed by the flood plain of the creek. Located near the entrance to the park are a softball field and parking lot, taking advantage of the flat terrain. The park entrance, however, is not well marked. A paved drive continues to basketball courts, play areas, and approximately 2.5 acres of community garden plots in the interior of the park. A chain link fence sections off one part of the flood plain adjacent the softball field, and this area has traditionally been used as a dog run.

Paths connect the park to adjacent residential areas, although these are also poorly marked. Generally speaking, there is a poor system of pedestrian circulation on-site, and connections beyond the site also tend to be poor. Access to the stream from the park is especially difficult and is necessarily hindered by the instability of the creek bed.

The creek suffers from terrible erosion problems. Heavy water flows negatively impact the creek during storms and have deteriorated the clay banks and contributed to the instability of the creek bed.

Site Attributes
- Stream adjacency.
- Variable topography.
- Considerable flat terrain (associated with the flood plain).
- Diversity of vegetation from streambank to upland.
- Neighborhood pedestrian access.

Important Site Features
- Ballfield.
- Basketball courts.
- Community garden plots.
- Pathways from adjacent neighborhoods.

Key Issues
Stormwater and drainage is a key issue to address at Azalea Park. Erosion control along Moore's Creek is of vital concern. Favorably, the topographic and vegetative conditions due to the proximity of Moore's Creek offer a unique opportunity to couple neighborhood and community-wide park activities with environmental education.

Plants:
- There is an opportunity to diversify plantings to promote environmental education.
- Local residents suggest the planting of azaleas as a means of contributing to the identity of the park.

Program:
- Sportsfields are desired by the community (but they must be considered within the context of the County park system).
- Park users also wish to maintain unprogrammed open fields.
- Gardening as an activity receives considerable support from the community; there is a strong desire to maintain the garden plots.
- The play equipment is old and outdated and requires replacement.
- Local residents support walking trails in the park.

Neighborhood Identity:
- Park space and facilities do not suitably address neighborhood use.
- The park edges are ill-defined, and the park lacks an identifiable entrance.
Although some parking is necessary, excessive park land is devoted to parking.

**Accessibility:**
- Pedestrian access and circulation on-site is inadequate; there are few paths.
- Improved public access to/along the creek is favored by the community.
- Park security is an issue.

**Trails and Connections:**
- Moore’s Creek represents a critical link in the Greenbelt trail system.
- Local residents suggest a trail connection along the creek, as a walk through the park and as a potential link between park functions.
- There is an opportunity for improved connections to adjacent neighborhoods.

**Stormwater and Drainage:**
- Stormwater runoff is problematic.
- Streambank stabilization is required; significant erosion problems exist along Moore’s Creek.
- There is an opportunity to integrate stormwater management with community environmental education.
- A stormwater summary is provided on pages 178-79.
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Azalea Park Plant List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>Acer saccharinum</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>Cercis canadensis</td>
<td>Eastern Redbud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cca</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>Eastern Hornbeam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf</td>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>Celtis occidentalis</td>
<td>Hackberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>Carya tomentosa</td>
<td>Mockernut Hickory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Fraxinus americana</td>
<td>White Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fg</td>
<td>Fagus grandifolia</td>
<td>American Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fp</td>
<td>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</td>
<td>Green Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>Juglans nigra</td>
<td>Black Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jv</td>
<td>Juniperus virginiana</td>
<td>Eastern Red Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Morus rubra</td>
<td>Red Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Black Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Platanus occidentalis</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pse</td>
<td>Prunus serotina</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pla</td>
<td>Pinus taeda</td>
<td>Loblolly Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pva</td>
<td>Pinus virginiana</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qf</td>
<td>Quercus falcata</td>
<td>Southern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qs</td>
<td>Quercus stellata</td>
<td>Post Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Salix alba</td>
<td>White Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>Tilia americana</td>
<td>American Linden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Recommendations

Plants:
1. Plant upland native species on the hills overlooking the park.
2. Plant hydric species along Moore's Creek.
3. Define outdoor spaces in the park with new plantings.
4. Line the entrance drive leading to the community gardens with a row of trees.
5. Establish landscape thresholds to clarify park entrances.

Program:
7. Move the basketball courts between the baseball field. Group the athletic facilities near parking.
8. Provide a play lawn and picnic area on the old basketball court site.

Neighborhood Identity:
- Maintain the park's role as a neighborhood park.
10. Emphasize pedestrian connections to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Accessibility:
11. Realign the entrance drive and parking.
12. Make all walks and trails ADA compliant.
Trails and Connections:
13 Make trail connections beyond the site to Fontaine Avenue and the Rivanna River.

Storm Water and Drainage:
14 Stabilize the banks of Moore's Creek by planting hydric plant species.
15 Establish a planting right-of-way along Moore's Creek to reduce erosion.
- Use stabilization techniques that will re-establish full use of the park.
- If structural stabilization is required, limit access to the water's edge accordingly.
Case Study: Azalea Park

Section through Moore's Creek and Ballfield

Woods Moore's Creek Baseba ll/Softball Field

Section through Moore's Creek and Community Gardens

Woods Moore's Creek Vegetated Corridor Community Gardens
The History of Meade Park

The site of Meade Park was once part of Nicholas Meriwether's enormous plantation, The Farm. Containing 1,020 acres, The Farm was established in 1735 on some of the first land cleared west of the Rivanna River. Lore, verging on myth, surrounds much of the property's history.

By the 1770s, Nicholas Meriwether's grandson, Nicholas Lewis, owned the estate. A nephew of the explorer Meriwether Lewis, Nicholas Lewis built a house that still stands - in greatly modified form - at 309 Twelfth Street. In 1781, British Colonel Banastre Tarleton supposedly camped on the premises while attempting to capture Thomas Jefferson, but there is some confusion about where, exactly, Tarleton stayed.

Another chapter in The Farm's saga begins in the mid 1820s. At this time, a lawyer named John A.G. Davis began buying up land within the Lewis' estate - 242 acres in all. In 1826 he built a house near Nicholas Lewis', and it is Davis' building which now bears the name The Farm. Architectural and documentary evidence suggests that the craftsmen who built the University of Virginia also erected Davis' house. Davis went on to become a law professor at the University. One night, after hearing a gunshot on the Lawn, he confronted a masked student who shot and mortally wounded him. This famous incident prompted the University to establish its honor code.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, The Farm belonged to Thomas Farish. He received the estate from his father William who had purchased it from Davis' widow in 1848. During the Civil War, Union Brigadier General George A. Custer (of Little Bighorn fame) stationed himself at Farish's house. Farish, a Confederate officer, came home to visit his family, unaware of Custer's presence. Farish was captured, charged with spying, and scheduled to be hanged. Custer supposedly pardoned him at the last minute.

During the early 1890s, Farish's estate began to be divided up. After a number of law suits, the Charlottesville Land Company acquired approximately 194 acres of The Farm. The Land Company speculated in real estate all over Charlottesville in these years, apparently hoping that trolley service would be extended to its property. The trolley never reached most of these sites and they often remained undeveloped until after the Second World War. Still, it is worth noting that many of the City's parks were carved out of land that was once part of a single real estate venture.

After the Land Company secured part of Farish's estate, it drew up a plan of the property and began selling off large parcels to a capitalist named Henry Clay Marchant. Marchant is famous for turning Charlottesville's Woolen Mills, just south of Meade Park, into a major industry. He also had an interest in the Riverview Cemetery Company, which acquired a sizable portion of The Farm from the Land Company in 1892. A plat of land that Marchant bought from the Land Company in the same year indicates that the Lewis family burial ground was specifically excluded from the purchase. Marchant bought most of the Land Company's property in 1894, including the future site of Meade Park.

In 1915, Marchant's heirs began leasing about 70 acres of his land to the Albemarle County Golf Club, one of the first country clubs in Charlottesville. A.C.G.C. subsequently purchased most of this property and erected a clubhouse on it. Club members played baseball - not just golf - and went boating on the Rivanna. Yet the Golf Club seems to have reserved some of its land for other uses; a 1929 plat shows 42 housing lots along the western side of the property. In that year, a man named John Fishburne bought 28 of these lots. His widow, Mary, sold half of the land to the City of Charlottesville in 1945, and Meade Park was born.

Nine years later, the park contained a shelter with rest rooms, a sandbox, swings, a junior baseball diamond and a drinking fountain. By 1975, it was home to the City's second outdoor swimming pool (the first being Washington Park's). This was named after Louis A. Onesty, the "Father of Charlottesville Swimming." Meade Park
was the subject of a City master plan in 1977 and has received a number of new facilities since then.

**Sources:**
- Albemarle County Land Book: 1894.
- Cemetery File, Albemarle County Historical Society.
- Deeds:
- "The Farm" File, Albemarle County Historical Society.
- "Meade Park Master Plan," [a report compiled by the City of Charlottesville Department of Community Development, 1977].
- "The Nicholas Lewis House" (309 Twelfth St.). City of Charlottesville Landmark Survey.
- "Riverview is Sold to Jessup." [Charlottesville] *Daily Progress* (7 February 1939).
Site Reading

Classified by the City as a neighborhood park, Meade Park measures 5.3-acres and is especially popular because of the One sty Swimming Pool. As a result, it is one of the most heavily used parks in the City. Meade Park is located at the corner of Meade Avenue and Chesapeake Street, in the Woolen Mills neighborhood. The Comprehensive Plan includes this neighborhood within the Southeastern Sector of the City. The Woolen Mills is one of the City's oldest neighborhoods, and grew up around one of the City's earliest manufacturing firms, the Charlottesville Woolen Mills. Although the neighborhood declined with the closing of the mills in 1964, the area is in the midst of revitalization. Single family homes make up the bulk of the neighborhood, with businesses dotting Market Street.

Meade Park can be read as two separate areas given its odd configuration, resembling two shifted planes. The "front" portion of the park, the area directly bounded by Meade Avenue and Chesapeake Street, is largely taken up by a playfield, primarily intended for tee ball. There are a few trees, mostly oaks which form an incomplete line along the street edges. Consequently, the boundary lacks clear definition. Moreover, there is concern that the ball field is not adequately separated from the street, and that this presents a dangerous situation for children.

