

**Integrated Land Use and Transportation --
Observations for Coastal Sussex County,
Delaware**

Final Report

Prepared by

**Whit Blanton, AICP
Vice President
Renaissance Planning Group
Orlando, FL**

Prepared for

**The Greater Lewes Foundation
And
University of Delaware Sea Grant College Program**

May 2002

The recommendations included in this report represent the professional opinions and observations of Whit Blanton of Renaissance Planning Group, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Greater Lewes Foundation, the University of Delaware Sea Grant College Program or other entities that sponsored the March 13th seminar on Sustainable, Integrate Land-Use and Transportation Planning in Coastal Sussex County.

Integrating Land Use and Transportation – Observations for Coastal Sussex County, Delaware

FINAL REPORT

Introduction

Coastal Sussex County is an area rich in history, tightly linked with the sea and its related natural and recreational features. The character of the coastal towns of Lewes, Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach and their historic, natural setting attracts hundreds of thousands of people annually. However, the area's popularity and attractive climate threaten to harm the unique character and quality of life of these coastal communities through rapid development and increasing levels of traffic congestion. What once was a tolerable seasonal problem has consistently begun to occur for multiple months outside of traditional summer peak season.

Compounding the problem is a growing sense among many residents that growth within the State Route 1 corridor is uncontrolled, haphazard and lacking in the quality necessary to sustain and preserve the very attributes that make coastal Sussex such a desirable place. The transportation responses to these growth pressures have suffered from a lack of integration with land use plans, which creates a disconnected set of strategies that can limit their effectiveness and increase costs.

To help address this issue, the Greater Lewes Foundation invited Whit Blanton, a consultant with Renaissance Planning Group in Orlando, Florida, and chairman of the American Planning Association's Transportation Planning Division, to speak to the community about managing these land use and transportation challenges.

The context of this process is a project undertaken by the Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT) called the SR 1 Land Use and Transportation Study, and an update of the Sussex County Comprehensive Plan. As a result of multiple local concerns regarding growth, development and transportation, the Greater Lewes Foundation engaged Mr. Blanton to participate in a public process to evaluate the situation and provide a brief report of observations and suggested approaches. The collaboration between the consultant, the Greater Lewes Foundation and the University of Delaware Sea Grant Program spanned several weeks in early 2002. The culmination of this collaborative effort was a seminar and public forum on land use and transportation issues in Coastal Sussex County held March 13th, with a report documenting this process and observations as the final product.

This report summarizes those activities, provides observations of the situation, and presents recommendations for consideration based on a review of materials and discussions with local residents and various agency and elected officials. The recommendations included in this report represent the professional opinions and observations of Whit Blanton of Renaissance Planning Group, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Greater Lewes Foundation, the University of Delaware Sea Grant Program or other entities that sponsored the March 13th seminar on Sustainable, Integrate Land-Use and Transportation Planning in Coastal Sussex County.

Overview

There is a clear sense of frustration among residents of the coastal Sussex area regarding the seeming intransigence of government agencies to cooperatively address the issues. The inability to get all parties on the same page and have a clear sense of strategies has generated a growing crisis in intergovernmental relations fueled by mistrust and skepticism on the part of citizens.

It is not too late to change the direction things appear to be heading. A large portion of coastal Sussex County remains undeveloped or in agricultural uses, and with careful and cooperative planning, steps can be taken to ensure that future development provides a positive influence on community character and preservation of important natural and man-made resources. A complementary set of strategies is needed to address mounting transportation and land development problems. Those strategies relate not only to physical measures such as tighter land use policies or investments in transportation facilities and services, but also to the institutional framework and process for land use and transportation decision-making.

"Today Lewes is a town of twenty-five hundred, though the population swells in summer. It has been spared the development that mars so much of this coast thanks in part to the clouds of mosquitoes that once bred on marshes and ponds, and to the presence of two strong-smelling fish-fertilizer plants on its bay shore, which perfume the streets.... Our main thoroughfare, Savannah Road, got its name from the flat farmland over which it traveled. Some of this land remains, and roadside stands piled high with sweet white corn and cantaloupes still populate the county highways in summer. But with the death of the fish factories in the late 1960s, Lewes has grown into nearby Wolfe Neck, Gills Neck and Holland Glade, slapping down over forest and farmfield subdivisions with names that memorialize what has been razed."

Jennifer Ackerman, "Notes from the Shore," Viking Penguin Books, 1995.

