Update of Best Practices per NCC review comments of 2-16-2016

Draft - For CLIENT REVIEW - March 8, 2016 - For Discussion Purposes Only

| | Grey: Items removed based on feedback from NCC LU. |
|--|---|
| | Blue: Items existing in current code to be updated. |
| | Green: Items to add to current code. |

| | п — | 1 | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---|
| | | | Consult | New Castle | | tle | |
| | | Input | . Team | County | | | Notes/Comments |
| | | Wrkshp 1 | | UDC | | | |
| | Goals & Strategies | 2/12/2015 Preferences | 4/9/2015 ecommend | Existing Reg. | Modify UDC | Add to UDC | |
| Scenic / Natural / Historic / Cultural / Recreation | | | | -0 | | | |
| 1 Preserving Scenic Viewsheds | | | | | | | |
| a. Multi-point vista controls | Х | Х | X | | | Х | |
| b. Development rights transfer program | X | Х | Х | Х | Х | | For scenic protection, not necessarily linked to agricultural preservation. |
| c. General (open space) protection goals | Х | Х | Х | | | Х | Could be performance based within overlay zone specific to scenic protection. |
| d. Minimum buffer and distance (setback) requirements | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | CMP mentions 200' setback; also setbacks mentioned at PW 1. |
| 2 Regulating Scenic Roadways | | | | | | | |
| a. DRAC (formerly Scenic roads commission) | Х | | Х | | | Х | Alliance currently acts in non-governmental role. |
| b. Context sensitive road design standards | Х | Х | Х | | | Χ | For both existing and proposed roadways. |
| c. Context sensitive design for other non-road infrastructure | Х | | Х | | | Х | Stormwater, dry utilities, lighting, etc. |
| d. Context sensitive design relative to landscaping | Х | | Х | | | | Suggest to include in design guidelines, not UDC regulations. ARCHITECTURE REVIEW DELETED. |
| 3 Linked View Preservation | | | | | | | |
| a. View protection linked with environmental protection | Х | Х | Х | | | Х | |
| i. Specified and approved plant lists | Х | | Х | Х | Х | | Update and refine existing list and add native species. |
| ii. Streams, waterbodies and associated riparian buffers | X | Х | X | X | Х | | Suggest review of current standards relative to byway. Potential |
| | | | | | | | increase to be discussed. |
| b. View protection linked with agricultural preservation | Х | | Х | | | Х | |
| i. Development transfer programs; PDRs and TDRs | ll x | Х | Х | х | Х | | Discuss modifications to existing programs. |
| c. View protection linked with historic resources | l x | Х | Х | | | Х | |
| i. Historic environmental settings | ll x | Х | Х | | | х | |
| ii. Establish historic roads classification | ll x | X | X | | | X | Historic designation would provide additional layer of protection. |
| d. View protection linked to rural character protection and/or enhance. | X | | Х | | | X | |
| i. Protection of features that contribute to rural character | X | | X | | | Х | Such as walls, fence rows, field edge tree lines, etc. |
| ii. Greenway and connected open space planning | ll x | | Х | | | X | |
| iii. Protections against negative or intrusive views | x | | X | | | X | Such as electric transmission towers, overhead wires, etc. |
| e. View protection linked with signage/billboard regulations | X | | X | Х | Х | X | Such as electric transmission towers, overhead wires, etc. |
| i. Sign and billboard restrictions | X X | | X | X | X | X | Standards for signage specific to the byway, possibly in overlay zone |
| ii. Size, type and quantity restrictions | X | Х | X | | Α | X | Standards for signage specific to the byway, possibly in overlay zone |
| 4 Implementation | | | | | | | Standards for signage specific to the sywdy, possibly in overlay zone |
| a. Overlay Zoning | Х | | Х | | | Χ | |
| i. Minimum open space ratios | X | | X | Х | Х | | Increase in overlay zone; upper limit not defined at this time. |
| ii. Management standards | X | | X | | | Х | Landscape mentioned in CMP. |
| 1 Landscape management | ll x | | X | | | X | Landscape mentioned in civii . |
| 2 Increase 'green' in existing developments | ll x | | X | | | X | Increased landscaping, forest, buffer plantings, etc. |
| iii. Supplemental development standards | l ^ | | X | | | X | DESIGN GUIDELINES. |
| 1 Conservation design standards | X | | X | Х | Х | ^ | Increased scrutiny in RCV. PUT IN DESIGN GUIDELINES ONLY. |
| Conservation design standards Open space design standards | X | | X | X | X | | Increased scrutiny in RCV. POT IN DESIGN GOIDELINES ONLY. |
| b. Protective/Restrictive Easements | | | X | ^ | ^ | | increased scruting in KCV. |
| | 11 | | | | | | |
| | H | V | V | | | V | |
| i. Scenic viewshed protective easements | X | X | X | | | X | |
| | X X | X | X X | X | X | X | Coordination between state, regional and county governments. |

LEGEND

Grey - Strategies that are no longer a recommendation as a result of review comments by CLIENT, specifically NCC Land Use Dept., but were previously recommended by consultant and/or public.

Blue - Strategies that are recommended by either the CMP or the general public (workshop 1) and are currently a part of the UDC but requires refinement or modification. Also recommended by the consultant team.

Green - Strategies that are recommended by either the CMP or the general public (workshop 1) and are currently NOT a part of the UDC and will require addition. Also recommended by the consultant team.

Note: It should be noted that the preferences identified at the Public Workshop are generally consistent with the recommendations of the CMP, despite the fact that implementation of the CMP has been ongoing for several years.

It should also be noted that the CMP was developed over a number of years and was the subject of numerous public meetings, roundtables and outreach efforts. As such, the preferences identified at the Public Workshop, while current, have not been vetted throughout the community in the same manner.