Appendix 7: Survery Summary

As part of its outreach efforts, the Commission offered individuals the opportunity to provide input via an on-line survey from June 11 through June 30.

The Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) notified 1,440 people about the survey using MDP and Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) mailing lists, including planning directors, the Maryland Citizen Planners Association (MCPA), local economic development directors, local government housing directors, Mayors, MDP stakeholder organizations, County executives and Boards of County Commissioners, main street directors and local historic commissions.

The survey was also publicized through rack cards (distributed at a variety of meetings and at the Maryland Municipal League Conference), several blog posts including a post by the Maryland Association of Counties (MACO), and the Infill, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Initiative website.

Survey responses helped to inform the recommendations. Equally important, however, is the fact that the Commission, MDP and other state agencies will use the survey results to continue to inform Reinvest Maryland work.

Distribution and responses

- Responses:
  - 331 total responses

- Respondents' geographic focus:
  - Baltimore Region: 80 (31%)
  - Washington Region: 65 (25%)
  - Upper Eastern Shore: 38 (15%)
  - Lower Eastern Shore: 27 (10%)
  - Southern Maryland: 27 (10%)
  - Western Maryland: 22 (8%)

- Respondents' geographic focus:
  - Maryland municipality: 129
  - Maryland county: 101
  - Maryland region: 25
  - Statewide: 36
  - Maryland and other states: 33
  - Other: 10

- Primary stakeholder group
  - Local planning and development staff: 73 (22.5%)
  - Other: 45 (14%)
  - Marylander: 31 (9.5%)
  - Local elected official: 29 (9%)
  - Developer or builder: 27 (8%)
  - Planning commissioner or BZA member: 27 (8%)
  - Advocacy group member: 16 (5%)
  - Town/county administrator: 16 (5%)
  - Community leader: 13 (4%)
  - Economic development staff: 13 (4%)
  - State official or staff: 14 (4%)
  - Business owner : 11 (3%)
  - Community development practitioner: 8 (2.5%)
  - Main street manager: 2 (.6%)

Growth Policies

- More than two-thirds of respondents strongly agree or agree that their local comprehensive plan and zoning contain a clear vision and policies for future growth and development.

- However, fewer than 50 percent of respondents strongly agree or agree that their local housing, economic development and historic resource plans, and development regulations other than zoning, contain a clear vision and policies for the community's future growth and development.

Infill, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Tools, Policies, and Programs

- Opportunities appear to exist to improve the effectiveness of tools, programs and policies to promote smart growth. Over 60% of the respondents believed that local efforts target growth to infill or redevelopment areas, but fewer than 50% felt that growth was restricted outside of designated growth areas. Just over 10% of respondents believed tools, programs and policies did

not direct growth at all.

- Of the 136 survey respondents that identified a tool and/or best practice that would make an IRR opportunity happen, 90% identified initiatives that started at the local level, while only 10% identified State government initiatives to make IRR opportunities happen.

Impediments to Infill, Redevelopment, and Revitalization

- Of the 141 survey respondents who answered this question, the identified IRR obstructions can be grouped into five general categories – Regulations (30%); Lack of Funding/Incentives (26%); Public Opposition (17%); Market Conditions (16%); and Lack of Vision (11%).

Best Practices

- Of the 85 suggested best practices identified by survey respondents, the top practices can be grouped under financing, streamlining activities, and regulation improvements.

State Programs

- Nearly 40% of survey respondents indicated that they had used State programs for infill, redevelopment or revitalization efforts with success, and only five percent indicated that did not have success using State programs. Nearly 30% of the respondents said that they could use technical assistance in the future accessing State programs for IRR efforts.

- A total of 62 people identified a minimum of one State program that was used in their community. A total of 37 different programs were listed as being either their first, second or third choice. Survey respondents identified the Community Legacy Program as the top mentioned state program followed by the Community Development Block Grant Program and the Sustainable Communities Historic Tax Credits.

Private Sector Investment

- Nearly 50% of the survey respondents felt that the private sector was investing in infill, redevelopment and revitalization efforts in their community, while over a quarter were neutral and nearly a quarter disagreed.

Impediments

- Market demand and project costs were consider important or very important by 84% and 82% of the survey respondents, respectively. These two factors were clearly considered barriers to infill, redevelopment and revitalization when compared to social issues, complex development review processes, or community opposition.

Design

- Over fifty percent of the respondents indicated that they have or use – Landscape Ordinance, Design Review Panel, Architectural Guidelines, and Streetscape Standards, while “Architect On-call services” was the design tool respondents would most like to use.

- Fewer than 30 percent of respondents indicated that they have or use form-based codes.

Education and Training

- Of the educational and training needs, training for planning staff was noted as being the most available, while training for elected officials, realtors and citizens was noted as the least available and the most needed.

- Planning Commissioner training was noted as being the second highest available training, after planning staff, but was also noted to be the highest form of education requesting technical assistance.

Housing Affordability

- Most survey respondents disagreed that there was an adequate supply of workforce housing in their community, and that the community supported workforce housing production.

- Most survey respondents also disagreed that some areas of their community had too much workforce housing and that new residential developments were required to building workforce housing.