Issues and Challenges

Physical/Infrastructure

- The outskirts of the historic towns of Lewes and Rehoboth Beach have developed over the past few years into a chaotic mix of agriculture, industry, retail stores and residential land out of context with its surroundings. Piecemeal, suburban development is resulting in poor accessibility to commercial sites along SR 1, which contributes to overall mobility problems throughout the area.
- Natural waterways and a fragile environment are threatened by stormwater runoff, air pollution and shoreline development spurred by a growing population and high land values.

- The mix of tourist traffic and local traffic compounds many of the limitations in the capacity of the transportation infrastructure. Two-lane roads that once meandered through rural areas are now strained by carrying suburban dwellers, summer vacationers and through travelers coming off the Cape May-Lewes Ferry. These differences in travel needs should be addressed through a set of strategies that recognize the needs of different travel markets ranging from signage and mobility improvements to land use and urban design regulations.
- The area suffers from an extreme lack of connectivity outside of the traditional town centers. A few roads designed for access to and from rural areas are now lined with suburban residents living in cul-de-sacs. This means most short vehicle trips are forced out onto the main road network because of single entrance subdivisions and poor access between adjacent land uses.

Institutional Issues

- The County as a whole suffers from a lack of fiscal equity. Much of coastal Sussex is a reasonably affluent part of the region. However, with low taxes and little non-agricultural industry in Sussex County, the commercial development in the coastal area is a major generator of revenue to help pay for various countywide public facilities and services, including those in the much larger, but more rural, western part of the county. In addition, workers from central and western Sussex fill the service-sector jobs supporting tourism and an increasing population in coastal Sussex County – adding to the daily mix of traffic in and out of the coastal area.
- There is a fundamental disconnect in land use and transportation responsibilities. DelDOT is responsible for transportation mobility and access, and Sussex County is responsible for land use decisions. Although they are jointly working on the SR 1 Study, their operating structures are not well coordinated. The towns and coastal citizens feel helpless as the two agencies defer to each other's primary responsibility. This reactive stance is not sustainable.
- The county controls very few roads, most of which fall under DelDOT's maintenance responsibility. Lacking a shared financial stake in transportation responsibilities, the county feels only indirectly the traffic-generating consequences of land use decisions.

The agencies have a limited tool set – incentives, disincentives and other strategies to influence quality development, preserve open space and encourage non-auto travel choices. Lacking a system of development impact fees, an adequate facilities ordinance, strategic land use policies or consistent design standards, there is little that local governments can do to affect desired pattern and character of development.

Conversations with Local Residents and Agency Staff

Over the two days in March, there were numerous opportunities to talk with local citizens, elected officials and staff regarding transportation and land use issues in the area. These conversations occurred during and after a field review on March 12th with various agency staff and the mayor of Rehoboth, and during mealtimes with citizens and other local elected officials. The discussions were varied and wide-ranging, but generally conformed to the subject of land use and transportation.

From those conversations, it is evident that a disconnect exists within the planning process. Residents are frustrated with the rapid pace of growth, an apparent lack of quality in development or presence of sufficient standards, and with a lack of a coordinated response from state and local agencies. Accountability for land use and transportation among the different levels of government (state, county, towns) is lacking, resulting in lack of confidence and trust that decisions are being made with the broader interest in mind. At the same time, they recognize that large tracts of available land exist both in town near Lewes, and further west in the Route 1 corridor and beyond, which threaten to worsen the current situation.

Lewes and Rehoboth citizens express concern about declining quality of life, deterioration of the inland waterways and a quickening pace of commercial activities in and around the historic coastal area. Land values are already very high in the area, driving up costs and encouraging growth farther out where land is cheaper beyond the core built-up area.

Although some residents begrudge the swelling population and traffic congestion in the season, it is generally an accepted part of living in the community, and people plan for it accordingly. However, the area has grown increasingly popular due to recent media attention, and the season has extended its stay in the community from a traditional 3-4 month period into eight months or more by many accounts. Combined with the rapid pace of commercial development and new housing subdivisions, the conflicts are becoming more pronounced and any resolution seemingly more difficult to attain.

