

Date: June 28, 2006

To: Attendees of Local Roads Workshop

From: John Eckman, Executive Director

Re: Local Roads and Smart Growth Proceedings and Follow-Up Materials

Thank you for attending the Local Roads and Smart Growth Workshop for locality planners and VDOT staff on May 31st, sponsored by the Valley Conservation Council as part of its Shenandoah Land Use Network. Approximately 60 people attended including representatives from 10 counties, 4 cities, 8 towns, 3 private companies, and 2 regional organizations, and 13 VDOT employees.

Enclosed are follow-up materials. We also invite you to the VCC website where a new section on Local Roads and Smart Growth contains resources and links.

References posted at www.valleyconservation.org/localroads:

Speakers' presentations (Mark Graham, Sara Hollberg, Michael Barnes)

Links to Web resources, including the following:

- Albemarle County documents on their Neighborhood Model, including their Neighborhood Model Ordinance, and Comprehensive Plan documents outlining the goals and purposes of the Neighborhood Model. This is a regional example of neotraditional planning and ordinances.
- VDOT's 2005 Subdivision Street Requirements for all the latest subdivision street regulations, including the changes from the recent review.
- VDOT's Road Design Manual. Appendix B of this manual is where to look for upcoming changes to the Subdivision Street Requirements.
- Neotraditional Neighborhood Design from the Federal Highway Administration is a general overview of some of the road issues associated with neotraditional development
- Investing in New Urbanist Development from the National Association of Realtors is a short article looking at the costs of neotraditional development.

- Fiscal Benefits of Walkable Communities from The Village Project (2001).
- Street Design Guidelines for Healthy Neighborhoods by Dan Burden (TRB Circular E-C019: Urban Street Symposium)

Recommended Print Resources:

American Planning Association (2004). *Codifying New Urbanism*. PAS Report # 526. Available at www.planning.org or by calling (312) 431-9985

Contact information for speakers:

Mark Graham, P.E.
Albemarle County Director of Community Development
401 McIntire Rd
Charlottesville, VA 22902
mgraham@albemarle.org
(434) 296-5832 x 3248

Sara Hollberg, AICP
Consulting Planner
24 Church St
Staunton, VA 24401
hollberg@ntelos.net
(540) 883-1921

David Patton
VDOT Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Coordinator
1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
David.Patton@VDOT.Virginia.gov
(804) 371-4869

Robert Hofrichter
VDOT State Land Development Manager
Robert.Hofrichter@VDOT.Virginia.gov
(804) 662-9612

Michael Barnes
KG Associates
P.O. Box 5207
Charlottesville, VA 22905
Michael@kgassociates.net
(434) 979-9500

VDOT Role
Robert Hofrichter, VDOT State Land Development Manager

VCC Local Roads Workshop ~ May 31, 2006

Robert Hofrichter, VDOT State Land Development Manager, provided an overview of VDOT's role in local roads. His presentation included the following points:

“If you want to do something different, it doesn't hurt to ask. Take it to your local residency and we'll work it through the process.”

VDOT's Subdivision Street Requirements (SSR) control development of streets to be accepted by VDOT for maintenance. If the roads are not going to be maintained by VDOT, they don't need to be up to VDOT standards. However, cities or towns won't get VDOT road payments for a road if it doesn't meet VDOT's list of requirements for city/town roads. One of these requirements is that roads meet the SSR.

VDOT recently went through the process of reviewing its SSR. The latest SSR became effective January 1, 2005.

The biggest change was to split the standards out from the regulations and put them in a guidelines section (part of the Road Design Manual). The advantages of separate guidelines are 1) revisions are easier and 2) a Design Exceptions Process gives additional flexibility.