The front portion of the park also contains a basketball court and on-site parking. The parking lot is accessed from Meade Avenue and is identified by a row of White Pines that separates the linear lot from adjacent residences.

The "rear" portion of the park is not immediately bounded by any street, but by neighboring residences, and is dominated by two features. The first of these is the pool and bathhouse, which form a visual link between the two areas of the park. The other feature is topographic; the park rises nearly 30 feet from the pool area toward its eastern boundary. This is a high point in the neighborhood, and the park boasts views of the surrounding area and mountains. A playground and picnic shelter are also located in the rear portion of the park, before the ground begins its ascent. Thus far, the grassy slope has escaped programmed use and appears as if to extend from the rear yards of adjacent residences.

A drainage channel which bisects the park is an important attribute, and the bridging across it emphasizes the division between the two areas of the park. The edges of the drainage channel are currently mowed and generally remain free of plants in order to prevent water passing through from becoming stagnant. Planting the channel edges with hydric plants has been suggested, however, as a means to revitalize and stabilize the stream. Some mature River Birch, Weeping Willow and Silver Maple currently line the stream and certainly add to the character of the park.

Site Attributes:
- Proximity to Rivanna Greenbelt Trail.
- Views from hillside of park.
- Stream.

Important Site Features:
- Basketball court.
- Playground.
- Pool.
- Teeball field.

Key Issues

History:
- Local residents have an interest in the history of site, and some regard the park as a traditional "Gateway" to the neighborhood.

Plants:
- The stream and wetlands in the park are without a sound planting strategy.
- There is an opportunity to use plantings to create more intimate spaces within the park.

Program:
- Both tee ball and youth soccer are popular activities and deserve to be accommodated.
- The playground equipment is outdated and needs replacement.
- The hillside is unprogrammed and little used. Local residents have expressed interest in a picnic area.
Neighborhood Identity:
- The park is of traditional importance to the neighborhood.
- Park boundaries are not suitably defined, especially along the street edges.
- Parking is problematic when both the pool and ballfield are in use, but additional parking risks compromising the neighborhood character of the park.

Accessibility:
- There is poor separation between the playfield and the street; there is concern for the safety of children playing.

Trails and Connections:
- There is potential for a trail connection to the Rivanna Greenbelt.
- There is potential for a connection to the proposed housing development directly east of the park.

Stormwater and Drainage:
- The stream lacks a suitable maintenance strategy.
- A stormwater summary is provided on pages 179-80.
Case Study: Meade Park
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Case Study: Meade Park
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### Case Study: Meade Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An</td>
<td>Acer negundo</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>Acer saccharinum</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bn</td>
<td>Betula nigra</td>
<td>River Birch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>Catalpa bignonioides</td>
<td>Catalpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf</td>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>Celtis occidentalis</td>
<td>Hackberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Fraxinus american</td>
<td>White Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fp</td>
<td>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</td>
<td>Green Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gt</td>
<td>Gleditsia tricanthos</td>
<td>Honeylocust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Morus rubra</td>
<td>Red Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Magnolia stellata</td>
<td>Star Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msp</td>
<td>Malus sp.</td>
<td>Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pse</td>
<td>Prunus serotina</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qa</td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qac</td>
<td>Quercus accutissima</td>
<td>Sawtooth Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qb</td>
<td>Quercus borealis</td>
<td>Northern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qc</td>
<td>Quercus coccinea</td>
<td>Scarlet Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qp</td>
<td>Quercus palustris</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>Salix babylonica</td>
<td>Weeping Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>Tilia americana</td>
<td>American Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleagnus angustifolium</td>
<td>Russian Olive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ligustrum ovalifolium</td>
<td>California Privot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Recommendations

Plants:
1. Plant new native trees to more effectively define and reinforce the outdoor spaces of the park.
2. Define the boundaries of the playfields by planting hedges at the street and along the parking lot.
3. Line the parking with a new planting of deciduous trees - establish a hedgerow.
4. Establish landscape thresholds to clarify park entrances.
5. Plant hydric species along the drainage channel.

Program:
7. Provide a picnic area on the hill.

Neighborhood Identity:
- Maintain the park’s role as a neighborhood park.

Accessibility:
8. Provide an ADA compliant path from the adjacent proposed housing development to the new picnic area.

Trails and Connections:
9. Make a trail connection to the Rivanna Greenbelt Trail.

Storm Water and Drainage:
10. Stabilize the drainage channel by planting hydric plant species.
11. Create a storm water wetlands educational area to demonstrate the value of wetlands.
Case Study: Meade Park

Section through Pool and Poolhouse, View towards Meade Avenue

- Proposed Residential Development
- Picnic Area
- Row of Shade Trees
- Poolhouse (in background)

Section through Hillside Picnic Area and Parking, View towards Poolhouse
The History of Forest Hills Park

Much or all of the land that now lies in Forest Hills Park was part of the Oak Lawn estate in the nineteenth century. In 1847, Reverend James Fife moved from Goochland to Charlottesville, buying 338 acres of land and a substantial brick house. The house was already several decades old by this time; it had been built for the Colonel Nimrod Bramham in 1822, supposedly by the same craftsmen who built the University of Virginia.

The beauty of Oak Lawn's surroundings would not have been lost on Reverend Fife. Before coming to Charlottesville he had trained as a landscape architect in Scotland and went on to lay out a number of Richmond, Virginia's early suburbs. While living at Oak Lawn, however, he put landscape architecture aside and served as the local Baptist minister. Before Fife's death in the 1880s, the Virginia Midland Railroad had passed through the northern part of his property. This development signalled the start of a period of rapid change for the estate.

The executor on Fife's estate, Micajah Woods, began selling off parts of Oak Lawn in 1885. By 1890, the mansion and 279 acres of land remained. These were purchased at public auction by Robert Herndon Fife and his sister Mary, apparently Reverend Fife's children. Like his father, Robert was to make money by laying out subdivisions, but in this case he was subdividing the family estate. Land which the Fifes sold to John E. Brooks and Walter and Harmon Dinwiddie in 1902 later became part of Forest Hills Park.

Another section of Forest Hills Park may once have been Fife property, but it belonged to the Charlottesville Land Company by 1890. At this time the Land Company owned parts of former estates all around Charlottesville and was subdividing them as quickly as possible. The result, at least on paper, was the establishment of some half dozen new suburbs such as Olinda, which adjoined the Fifes' land. At a time when Charlottesville had no public parks, these suburbs had their own, private ones. Belmont's residential park came under public ownership after World War I, and remains in use today, but Prospect Avenue is the only reminder of Prospect Park, planned for Olinda.

A man named J.R. Elam had started acquiring undeveloped portions of Oak Lawn and Olinda in 1911, and he sold them to Charles R. Galloway the following year. Galloway's purchase consisted of about 47 acres in rural Albemarle County. When he sold this land in 1945, the deed described it as lying along Cherry Avenue in the Fifeville section of the City, conveying some sense of the development that had occurred over the previous three decades.

The buyers in 1945 were J. Hubert Carver and his wife Dorothy. The Carvers appear to have initiated their own subdivision campaign, naming the area they owned Forest Hills. On July 28, 1955, they sold three Forest Hills lots to the City and donated roughly three acres of adjoining land. The City added these pieces to a four-acre tract it had acquired some years earlier, and the present Forest Hills Park was formed. Even before getting hold of the Carvers' land, the City had begun working on its four-acre parcel. By 1954, Forest Hills Park was equipped with a pool, swings, a climbing structure, a baseball diamond, picnic tables, fireplaces, and a small, multi-purpose building that housed a club room, lounge and bathrooms.
Sources:
- "Additions or Subdivisions in or on the Immediate Suburbs to Charlottesville, VA, 1763 - Dec. 31, 1935," [a bound manuscript in the Albemarle County Historical Society's collections].
- Oak Lawn File. Albemarle County Historical Society.
Site Reading
Classified as a neighborhood park, Forest Hills Park measures 7.35-acres in extent. It is located on Forest Hills Avenue in the Forest Hills Prospect neighborhood in the South Sector of the City. It is situated in close proximity to Buford Middle School.

Forest Hills Park sits on a hillside and slopes down from Forest Hills Avenue toward a woodland dell which defines the lower edge of the park. The street edge is poorly defined, and the entrance drive for the park is easily missed.

A small recreation center fronts the park on Forest Hills Avenue and occupies the high point of the park with views to surrounding mountains. A picnic shelter, wading pool, and basketball courts also occupy the upper reaches of the park. There are relatively few trees and little shade in this area of the park. However, just below the basketball courts is a grove of mature trees. A number of spectacular old oaks and some maples create one of the most pleasant wooded spaces in the entire Charlottesville park system.

This middle stretch of the park is the least programmed, although there is playground space for children. Otherwise, one's impression of the park is essentially that of a grass slope and the shade and shelter provided by the mature oaks.

As the park continues down the slope, the oaks eventually give way to a small, graded ballfield. This is the park's lowest spot, and the ballfield's backstop signals that the park boundary is nearby. Here, the wooded dell forms a clear enclosure to the lower reaches of Forest Hills Park. Densely wooded, hydric species such as Tulip Poplar and Red Maple are most apparent within the dell.

The eastern edge of the park, where the entrance drive travels downslope for much of the park's length to a small parking lot, has a distinct character and is itself something of a low area in the park. It appears that the intention of the long drive is to bring the parking lot into close proximity to the ballfield. A narrow hedgerow separates the drive and parking lot from the rear yards of adjacent residences. At the end of the parking area, a drainage ditch emerges and continues along the ballfield to become a creek in the wooded dell. During heavy rainfall, the drive and parking convey considerable stormwater to the drainage ditch.

Site Attributes:
- Dramatic topography.
- Hardwood specimens among oldest and largest in park system.
- Existing and potential neighborhood links.