A coalition of coastal area municipal governments has tried, with limited success, to urge Sussex County to take different approaches to land use and transportation planning in the Coast Sussex County region. A principal focus has been on land use and zoning controls, as well as the development review and approval process. The coastal residents believe there is a lack of coordination between DelDOT and Sussex County to effectively link land use and transportation in ways that would preserve community character and mobility. There is confusion about the current development review process, and it is not transparent how decisions are reached. Residents and some staff would like to see Sussex County divided into different development districts, with different guidelines, requirements and standards to reflect local issues and needs. Most importantly, at these informal meetings, the residents and elected officials tended to favor a more visible development review process that linked land use decisions to specific transportation system criteria, including adequate peak hour capacity, livable community design features, provision of facilities and amenities to support non-auto travel and increased safety.

Charrette Outcomes

The afternoon charrette activities entailed a Nominal Group Technique exercise to identify priority issues from participants using small breakout groups. The groups were organized into different areas of interest, including DelDOT representatives, Coastal Sussex citizens and officials, Inland Sussex County representatives, non-DelDOT state agency representatives, economic development interests and environmental interests.

Participants responded to the question "What is needed for the area to preserve its unique character and ensure good mobility and accessibility into the future?" with a list of more than 200 ideas and suggestions, which were about evenly divided between physical and institutional or policy responses. The groups ranked and prioritized the ideas using the Nominal Group Technique so that each group narrowed its list of 20-25 responses to five or 10 consensus responses. A summary of this exercise is attached for reference. Each of the groups then presented their priority issues and marked up maps to geographically reference the responses to the extent feasible.

A review of the outcomes of the exercise reveals some common threads, even among groups that tend to have different perspectives. Common priority issues included:

- Protect water supplies and ensure water quality;
- Coordinate the land use/transportation approval process to measure cumulative development impacts on facilities, services and resources;
- Improve operations of Route 1 using service/frontage roads to separate local traffic from through traffic;
- Divert seasonal traffic to existing or new reliever route(s), and
- Expand travel choices to include buses, bicycles, walking and rail.

Evaluation measures for the Land Use-Transportation Study may be developed from the Nominal Group Technique exercise. Such measures should be used in the evaluation of alternative development scenarios and incorporated into a continuous monitoring program for the Route 1 study area and Coastal Sussex County. Candidate measures may include:

- Percent of farmland and open space preserved;
- Percent of new development occurring as mixed-use;
- Water quality measures of key locations;
- Multi-modal level of service within sub-areas or districts (measures the perceived comfort, convenience and safety for non-auto modes);
- Accessibility of commercial districts via walking, bicycling and transit;
- Street connectivity index for centers of sub-areas or districts;
- Percent of roadway segments operating below acceptable level, and
- Vehicle hours of delay / Vehicle miles of travel in congested conditions.

Transportation – Land Use Scenarios

DelDOT is in the process of a Land Use and Transportation Study for the Route 1 area. The work entails developing and evaluating alternative land use scenarios. Those scenarios examine pending and future development in the study area within the context of the impact on transportation conditions and air quality. The development of the scenarios is a critical step in achieving a clear vision for growth and development, a priority issue among charrette participants.

To effectively employ land use scenarios in a regional study, the concepts for each should be clearly defined as to their desired objective(s) and aggressively applied so the tests are meaningful. It is not the time for incremental approaches; testing “what if” strategies requires a strong distinction between alternative courses of action so that outcomes are clear. Scenarios are meant to explore policy alternatives and their impacts, and therefore, need to illustrate possible outcomes. By not being aggressive enough with the scenarios, whether due to political/public considerations or lack of data, there is a strong risk that the results among each alternative may not be very indicative or help point toward a clear result. The public should help shape the conceptual scenarios, but refinement of the scenarios should be conducted as part of the initial evaluation of results.

Land use alternatives should be developed with a supporting transportation plan for each. Even though it can be difficult to separate out the impacts of land use changes or the transportation system improvements, transportation access sets such a strong foundation for land use decisions that the two elements need to be considered jointly in developing scenarios. Potential alternatives for the Route 1 area include a nodal development pattern (activity center based), a radial development pattern (corridor based), and continued western area development. The first two options could focus on in-fill development opportunities, including the development of centers, or nodes of compact, mixed-use development in appropriate locations. Those centers imply a certain level of transportation access, and should be located accordingly, or new transportation access points defined in the alternative.

In developing the scenarios, a useful part of the process begins with defining and classifying community elements – the buildings, open space, streets and parking that create urban form. Neighborhoods and commercial areas should be defined through use of aerial photographs, physical or natural boundaries and access. They can be grouped into urban, suburban and rural categories and their typical form photographed and mapped for illustration of land use and transportation planning concepts. Within each neighborhood or commercial area (e.g., development district) centers or logical focal points should be defined within each. Such centers could be parks, schools or civic uses, or they could be commercial in nature. They serve as the hub or gathering point for the land use area. The center should generally be about ¼ mile in diameter – the distance for most people to walk comfortably.