There have been slight changes already and may be more over time. Before using the SSR check VDOT website for updates: <http://www.virginiadot.org/business/locdes/rdmanual-index.asp> (Changes to the Subdivision Street Requirements will be listed as Appendix B in the Road Design Manual)

The Design Exceptions Process (Site Specific) can allow a project to be built to lower standards. The process begins with submittal to the residency. It then is reviewed by the appropriate VDOT Division (e.g. Structures and Bridges, etc.).

A new Countywide Neo-traditional Standards process enables counties to propose adopting neotraditional ordinances countywide. The process begins with submittal to the residency. It then is forwarded, with recommendation, to the Asset Management Division (AMD). AMD coordinates review with Location and Design Division. Prince William County is going through this process right now.

The nature of VDOT's role is one of compromise and balance. “We tried to design the standards so that we can give people what they want. There are sometimes competing views. Some people want gravel to let infiltration keep pollutants out of the water; others want curb and gutter. We're stuck trying to balance things.”

Counties are in control of the subdivision process. The County has to say that it looks good before a residency will review it. VDOT wants to know the County is happy with a project before they look at it. County standards have to be followed if they're higher than VDOT's.

Standard Plan Approval Process:

- Developer submits concept plan to county.
- County reviews plan and submits to VDOT residency.
- VDOT reviews concept and reports back to county.
- County acts on concept plan.
- Developer submits construction plans to county.
- County reviews construction plans and consults with VDOT.
- VDOT advises county on plan approval.
- County acts on construction plan.
- Developer begins construction.

The Subdivision Street Requirements include provisions for alleys, but alleys are not part of the road network maintained by VDOT and alleys won't qualify for road payments to cities/towns.

Cities also can submit cases through the exceptions process.

Changing the Development Pattern: Principles of New Urbanism
Sara Hollberg, AICP

VCC Local Roads Workshop ~ May 31, 2006

Sara Hollberg, for Valley Conservation Council, presented the context for the day's session. She covered four topics:

1. Why encourage compact growth?
2. Definitions of terms
3. Principles for livable communities
4. Role of roads in designing for density

1. Why encourage compact growth?

Growth trends show that the Valley region is growing in a sprawl pattern, with the land consumption rate more than double the population growth rate (VCC State of the Valley Report). Population projections call for more than 19,000 more dwelling units to be needed by 2010.

Nationwide, there will be 94 more million people in the U.S. by 2030 (Urban Land Institute). Of land used since 1994 for new housing, 80% is outside urban areas, 94% is in lots of 1 acre or larger, and 57% is in lots of 10 acres or more ((Rural Smart Growth).

Many of these people are likely to come to the Shenandoah Valley. Population projections quickly can be overridden by the scale of development proposals being fielded in all types of communities in the region (counties, cities, and towns). The scope is much bigger than in the past. Localities need to be ready for these big, community-changing projects.

What will new growth look like? Will we like the results? Can we afford the results?

She showed a graphic of a sprawling development pattern and compared it to one that shows the same population accommodated in a more compact pattern. The important principle is that in the second image, "there is still a countryside."

What is sprawl? (Defined by its features - slides to illustrate)

- Excessive consumption of land
- Separation of uses
- Car orientation
- Lack of semi-public realm

A Better Option? Compact Development:

To protect the rural areas and not spread out in an unsustainable way, you would obviously have to densify where you do develop. But can you make this compact growth functional and attractive and livable, rather than just dense? Communities all over face the same dilemma and concepts have sprung up to address the problems of sprawl.

2. Definition of Terms

Smart Growth (Smart Growth America)

Smart growth is development that helps achieve these 6 goals:

1. Neighborhood Vitality – safe, convenient, attractive, and affordable
2. Better Access, Less Traffic – put jobs, homes, and destinations close together; make driving a choice rather than a necessity
3. Thriving Cities, Suburbs, and Towns – puts the needs of existing communities first
4. Shared Benefits – enable all residents to benefit (not leave people behind)
5. Lower Costs, Lower Taxes – efficient infrastructure costs less; for individual households, transportation is second highest household expense
6. Keeping Open Space Open – preserve farmland and protect natural resources (with benefits for water and air quality); bring parks and open space within reach of more people.

