Hunter College Studio (Kate and Richard)

- Case was flawed and we asked them to reassess the exercise
- Presumed no change over time – a significant concern if students were to propose projects for the site

Pol.is (Tom)

- Given the size of our cities but even the size of our villages we have a pronounced problem. It’s no longer easy to convene a significant proportion of a community to gauge the will of the people.
- A virtual tool for civic engagement
- A digital tool intended to help accurately map areas of consensus and areas of disagreement; it scales up ability of government to listen to citizens and not just the loud voices on an issue.
- this tool has been used to not only arrive at consensus (the Tainwanese democracy movement used it to crowdsource a charter on which everyone could vote); it also has been used to demonstrate consensus (Bowling Green, Kentucky)
- three steps: a proposition – vote yes, no, or skip. This allows you to see which topics command the most agreement or where the village is most split
- And anyone can add propositions – we need more affordable housing; we need to ensure that 30% of all units meet affordable housing requirements; we need basketball courts; we need a
  - this latter step allows the tool to combine analytics previously restricted to rich qualitative research methods with rigorous quantitative data collection
    - you can get a series of value statements that normally you might obtain only in a longform interview or a panel interview; and SIMULTANEOUSLY poll community sentiment on each proposition – all in a single tool, which is incredibly valuable
- Some concerns: we might find that the great majority dislike that which we are embarked on
- Things we regarded as nonstarters might command majority support
Anonymity encourages use but also allows abuse

Other outreach fora related to strategic plan:
- Food town
- Train stations
- Library

Daniel Messplay – Assistant Director, Department of Planning and Economic Development, Village of Port Chester
- Discussed form based zoning code used throughout the entire village
- Port Chester waterfront is different regarding ownership, number of parcels, density (equivalent to Boston or Chicago), urbanity of site
- Zoning is a piece of it but there is considerable added effort to make a vital commercial zone that provides new economic opportunity
  - 13% of households below the poverty line; 41 percent of median household income below that of neighboring villages/towns; “majority minority” community
  - Two minute walk will take you from mainstreet to waterfront and through downtown (compact)
  - Heavy industrial use of waterfront
- Some parts of the waterfront are publicly owned (DPW based there; a small waterfront park based here)
- Able to creatively adapt industrial buildings for new purpose (housing, business)
- Village condemned property and transferred ownership to private developer before there was a central planning department; developer promised community assets and instead put in big box development. Permitted by bad zoning and if zoning is permitting bad design the zoning needed to be rethought
- Studied land-use regulations – Conventional, which focuses on use; form-based which prioritizes urban design, density and use, management – prioritizes not use but rather the urban fabric and texture
  - Decided to focus on form-based code
  - Cost is wildly variant to develop a code from Beacon at $23,000 to Miami at $2.2 million; village determined it would cost 600k to replace existing code and undertake GEIS (code part cost $200k)
    - How to fund? Portchester bonded this expense and issued a serial bond for that item – 15 year bond roughly
  - Developed RFP that emphasized the following elements
    - Community-driven process
    - Bilingual capability
    - Well-rounded team
      - Architects
      - Planning
      - Urban designers
      - Engineers
Attorneys
Real estate market advisors

Brought on a firm called urban advisors to undertake a finance assessments

Put the RFP on urban land institute; macgraw hill site;

Town Planning and Urban Design Collaborative won the bid and teamed up with others including transportation consultants; Fisher Associates; Seqra; City Explained

Community driven process began with consultants
Branded it as “Plan the Port”.

A week-long charrette process
Took over empty downtown storefront – planapalooza
Swing by and chat with people outside, in farmer’s market
This was first real public engagement on the waterfront planning/zoning

The team did intensive consultations, presentations where they reflected back what they heard, and then embarked on the planning/zoning process

Did not set metrics for engagement; sought comprehensive survey instead

Found a real middle ground around opinions – sharing visioning proved to be quite popular

More green space
Smarter parking design
Bridge to facilitate passage across traintracks

How do you go from vision to code/land regulations

Ensure that buildings face any streets they are adjacent
Rather than turn back or shoulder to the street
Put doors every 20 feet;
Unobstructed access to waterfront by limiting building length
Structured parking must be lined by buildings with other uses so that you aren’t focused on parking structures (also created other incentives such as providing train vouchers; bike parking, etc)

How do you get revenue if you are form-based? If you aren’t dictating use you can’t push developers in one direction or another when it comes to use

How do you account for sea level rise? Set backs, more parkland
First draft of the code now published

Learning from process

Know where you want to end up when you begin
Importance of a community-driven process
Ensure that what you are zoning for will result in the type of a place you are trying to create
Don’t need density to benefit from form-based code
  o Can find the plan and other materials at https://www.plantheport.com (zone for waterfront is CD5WF)
● Focused on massing, scale, landscape, fenestration, screening
● Question: did you put green designations in your masterplan such as solar?
  o Kept it out of zoning; could have put green building technology in code but did not as it might change the texture of the community if we required this step
● Question: Developer in new Rochelle came up with visioning, did you consider
  o No; we didn’t want to create perception that developer led process
  o We also didn’t want the possibility of two competing codes emerging
  o And last our consultants told us not to try to entice developers, just require it – don’t dangle incentives of exchanges for your wish list
● Question: any prompts for use categories
  o Yes, but broad that might encapsulate co-working spaces and cabinet manufacturer – we would do ourselves a disservice by trying to capture precise uses
  o Shortened use tables

Discussion of October 11, Public presentation (Kate)
● Need to include landscape architect in required expertise in RFP
● Goal to draft RFP issued in January with kickoff in March
● Review RFPs on the sharedrive; ask Daniel Messplay for their RFP

Questions
● Who are you looking to hire through the RFP
  o We need a constellation of expertise to help us arrive at a code
● Don’t forget we own roads, southside, Rowley Trail
● We need 300 more parking spaces
  o Response: we will do scenario plan
● Will you issue the RFP for public comment?
  o In January we will issue