GIS as a Tool for Evaluating and Identifying Growth Centers in Rhode Island

Main Street and Growth Centers 101 Power of Place Summit May 11, 2012



Brian Boisvert, Graduate Assistant, Roger Williams University

Edgar Adams, Professor of Architecture, Roger Williams University

Introduction to Geographic Information System (GIS)





Source: http://egsc.usgs.gov/isb/pubs/gis_poster/

Source: http://www.igic.org/about/index.html

Main Street Districts & Growth Centers 101 RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation

Land Use 2025 and Our Study



Growth Centers Identified in LU 2025

HARRISVILLE CHEPACHET NORTH FOSTER HOPE VALLEY WYOMING **CHARLESTOWN** CAROLINA SHANNOCK NOOSENECK WICKFORD JCT WEST KINGSTON PORTSMOUTH MIDDLETOWN LITTLE COMPTON **BLOCK ISLAND TIVERTON** EXETER COVENTRY BRADFORD PASCOAG NASONVILLE

Village Town Town Village Village Village Village Village Village Village Village

Source: Land Use 2025

Main Street Districts & Growth Centers 101 RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation

Technical Paper 160: Mapping Potential Sites Suitable for Higher Density Residential Development

•Goal: Map vacant areas that have potential to support higher density residential development based on statewide GIS data and community input

•Only evaluated areas within the Urban Service Boundary

In order to build on this study we...

•Used TP 160 as a guide

•Focused on communities outside of the Urban Services Boundary

•Established a methodology for evaluating developed and undeveloped land according to criteria created in Land Use 2025.

•Looked at the potential to evaluate existing centers and identifying new growth centers using the weighted overlay tool in ArcMap 10.

Main Street Districts & Growth Centers 101 RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation

Carolina

Charlestown RI





Main Street Districts & Growth Centers 101 RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation

Brian Boisvert

0.4

Carolina

Charlestown RI

Criteria Considered:

Provide a variety of transportation choices





0 0.05 0.1

0.3

0.4

0.5

0.2

Main Street Districts & Growth Centers 101 RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation

Brian Boisvert

NORTH

Carolina



Main Street Districts & Growth Centers 101 RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation



Main Street Districts & Growth Centers 101 RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation

Overview of Methodology



RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation

Determining Goals and Metrics

Growth Planning Council: 2002		Land Use 2025: 2006*	
GOALS / Objectives		GOALS / Objectives	Measurable Criteria
Strengthen and encourage growth in existing centers		A Sustainable Rhode Island	
•	The preferred locations for growth centers are areas with existing infrastructure and public services. Infill projects, reuse of brownfields sites, and conversion of underutilized structures have priority over greenfield sites	A sustainable Rhode Island that is beautiful, diverse, connected and compact with a distinct quality of place in our urban and rural centers, and abundance of natural resources, and a vibrant sustainable economy.	 (+) Proximity to public facilities / services (+) Proximity of underutilized structures (+) Existing density of center (-) Groundwater Considerations (-) Capacity to build on soil
Encourage growth in appropriately scaled		boundary and in centers of different	•Brown and Greyfield sites
•	While the configuration of an identified growth center will vary from community to community, growth centers should be small enough to be comfortably walked. Municipally-identified growth centers should be no larger than an area with an approximately ¼ to ½ mile radius from its center to its edge in all directions (approximately ½ square mile to maximum of 1 square mile area).	 sizes and types; support traditional centers instead of new development. Support regional and watershed-wide planning to coordinate policy development and promote cooperative implementation of plans, programs, and projects affecting more than one community. Policies: (LUP-1,2,9,12,21,33,34,41,42,43) 	•Job Density
Protect and enhance critical environmental resources		The Greenspace System	
•	The center avoids converting working lands, such as prime farmland and forestland, into development.	 Permanently protect critical natural resources. Provide a diverse, well-balanced system 	 (-) Prime farmland w/in center (-) Prime contiguous forest w/in Center (-) Proximity to sensitive environmental
•	The center protects the local watershed and/or does not negatively impact critical and/or resource areas	 of public outdoor recreation facilities. Ensure that shoreline areas compose a significant portion of the Greenspace system. Policies: (LUP-3,10,11,13,14,15,17,18,19) 	resources (-) Proximity to critical watershed resources (-) Previously Established Conservation Areas (-) Areas prone to flooding (-) Coastal considerations