PUD (Planned Unit Development) – single ownership. Allows design flexibility. But this lack of design specificity may leave too much to chance and does not necessarily result in a walkable neighborhood.

TND (Traditional Neighborhood Development) - A TND ordinance, like the PUD, usually applies to a single owner and project. It contains clear and well-defined standards of New Urbanism in order to achieve goals like walkability and mixed housing types. (Also called neotraditional development.)

New Urbanism

New Urbanism proposes walkable communities with densely built downtowns and a mix of business and homes in every neighborhood. Proponents believe a coherent physical framework, adapted from traditional urban design, can improve communities and combat sprawl. But to do this requires rewriting development codes.

Principles of New Urbanist Development:

- Neighborhoods should be diverse in use and population.
- Design for the pedestrian and transit as well as the car.
- Physically defined and universally accessible public spaces should shape cities and towns.
- Urban places should reflect local history, ecology, and building practice.

3. Principles for Livable Communities

“We can keep on accepting the kind of communities we get, or we can start creating the kind of communities we want.”

Richard Moe, National Trust for Historic Preservation

People want to live in village or town settings:

- 50% of Americans want village style neighborhoods (vs. 22% conventional suburbs)
 - Yet, less than 1% of new development is styled in this traditional pattern.
- (Rutgers University study quoted in Street Design for Healthy Neighborhoods by Dan Burden)

Features of Livable Communities (slides to illustrate)

- Mixture of housing types (choices)
- Mixture of uses and building types
- Good design
- Connected / Walkable

- Parks and open space
- More than the house
- Lots of destinations

Putting the Pieces Together

- New Development - Geneva, Illinois has exemplary package of large infill mixed use development, accessible open space, and compatible blending of old with new in business strip.
- 'Old Urban' – downtown Staunton neighborhood shows how the intermingling of housing options and compatible business destinations can work well.

4. Role of Roads

“First fix the streets, then the people and businesses will follow.”

Dan Burden, Walkable Communities, Inc.

Street Design

- Conventional street hierarchy vs. connected streets (graphic and examples to illustrate)
- Importance of height to width ratio

Summary

- Design matters as much or more than density.
- Amenities and infrastructure are key to function and attractiveness.
- Streets are fundamental design element.

What's New in the VDOT Subdivision Street Requirements (SSR)
Mark Graham, Albemarle County Director of Community Development
VCC Local Roads Workshop ~ May 31, 2006

Mark Graham, Albemarle County's Director of Community Development, presented his experience as part of the Statewide Committee that revised VDOT's Subdivision Street Requirements (SSR).

(As background, he noted that Albemarle County has designated 5% of its land area growth area and the remaining 95% rural. The county is using what it calls the Neighborhood Model to set a pattern of compact growth in these growth areas and so they are interested in having options for New Urbanist street designs.)

Some of the most important changes in the new SSR:

- the local VDOT Residencies are empowered to make exceptions and decisions
- sidewalks and bikeways not only are allowed but will be maintained
- planting strips and street trees are allowed (but not maintained)
- bump outs (to narrow the street for pedestrians at intersections) are allowed
- one way streets are allowed (which can enable narrower designs)
- traffic calming measures are allowed
- utilities in the street/right of way are now possible

Some of the issues that remain:

- curb radii - he'd prefer them even smaller, for pedestrians
- narrower streets – he'd like to see them even narrower
- special surfaces
- curbs
- clear zones - vs. street lights and trees near the road

Mark Graham led the group through pictures illustrating these issues. His comments:

A small (5 to 10 ft) curb radii, rather than a large (20 to 30 ft) curb radii, can cut in half the amount of time the pedestrian is in the street.

Some types of roads that previously were not considered wide enough are acceptable now under VDOT's new standards. Even so, Graham gave examples of other roads that still may not be considered wide enough but seem to be meeting the neighborhood's needs.

