Design Brief Part A, Performance Objectives Draft 4/5/99

This brief constitutes your instructions.

The following qualitative and quantitative performance objectives constitute your instructions for this charrette. Background information that inform these objectives can be found in other parts of this brief and in the myriad resource books and reports that are available in the charrette library.

These instructions are based entirely on public policy.

It is important to point out that in every case these performance objectives have been drawn from publicly sanctioned policy documents. These policy documents have originated at the local, county, and state level. These policy documents have in turn been influenced by national and in some instances global problems and the concerted efforts of the higher levels of government to co-ordinate practical solutions to them.

We have boiled down that policy into one goal and seven objectives.

The charrette organizers have boiled these policies down to one goal and seven objectives. This goal and these objectives frame the policies so that you can translate them into physical design proposals for the Somerset County Center area.

Your Goal is:

If the New Jersey State Plan and the "Centers" initiative are successful, the number of jobs and homes in this valley will eventually (increase by X %). Somerset County has asked us to help identify an equitable, economic and ecological vision of what this valley may look like when that day comes.

Your instructions are:

Your instructions are in the table below. The left column contains the seven design objectives and, below them, sub-objectives that contribute to the main objective.

Use indicators to guide and describe your design.

The New Jersey State Plan depends on indicators of sustainability to measure progress. In conformance with this spirit we ask you to describe the consequences of your design through measures of economic, social, and environmental sustainability. The middle column below provides a lengthy but still partial list of possible sustainability indicators. As anticipated in the State Plan, these indicators are both quantitative and qualitative.

| Design Objective | Possible Indicator | Reference (more to come) |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Objective 1. Create a Single Place From this Disparate Location. | | - |
| Regional Center Designed and planned to foster a sense of community. | Amount of new or revived public squares and community parks. Number of new or rehabilitated feature buildings Percentage of population that lives within walking distance to commercial and transit services. Miles of new pedestrian or bikeways. | RCDR |
| Create opportunities for community interaction and safety | Walking distance to commercial and transit services. Percent of new and in-fill buildings that connect to and observe public spaces. | RCDR |
| Enhance the quality of open spaces, streetscapes, and historic structures and features | Percent of roadway devoted to pedestrians and bikes. Degree of importance and forgrounding of public open space. Degree of public utility, forgrounding and visibility of important historic structures. | RCDR |
| Use stream and river system to make place | Percentage of streams incorporated into open space and greenway system. Percentage of the population within a two minute walk of riparian stream area. | RCDR |
| Use infill development in a variety of sizes, uses, and styles within centers and on corridors as a means to complete and enhance the community. | Ratio of square footage of new uses in infill sites to new uses overall. Number of other listed performance indices affected by in-fill projects. | RCDR |
| Objective 2. Create Connections Between the Three Major Urban Points | | |

| Design Objective | Possible Indicator | Reference (more to come) |
|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Facilitate walking for recreation and as a transportation element or mode | Degree of interconnectivity in the circulation network. Percent reduction in sprawl and separation of functions when compared with present trends. Degree of integration between walking as recreation and walking as access to transit or public/commercial buildings. | RCDR |
| Co ordinate the urban design between Raritan, Somerville, and Bridgewater Commons area. | Miles of enhanced and/or new community connections between the three nodes. Success in determining and implementing an urban design strategy for road and greenway connections between points. Degree to which infill projects fill the gaps between the three points. Degree to which infill and new projects provide continuous mixed use opportunities to create neighborhood nodes in the larger constellation of other related neighborhood nodes. | RCDR |
| Accommodate but don't promote the automobile. | Percentage of trip share migrating to short hop car trip, transit, bike, or walking if all mixed use and infill objectives are achieved. Capital theoretically available for land use and alternative transportation mode investments as a ratio of presumed success in shifting modes¹ Assess the positive and negative implications of the proposed hundred million dollar roadway improvement plan. | SP |
| Objective 3. Integrate and Exploit the Transportation Corridors That Dissect the Center | | |
| Plan for the transportation corridors while integrating them with lower order streets and pedestrian and bike ways. | Number of new and improved means for moving from one node to the other. Number of areas where transportation corridors are no longer a barrier, both practically and in urban design terms, between key centers. Number of areas where pedestrian and bike access has been established where presently denied. | RCDR 55 |