The public should be involved in the development of the alternatives by helping evaluate and critique existing community elements in Coastal Sussex County. Workshop participants would comment on various types of elements that currently exist, such as urban center (e.g., downtown

Lewes) suburban residential, suburban strip commercial, big box retail or rural village, using aerial photos and design illustrations (typical street section, building-to-building relationships and open space locations). Those evaluations, including aspects that are desirable and those that are undesirable, can be used to develop “enhanced” versions of each element. Thus, an “enhanced” big box retail community element may contain changes in parking lot layout so parking can be shared with other land uses, more visible pedestrian pathways, a reorientation of the building on the site, etc. Other factors for “enhanced” elements may include proximity of complimentary land uses, interconnectivity of collector and local streets, and presence of transit and non-auto infrastructure (pull-out bays, pathways, shelters, etc.).

Once enhanced elements are defined, the public can also define areas where desired community elements should be introduced based on the regional and local transportation network. Modifications to that network should be considered as part of the application of the enhanced elements to the study area. Use of powerful tools like geographic information systems (GIS), traffic models and design illustrations can articulate the development concepts being applied in each area and their resulting impacts.

These enhanced elements could be applied to any of the scenarios being developed for the Route 1 study area; however, one of the scenarios that should be considered for development is a sustainable community vision alternative that focuses on how such enhanced community elements may be applied to the Coastal Sussex area. Such an alternative would focus on preservation of inland bays and farmland/open space through compact patterns of development (centers), and development of a system of local street connections, greenway corridors and lower densities in developed areas outside of defined centers.

Once developed and evaluated, it is likely that the land use-transportation scenarios will be modified and a hybrid alternative developed that reflects the best attributes of scenarios with the most favorable community support.

Choices

The Coastal Sussex County region has essentially two choices for regional roadway capacity needs. One is to build an alternative limited access highway with strict zoning controls to preserve its future mobility and reduce the potential for sprawl, and then address Route 1 according to local needs. The other is to improve the regional capacity of Route 1 itself, through widening, development of frontage roads for local access, strict management controls of access to Route 1, and/or possible grade separation of interchanges, such as at Route 9 in the Five Points area.

The land use implications of each option are significant, and they are potentially mutually exclusive options, at least in the next 10-15 years, given the substantial capital investment required for each. The alternatives should be adequately defined and compared to assess mobility and environmental impacts, rural/open space preservation and impacts to existing developed areas. If an alternative route is developed that improves regional accessibility, it may enable Route 1 to be redeveloped in a manner that is more urban in character, removing from the mix

high speed, regional traffic. In this situation, SR 1 may be successfully resuscitated as a series of urban centers with high accessibility for non-auto modes and a greater proportion of local automobile trips.

Recommendations

- Sussex County and DelDOT need to establish a **transportation system performance monitoring process** that measures transportation service characteristics in the study area. In addition to tracking the impact of new development on roadway capacity, the monitoring system should address non-auto travel modes, like provision of quality walking, bicycling and transit environments. Desired standards should be set for these travel choices so that progress toward objectives can be measured. The monitoring program should also track land use trends and summarize changes in land use in terms of traffic generated. A State of the System report should be prepared annually or at least every two years.
- Somewhat related to the above point, the towns, Sussex County and DelDOT should work cooperatively to **define a set of community goals and indicators** that will be used to benchmark progress toward positive change in land use-transportation conditions. These must be developed carefully and include baseline data on the current status of each indicator. Local officials and the state can then identify specific strategies related to the indicators. For example, a goal set by many regions is to conserve open space. An indicator for this could be the amount of working farms and forestland. Strategies to support the indicator include agricultural designations in land use plans and the development of programs such as conservation easements and tax abatement for farmland.
- The County and towns can **address the equity issue** by identifying specific funding needs in western Sussex County that can be aided in a targeted fashion by eastern-generated revenues in exchange for consensus and cooperation from the county toward the coastal areas' growth management needs. For example, if development has a higher standard in coastal Sussex and as a result generates greater revenues in terms of property or sales taxes, the coalition can identify ways for the incremental revenue to fund public health or job training needs in western Sussex, while the County works with DelDOT to build connecting roads and bicycle paths in the eastern area to create local travel alternatives to using SR 1. These are just examples, but without some agreement on how the objectives for the County as a whole can be met it is unlikely that the situation will substantially change.
- DelDOT and the County should work together to **develop the inter-connectivity of the transportation system**. While DelDOT concentrates on creating cross- or shared-access driveways, frontage roads (where appropriate along SR 1), greenway/trail systems and sidewalks, the county can take a proactive role in the review of development proposals to ensure that an internal local street network is built for larger projects that would improve access between buildings and adjacent land use parcels.