Some common design problems that arise when working with the SSR involve how to fit in all the elements and still have the buildings close enough to the street to establish the special relationship between streets and buildings that New Urbanists want. For example, VDOT does not like street lights or trees close to the road. The general VDOT minimums are 3 feet from road to sidewalk (5 feet wide if add street trees), 5 feet sidewalk, and 3 feet from sidewalk to building. [Robert Hofrichter clarified during the Question and Answer session that the required

building setback has to do with providing a clear zone for pedestrians and having room for VDOT's maintenance. This may be difficult if the building is right on the sidewalk and there is no separation. As described below, maintenance agreements between a locality and VDOT may be a way to work out such special cases.]

Special Paving Materials – If a locality wants a special paving material that may be costly or difficult for VDOT to maintain, it may be possible for the locality to take on the maintenance responsibility.

Building Setback – Likewise, a locality might need to take over maintenance on a sidewalk that has little or no setback from the building.

“There are a lot of particulars with New Urbanism. People are trying to do special things that don't fit neatly into boxes, and that require special consideration. On a lot of these issues there's not clear resolution yet. It depends. Those are hard words for a developer.”

“If something looks outside the norm, bring it to people's attention early so that there's time to resolve the issues.”

Question and Answer Session:

Clarification of VDOT Stance: Garrett Moore, VDOT Staunton District Administrator, responded to Mr. Graham's presentation by saying, “To make a general statement that we don't want [New Urbanist] things is not my understanding.” He went on to say that part of the issue is maintenance, “We want things to look good, but when there's a maintenance trail associated with it, we want to make sure there's enough of a pot of money for it.” He also pointed out that VDOT supports many New Urbanist streetscape features through federal TEA (transportation enhancement) funds.

Graham replied that what he's saying is that some things are currently outside the SSR and are not fully resolved.

Maintenance and Funding: Brad Price added that there are ways to address this funding issue. The developer could put money into a maintenance fund. Any maintenance agreements would be between three parties: between VDOT and the locality and between the locality and the developer (or homeowners association).

Graham agreed, noting that Albemarle, for example, can decide a feature is important enough that the county will pay for the maintenance.

Next Update to the SSR: The VDOT Design Committee will probably reconvene in a few years after enough time has passed to allow issues to crop up for them to address.

New Urbanism: Where are Smaller Streets Taking Us?

Michael Barnes, KG Developers

VCC Local Roads Workshop ~ May 31, 2006

Michael Barnes, whose firm does New Urbanist projects, began the presentation by answering the question he posed in the title to his talk. Where new urbanism is taking us can be summed up with two words: “increased complexity.” He emphasized that these projects are not easy to do for a variety of reasons, including

- the review time is longer (a faster process would be an incentive)
- the market is untested (people fear the density that comes with new urbanism)

In his presentation, Barnes made the following points:

- Individual street design is context driven. The goal of a developer is to create a pedestrian friendly street with active street life whose impact is reduced for its residents with trees and other buffers (i.e., high ADT streets with lower impacts).
- Spatial enclosure is an important design feature to keep in mind when designing a street that will feel friendly to pedestrians. A 3:1 ratio of the width of the street to the building height is preferred, or a 2:1 ratio between the street width and the street trees. Achieving these spatial enclosure ratios can be difficult if the street width must be wide, and that width is expanded by a utility right of way, a VDOT right of way, a large sidewalk, and a building setback.
- One of the most important things with new urbanist streets is the details. Why isn't everyone doing this? In part, the answer is that it's difficult.
- It's difficult to fit in all the infrastructure in a small space.
- Also, lot of times, localities are not set up for these designs. Regulations are written to prevent worst case scenarios, such as zoning that prevents multiple uses.
- “We definitely think there's a market out there for new urbanism—that's why we're doing it. We're trying to capture that niche market. But there are still a lot of people who want their home on a cul de sac or their farmette. We're battling 50 years of marketing here.”
- A new urbanist street costs more than a conventional rural road, but that difference is not very large when compared to a conventional city street.
- Developers think of lots as road frontage rather than acreage.
- Because the infrastructure costs are higher and need to be put in up front, new urbanist designs are riskier for the developer. Density doesn't always equate to more money for the developer, especially given higher infrastructure costs, and lengthy review processes.
- New Urbanism is NOT ecofriendly on a site level. It's ecofriendly on a regional scale because it's concentrating the footprint of development, but within the site bounds, the intensity of the development does not make it ecofriendly.