Important Site Features:
- Basketball courts.
- Little League ballfield.
- Playground
- Wading pool.

Key Issues
Plants:
- The park's trees are some of the oldest and largest hardwoods in the park system and show signs of decline. Their decline needs to be anticipated.
- There is an opportunity to plant the slope with more oaks.
- The area devoted to lawn is excessive and could be reduced.
- There is an opportunity to use plantings to create intimate spaces within the park.
- There are few shade trees at the upper reaches of the park, especially around the wading pool.

Program:
- The park facilities are generally in poor condition and maintenance of the field area is a concern.
- The community building is in a state of disrepair. Many local residents regard the building as overused.
- The wading pool needs rehabilitation and might serve to restructure the park entrance.
- Local residents have shown some interest in improving and expanding the picnic shelter.

Neighborhood Identity:
- Neighborhood residents desire clear physical connections to their park.
- The link to Buford School is poor and represents a missed opportunity.
The park boundaries lack suitable definition, especially along Forest Hills Avenue.

**Accessibility:**
- The hilly topography demands that special consideration be given to handicapped accessibility issues.
- The community building is not accessible by the mobility-impaired.
- There is no parking near the wading pool; park users indicate that parking at the upper reaches of the park is desirable.
- Security is an issue.
- The community is concerned about drug use in and around the park.

**Trails and Connections:**
- There is an opportunity to improve connections between the park and its surroundings, including Buford School.

**Stormwater and Drainage:**
- Excessive storm water runoff is a problem.
- A stormwater summary is provided on page 180.
Case Study: Forest Hills

View along Forest Hills Avenue and Park Edge

View to Recreation Building and Basketball Courts
Case Study: Forest Hills

Oak Woodland

View from Woodland Dell Uphill to Oaks and Parking
### Forest Hills Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>Tree of Heaven</td>
<td>Ailanthus altissima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>Catalpa</td>
<td>Catalpa bigelobiflora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Mockernut Hickory</td>
<td>Carya tomentosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dva</td>
<td>Persimmon</td>
<td>Diospyros virginiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fg</td>
<td>American Beech</td>
<td>Fagus grandifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo</td>
<td>California Privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum ovalifolium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
<td>Morus rubra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Black Gum</td>
<td>Nyssa sylvatica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>Black Mulberry</td>
<td>Picea abies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>Platanus occidentalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pse</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>Prunus serotina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pva</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>Pinus virginiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qa</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qb</td>
<td>Northern Red Oak</td>
<td>Quercus borealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qf</td>
<td>Southern Red Oak</td>
<td>Quercus falcata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
<td>Quercus palustris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qs</td>
<td>Post Oak</td>
<td>Quercus stellata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>White Willow</td>
<td>Salix alba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study: Forest Hills

Design Recommendations

Plants:
1. Plant new native trees to reinforce the outdoor spaces in the park.
2. Line the parking lot with trees.
3. Establish landscape thresholds to clarify park entrances.
4. Plant trees along the street.

Program:
5. Reconstruct the basketball courts and provide terraced seating.
6. Redesign the children's wading pool.
7. Provide new playgrounds.
8. Move the community building and add restrooms.

Neighborhood Identity:
- Maintain the park's role as a neighborhood park.

Accessibility:
10. Reconfigure the entrance drive and parking lot. Provide parking near the wading pool and community building.
11. Reserve handicap parking stalls.
12. Make all walks and trails ADA compliant.

Trails and Connections:
13. Make trail connections beyond the site.

Storm Water and Drainage:
14. Stabilize the drainage channel by planting hydric plant species.
15. Regrade the ballfield to improve drainage.
Section through Parking, Basketball Courts and Existing Picnic Shelter

Section through Wading Pool, Oak Grove and Ballfield
Existing Picnic Shelter Forest Ridge Road Residences

Shade Trees

Oak Grove Baseball/Softball Field Woods

1" = 100'-0"
The History of Venable School

Prior to the 1870s, Charlottesville’s primary and secondary schools were privately financed. Whites attended classes at small institutions such as Miss Virginia Parson’s School, which consisted of one building and one teacher. A former abolitionist named Anna Gardener established freedmen’s schools to serve the area’s African-American populace after the Civil War.

The City’s first white, public grade school opened on Garret Street in February, 1872. It was a 3-room building and served 112 students in its first session. In 1877 Charlottesville’s first public high school opened its door. It occupied a building known as Midway House, located at the end of West Main Street. After five years this institution went private, and it was not until 1890 that a long-lived public high school began operating in a new building on the same site.

In 1909, James G. Johnson became superintendent of Charlottesville’s public schools. By the time he assumed this position, all the City’s white grade school students were attending Midway School. African-American children went to Jefferson School, located on Fourth and Commerce Streets; it had started out as the largest of Anna Gardener’s freedmen’s schools and had been incorporated into the public system.

These institutions were crowded, prompting Superintendent Johnson and the School Board to undertake a massive school building campaign. This began with the McGuffey School (now the McGuffey Art Center), built in the eastern part of the City between 1915 and 1916. Johnson launched a “publicity campaign” to gain public support for the project because it could only proceed if the citizens of Charlottesville approved the expenditure in a special election. Johnson put great effort into choosing the building site and selecting the architects who would handle the work. The commission went to the Norfolk firm Ferguson, Calrow, and Taylor.

In 1925, Johnson went through the same process to construct a grade school to serve whites in the western part of the City. According to his own account, he wrote over 20 articles in the Daily Progress to publicize and promote his plans. With public approval secured, the Venable School was built. It was named after Charles S. Venable who, like McGuffey, had been a University of Virginia professor and written popular grade-school textbooks.

Like its eastern counterpart, Venable was a grand neo-classical building; Johnson had seen to it that one of the architects who designed McGuffey was hired again for the Venable project. In both its style and its site, the building was reminiscent of an enormous villa, and the visual connection between the school and Monticello on clear days was intentional. Designed to meet the needs of its district for many years, Venable School received no major additions until 1951.

With more funding from the City, the School Board acquired land for an athletic field behind Venable. This and other parts of the grounds were carefully landscaped. Johnson and the architects put much consideration into “the location of the proposed building with reference to street lines and the points of the compass, the approaches from the street, the cement walks to be laid on the yard, the position of any native trees and shrubs, the elevation of the proposed structure to fit the ground contour, [and] the terracing...filling and cutting.”

A few years after Venable was completed, Jefferson School was remodeled as a rather simple neo-classical building, and in 1931, the grander Clark School was built. The contrast between the latter two buildings suggested that the maxim of “separate but equal” did not apply here. In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court ordered desegregation, sending Charlottesville’s schools into a period of upheaval. Responding to Senator Harry Byrd’s call for “massive resistance,” Governor Lindsay Almond closed Venable and other area schools in 1958. Two white private schools soon opened and began serving the children of segregationists. By 1959, however, the City’s public schools reopened, and during the 1960s grew into integrated institutions.
Sources:

- School File, Albemarle County Historical Society.
- Sullivan, Colleen A. “A History of Charlottesville Public School Facilities.” Unpublished manuscript located at the University of Virginia Fine Arts Library.


Case Study: Venable School

Site Reading
Venable is a primary school and provides play fields and playground facilities on a 7.1-acre site. It is located at 14th Street and Gordon Avenue, in the 10th and Page neighborhood and adjacent to the Venable neighborhood within the Northwest Sector of the City. No other parks or school facilities are located in either neighborhood, although Washington Park borders the 10th and Page neighborhood. These two neighborhoods typically house a high concentration of University students but are also home to a substantial year-round community.

Venable School is a monumentally-scaled public building matched by enormous old oaks planted at the street. The grandeur of the building signifies the importance of the institution. Moreover, the size and architectural style of the school contrast with the smaller scale of the residences nearby.

The school's site has a rather urban character due in part to the density at which the surrounding neighborhood is built and the simple grid of the immediately surrounding streets. Also contributing to this character is the terracing of the site to match the grid of the block pattern. The terracing forms two primary levels. The school building sits prominently on the upper level. Lawn, playgrounds, and parking and service at the rear of the school also occupy this level. The lower terrace, located to the southeast, is a large playfield, which includes a backstop for Little League and softball play. Stretches of the lower field's border are lined with mature silver maples which help to clearly define the edge.

Despite the monumental nature of the school, the site suffers from some deterioration and poor space planning. Chainlink fencing surrounds the fields and shows wear-and-tear, and much of the grass in the play areas has worn away. A large metal power transformer located directly to the east is visible from the lower playfield and distracts from the view of Brown's Mountain in the distance. The parking extends into a service and dumpster area that makes for an unwelcoming space immediately to the rear of the building. Abrupt grade changes between play and field areas create accessibility problems for the school.

Site Attributes:
- View to Monticello and Brown's Mountain.
- Large terraced play areas.
- Presence of mature oaks and maples.
- Strong environmental program.

Important Site Features:
- Educational gardens.
- Little League/youth playfield.
- Playgrounds.

Key Issues

History:
- There is an intentional connection between Venable School and Monticello.
- There is an important relationship between the building and site; terraces are an important feature of the design.
- Appreciation of nature is historically important to schooling at Venable.

Plants:
- There is an opportunity to enhance environmental education and diversify plantings.
- There is potential for the expansion of the gardening program.
- Existing mature oaks and trees are valued but exhibit signs of decline.
- Recent plantings have failed to emphasize native species.
- Local residents would like to see more trees around the lower playfield.
- The playground areas lack sufficient shade.

Program:
- The appropriate level of neighborhood use of the school site needs careful consideration.
- There is a desire among local residents to maintain the lower playfield as a multi-purpose space.
- The asphalt play area is poorly designed; a multi-purpose play area is an option.
Neighborhood Identity:
- The school represents an opportunity to meet the recreation needs of the adjacent neighborhood, especially its youth.
- Parking and pedestrian entrances are not clearly announced.
- Outdoor spaces lack clear definition.