- The County should update its land use plan and urban design regulations to **address the street realm of buildings, parking, sidewalks and landscaping**, treating streets as a valued form of public open space. This can be accomplished by providing appropriate landscaping and facilities, adopting land development standards that promote a pedestrian scale to buildings and streets, creating points of visual interest like pocket parks and store windows near the street, and breaking up the parking with landscaping, pedestrian pathways and buildings. This can enhance the proximity of buildings to the street and each other – a key ingredient in encouraging shorter trips to be made by non-auto options.
- The County and DelDOT should work together to identify and **develop public gathering places in the SR 1 area where transit service** could be more effectively and efficiently provided. Such gathering places, or community focal points, should be developed as compact, mixed-use centers. In the tourist season, transit vehicles can serve these places to pick-up and drop-off passengers. Direct shuttle service should be considered for beach resort areas to the outlet malls, along with plans to improve the proximity of buildings and a mix of uses by improving the design and access within the mall areas so that transit users can enjoy shopping without a car. Techniques for accomplishing this type of commercial redevelopment were presented at the March 13th seminar by Bob Dunphy of the Urban Land Institute.
- The state and county should create more **tools to integrate transportation and land use**. Transfer of Development Rights, graduated impact fees, overlay districts/land use policies and design standards are important incentives to encourage the desired private sector response.
- A system of **variable message signs** should be constructed along the SR 1 corridor (perhaps beginning as far north as Dover) indicating traffic delays and alternate routes. Using video technology and fiber optic cables, the signs can provide real-time traffic information to motorists. They could also be used to promote transit park and ride opportunities.

Summary

This report compiles a review of the transportation and land use situation in Coastal Sussex County, Delaware, based on observations of local conditions and discussions with citizens, staff and elected officials over a two-day period in March 2002. The report is presented as a brief situational assessment, and is intended to provide assistance to the Greater Lewes Foundation and the University of Delaware Sea Grant Program, as well as other agencies involved in the process, regarding resolution of land development and transportation issues in this area.

APPENDIX A

Sustainable, Integrated Land Use and Transportation Planning in Coastal Sussex County

CHARETTE SUMMARY MARCH 13, 2002

GROUP 1 – (DelDOT)

Priorities

1. Develop a clear vision for growth and development
2. Provide access management for SR1
3. Require a coordinated land use/transportation approval process
4. Improve land use regulations
5. Develop multi-modal systems for local and through traffic
6. Develop an east-west transportation system
7. Obtain state and county agreement on a standard policy
8. Divide Sussex County into several development districts
9. Rural space is available and part of the county's unique character
10. Preserve SR 1 capacity by use of Rt. 113 for through traffic

Brainstorm

1. Rural space is available and part of unique character
2. Change the character of Route 1
3. Multi-modal transportation system – local and through
4. Improve land use regulations
5. State & county agreement on standards and policy
6. Divide Sussex County into several development districts
7. Walk destinations
8. Revamp development to investment districts by incentives and commitment to implement prior to development
9. Relocate park and rides: 1 west of Five Points; 1 north of Five Points
10. Clear vision of growth and development
11. New North/South thruway
12. Rail system north of Five Points with bus distribution system
13. Commitment by State and County on implementation
14. Market plan for transit service
15. County moratorium on development until SR1 study is complete
16. Sign height/number limits

17. Roadway connectivity between developments
18. Access management on SR1
19. Provide adequate capacity
20. Coordinate land use/transportation approval process between state and county
21. Preserve SR1 capacity by use of Rt. 113 for thru traffic
22. More sub-area plans
23. Better directional information
24. Transfer of development rights
25. Beach nourishment
26. Acquisition of open space
27. Traffic signal timing
28. More mixed use development
29. East-west transportation system

GROUP 2 – (Citizens)