Advice to localities

To facilitate new urbanist designs, localities need to:

- Write a liberal PUD (Planned Unit Development) ordinance
- Have a mechanism to waive other sections of their ordinance if they get in the way with new urbanist designs

- Designate a staff member as a “Development Czar,” someone who works to iron out issues with VDOT, utilities, and also within the locality so that developers can get answers
- ‘Incentivize’ these projects and have flexibility in their ordinances (such as reduced setbacks)

Advice to VDOT:

- Balance the car environment vs. the pedestrian environment
- Address utility / right of way conflicts, including cable (that push buildings back from the street)

Cost and Market Acceptance for New Urbanism

We don’t know what the market is for compact new urbanist projects versus projects that have more yard and are of a suburban style. We do know people want cul de sacs and farmettes.

Cost comparison:

New urbanist projects are riskier for the developer. Infrastructure costs are higher (than for rural section developments) and the infrastructure must be done first. But there are more lots in the new urbanist design so the net profit can be more. (How long the approval process takes, however, can change the cost effectiveness.)

In his sample cost comparison, a New Urbanist street (with curb and gutter, storm sewer, sidewalks, and street trees) cost \$1.6 million versus \$364,000 for a conventional street with none of these features, but netted a greater potential profit.

Question and Answer Session:

Q: How many cars per household do you plan for?

A: 2.5 per household (Overflow parking was brought up.)

Q: Do their designs include two-over-two units?

A: No, but Ryan Homes is trying them in Hollymead.

Q: How do you reorient people’s desire for this market?

A: Semi-public open space is very attractive. A certain percentage of the development community sees a market for these projects.

Q: How much does KG Associates actually build?

A: They do the concept and the entitling and then sell the lots or partner with builders.

Q: What’s the population of the Albemarle area?

A: About 90,000 in the county and 40,000 in Charlottesville, and adding about 2,000 people per year.

KG Associates has two new urbanist developments in the works. Cascadia (300 dwelling units and 20,000 square feet of mixed use on 61 acres) and Rivanna Village (near Zions Crossroads).

Integrating Bikes and Pedestrians in Road Design
David Patton, VDOT Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator

David Patton serves on VDOT's Implementation Team for the Policy on Integration of Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations. This team is addressing how the agency will carry out the policy adopted in 2004 by the Commonwealth Transportation Board that bicycles and pedestrians must be considered in transportation design. With this policy, VDOT recognizes that bicycling and walking are fundamental travel modes. Patton explained that VDOT is working on "building in from the beginning that streets are not complete unless they accommodate all the users of the street."

Some of the challenges include that VDOT is doing less and less new construction and more maintenance, so only considering bike/pedestrian concerns in new construction is not enough. Another challenge is that VDOT doesn't have a trained cadre of engineers statewide who are really good at designing for bikes and pedestrians yet. They are working to create that expertise in-house.

VDOT created an Implementation Team for the new policy on bikes and pedestrians in the later fall of 2005. This team is trying to take some of the guesswork out of what it will look like to accommodate bikes and pedestrians. They are working on creating a range of accommodations that make Virginia's roads suitable to pedestrian and bike traffic. The goal is to get to 'Best Practices' and disseminate them.