Accessibility:
- There is a weak connection between the immediate school grounds and the lower playfield.
- Handicapped accessibility is inadequate, especially between the immediate school grounds and the lower playfield.
- Parking and service areas lack a clear separation from the playground areas.
- Fencing limits access to the lower playfield.

Stormwater and Drainage:
- The site has poor field drainage and the grass is in poor condition throughout the site.
- Erosion along minor slopes is problematic.
- A stormwater summary is provided on page 180.
Case Study: Venable School
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## Case Study: Venable School Elementary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Acer ginnala</td>
<td>Amur Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apl</td>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>Acer saccharinum</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bp</td>
<td>Broussonetia papyrifera</td>
<td>Paper Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>Catalpa bignonioides</td>
<td>Catalpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf</td>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ck</td>
<td>Cornus kousa</td>
<td>Kousa Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cedrus libani</td>
<td>Cedar of Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Fraxinus americana</td>
<td>White Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gd</td>
<td>Gymnocladus dioicus</td>
<td>Kentucky Coffeetree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>Southern Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Morus rubra</td>
<td>Red Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msp</td>
<td>Malus sp.</td>
<td>Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Black Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>Picea abies</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Platanus occidentalis</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pse</td>
<td>Prunus serotina</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qa</td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qf</td>
<td>Quercus falcata</td>
<td>Southern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qp</td>
<td>Quercus palustris</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs</td>
<td>Rhododendron speciosa</td>
<td>Azalea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Syringa reticulata</td>
<td>Japanese Tree Lilac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tcr</td>
<td>Tsuga caroliniana</td>
<td>Carolina Hemlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upa</td>
<td>Ulmus parvifolia</td>
<td>Chinese Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upu</td>
<td>Ulmus pumila</td>
<td>Siberian Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrangea macrophylla</td>
<td>Bigleaf Hydrangea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrangea quercifolia</td>
<td>Oakleaf Hydrangea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilex cornuta 'Burford'</td>
<td>Burford Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilex crenata</td>
<td>Japanese Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilex crenata 'Helleri'</td>
<td>Helleri Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilex glabra</td>
<td>Inkberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilex opaca</td>
<td>American Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilex x attenuata 'Fosterii'</td>
<td>Foster’s Hybrid Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juniperus horizontalis</td>
<td>Creeping Juniper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ligustrum ovalifolium</td>
<td>California Privot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirea prunifolia</td>
<td>Bridalwreath Spirea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirea x bumalda</td>
<td>Bumald Spirea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taxus baccata 'Repandens'</td>
<td>Spreading English Yew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Recommendations

History:
- Build upon Venable's strong landscape design and environmental education traditions.

Plants:
1. Create a successional garden adjacent to the soccer field.
2. Line the playfields with new plantings of deciduous trees - establish a hedgerow.
3. Reinforce the outdoor spaces surrounding the school by planting new native trees.
4. Define the boundaries of the playfields by planting hedges at the street and along the parking lot.
5. Use plants to establish landscape thresholds and clarify school entrances.

Program:
6. Provide a basketball court and multipurpose hard surface play area.
7. Establish a children's garden and playground in a new courtyard space.

Neighborhood Identity:
- Maintain the school's role as a neighborhood park.

Accessibility:
8. Relocate the parking lot.
9. Provide wheelchair access from the parking lot to the lower playfield via a new seating terrace.

Trails & Connections:
10. Reinforce walk connections to the neighborhood.

Storm Water & Drainage:
11. Regrade the athletic fields and improve drainage.
Case Study: Venable School
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The History of Greenbrier Park and School

Before 1830, the land that now makes up Greenbrier Park belonged to the Carr family. Although the Carrs were prominent in the Charlottesville area, the family members who owned land along Meadow Creek have received little attention in histories of the region. The same holds true for John R. Jones who bought a tract totalling 702 acres from the Carrs between 1830 and 1850. Jones appears to have acquired the land through three separate transactions. The first of these occurred in 1836 when he bought 500 acres from John Addison Carr. Jones bought another 40 acres from Samuel Carr in 1840, and, in 1849, he bought the final 162 acres from Samuel's son James.

The area along Meadow Creek was certainly more rural than urban in these years, but it actually represented one of Albemarle's early industrial districts. The land that the Carrs sold to Jones is often listed as adjoining Park Mills, also called Cochran's Mill. Saw mills, cotton mills, and even a few textiles mills dotted the Rivanna River and its tributaries in the early and mid nineteenth century.

John Jones' estate was split up in the 1850s. The part containing the future site of Greenbrier Park belonged to the Dabney family between 1860 and 1873. By this time the parcel had shrunk to 310 acres. In 1874, F.W. Sykes bought the 310-acre parcel for his son-in-law Henry Clay Michie. In the deed, Sykes specified that the land was "granted in trust for the sole benefit and use of [his daughter] Eunice." The land that Sykes placed in Michie's hands appears to be the Meadow Brook estate shown on G. Peyton's 1876 map of Albemarle County. The map also indicates that Michie owned a nearby estate called The Meadows.

Eunice Michie died in 1880, followed by her husband in 1925. But it was not until 1946 that the Michie heirs sold off the portion of Meadow Brook which contained the future site of Greenbrier Park. The buyers were Downing Cox, Junior and Senior. They joined their neighbor A.T. Durer in prohibiting non-Caucasian ownership or tenancy of the land. This restriction was lifted by the Greenbrier Corporation, which bought most of the Cox' land in 1956. Nine years later, the Corporation still owned about 28 acres of undeveloped land along Meadow Creek, and it donated this property to the City.

Because of its peripheral location and its topography, Greenbrier Park has largely avoided construction. The only constructed features are paths and a footbridge. The latter was rebuilt with concrete supports in 1982. Greenbrier School, north of the park, provided playground facilities, making them unnecessary in the park.

Construction of the original Greenbrier School building was completed in time for the 1962-63 school year, although a small addition of four classrooms was already begun that first year. Greenbrier School was further expanded for the 1969-70 school year, including a number of new classrooms and renovation of the library. The remodeling of the library space won recognition from the American Library Association. More recent improvements have included construction of the school's outdoor amphitheater and courtyard garden, both completed in 1994 with the assistance of a local fraternity.

Sources:
- Albemarle County Land Books: 1841, 1845, 1846, 1853.
- Deeds:
• "New Bridge Over Meadow Creek." [Charlottesville] Daily Progress (20 October 1982).


• Peyton Map of Albemarle County. 1875.


1964 survey of Greenbrier Park.
Case Study: Greenbrier School

Site Reading

Greenbrier is a primary school, encompassing approximately 10.3 acres of land in a largely single family residential neighborhood in the northern part of the City. It is located at the corner of Greenbrier Drive and Brook Road, in the Greenbrier neighborhood; the Comprehensive Plan includes this neighborhood within the North Sector of the City.

Residents from the area tend to consider the site as both school and park and use the grounds accordingly. A wooded area on-site features a public trail which leads to nearby Greenbrier Park and Meadow Creek. Highly valued by the community, this fragment known as the “Robert Knighton Nature Area” forms a dense boundary of native tree species on the northwest side of the school. Here also, the land slopes up from the school building and playfields, the most noticeable topographic condition on-site. Greenbrier Park, equally cherished by the community for its natural quality, is located approximately a tenth of a mile from the school by way of the trail and sidewalk leading south from the school.

The primary means of entry to the Greenbrier School building is a rather long drive and associated parking accessed from Greenbrier Drive. These are the most prominent features in the area between the “front door” of the school building and the property’s southwest boundary. A long, narrow hedge row, consisting primarily of maples, oaks and pines, separates the drive and parking from the backyards of adjacent residences.

Approximately to the west and near the parking lot is a small amphitheater where the land gradually drops down toward the entrance to the school’s nature trail. The trail is accessed off of Kerry Lane. Utilitarian in character, the amphitheater has wood seats and includes a small performance platform. The trail traces its path up from Kerry Lane to the amphitheater, through the nature area, where it continues uphill close to the school’s northwest property line, and finally connects with the school’s large playfield.

The north grounds of the school site are primarily an extensive lawn area. Within this area are a Little League baseball/softball field, playgrounds and an asphalt paved area with basketball courts. Along Greenbrier Drive and Brook Road, a single row of White Pines rings the boundary of the field area.

Site Attributes:
- Strong sense of neighborhood ownership.
- Strong environmental education program.
- Link to Greenbrier Park.
- Existing nature area and trail.

Important Site Features:
- Basketball court.
- Educational gardens.
- Playfield.
- Playgrounds.

Key Issues

Plants:
- There is an opportunity to enhance environmental education programs by planting new native species.
- There is potential to expand the area currently devoted to the growth of native grasses.
- The White Pine screen is on the verge of decline; local residents favor a replacement “screen.”
- There are few plantings to provide shade or define outdoor spaces near the school building.

Program:
- Both Little League baseball and youth soccer are popular activities and deserve to be accommodated.
- There is potential for a multi-purpose playfield.
- The asphalt play area is poorly designed; a multi-purpose play area is an option.
- The playground equipment is some of the oldest in the park system and needs replacement.
- A shaded picnic area is desired by the neighborhood.
- The “sledding hill” is regarded by the neighborhood as a desirable feature.
- Local residents have expressed a desire for bathrooms immediately accessible from the outside.
Neighborhood Identity:
- The school grounds are used extensively by the surrounding neighborhood; local residents regard the grounds as a neighborhood park.
- Local residents indicate that the site has many favorable features, but that the grounds are poorly designed.
- The main entrance to the site and the school building are unclear.

Accessibility:
- Pedestrian circulation is unclear.
- There is some demand for additional parking but no suitable location for expansion.

Trails and Connections:
- Local residents suggest trail connections to other parks and schools.
- Existing connections to Greenbrier Park are especially valued.