Priorities

1. Master plan for region- residential and business
2. Protection of ground and surface water supplies – alternative surfaces to reduce imperviousness
3. Safe lanes for bikes and pedestrians
4. Service roads for RT 1 retail
5. Adequate facilities ordinance
6. Accel/decel lanes (long and marked)

Brainstorm

1. Parking satellites (park & rides)
2. Bypass for through traffic
3. Safe lanes for bikes and pedestrians
4. No more curb cuts on Rt. 1
5. Adequate facilities ordinance
6. Accel/decel lanes (longer and marked)
7. Accessibility for all
8. Protection of inland bays
9. Pedestrian connectivity (retail) on Rt. 1 corner.
10. Master plan for region
11. Assess traffic movement
12. Service roads for Rt. 1 retail
13. Subtle signage and landscaping
14. Summertime bus lanes
15. Commercial business and residential comp plan – Rt. 1
16. Preservation of park land
17. Utility service planning and integration

18. Beach access/parking
19. Enforce traffic rules.
20. Regularly scheduled public transport
21. Community centers
22. Design standards for buildings and facilities on Rt. 1
23. Business improvement district
24. Alternatives to impervious surfaces for roads and parking lots
25. Build road and light rail along railroad access
26. Protection of ground and surface water supplies

GROUP 3 – (Sussex County Coastal)

Priorities

1. Interconnectivity with side Rt. 1
2. Access roads
3. Local road improvements and connectivity
4. Park and ride shuttles
5. Signage at regional splits
6. Consider cumulative impacts of development
7. East/west transit
8. Elevated road
9. Protect inland bays
10. Railroad connection Lewes/Rehoboth
11. Expand transportation to Ocean City
12. Improve access to superstores

Brainstorm

1. Expand transit to Ocean City
2. Elevated route for through traffic with local access
3. Protect inland bays
4. Consider cumulative impact of development decisions
5. Access roads for both sides of Rt. 1 for shopping
6. Signage at regional splits; i.e, Rt. 1/113 Milford
7. East-west public transportation access
8. Select new town center off Rt. 1
9. Improve access to super stores
10. Add alternative transport options between stores; i.e., bike/pedestrian trails, trolleys, etc.
11. Interconnected shopping centers on side Rt. 1
12. Safer/easier access from shopping centers to Rt. 1
13. Local road improvement and connectivity
14. Colored paving stones for pedestrian crossing (Dewey)
15. Park and ride/shuttle serving south and north of Rt. 1 area
16. Better landscaping of parking lots
17. Make transit more appealing – trolleys

18. RR right of way to connect ferry to Rehoboth
19. Wide (10ft) sidewalks on both sides Rt. 1
20. Alternative route around Dewey Beach
21. Greater setbacks
22. Bike/pedestrian lanes

GROUP 4 – (Sussex County Inland)

Priorities

1. Make Rt.1 a limited access highway by eliminating traffic lights and using service roads
2. Build a new limited access highway from Rt. 13/404 to Rt. 1 (north of Indian River)
3. Widen Rt. 1 from Red Mill Pond to Dewey Beach
4. Build a new limited access highway from Rt. 16 to Rehoboth
5. Change zoning from C1 to AR to reduce amount of commercially zoned land from Rehoboth to ferry access road

Brainstorm

1. Widen Rt. 1 from Red Mill Pond to Dewey
2. Change zoning from C1 to AR to reduce amount of commercially zoned load
3. Make western part of county more attractive to development to relieve eastern area
4. More cooperation between counties and municipalities to plan for future
5. Make Rt. 1 a limited access highway by eliminating traffic lights and using service roads
6. New limited access highway from Rt. 16 to Rehoboth
7. New limited access highway from Rt. 13/404 to Rt. 1, North Indian River
8. Create new strip shopping development off Rt. 1
9. More meetings between DelDOT and developers on entrances and transportation improvements
10. Make sure infrastructure is in place – sewer and water
11. Make county sewer available to all areas around Rt. 1
12. Build limited access elevated highway over Rt. 1 from Rt. 16 to seashore area
13. Build new egress/access point to Rehoboth

GROUP 5 – (State agencies, non-DelDOT)

Priorities

1. State commit to infrastructure plan
2. Strong leadership
3. Better coordination with and among all levels of government
4. Sub-county regional plans
5. Stronger land use control
6. Establish and control resource critical areas