Incorporating bike/ped into VDOT procedures is an important element of the new program. They are amplifying existing documentation to capture new multi-modal concerns. The LD-430 form is being updated to add details for bike/ped. There also will be a new scoping form for maintenance (AM-30) to cover bike/ped issues, for instance when mowing or repaving takes place. Because there is no additional funding, it's necessary to balance priorities. Localities and MPOs must come up with priorities. This includes clarifying when exceptions are warranted. Now that we're opening our arms to bike/ped, we need a process for when localities may NOT want them.

One important component of VDOT's bike/pedestrian accommodation program will be to use local bike/pedestrian plans as a resource to direct and determine where localities desire accommodations. "It's in the planning documents that the local folks figure out where land use meets up with transportation infrastructure." Another recent policy change has been revisions to the Industrial Access Program that removed the prohibition of funding sidewalks in specific types of industrial areas.

One of the goals that the bike/ped program has is to develop performance measures to monitor the impact of the new bike/pedestrian policy (on par with the "dashboard" website VDOT has now to let the public monitor timeliness and cost of road projects statewide). He identified some complex issues that still need addressing:

- Developing Criteria and performance measures
- Asking CTB to direct discretionary funds to be available for bike/ped
- Determining how maintenance funds will be used for bike/ped

Full Panel Question and Answer Session:

Q: What about neotraditional and LID (Low Impact Development) vs. curb and gutter?

Hofrichter: We did discuss this when doing the SSR. We have no idea what the solution is. We tried to do the regulations so they could accommodate either approach.

Graham: We struggled with this. Albemarle's underlying soil is clay so LID doesn't work where we are.

Barnes: In urban development it's very difficult to do LID. You could do it in parking lots, although there would still be the problem of overflow. The two are incompatible with the density of a highly designed streetscape. On the other hand, Albemarle is saying they will only develop 5% of its land area and LID can work in the rural settings.

Q: What about Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)?

Graham: Albemarle has already so limited the amount of rural development [that there's not much likelihood of using it there]. The rural rights are too expensive and in the growth areas, the developers are not even approaching the density currently offered. We are asking them to build more densely than they are.

Q: Affordable housing?

Graham: This is a serious issue. In Albemarle, they are actually producing more of the product, like townhouses, four-plexes, and apartments, but are not seeing ANY affordable single-family detached being built. The goal is that 15% of housing stock be affordable.

Barnes: They plan for 5% in townhouses and condos; 5% secondary units, and 5% rented townhouse/condos (rent control for 5 years). The non-affordable units end up subsidizing the affordable units, at about \$9,000 per home.

Q: How do you maintain a landscaped median?

A: VDOT would require a bond but no bond would be needed if the locality maintains it.

Q: Street trees and maintenance?

A: Eventually the county may have to take over and budget for maintenance.

Q: Roundabouts?

A: VDOT allows landscaping in roundabouts but nothing can be visually obstructive.

Graham: We've done them. It's very important to do public relations beforehand. Many people are not used to them.

Q: Small towns?

Barnes: We're working in Stanardsville, which plans to grow the town. But infrastructure issues (water and sewer) will probably kill it. Towns need to get their ducks in a row, so developers can come in. There is no reason why cities and towns can't do these projects.

Break- Out Group - Counties

Attending: Augusta (Becky Earhart), Bath (Miranda Redinger), Frederick (Susan Eddy and others), Page (Brian Henshaw), Shenandoah (Chris Boies and Rob Kinsley), Rockingham (Rhonda Henderson and Diana Cobb-Stultz); also guest speaker Mark Graham of Albemarle County, Tom Cristoffel of the Northern Shenandoah Valley Regional Commission, and Brad Price of VDOT. Sara Hollberg facilitated.

Q1: What's the status of compact development in your community? Share experiences with this type of development, good or bad.

All raised their hands to the question: Is your community interested in this type of development?