¹ The *Somerset Regional Center Traffic Study; Recommended Improvement Program* was submitted to the Somerset County Planning Board on February 9, 1998. It outlines 90 million dollars worth of road and intersection improvements that, in the opinion of the consultants, will be needed in the short to medium term[10-15 years]. This amount was generated using standard methodologies to determine future mode share, trip number, and trip length. A very large proportion of these improvements were suggested as means by which to improve access to the Chimney Rock Road area with 29 million suggested for one grade separation at Chimney Rock Road and Route 22.

| Measured improvement in citizen satisfaction with the appearance and utility of the corridors. Measured ease in moving from one part of the center to the other in terms of trip duration, reduced | RCDR 55 |
|--|---|
| congestion, availability and ease of transit use, biking and walking. | |
| | |
| Percentage of designated areas redeveloped. Floor Surface Ratio (FSR) of redeveloped parcels (set target, such as 1). Residential density of parcels converted for housing (set target, such as 8 d.u./acre). | RCDR |
| Degree to which new development attaches to and completes surrounding urban context. Percentage of existing buildings retained and re-used. | RCDR |
| Parcels developed without requiring all new road and utility infrastructure. Jobs created as a proportion of new paved areas in the valley (strive to minimize new pavement/infrastructure). Percentage of private sector contributions used to finance re-construction vs. for new roads. | SP |
| | |
| Population located within a five-minute walk of public, commercial, employment nodes. Percent population located within five-minute walk of frequent transit to major regional employment and commercial nodes. | RCDR 55 |
| Percentage of new housing affordable by low to moderate-income households. Percentage of new housing affordable by average worker. Affordability of home ownership for average worker. Percentage of streets with wide range of different housing types and cost. Percent increase in integration of new commercial, office and light industrial facilities into existing and new mixed use communities. | RCDR 55 |
| | Floor Surface Ratio (FSR) of redeveloped parcels (set target, such as 1). Residential density of parcels converted for housing (set target, such as 8 d.u./acre). Degree to which new development attaches to and completes surrounding urban context. Percentage of existing buildings retained and re-used. Parcels developed without requiring all new road and utility infrastructure. Jobs created as a proportion of new paved areas in the valley (strive to minimize new pavement/infrastructure). Percentage of private sector contributions used to finance re-construction vs. for new roads. Population located within a five-minute walk of public, commercial, employment nodes. Percentage of new housing affordable by low to moderate-income households. Percentage of new housing affordable by average worker. Affordability of home ownership for average worker. Percentage of streets with wide range of different housing types and cost. |

| Design Objective | Possible Indicator | Reference |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------|
| | | (more to |
| | | come) |
| The regional Center must | 1. Degree of change of storm drain performance toward emulation of pre-development function. | RCDR 55 |
| respect and ultimately | 2. Degree of mitigation of flooding and non point source pollution discharged to the Raritan River. | SP |
| enhance its green | 3. Number of sizable natural areas protected/number of plant and animal species protected. | |
| infrastructure. | 4. Miles of continuous public greenway established. | |
| Use the drainage systems as | 1. Miles or acres of land where drainage system has been forgrounded. | RCDR 55 |
| a framework for re- | 2. Acres of forests restored near streams and rivers. | |
| development and as a | 3. Number of new points where public access from surrounding neighborhoods has been enhanced. | |
| recreational resource. | 4. Number of neighborhoods defined by drainage system. | |
| Objective 7. | | |
| Create a Landscape of Equity | | |
| Create an environment | 1. New urban squares, sidewalks, playgrounds, walking paths. | RCDR 55 |
| where people help people | 2. New communities knitted into fabric of existing community and environment. | |
| and the focus is on families. | 3. Schools as social, physical, and visual focus for neighborhoods. | |
| Increase opportunity for | 1. Improvement in measures of access to housing. | |
| senior and affordable | 2. Appropriate housing for seniors with access to transit, shops, and public amenity spaces. | |
| housing | | |