

**Red Clay Valley Scenic Byway Design Standards Overlay  
Advisory Committee Meeting #1  
Tuesday, February 10, 2015, 1 p.m., Ashland Nature Center**

**Meeting Notes**

1) Introductions

Fifteen individuals representing the Advisory Committee and the Red Clay Valley Scenic Byway Alliance attended the meeting (list of attendees shown at the bottom).

2) Brief project overview

Heather Dunigan (WILMAPCO project manager) gave a brief introduction to the project and introduced John Gaadt (lead consultant) and David Ager (landscape architect). Mr. Gaadt and Mr. Ager ran through a PowerPoint (PP) presentation which outlined the history of the Byway, described the intent and purpose of the project, discussed their evaluation of the County's Unified Development Plan (UDC) and the Byway's Corridor Management Plan (CMP), and outlined examples of design standards elsewhere in the country. In general, the PP was well received although the group concluded that the content was too detailed for use as a presentation at the first Public Meeting to be held February 12.

Mr. Gaadt and Mr. Ager agreed to modify the presentation for the purposes of the public meeting, as well as address formatting and design issues. Further discussion follows.

3) Review of the Unified Development Code (UDC): Has the UDC addressed the recommendations of the Corridor Management Plan (CMP)?

Mr. Gaadt and Mr. Ager identified planning activity at the state, county and local levels and concluded that the UDC does not adequately reflect the planning objectives of the CMP, the County Comprehensive Plan or state planning objectives. The UDC provides no rural zoning opportunities nor does it incentivize such options, yet planning at all levels identifies the Red Clay Valley as a rural area. While no opportunities for sewer currently exist (thus limited some development potential), the entire area is essentially zoned for 2-acre large lot suburban development. Such a development pattern will not ultimately protect the intrinsic qualities of the Byway.

Comments from those in attendance included:

- Need to include rural district in the UDC (doesn't currently exist)
- Rural standards don't exist or not incentivized
- Resource protection is limited in the byway

- 2 ± acre zoning does not protect the area from development
- UDC limits sewer only
- UDC only provides “suburban estate” zoning which doesn’t adequately protect rural areas – byway is designated in the Comp plan, CMP, and state zoning as a rural area
- Need to add scenic protection in the UDC

Mr. Ager and Mr. Gaadt asked that everyone keep in mind that the guiding principle of the CMP is to protect and enhance the intrinsic qualities of the Byway.

#### 4) Investigation of Best Management Practices

Mr. Ager highlighted some of the examples of BMPs the consultant team has evaluated to date. Many more examples exist and he and Mr. Gaadt will be evaluating other approaches throughout the life of the project.

Two of the examples discussed were of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program in Gaithersburg MD and a corridor entry and frontage protection strategy in Park City UT. TDR has been shown to be very effective in some parts of the country, allowing for the transfer of development rights from “preservation” areas to “development” areas. Corridor protection programs, such as in Park City, provide protection in critical areas (within 300 feet of the corridor), and allow varying levels of development the further away from the corridor.

It was stated that an objective of this project is to develop a Menu of Strategies for achieving the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the CMP.

One significant question is whether the steering committee (and public) should push for a change of the zoning in the UDC and/or whether this effort will confine itself to the development of an overlay that will incentivize protection.

#### 5) Public Outreach

Goal: To give the public access to the planning effort and the opportunity to comment on implementation strategies

For the first public meeting, a short presentation with photos/graphics will be used to:

- Give a brief history and background of the Byway ( 5 minutes)
- Define the project and identify the goal/purpose ( 5 minutes)
- Discuss issues at stake and representative tools to address issues (10 minutes)
- Break into groups & discuss “what is appropriate for this place” – hopes, fears, favorite things - present each groups findings
- Use this meeting to inform investigation of strategies

Additional discussion centered on the desire to adequately involve the public. Consideration was given to the idea that a second public meeting be held partway through the process to discuss the menu of strategies using a design charette approach; images and other components of a “visual preference survey” could be used to explain and rank the various strategies available.

## 6) General Discussion

- Always state the purpose/goal very clearly
- Get adequate feedback from the public – need to be educated and need to know what the options are
- Clearly define the options, explain zoning differences, TDRs, etc.
- Use photos to show the different methods and successes
- Photos/maps/graphics to clearly show the threats – if all land was built out according to the present zoning
- Explain the barriers or downsides of each option (including unintended consequences)
- An approach is needed that can be politically supported and implemented
- Downzoning is a hot button
- Need is urgent but project needs to be well thought out
- A public duty is to protect and pass on to future generations the intrinsic values of the byway
- Keep first meeting general not too many details and explanation
- Make sure the public understands that they are full participants in the process

## Advisory Committee Meeting Attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>email</u>
Ginger North	<a href="mailto:ginger@delnature.org">ginger@delnature.org</a>
Gary Burcham	<a href="mailto:gburcham@juno.com">gburcham@juno.com</a>
Bob Weiner	<a href="mailto:bob@bobweiner.com">bob@bobweiner.com</a>
Ann Gravatt	<a href="mailto:ann.gravatt@state.de.us">ann.gravatt@state.de.us</a>
Lisa Pertzoff	<a href="mailto:wolfhill@comcast.net">wolfhill@comcast.net</a>
William Bizjak	<a href="mailto:Bizjak2@comcast.net">Bizjak2@comcast.net</a>
Valerie Cartolano	<a href="mailto:vcartolano@nccde.org">vcartolano@nccde.org</a>
Stuart Sirota	<a href="mailto:ssirota@nccde.org">ssirota@nccde.org</a>
Randi Novakoff	<a href="mailto:rnovakoff@wilmapco.org">rnovakoff@wilmapco.org</a>
Heather Dunigan	<a href="mailto:hdunigan@wilmapco.org">hdunigan@wilmapco.org</a>
David Ager	<a href="mailto:dager@townscapedesign.com">dager@townscapedesign.com</a>
John Gaadt	<a href="mailto:jgaadt@gaadt.com">jgaadt@gaadt.com</a>
Jeff Greene	<a href="mailto:jgreene@delawaregreenways.org">jgreene@delawaregreenways.org</a>
Charles Stirk	<a href="mailto:civicleaguefornc@gmail.com">civicleaguefornc@gmail.com</a>
Jim Jordan	<a href="mailto:jejordan@bva-rcva.org">jejordan@bva-rcva.org</a>