Frederick: Frederick has had a PUD ordinance for many years, but it is not used. At the same time, general development is pushing the density higher. The county is working on their Urban Development Area (UDA) study for at least another 6 months and then hope to address an ordinance. Their UDA study includes the concept of 'neighborhood centers' at the nodes. The intent is to provide a smaller priority area for which to determine ordinance language rather than the whole area. These Neighborhood Centers might be TND, mixed use.

Shenandoah: No examples and no ordinance. They try to steer growth towards the public service areas, which generally are the towns (5 of the 6 towns have water and sewer).

Augusta: The County has had a PUD ordinance since 1970s. A few have been built, but they have been very slow to develop and so the public perception is that they are not the best. Developers are asking for them and the PUD section says they can write their own ordinance. But staff is reluctant to accept them and discourages them. It takes much longer to do a PUD and standard development is easier (for example, rezoning takes only 6 weeks). There are three PUDs in the works now, including a 1,600-unit Master Planned Community for active adults.

Rockingham: The county has had PUDs since the early 1970s, but none of them developed in a compact manner. Some have cluster and open space, but the overall density per gross acre is still low.

An upcoming New Urbanist example has been approved - Preston Lakes at the corner of Route 33 and Massanetta Springs. Groundbreaking will be in fall 2006 with the commercial area to follow in 2008. It will be compact mixed use with open space, providing about 400-500 dwelling units and a commercial area on 150 acres. The retail and professional center will have residential in the upper stories. The developer has proffered architectural styles and landscaping. The project has good linkages. In fact the owner of the adjoining property (which is not yet developed) will help build the road. The developer is the Hine Group (Rich Hine is from Long Island but likes this area so much he moved here.) The community is showing it's ready. Sales have gone so briskly on the 46 upper-story residential flats that there's a waiting list and they are proposing to add an additional 40 such units. These one-bedroom units sell for \$149,000.

Page: There is interest in density, but also fear of it. What is allowed? What if we get the wrong type of development? How much density is too much? Currently, the county has no provisions

for PUDs or TNDs in the ordinance. The goal has been to direct growth to towns. There needs to be education on the topic.

Bath: Bacova is an old example and people love it. It's nice to have an example to look at. The Homestead Preserve will be doing some development in downtown Hot Springs, including residential units over shops. Their R5 zoning allows cluster, but with lots of oversight.

Q2: What are the road design issues (and other issues) with compact development particular to Counties/Cities/Towns?

Emergency Vehicles - making sure roads are not too narrow to provide access; on-street parking vs. emergency vehicle. This was a problem in Frederick County where a road was built too narrow. It was suggested that maybe we don't need to plan for the largest emergency vehicle (why send hook and ladder to a two-story building?). Mark Graham noted that some of these problems are not as hard to overcome as they initially seem. For example, emergency services may be stating their radius requirement based on not crossing the center line. If it's understood that in an emergency, the truck can cross the line, the radius may no longer be a problem.

Consensus: Don't forget to include Fire and Rescue in the review process.

VDOT - Making contact with VDOT representatives early is a good idea. Frederick realizes they should have checked with emergency services earlier. Brad Price explained that VDOT is not going to be against a proposal. They do need to know that the locality itself has reviewed it and is in favor of the proposal. If they can, then VDOT staff will approve the project.

Other issues:

- Utility Locations – Mark Graham advises addressing these beforehand.
- Sidewalk and bicycle design – incorporating these into layouts requiring VDOT approval.
- Neotraditional standards
- Maintenance issues and funding (including sidewalk maintenance versus road maintenance)

Q3: Who needs to do what in order for compact development to happen?

Education:

People need to see it (livable density). Need local examples from the Valley. Citizen and public will in favor of this type of development is needed. Citizen opposition can squash a good project so without major education of citizens, compact development won't take hold.

Policies:

Rural zoning (Compact development vs. Countryside)

Albemarle experience: Mark Graham noted that Albemarle probably would not have its compact development if it had not greatly reduced rural development opportunities. For years, the growth areas were developing at a fairly low density. But when the board was faced with either expanding the boundaries or somehow building more densely, they kept the boundaries the same.