Brainstorm

1. State commit to infrastructure plan
2. Stronger land use controls
3. Revolution governance
4. Redevelop small towns, villages, places among and within
5. Better coordinate all levels of government
6. Strong Lewes/Rehoboth
7. Increase east-west connectivity
8. Interconnectivity
9. TDRs, PDRs, TZ
10. Improve water quality
11. Demographic sensitivity
12. Preserve farmland
13. Enforce respective land use regulations
14. Look to Ocean City
15. Increase public involvement
16. Water taxis
17. Strong leadership
18. Strictly agricultural zoning district
19. Separate bike/pedestrian lanes
20. Sub-county regional master plans
21. Dispersed economic development, geographic mixed use redevelopment
22. Education and/or enlightenment
23. Develop with a sense of community
24. Design guidelines that support zoning types compatible growth
25. Affordable housing options
26. State commitment of money to infrastructure plan
27. Reassessment – property tax equity
28. Establish and control resource critical areas
29. County-wide school districts

GROUP 6 - (Environment)

Priorities

1. Preserve and protect drinking water supply
2. DelDOT says “yes” or “no”
3. Rail line
4. Integrate local, regional, state planning
5. Roadway/streetscape designs
6. Professional planner
7. Enhance emergency vehicle accessibility

Brainstorm

1. Low impacts to environment – air, water, vistas
2. Responsible development combined with recreation and natural areas
3. Conservation and preservation of water related environment as a focus for growth
4. Map of zoning districts – official part of land use planning – gives clear direction to all
5. Professional urban planner on staff for council
6. Encourage roadway/streetscape design that respects the historic pattern of development
7. Decide how many building can/should be built in given areas
8. Address cumulative impact of development
9. Plan to support state's compliance with Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act
10. Integrate local, regional and state planning people
11. State codes support regional and local plans
12. Preserve and protect drinking water supply
 - a. Protect groundwater recharge
 - b. Water committee facilities planning
13. Reduce amount; retrofit existing commercial strips with walkable, bikeable, transit-friendly community design
14. Legal instrument for eminent domain to retrofit developed areas (target those areas and do it)
15. Get people from here to there
16. DelDOT needs to say yes or no without suggesting loopholes
17. Enhance emergency vehicle accessibility
18. Network of pedestrian/bike corridor throughout county – transportation alternatives and recreational opportunities
19. Improve function, safety especially of critical intersections; i.e., Five Points
20. Promote wetland buffers
21. Require EIS for development
22. Re-open railway line connecting Georgetown, Lewes, Rehoboth
23. Beautification plan for all municipalities
24. Green infrastructure – parks, greenways, linked by trails
25. Incentives refill/compact development
26. Treat SR1 as the unique facility it is; mix of tourists, Main Street for local and through traffic
27. Treat pedestrians and bikes equal to vehicles, especially pedestrian safety
28. Establish no growth area
29. Reduce size of growth zones

GROUP 7 – (Lewes-Rehoboth)

Priorities

1. Preservation of environment
2. Regional plan for all public services
3. Divert traffic on relief route and expand capacity of SR 1
4. Establish better planning and coordination (towns, county, state) that is accountable
5. Expand and link bike and pedestrian pathways
6. SR 1 as a main street, not highway

Brainstorm

1. Involvement of full community in solving problem
2. Preservation of environment
3. SR1 as Main Street
4. State and county accept responsibility to towns
5. Understand what attracts people to regions
6. Establish better planning and coordination mechanism
7. Expanded and linked bicycle and pedestrian pathways
8. Direct and practical public transportation from major cities
9. Public transit to serve both local and beyond
10. Zoning county by area
11. Preserve distinct draw of towns
12. Preserve real place – small town/working city
13. Revolving funds to assist long time residents staying in community
14. Emergency access and evacuation
15. Promote and fund public transit
16. Regional plan for all public services (code, fire, police, animal control, sewer)
17. Divert thru traffic relief route
18. Conservancy/trust to buy and model land out of development
19. Affordable housing
20. Pedestrian safety on and across Rt. 1
21. Strategic placement of essential services (medical, grocery, home supplies)
22. Expand capacity of SR1 and build parallel roads
23. Capitalize on existing Lewes-Rehoboth canal as transport
24. Make non-residents pay for using resources
25. Service roads on Rt. 1
26. Water quality and water table presentation/carrying capacity

GROUP 8-9 – (Economic Development)

Priorities

1. Protect coastal and inland waterways
2. Better design required for neighborhoods
3. Preserve beach and keep free
4. Incentives for good development
5. Ensure economic success for region
6. Traffic separation – through and local