Stormwater and Drainage:
- Stormwater drainage is an issue.
- A stormwater summary is provided on pages 180-81.
View across Playground to Pine Hedgerow and School Building
Case Study: Greenbrier School

View from Wooded Hillside to Playfield and School Building

View of Pine Hedgerow and Ballfield
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apa</td>
<td>Acer palmatum</td>
<td>Japanese Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apl</td>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>Catalpa bignonioides</td>
<td>Catalpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>Cercis canadensis</td>
<td>Eastern Redbud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf</td>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>Carya tomentosa</td>
<td>Mockernut Hickory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cle</td>
<td>x Cupressocyparis leylandii</td>
<td>Leyland Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dv</td>
<td>Diospyros virginiana</td>
<td>Common Persimmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Fraxinus americana</td>
<td>White Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fg</td>
<td>Fagus grandifolia</td>
<td>American Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica</td>
<td>European Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Io</td>
<td>Ilex opaca</td>
<td>American Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Malus speciosa</td>
<td>Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Morus rubra</td>
<td>Red Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Black Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>Picea abies</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>Pyrus calleryana 'Bradford'</td>
<td>Bradford Pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pva</td>
<td>Pinus virginiana</td>
<td>Scrub Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pse</td>
<td>Prunus serotina</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qa</td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qf</td>
<td>Quercus falcata</td>
<td>Southern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr</td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Northern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qs</td>
<td>Quercus stellata</td>
<td>Post Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tcr</td>
<td>Tsuga caroliniana</td>
<td>Carolina Hemlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelia japonica</td>
<td>Japanese Camelia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortaderia selloana</td>
<td>Pampas Grass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex crena 'Helleri'</td>
<td>Helleri Holly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex cornuta 'Burford'</td>
<td>Burford Holly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex glabra</td>
<td>Inkberry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyracantha coccinea</td>
<td>Scarlet Firethorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhododendron catawbiense</td>
<td>Rhododendron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhododendron speciosa</td>
<td>Azalea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apa</td>
<td>Acer palmatum</td>
<td>Japanese Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApI</td>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Catalpa bignonioides</td>
<td>Catalpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>Cercis canadensis</td>
<td>Eastern Redbud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cle</td>
<td>Carya tomentosa</td>
<td>Mockernut Hickory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dv</td>
<td>Diospyros virginiana</td>
<td>Leyland Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Fraxinus americana</td>
<td>Common Persimmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fg</td>
<td>Fagus grandifolia</td>
<td>White Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica</td>
<td>American Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Io</td>
<td>Ilex opaca</td>
<td>European Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>American Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Malus speciosa</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Morus rubra</td>
<td>Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Red Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>Picea abies</td>
<td>Black Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>Pyrus calleryana 'Bradford'</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>Bradford Pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pva</td>
<td>Pinus virginiana</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pse</td>
<td>Prunus serotina</td>
<td>Scrub Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qa</td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qf</td>
<td>Quercus falcata</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qr</td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Southern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qs</td>
<td>Quercus stellata</td>
<td>Northern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tcr</td>
<td>Tsuga caroliniana</td>
<td>Post Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camellia japonica</td>
<td>Carolina Hemlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotoneaster selloana</td>
<td>Japanese Camellia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilex crenata 'Helleri'</td>
<td>Pampas Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilex cornuta 'Burford'</td>
<td>Helleri Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilex glabra</td>
<td>Burford Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pyracantha coccinea</td>
<td>Inkberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhododendron catawbiense</td>
<td>Scarlet Firethorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhododendron speciosa</td>
<td>Rhododendron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Azalea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Recommendations

History:
- Build upon Greenbrier's strong environmental education programs.

Plants:
1. Create a successional garden adjacent to the nature trail and nearby classrooms.
2. Replace the row of white pines with new plantings of deciduous trees - establish a hedgerow.
3. Define the outdoor spaces surrounding the school with new native trees.
4. Use plants to establish landscape thresholds and clarify school entrances.

Program:
5. Establish a multi-purpose playfield for youth sports.
6. Provide two basketball courts.
7. Construct new playgrounds and provide new play equipment.
8. Maintain a children's garden in the courtyard.

Neighborhood Identity:
- Maintain the school's role as a neighborhood park.

Accessibility:
9. Provide wheelchair access from the school to Greenbrier Park.

Trails and Connections:
10. Reinforce the walk connections to Greenbrier Park, Meadow Creek and the neighborhood.

Storm Water and Drainage:
11. Create an educational storm water wetland garden adjacent to Greenbrier Drive.
Case Study: Greenbrier School

Section through Playfield, School Building, and Parking, View towards Greenbrier Drive

Residences  Brook Drive  Hedgerow  Playfield  Picnic Area  Allee

Section through Hedgerow, Playfield, and Nature Area, View towards School Building

Residences  Greenbrier Drive  Hedgerow  Wetland Garden  Playfield  Allee (in background)
The History of Charlottesville High School

In the late 1800s, the property which is now occupied by Charlottesville High School was a portion of a larger land holding known as the “Cochran’s Estate.” Among those with a stake in the “Cochran’s Estate” were John L. Cochran, an original member of the City Council and the School Board following the incorporation of Charlottesville as a City in 1888, and Howe P. Cochran, who briefly served as the Superintendent of the City Schools. A portion of the estate measuring approximately 133 acres was sold to Ellie M. Elliott in 1889, the first in a series of sales which further subdivided the land. By 1916, Alexander Smith acquired 54 acres upon which he built his estate. The land was next divided among family members following his death in 1942. From the former “Alexander Smith Estate,” the City acquired approximately 42.44 acres of land in two installments from the heirs of the estate in 1971. The high school was developed upon this property, the land formally granted from the City of Charlottesville to the School Board of the City of Charlottesville in February 1982.

Charlottesville High School opened its doors in September 1974, as the first new City high school in 49 years. The school’s opening was coupled with the closing of Lane High School. Some controversy resulted from the School Board’s decision to name the facility “Charlottesville High School,” because many supported retaining the name Lane High School. Nonetheless, others associated Lane High School with segregation and felt that the new school should begin with a name that communicated its belonging to all residents of the City.

Despite shortcomings due to budget constraints, including the lack of adequate athletic and auditorium facilities, the school was subsequently honored for architectural excellence by the American Association of School Administrators and the American Institute of Architects. Priority was soon given to correcting these shortcomings, and a comprehensive plan to expand the school’s facilities was quickly devised.

Sources


• Deeds:


Above: CHS courtyard shortly following the school’s opening. Photo courtesy of the Daily Progress.
Case Study: Charlottesville High School

Site Reading
Charlottesville High School is a large, 43-acre secondary school facility with regional uses. The school is located just north of the Route 250 Bypass, in the Meadowbrook Heights neighborhood; the Comprehensive Plan includes this neighborhood within the North Sector of the City. Much like Greenbrier School, Charlottesville High School was central to the surrounding area's development.

First opened in 1974, the City's public high school offers extensive athletic facilities for the entire Charlottesville community. It is also home to Charlottesville’s Performing Arts Center. Clearly, the high school's role as a provider of regional facilities is a prime determinant in any design work to be done there.

To accommodate the range and number of facilities, the school is located on two sites divided by Melbourne Avenue. The main school site located approximately west of Melbourne Avenue is dominated by the school building and includes extensive parking and considerable athletic facilities. The site across the street is an athletic complex that is essentially limited to athletic and active recreational facilities.

Another regionally significant use, McIntire Park, is situated approximately south of the high school, and covers well over 100 acres. The main school site shares an extensive property line with the park, although it is physically and visually separated from the park's facilities by a wooded area and creek. There is, however, a single bridge and trail for access across the creek.

A vast linear parking lot (assigned to the students) forms the northern edge of the the main school site, with some hedgerow plantings and a grade change separating the parking from adjacent residences. Unfortunately, the parking lot forms a dominant impression upon entering the school grounds.

Lawn areas and service access and drives surround much of the building, while the lawn areas typically slope down from the building to athletic fields and the faculty parking lot. A running track is located at the west end of the campus, tennis courts to the south, and a competitive baseball field and practice field to the east.

The athletic complex is dominated by the football stadium bordering the street. The site also features another baseball field, a soccer field, and a competition softball field. Although the athletic complex relies on the parking at the main school site, the pedestrian connections between the two sites are poor.

In general, the school site appears disconnected from its surroundings, and community access is limited despite the number and variety of uses offered on-site. Consequently, facilities tend to be limited to school use.

Site Attributes:
- Stream and trail connections.
- Linkage to McIntire Park.
- Extensive athletic facilities/fields.

Important Site Features:
- Numerous athletic facilities, including:
  - Basketball courts.
  - Running track.
  - Tennis courts.

Key Issues
Charlottesville High provides regional scale facilities to the community at large. The key issue then is how to improve access to these facilities. The school is quite isolated, and circulation on-site is not clear. A major issue unique to the high school is the impact the proposed Meadow Creek Parkway will have on the grounds of the athletic complex.

Plants:
- There is strong potential for planting design to clarify circulation and organize and define outdoor spaces.
- There is an opportunity for planting native species to support environmental education.

Program:
- There is substantial community demand for regional athletic facilities.
- The school site represents an important opportunity to meet regional demands for recreational facilities.
Accessibility:
- Pedestrian and automotive circulation throughout the site is confusing.
- Handicapped accessibility throughout the site is poor.
- The girl's competition softball field at the athletic complex is hidden.

Trails and Connections:
- There are especially poor pedestrian connections between the athletic complex and the school grounds.
- There is potential for better access to the stream adjacent the school grounds.
- There is potential to strengthen trail connections to McIntire Park.