The citizens just showed such a strong desire to protect the rural areas. The county currently is doing master planning for their growth areas.

Complexity – It is so hard to work through the details of an ordinance, and then the enforcement is another level. Graham said he'd heard about a locality that enforces only a short list of elements and the development 'self enforces' the rest.

Ordinances. - Where are there examples?

- Albemarle County's Neighborhood Model ordinance is downloadable from Albemarle.org (Volume 2 was adopted by Board of Supervisors and made part of the Comp Plan; the rest is supporting documentation.)
- Model ordinances. Sara pointed out that a recent PAS Report Codifying New Urbanism discusses several strategies including parallel codes, where conventional remains an option alongside a new urbanist code, and Form-Based codes, especially for commercial areas.

Developers

- Developers from the outside seem to be the ones doing New Urbanism. They have the expertise and the backing.
- Developers need to be able to make money and also demonstrate that they can build projects that aren't ugly.

Ideas for future efforts:

- Educating the public, officials, and staff. Future workshops might address educating the elected officials on compact development.
- Finding out what is needed (as an ordinance) from the developer's point of view.

Break-out Group: Cities

Attending: Jim Deskins, Winchester Economic Development; Jerry Van Leer, VDOT; John Eckman, VCC, 3 other VDOT employees.

The city breakout group consisted of VDOT employees, one city economic development director and the VCC facilitator. The lack of city representatives limited the groups discussion to more general topics.

The group felt that since cities tend to set their own rules, the relationship with VDOT was not as much a factor in creating flexibility for design innovation. However, at the same time, cities are in the best position and have the most to gain by adopting new urbanist style development.

Discussion focused on broader regional concerns and raised further questions about how to entice new urbanist developers into the area and how to create strong demand for this style of development with the public.

Break-Out Group: Towns

What's the status of compact development in your community?

The consensus in the group was that planners want compact development, but three of the main obstacles to compact development are the ease of conventional by-right subdivisions, the uncertainty and time required for a new urbanist-style development, and residents' concern over apartments and the effect of mixing housing types on home values and town character.

The current situation in the towns:

- Increasing growth pressures from Northern Virginia
- Conflict between locals and come-heres
- Affordable housing problem
- Housing prices increasing fast
- Heavy demands on current infrastructure
- Wages are not going up to match the increases in land values

Brent Manuel mentioned that the way he sees that compact development could have success is to create incentives for the developers to make it attractive enough to overcome the barriers being discussed. The primary incentive he sees is a density incentive. Another key component is educating townspeople about compact development.

There is a big difference between the towns that control water and sewer, and those that do not. The people who control water and sewer control building. There is also a split between which towns take care of their own streets—a town has to be over 3500 people to control its streets (instead of VDOT).

The Town of Woodstock mentioned that it tries to have the Right of Way to continue a cul de sac if the parcel next door gets developed. The incentive for getting this right of way is to decrease the amount of road frontage each lot at the end of the cul de sac needs.

One town mentioned that it has a situation where apartments are in close proximity to single family homes, and those home owners are having a hard time selling their homes. Part of this is due to apartments typically being seen as housing transitional and migrant populations. There is a lot of resistance to putting this type of housing in the center of the town and potentially changing the character of the town.

Discussion about the economic forces increasing the cost of living in the towns in the northern part of the Valley led to the speculation that as housing becomes less affordable, people will want to see a greater mixture of housing types so that their kids can stay in the area. In some towns right now, accessory building units are not allowed that are occupied by anyone outside the owner's family.

The cost of all the demands on the infrastructure is getting built into the cost of a lot. The connection fee to the town water and sewer is \$15,000 in Woodstock compared to \$2,000 in Harrisonburg. Another issue for towns is that it can be difficult to cooperate with the surrounding county, especially on planning issues.