

## **South Frederick Corridors Plan – FCPC Workshop 08-17-2022**

### **Notes from Discussion Group BLUE (Basement 30NM): Denis facilitating**

Participants present: Carole Sepe, Joel Rensberger, Noel Manalo, Alyse Cohen, Eric Soter, Kelly Russell, Andrew Banasik, Mike Workosky, Danielle Adams, Mark Long, Ashley Moore (portion of discussion), and 1 unidentified male.

#### **General**

- The plan should not seek to achieve every plan goal on each individual parcel, but by achieving things on a neighborhood or subdistrict level; this approach eases the burden on developers, regulators, and the Planning Commission, and allows more of the regulatory oversight to occur at an administrative level
- Some elements of the plan – both on a regulatory and policy level – should have built-in review/update schedules to maintain flexibility as conditions change; this is particularly useful for achieving subdistrict residential allocation goals over time
- The existing vast areas of surface parking provide the foundation for injecting residential uses into the SFC while accomplishing multiple goals stated in the plan including: achieving a mix of res/non-res uses, making better use of currently impervious surfaces (potential to turn rooftops into more sustainable assets for renewable energy production, stormwater abatement, diminishment of heat-island effect), and introducing a 24-hour presence in the neighborhoods to increase security, expand commercial/retail opportunities, and increase the chances of weaving together a more robust environment for daily living
- Creating regulatory certainty will in itself serve as an incentive to develop in the SFC
- There is likely more development/redevelopment interest in the SFC than is openly shared by landowners, investors, and outside development interests; users definitely want to move forward with plans
- Lack of school capacity for development in the SFC is the primary hurdle to redevelopment that incorporates residential uses; County must use its resources to fund school construction at HS and ES level
- Keep document short ...75 pages is great; no need to repeat material presented in other documents, with the exception of short targeted references at the head of each chapter that communicate consistency with goals of LFMP

#### **Boundaries**

- Consensus that overall boundary of planning area is sound, and that overall expansion of planning area was a good choice (compared to smaller 355/85 vicinity which had been the working concept in previous years)
- Some discussion of how boundaries of sectors and subdistricts are determined,
- Consensus that boundaries of sectors and subdistricts make sense, and that these delineations will serve the plan well in terms of regulatory frameworks, apportionment of impacts, establishment of various triggers and thresholds, as well as ongoing plan maintenance and course corrections that can be applied to sub-areas rather than to the entire planning area when appropriate

## **Residential Uses**

- Need residential uses in the SFC that will serve as a catalyst to other redevelopment activity (both res and non-res)
- Consider fuzzier residential allocations at the subdistrict level...perhaps +/- 10%?
- The pursuit of affordable housing is an economic development strategy
- Agreement that Implementation item A5 (modest sized dwelling units) is a sound idea; also, APF mitigation should be calculated on a per square foot basis so that smaller units (which can also be more affordable) will bear something closer to their fair share of impacts on infrastructure
- Allow increases in MPDU units in a project (with lessened/limited impact fees) as an incentive to create more units in the SFC
- Decrease parking requirements for MPDU/affordable units since these households own few vehicles

## **APF**

- Consensus that 'baked-in' APFO approvals will lead to quicker approvals, regulatory certainty, and investor/lender confidence
- Consider review of any pre-approved APF limits every two years or at some other regular interval to allow for an evolving landscape and changing needs/economic conditions

## **Environmental**

- Questions as to the impact of the Zone of Dewatering Influence (both quarries, but with an emphasis on Martin-Marietta); how does this impact the potential for construction/development activity and how might we avoid problems by studying the existing MDE data/mapping; group requested link to MDE mapping resources for ZDI
- Climate-related regulatory changes disincentivize redevelopment; some developers are engaged in a race to complete projects prior to the adoption of new regulations targeting environmental quality and sustainability goals
- Consensus that regional SWM facilities (quantity) are a good idea in this urbanized environment

## **Infrastructure**

- Consider the forward-funding of key infrastructure projects, particularly those projects which serve multiple sites; definitely seek to forward fund projects that serve as links between redevelopment efforts (eg., sidewalk/street segments, parks/trails, water/sewer lines)
- Work with SHA to pre-establish protocols for access onto MD 355 and MD 85, or key segments thereof
- Catalyzing Projects (County) may include: MD 355 reconstruction, Shockley Drive overpass, w/s line upgrades, SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION!
- Consider HS campus as a potential magnet school site for bio-tech, manufacturing, trade skills, etc. to take advantage of proximity to industrial core
- Establish a Transportation Demand Management framework for the SFC
- Right-size parking requirements
- Roads/streets/alleys network – be less prescriptive, but create performance criteria so that network is enhanced

## Regulatory

- Avoid hard percentage limits/floors for mixed uses within a project, particularly in vertical MX
- Use the idea of 'Compensating Features' (I prefer the term 'Compensating Elements') as a way of providing multiple paths to regulatory compliance; in some sense, this has been done with 'points systems' as utilized in performance zoning; an example might be to allow for the inclusion of *additional* MPDUs or MSDUs in exchange for permitting a project to proceed with out – or with limited - non-residential uses as part of its mix; in general the notion of Compensating Elements allows codes to be more nimble on any given project while still advancing the goals of the plan in some way
- Compensating Elements can be presented in tabular/matrix form to create ease of use by both regulators and developers; this was referred to throughout our discussion as the 'Menu' approach
- Consider FAR as a metric in the SFC
- Consider fast-tracking as an incentive; think in terms of current economic development processes in order to spur the types of development that will help to achieve the vision for this planning area; but, residential projects are difficult to fast-track
- Perhaps fast-track proposals for vertical MX to provide more of an enticement to this type of development
- Consider proximity of a proposed project to certain amenities/infrastructure as a key factor in offering any kind of fast-tracking

## Costs/Funding

- Utilize the CDA/TIF devices to provide timely and adequate infrastructure; this takes advantage of government bonding authority and cheaper money
- Use forward-funding approach to support affordable housing in SFC

## Mixed Use

- Consider minimum requirement for all reasonably appropriate uses including residential, commercial/employment, and institutional, but later discussion focused on the need to remain flexible for any single project....in other words, perhaps a mix of uses (vertical) should not be a requirement in many areas covered by the plan given that there is an abundance of existing non-residential activity in the SFC right now
- Difficult for landowners to develop some sites if there are hard percentage limits (or minimum inclusionary percentages) for certain uses; lenders/investors may balk at some elements of a mixed use development if revenue is delayed to later years in the life of a project; a typical example is that non-res uses may take longer to lease/sell within the context of a predominantly residential project
- Prefer softer edged approach to accomplishing vertical mixed use (ranges?), or an acknowledgement that in some cases a horizontal model that otherwise abides by form-based codes may provide the best opportunity to accomplish the vision of mixed use neighborhoods

- Consensus that having non-residential uses already established PRIOR to residential development will make it easier for developers to manage NIMBY sentiment
- When regulating for vertical MX, allow discounting of non-res uses in some circumstances
- 

#### **Vision**

- Need density and intensity to make the plan work
- Most development should occur in municipalities, but City of Frederick understands the importance of developing this growth area and urges the county to act conservatively when making decisions regarding elements of the plan that may negatively impact the City (viewsheds, competing economic activities, transportation network changes); avoid cannibalization of City economic development
- What can the County provide that the City cannot (or will not)? What can the City provide that the County cannot (or will not)? Seek coordination and build upon the strengths of each jurisdiction

#### **NPS-Monocacy**

Study the park's visual resources management plan and avoid conflicts with critical park viewsheds; view to the west/northwest (from Worthington House) is the most critical viewshed