Stormwater and Drainage:
- Stormwater from the lower parking lot of the school grounds drains directly to the nearby stream.
- Meadow Creek suffers from streambank erosion.
- A stormwater summary is provided on page 181.
View Across Parking Lot to Athletic Fields (Recreation Facility)
Case Study: Charlottesville High School

Entrance into CHS

View Down Slope to Tennis Courts
## Case Study: Charlottesville High School

### Symbols and Botanical Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>Ailanthus altissima</td>
<td>Tree of Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aj</td>
<td>Albizia julibrissin</td>
<td>Silk Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apa</td>
<td>Acer palmatum</td>
<td>Japanese Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apl</td>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cj</td>
<td>Cercidiphyllum japonicum</td>
<td>Katsura Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cle</td>
<td>x Cupressocyparis leylandii</td>
<td>Leyland Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Fraxinus americana</td>
<td>White Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>Forsythia x intermedia</td>
<td>Forsythia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fp</td>
<td>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</td>
<td>Green Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gl</td>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos</td>
<td>Honeylocust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>Waxleaf Privet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ls</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Sweetgum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>Southern Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Morus rubra</td>
<td>Red Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mv</td>
<td>Magnolia virginiana</td>
<td>Sweetbay Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>Picea abies</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>Pyrus calleryana 'Aristocrat'</td>
<td>Aristocrat Callery Pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Prunus laurocerasus</td>
<td>Cherry Laurel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Charlottesville High School Recreation Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>Ailanthus altissima</td>
<td>Tree of Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An</td>
<td>Acer negundo</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApI</td>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ck</td>
<td>Cornus kousa</td>
<td>Kousa Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cle</td>
<td>Cupressocyparis leylandii</td>
<td>Leyland Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esp</td>
<td>Eleagnus sp.</td>
<td>Eleagnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gl</td>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos</td>
<td>Honeylocust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Platanus occidentalis</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pse</td>
<td>Prunus serotina</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psr</td>
<td>Photinia serrulata</td>
<td>Redtip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Py</td>
<td>Prunus yedoensis</td>
<td>Yoshino Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qf</td>
<td>Quercus falcata</td>
<td>Southern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qp</td>
<td>Quercus palustris</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qr</td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Northern Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsp</td>
<td>Viburnum sp.</td>
<td>Viburnum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berberis thunbergii</td>
<td>Japanese Barberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirea x vanhouttei</td>
<td>Vanhoutte Spirea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Recommendations

Plants:
1. Provide working educational gardens.
2. Introduce plants to aid environmental education. Emphasize the following plant communities:
   - Forest.
   - Meadow.
   - Hedgerow.
3. Eliminate mowing in areas where it is unnecessary - allow succession to occur.
4. Use plants to better define and establish a hierarchy of outdoor spaces.
5. Use plants to establish landscape thresholds and clarify school entrances.
6. Work with students to develop a new planting design for the school's courtyards.

Neighborhood Identity:
7. Reinforce walking connections to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Accessibility:
8. Improve pedestrian access to walks and trails.
Trails and Connections:
9 Create trail connections to destinations beyond the site, including McIntire Park and Meadow Creek.

Storm Water and Drainage:
10 Reduce erosion and improve water quality through streambank planting.
11 Develop educational projects centering on streambank protection and water quality issues.
Design Recommendations

Plants:
2 Introduce plants to aid environmental education. Emphasize the following plant communities:
   - Forest.
   - Meadow.
   - Hedgerow.
3 Eliminate mowing in areas where it is unnecessary - allow succession to occur.
4 Use plants to better define and establish a hierarchy of outdoor spaces.
5 Use plants to establish landscape thresholds and clarify school entrances.

Neighborhood Identity:
7 Reinforce walking connections to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Accessibility:
8 Improve pedestrian access to walks and trails.

Trails and Connections:
9 Create trail connections to destinations beyond the site, including McIntire Park and Meadow Creek.
Case Study: Charlottesville High School

The City as a Park: A Citizens' Guide to Charlottesville Parks

Gregg Bleam, Landscape Architects
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Design Recommendations for the System

Park Structures
The City of Charlottesville’s park system includes everything from forested natural areas to active recreational play spaces to planted boulevard medians. Although emphasis has been given to expressing the unique and individual attributes of each park site, it is also important to convey to the public the unity of this system.

The design of park structures presents an opportunity to balance the individual qualities of each of Charlottesville’s 34 park and school sites with the idea of system-wide cohesion. For instance, park shelters and playground equipment should vary in response to their respective sites. Signs, lamps and lighting, and park furniture might instead contribute to a singular identity for the park system.

With this in mind, the City should develop an assemblage of park structures designed to bring visual unity to the system - a city-wide “kit of parts.” There are practical considerations in this strategy as well. The park structures identified in this “kit of parts” should be chosen not only for their appearance but also on the basis of cost and durability. Each structure must also satisfy ADA standards. This approach should prove economical in the long run, as the City may often purchase greater quantities of a particular structure at lower cost.

The park structures recommended for this universal “kit of parts” include:

- Signs.
- Lights.
- Fences.
- Park furniture: grills, picnic tables, benches and bleachers, and water fountains.

For parks with special historical significance, such as Lee, Jackson, Belmont, and Washington Parks, special care must be taken to incorporate park structures that do not compromise the historic integrity of these sites.

Some general guidelines for the design of park structures are provided elsewhere in this document. However, it is recommended that the City develop a detailed set of design criteria for park facilities and structures, including specific design recommendations for the “kit of parts.”

Shelters
Park shelters serve any number of functions, and their use differs with the needs of each park and neighborhood. Therefore, these structures should be more expressive of the individual qualities of a park site. Whether used for community gatherings, recreation, or storage, shelters should reflect the architectural character of the surrounding neighborhood. Park shelters with a generic (“off-the-shelf”) quality are discouraged.

Restrooms
Restrooms in particular contribute to a park’s convenience and usability. Restrooms shall conform to ADA standards and should be available for use during all hours the park is open. If feasible, restrooms should be incorporated into the design of park shelters.

Playground Equipment
The maintenance of playground equipment is one of the most time and labor-consuming tasks in the park system. Therefore, the design and placement of playground equipment should be a well-considered part of any park that includes a playground as a programmatic element.

Although consumer safety regulations determine much of the design and maintenance criteria for playground equipment, there is still the opportunity for imaginative playground design. Care must be taken to provide playground equipment that is safe for children to use, encourages creative play, and is attractive and harmonious with the character of the park.

Signs
Charlottesville’s park system announces its parks with entrance signs. Therefore, it is especially important that the City’s parks and schools exhibit signs that both clearly provide information and effectively contribute to the identity of the whole park system.

Fences
Fencing, and decisions about its placement and use, should be individual to each park. Yet, there should also be a common language of fence types among the parks and schools. Available fencing materials include the typical chainlink fence, as well as more elaborate (and expensive) wooden fences.

**Water fountains**

Like restroom facilities, water fountains should be available during the operating hours of the park. Moreover, they should be sturdy enough to withstand heavy public use and shall conform to ADA standards.

**Surfacing**

The careful design of trail surfacing reinforces the character of each park and neighborhood. Trail surfaces also affect the degree of accessibility for different users, and influence park maintenance and labor costs. A variety of trail surfaces have a potential place in the park system, but each has its associated benefits and disadvantages. The factors to consider are numerous: pedestrian accessibility and ADA compliance; bicycle use; service and public safety vehicle access; surface permeability; cost; and maintenance.

Trail surface types include:

- **Crush & run aggregate**: 8' wide, 4" thick. Initially a stable surface for bikers, wheelchairs, and safety vehicles, the crush and run trail may deteriorate or become rutted without routine maintenance. It has moderate permeability, though some water ponding may occur if not well-maintained. Its initial cost is low, though long-term maintenance is moderate.

- **Stone dust**: 8' wide, 2" thick, with 4" thick crushed stone base. The stone dust surface has the same maintenance concerns as the crush & run aggregate, but its initial cost is higher.

- **Chip-seal treatment**: 8' wide, on 4" crushed stone base. Chip-seal trails are very solid surfaces for use by bikers, pedestrians, and vehicles, and they provide firm and stable surfaces for accessibility. These surfaces suffer from poor permeability and are easily damaged in floods or by tree roots which heave the trail surface. The initial cost is moderate, but long term costs are low.

- **Asphalt**: 8' wide on 4" crushed stone base. Asphalt trails provide excellent stability for bikers, pedestrians, wheelchairs, and safety vehicles, though they suffer from the same problems as chip-seal surfaces. The initial costs are moderate to high, and long-term costs are low.

- **Wood boardwalk**: 8' wide. Wood trails are a stable though potentially slippery surface for bikers, pedestrians and wheelchair users. It is important that the gaps between the planks not exceed 1/2". However, wood boardwalks are not recommended for any large vehicles. Permeability is good as water drains through the gaps between the wood planks. Decking and handrails must be maintained in a smooth condition, and damaged wood members replaced as needed. The initial costs may be moderate to high, and long-term costs are moderate.
**Washington Park**

The 9.25-acre Washington Park site is located in the North Schenck's Branch drainage area which drains to Meadow Creek. A conveyance channel parallel to Madison Avenue provides stormwater conveyance for several pipe systems draining developed areas to the north, south, and west of the park site. The approximately 1,600-foot channel drains to a culvert crossing at Rose Hill Drive which drains to a large natural channel to Schenck's Creek. The culvert at Rose Hill Drive has recently been improved to address flooding problems caused by inadequacy of the existing culvert. The portion of the conveyance channel that drains through the park site as well as through the Burley School site has been heavily impacted by urban stormwater flows. Site visits indicate severe erosion of the streambanks, with related tree root exposure, heavy debris, and vertical side slopes. The stream degradation appears most severe in areas where storm drain pipes drain directly into the channel and at locations where weir structures have been installed. Though the original purpose of these structures may have been to dissipate energy from outfall pipes or to provide in stream storage during extreme rainfall events, the structures no longer tie into the existing top of bank, therefore no longer effective. The Madison Avenue roadway and the ballfields on the Washington Park site and the Burley School site encroach into the natural stream buffer and floodplain and are believed to contribute to the degradation of the channel. Site visits also indicate that the channel tends to meander within a very narrow corridor. The streambanks will continue to erode, resulting in loss of the remaining trees along the banks, if the situation is not remedied.