Brainstorm

1. Less like gas alley (character)
2. Improve access to beach
3. Better design required for neighborhoods
4. Improve road infrastructure
5. Improve safety
6. County wide park system
7. Preserve beaches/free
8. Preserve heritage tourism
9. Good government
10. Alternative routes (grid) local roads, local people
11. Traffic separator (thru/local)
12. Win-win versus mandated solutions
13. Finer level zoning
14. Intergovernmental coordination (better)
15. Transportation alternatives for visitors
16. Attack blight (major roads)
17. Professional planning staff
18. Villages
19. Pedestrian and transit friendly
20. Continued public commitment
21. Incentives – historically compatible architecture
22. Preserve property rights – local character
23. Maximize yield of development district
24. Business routes (east-west)
25. Create "destinations"
26. Project growth further in future
27. Parallel roads to Rt. 1 without commercial sprawl
28. Affordable houses for local employees
29. Require green space in large developments
30. Faith in capitalism
31. Purchase open space (don't assume farmland)
32. Regional traffic (to Ocean City)
33. Protect coastal/inland waterways

34. Landscape regulations for subdivisions
35. Urban design guidelines
36. Limited access for retail shops
37. Bypass from Five Points to south of Dewey
38. Sources of school system
39. Planning for Sussex airport
40. Regional train service
41. Compact mixed use development
42. Communication (open, good, better)
43. Control height in historic towns
44. Strategically located medical facilities and services
45. Design standards for strip parking lots
46. Incentives for good development (review, fast track, fees)
47. Follow the agreed upon plan
48. Incentives for "town centers" in residential development
49. Recognize outstanding design/development
50. Public parking garages
51. Ensure economic success of region
52. Consider benefits (economic) to consumer of growth

Appendix B

**Sustainable, Integrated Land Use and Transportation Planning in
Coastal Sussex County**

Seminar Agenda

**SUSTAINABLE, INTEGRATED LAND-USE AND
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING IN COASTAL SUSSEX COUNTY**

Wednesday, March 13, 2002 — 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

SEMINAR AGENDA

- 8:00 - 8:30 REGISTRATION (Coffee and Danish)**
- 8:30 - 8:40 INTRODUCTIONS AND OVERVIEW**
James M. Falk, Director, University of Delaware Sea Grant Program
John Mateyko, AIA and Greater Lewes Foundation
- 8:40 - 9:00 WELCOME**
Honorable George H. P. Smith, Mayor, City of Lewes
Honorable Sam Cooper, Mayor, City of Rehoboth Beach
Honorable Lynn Rogers, Councilman, Sussex County Council
Honorable John Schroeder, Representative, DE General Assembly
Honorable Gary Simpson, Senator, DE General Assembly
- 9:00 - 9:30 DELAWARE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AS A COMPONENT OF "LIVABLE DELAWARE"**
Lee Ann Walling, Senior Policy Advisory, Office of the Governor
- 9:30 - 10:15 TEN PRINCIPLES FOR REINVENTING AMERICA'S SUBURBAN STRIPS**
Robert Dunphy, Senior Resident Fellow for Transportation Policy, Urban Land Institute
- 10:15 - 10:30 BREAK**
- 10:30 - 11:15 INTEGRATING LAND USE/TRANSPORTATION PLANNING: COMMUNITY CASE STUDIES**
Whit Blanton, Vice President, Renaissance Planning Group
- 11:15 - 12:00 QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION**
Morning Speakers
- 12:00 - 1:00 BUFFET LUNCH**
- 1:00 - 3:00 DESIGN CHARETTE – CASE STUDY: ROUTE 1 COORIDOR (LEWES TO REHOBOTH)**
Joe Farrell, Marine Advisory Specialist, University of Delaware Sea Grant Program
Whit Blanton, Vice President, Renaissance Planning Group
- 3:00 - 3:15 BREAK**
- 3:15 - 3:45 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF CHARETTE FINDINGS**
- 3:45 – 4:15 COMMENTS ON INTEGRATED, SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE**
Nathan Hayward III, Secretary, Delaware Department of Transportation
Honorable Finley Jones, President, Sussex County Council
Honorable James Ippolito, Councilman, City of Lewes
- 4:15 – 4:30 CONCLUDING REMARKS**
Jonathan Gifford, Associate Professor, George Mason University