Despite a thorough analysis of the channel should be conducted during final site plan development, recommended alternatives may include:

- Widening of the channel corridor, establishment of a 100-foot buffer along the channel and restoration of the streambanks, especially along the southern banks. The buffer may require additional sidewalk and street lighting.
- Stabilize the channel and prevent continued loss of trees. Pedestrian paths are allowable within the buffer but should be located above the low flow channel/reed zone. Bike paths are allowable within the shrub zone.
- Stilling Basins and energy dissipators at outfall pipes draining into the channel to reduce erosive velocities in the channel. This may require the removal of some of the pipes to allow for a more gradual discharge into the main channel.
- Removal or repair of existing weir structures in the channel. The original purpose of these structures is not known. They are now obstructing and redirecting flow and appear to be promoting localized bank erosion.
- In addition to recommended improvements to the channel, the regrading of the ball fields will improve drainage and increase available playing time.

**Azalea Park and Moore’s Creek**

The 23-acre Azalea Park site is located in the Moore’s Creek drainage area. The creek forms the park’s southern border. The severely eroded banks of Moore’s Creek have impaire the use of the park site and pose a hazard to citizens frequenting the site. The recently completed Moore’s Creek Watershed Study (Dewberry and Davis, April 1996) predicts continued, frequent overtopping of the normal streambanks and makes recommendations to address the erosion problem in Azalea Park.

Moore’s Creek appears to be responding typically to the effects of upstream development. The watershed need not be fully developed to impact creeks like Moore’s Creek. Not only do peak flow rates increase in developed watersheds, but bankfull conditions are experienced more frequently, which hastens erosion of streambanks due to lack of recovery time. The watershed study indicates that the 2-year predicted velocity in the channel ranges from 8-12 feet per second (fps). Due to the inadequacy of the channel to convey even the 2-year flow, the study recommends stream stabilization measures to protect Azalea Park from continued loss of land due to streambank erosion.
stabilize the streambanks due to the frequency of overtopping and the highly erosive velocities predicted in the creek.

An additional concern is that channel geometry will continue to change in response to increased flows from predicted upstream development. The watershed study predicted that 2-year flows will increase by 94% percent based on future land uses in the watershed. The predicted stream response is a greater degree of meandering and the formation of a wider channel. Therefore, stable conditions will be difficult to obtain along this channel reach unless aggressive channel stabilization measures are employed and strict stormwater controls are legislated.

The severe erosion problem experienced in Azalea Park demonstrates the need to establish stream corridors along urban streams. By providing a corridor, or buffer, between the creek and the surrounding development, it allows the creek response time and space to recover from the more frequent extreme storm events experienced in urban areas. Establishing such a buffer along Moore's Creek as well as along the ditch between Monte Vista Avenue and Azalea Drive will help to protect Azalea Park from further erosion and loss of use. The establishment of a stream corridor does not prohibit the use of the corridor by pedestrians and cyclists as long as the trail facilities are placed sufficiently above the streambanks to prevent erosion.

Recommendations:

- More than one approach should be investigated to determine the most effective method to stabilize Moore's Creek in the area of Azalea Park.
- Stabilization techniques should be investigated that will re-establish full use of the park. If structural stabilization methods are required, limited access should be provided to the water's edge.
- A stream corridor should be established along Moore's Creek to preserve floodplain areas and to help stabilize the creek. The minimum width for the corridor is 200 feet, but the optimum width should include the entire 100-year floodplain. (Note that the entire floodplain.) Within the stream corridor, a minimum 25-foot wide vegetated area should be established, extending from the top of bank landward. No facilities should be located within the 25-foot strip, with the exception of footpaths. This may require relocation of the ballfield and driveway through the park.
- Stormwater controls are required to prevent the continued erosion and degradation of Moore's Creek.
- Soils on-site are poorly drained with low infiltration rates. Therefore, improved site grading and the establishment of heavily vegetated areas will help to keep the play areas and ballfields more dry.

Meade Park

The 5.2-acre Meade Park site is located in the Meade Avenue Creek drainage area which drains to the Rivanna River. The site is bisected by a drainage channel that conveys stormwater from Jefferson-Market Street to a culvert downstream of the park site at the intersection of Fairway Avenue and Carolina Avenue. Two elliptical pipe arches cross the drainage channel near the existing swimming pool. The existing channel is adequate to convey the 2-10 year design storms without overflowing its banks or experiencing excessive erosion. The 2-10 year velocity in the channel ranges between 5-7 feet per second. The channel appears to be stable and provides stormwater storage for extreme rainfall events. No improvements are recommended to improve conveyance within the channel. However, establishment of natural vegetation along the banks of the channel is recommended to improve streambank stability, enhance the water quality benefits of the channel, and create a natural buffer (habitat) along the stream. The buffer will provide a filter for overland flows which may carry pollutants, such as heavy metals and oils, from roadways and fertilizers and pesticides from residential areas. The buffer will reduce the mowing and maintenance requirements along the bank.

In addition to the recommended stream buffer, the area just upstream of the double pipe arches provides an ideal setting for the establishment of a freshwater wetland area. The area is easily accessible from both the parking area off Meade Avenue and from...
the pool area and provides a safe, open location for educational programs which demonstrate the value of wetlands, including vegetative uptake of pollutants, habitat establishment, capturing of sediment, and improved water quality. With its central location and easy accessibility, the drainage channel and wetland pool will provide a unique opportunity to demonstrate the value of natural systems in urban settings.

**Forest Hills Park**
The 7.4-acre Forest Hills neighborhood park is located in the Orangecade drainage area which drains to Moore's Creek. The site drains generally south to tree-lined ditches and is well-graded to provide adequate drainage. The driveway/parking area located on the eastern border of the park is located in a low spot which conveys stormwater during heavy rainfall events. The terminus of the drive is an ideal location for a rain garden or other best management practice to filter pollutants from the parking lot runoff before it reaches the downstream ditches. The softball field at the south end of the site puddles at center field due to poor grading. This problem can easily be alleviated by regrading the field. The natural buffers along the ditches on the western border and the south end of the site should be preserved to provide erosion control and creek protection.

Recommendations:
- In the event that the drive is converted to a footpath and the parking is relocated, vegetative best management practices should be employed in the parking area to provide a visual buffer and to filter pollutants. This park can easily connect to the proposed Greenbelt trail to Moore's Creek.

**Venable School**
The 7.1-acre Venable School site is situated in the upper reaches of the South Schenck's Branch drainage area which drains to Meadow Creek. The site drains generally southeast to a storm drain system along 11th Street. The site has no direct connection to any natural drainage systems. Though the site appears to be well-drained, with no noted drainage problems, vegetative buffers could be established to filter pollutants from on-site impervious areas to provide water quality benefits to downstream receiving waters. The importance of preventing leaks, spills, and dumping into storm drain inlets could also be integrated into the school's curriculum. The urban setting of the site is ideal for demonstrating the impacts of urbanization on the environment.

**Greenbrier School Site**
The 10.3-acre Greenbrier School site is within the Greenbrier drainage area which drains to Meadow Creek. According to the Meadow Creek Drainage Study (Baldwin and Gregg, 1985), drainage problems exist in close proximity to the school grounds. Potential flooding was noted along Brook Drive near Greenbrier Drive and at the south end of Tarleton Drive. A 36-inch pipe draining Hillwood Place and Brook Drive crosses the school yard and discharges into a natural ditch between Greenbrier Drive and Tarleton Drive. In the event that the 36-inch pipe is improved to reduce flooding on Brook Road, realignment of the pipe is recommended to eliminate the encroachment onto the school grounds. There may be opportunities to demonstrate the effectiveness of erosion control devices and dry detention ponds along the eastern border of the school grounds along Greenbrier Drive.

The school's close proximity to Greenbrier Park and Meadow Creek provides educational opportunities to demonstrate the values of floodplains and the importance of stormwater management in protecting the area's creeks and rivers. The erosion process should be evident after heavy rainfalls and will demonstrate how creeks recover from flood events. Also, the effects of urbanization can easily be seen in areas where permanent creek degradation has taken place. Pedestrian access from Greenbrier School and Greenbrier Park is recommended.

Recommendations:
- The floodplain is approximately 600-feet wide in Greenbrier Park. Greenbrier School has an opportunity to provide educational opportunities to demonstrate the impact of urbanization on the environment.
environmental club. An outdoor classroom may be appropriate at the park site. Soils, hydrology, and vegetation are present to identify wetlands.

**Charlottesville High School**

The 43-acre Charlottesville High School site is located in the Meadow Brook/Meadow Creek drainage areas which drain to Meadow Creek. The site drains generally south through a series of storm drain pipes to a tributary of Meadow Creek. Expansion of the high school site has severely encroached into the natural floodplain of Meadow Creek and tributary creek. The baseball field on the main school site appears to be built on fill entirely within the original floodplain limits. The auxiliary fields on the east side of Melbourne Avenue also encroach into the original Meadow Creek floodplain. Filling of the natural floodplain reduces flood storage needed for heavy rainfall events. Reduction of flood storage causes higher water surface elevations and flooding upstream. Fill areas are often unstable because they disturb normal stream behavior. Additional filling of the floodplain should be discouraged.

The site appears to be well-drained. In the event the parking areas are re-graded or improved, best management practices, such as dry ponds or rain gardens, could provide some water quality protection to Meadow Creek.

The school's close proximity to McIntire Park and Meadow Creek provides educational opportunities to teach the importance of habitat and floodplain protection, erosion control, and the effects of urbanization on creeks and streams. Also, the abundance of storm drain inlets on site and the close proximity of outfalls demonstrates the direct link to natural waters and the importance of preventing spills, leaks, and dumping into the storm drains.
Capital Improvement Program
Parks and Recreation Funding Select Items

Neighborhood/Regional Park Improvements
The Parks Advisory Board appointed by City Council develops recommendations for the improvements of Charlottesville’s park and recreation facilities. Funds are expected to be used to implement projects recommended by the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan. These funds are used city-wide to maintain, develop, and improve facilities. Projects are varied - addressing safety concerns, citizen’s requests, and long-range planning issues.

Fiscal Year | City Cost
--- | ---
1997-98 | $160,000
1998-99 | $165,000
1999-00 | $170,000
2000-01 | $175,000
2001-02 | $175,000
2002-03 (proposed) | $175,000

Neighborhood Park and School Grounds Renovations
These funds are targeted for playground improvements throughout the City’s parks and school grounds. The 1997-98 funding will be utilized for improvements at Greenbrier School. Subsequent monies are to provide funding for playground renovations at Forest Hills Park, Greenleaf Park, Jordan Park, Meade Park, Northeast Park, Starr Hill Park, Clarke School, Jackson-Via School, Jefferson School, Johnson School, and Venable School.

Fiscal Year | City Cost
--- | ---
1996-97 | $75,000
1997-98 | $75,000
1998-99 | $175,000
1999-00 | $150,000
2000-01 | $150,000
2001-02 (proposed) | $100,000

McIntire Park/Phase 2 Development
The first phase of redevelopment at McIntire Park was completed in FY 1991-92. Funds for Phase II were originally programmed in FY 1994-95, but were delayed because of the uncertainty of the location of Meadowcreek Parkway. These funds are to be used to finalize the drawings and construction of the next phase.

Fiscal Year | City Cost
--- | ---
1997-98 | $50,000
1998-99 | $400,000
1999-00 | $400,000

Landscape Beautification
These funds will be used to improve landscaping throughout the City, with emphasis on the planting of low maintenance trees, shrubs, and groundcovers on the slopes of 250 By-Pass and major thoroughfares. Funds will also be utilized for improvements to City Hall landscaping and Lee Park.

Fiscal Year | City Cost
--- | ---
1996-97 | $20,000
1997-98 | $75,000
1998-99 | $75,000
1999-00 | $75,000
2000-01 | $75,000
2001-02 | $75,000

Towe Park
Towe Park has been built in three phases over a nine year period. Funds are to be used to construct a bridge for pedestrians and cyclists that links Darden Towe Park and Pen Park.

Fiscal Year | City Cost
--- | ---
1999-00 | $75,000

Greenbelt
These funds will be used to extend the Greenbelt trail up the Rivanna River toward Towe and Pen Parks and to Meadow Creek.

Fiscal Year | City Cost
--- | ---
1997-98 | $50,000
1998-99 | $50,000

Washington Park and Pool Reconstruction
These funds will be used for the renovation of Washington Park, including the design, engineering, and replacement of the existing pool. The pool shell and deck are leaking a considerable amount of water, and soil is eroding from underneath the pool. The integrity of the pool structure is seriously jeopardized, and construction is urgently needed.

Fiscal Year | City Cost
--- | ---
1996-97 | $200,000
1997-98 | $1,300,000
1998-99 (proposed) | $200,000
Parks Master Plan Implementation

The Parks Master Plan sets design principles for the neighborhood parks and includes conceptual designs for Washington Park, Azalea Park, Meade Park, Forest Hills Park, Venable School, Greenbrier School, and Charlottesville High School. These funds will be utilized to implement the Master Plan. The planning process will continue to involve a series of community meetings.

Fiscal Year 2001-02 $500,000
Fiscal Year 2002-03 (proposed) $500,000

Recreation Facilities Master Plan Implementation

A Recreation Facilities Master Plan is currently being completed which will recommend the renovation of a number of recreation facilities.

Fiscal Year 1999-00 $500,000
Fiscal Year 2000-01 $500,000
Fiscal Year 2001-02 $500,000

Ivy Creek Repairs

Funding is needed to protect and maintain the house and barn in good repair. This project includes cleaning existing surfaces, scraping, priming, caulking and painting roofs and exterior surfaces.

Fiscal Year 2000-01 $14,500

Pen Park Tennis Courts

These funds will be used to resurface eight courts, complete with color coating. Funding options with the County are being explored.

Fiscal Year 2000-01 $150,000

Pen Park Restroom Facilities

These funds will be used to design, reconstruct and expand the restroom facilities at Pen Park. Funding options with the County are being explored.

Fiscal Year 2001-02 $150,000

Parks Division Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>City Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>Salaries and Benefits $912,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractual Services $157,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Charges $167,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund Total $1,237,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parks Division Operating Budget

Fiscal Year 2002-03 (proposed) $500,000
Volunteer Parks Programs

Park Programs and Funding
The City of Charlottesville Public Works Department, Parks Division operates several programs that allow citizens to contribute to the park system. To get involved, contact:

Parks Division
City of Charlottesville
1300 Pen Park Road
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Matching Funds are available for playground development and renovation - up to $20,000 each fiscal year.

Gifts for the Garden
Gifts for the Gardens is an opportunity for members of the community to give financially to Charlottesville's flower bed program. The majority of the plants for the City's flower displays is grown in the greenhouses located on Pen Park Road. A tax deductible contribution goes towards purchasing seeds, plants, and supplies for the greenhouse operation. Highlights in the park system gardens include: Azaleas and Dogwoods on the 250 Bypass between Hydraulic Road and McIntire Road; huge displays of Tulips across the street from the Albemarle County office building at Preston Avenue and McIntire Road; Irises in Lee Park and Washington Park; and the numerous flower displays along thoroughfares and in neighborhoods. Donations can come from individuals, businesses, civic groups, organizations, and anyone who has a love and appreciation for gardening.

Volunteers in the Gardens
Any experienced or beginning gardeners are invited to lend their skills to the gardening program in the parks. The City provides tools and supplies, and gardeners set their own hours and amount of time they are willing to contribute. The gardens are in Lee Park, Jackson Park, City Hall Area, the Greenhouse at Pen Park, flower displays in schools and parks, and on the Downtown Mall. Applications are available by calling 970-3550.

Adopt a Park
All interested groups, clubs, or individuals can help maintain the City's park system. Duties could include painting playground equipment, taking care of trees, shrubs, and flowers, litter control, etc. It is a wonderful opportunity to meet people, give back to the community, learn, and have fun. Parks and schools available for adoption include:

- Azalea Park
- Bailey Park
- Belmont Park
- Fifeville Park
- Forest Hills Park
- Greenbrier Park
- Greenleaf Park
- Lee Park
- Jackson Park
- Jordan Park
- Meade Park
- McGuffy Park
- McIntire Park
- Northeast Park
- Pen Park
- Quarry Park
- Riverview Park
- Rives Park
- Rothwell Park
- Starr Hill Park
- Tonsler Park
- Washington Park
- Burnley-Moran School
- Buford School
- CHS
- Clark Elementary
- Greenbrier School
- Jackson-Via School
- Jefferson School
- Johnson School
- Venable School
- Wallace School

To become involved, call 970-3558.

Tree Stewardship Program
There are three Tree Stewardship programs if you want to help protect Charlottesville's trees.

Blooming Boulevards allows community groups, neighborhood associations, and businesses to get involved with the maintenance of the trees in parks, thoroughfares, tree lawns, cemeteries, and schools.

Trees as Teachers is a program associated with Charlottesville schools that works on tree plantings and nature trails and maintains the urban forest around schools.

Funds for the Forest allows members of the community to donate trees for the increase and diversity of Charlottesville's urban forest. The donations are tax deductible and go to the purchase of and planting of trees on public property for everyone's enjoyment. Call 970-3589.
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### Master Plan Time Line

**1995**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOV 19</td>
<td>First meeting of the Parks Master Plan Working Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC 27</td>
<td>Parks Master Plan Working Committee meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAN 24</td>
<td>Parks Master Plan Working Committee meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 9</td>
<td>Day long workshop - “City as a Park.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FEB 23 | Meeting with school Principals:  
- Bobby Thompson, Charlottesville High School.  
- Ron Broadbent, Venable School.  
- Deborah Collins, Greenbrier School. |
| FEB 24 | Community meeting at Trinity Episcopal Church.  
- Press Coverage: WINA, Daily Progress.  
- Publicity: Neighborhoods and schools canvassed with flyers.  
- Advertisements: Tribune, Daily Progress, Observer. |
| MAR 2  | Community meeting at Buford Middle School.  
- Topic: Azalea Park and Forest Hills Park. |
| MAR 21 | Community meeting at Thomas Jefferson Senior Day Care Center.  
- Topic: Meade Park. |
| MAR 23 | Community meeting at Walker School.  
- Topic: Greenbrier School and Charlottesville High School. |
| MAR 27 | Parks Master Plan Working Committee meeting.  
- Press Coverage: WINA, Daily Progress.  
- Publicity: Neighborhoods and schools canvassed with flyers.  
- Advertisements: Tribune, Daily Progress, Observer. |
| APR 2  | Meeting with school Principals and administrative staff. |
| APR 25 | Parks Master Plan Working Committee meeting. |
| MAY 6  | Open House: Downtown Library.  
- WINA interview of Gregg Bleam and Kay Frazier.  
- “The City as a Park” newsletter published. Mailed to 300+. |
| JUN 26 | Parks Master Plan Working Committee open meeting.  
- Topic: Charlottesville High School, Venable School, Greenbrier School.  
- “The City as a Park” newsletter published. Mailed to 300+. |
| JUN 27 | Meeting with Nancy Brown, Office of the Architect, UVA.  
- Topic: Trails. |
| JUL 11 | Parks Master Plan Working Committee meeting.  
- Topic: Trails.  
- “The City as a Park” newsletter published. Mailed to 300+. |
| JUL 31 | Parks Master Plan Working Committee meeting.  
- “The City as a Park” newsletter published. Mailed to 300+. |
| AUG 7  | Meeting with Nancy Brown, Office of the Architect, UVA.  
- Topic: Trails. |
| AUG 28 | Parks Master Plan Working Committee meeting.  
- Topic: Azalea Park and Forest Hills Park.  
- “The City as a Park” newsletter published. Mailed to 300+. |
| SEPT 27 | Parks Master Plans review with Parks Division staff.  
- “The City as a Park” newsletter published. Mailed to 300+. |
| OCT 4  | Meeting with Ron Broadbent, Venable School Principal. |
| OCT 23 | Open House meeting at Downtown Library. |
| NOV 26 | Parks Master Plan submission. |
| DEC 10 | Public hearing on Master Plan. |
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