Determining Goals and Metrics

Growth Planning Council: 2002	Land Use 2025: 2006*	
GOALS / Objectives	GOALS / Objectives	Measureable Criteria
Promote community design that creates a sense of place	Community Design	Not the
 Community design within the centers encourages interactions among people, facilitate vibrant and safe street life, and maximize a strong sense of local community in harmony with the natural setting. Create a range of housing opportunities and choices Residential housing includes a range of housing opportunities, including single- family and multiple-household units for purchase or rental, and should cover a range of prices to address a full spectrum of income levels. Include mixed land uses Centers include a mix of housing, significant employment opportunities, schools, commercial and industrial uses, and civic/public spaces and buildings. 	 Excellence in community design: communities that are of high quality, energy efficient, safe and healthful, distinct, diverse and aesthetically pleasing; communities that are rich in natural, historical, cultural, and recreational resources; communities that provide abundant economic opportunities. Give a majority of the State's residents the opportunity to live in traditional neighborhoods, near growth centers. Preserve and enhance special districts and special places, supporting particular uses and resources. Provide a diverse, affordable housing stock. Increase energy efficiency through building design and location. Policies: (LUP-4,7,16,20,22,23,24,25) 	 (+) Walkability of Center (+) Mixed Use Center (+) Civic building, uses or spaces (+) Amount of developable land (-) Areas of cultural or ecological importance
Scale new infrastructure to support compact growth	Infrastructure	
Planned infrastructure is sized to support designated compact growth, not a sprawl development pattern. Provide a variety of transportation choices	 Maintain fully functional water and sewer systems; focus development to maximize the investment and capacity of these community assets. Protect drinking water supply resources. Utilize infrastructure to avoid or mitigate significant negative environmental impacts from development. Locate new infrastructure in appropriate areas. Promote intermodal centers and greater reliance on transit. Policies: (LUP- 6,8,28,29,30,31,32,35,36,37,38,39,40) 	 (+) Proximity to existing sewer (+) Proximity to public water (+) Proximity to public transit (+) Proximity to major roadway
 Locations with convenient access to mass transit (existing or planned) are preferred. Centers are encouraged to include public transit hubs/stations to connect local routes. Center layout, density, and design should encourage public transit, walking, and biking over automobile use for local trips. 		Criteria for future analysis: (+) Availability of well water

Overview of Overlay Analysis Tool in ArcGIS



RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation

Analysis Breakdown: Infrastructure



Main Street Districts & Growth Centers 101 RWU School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation

Initial Results



Urban Service Boundary Growth Center Half Mile Radius Town Border Scores High Priority Conservation

Low Priority Development

High Priority Development

Areas Not Suited For Development



Urban Service Boundary
 Growth Center Half Mile Radius
 Town Border
 Inland Water
 Wetlands
 Local Conservation
 State Conservation
 Soils with Significant Restraints

Undeveloped Land



Urban Service Boundary Growth Center Half Mile Radius Town Border Inland Water Wetlands Undeveloped High Priority Conservation Low Priority Conservation

Low Priority Development

High Priority Development

Developed Land



Urban Service Boundary Growth Center Half Mile Radius Town Border Inland Water Wetlands

Developed



Composite Map





Low Priority Development Medium Priority Development High Priority Development





Growth Center Half Mile Radius Town Border

Initial Results



High Priority Development



Carolina and Shannock, RI

Areas Not Suited For Development





Undeveloped







Developed



Composite Map



Developed



Low Priority Development Medium Priority Development High Priority Development



Thank you!

This study was funded by the *RWU Foundation to Promote Scholarship and Teaching* grant.

> Additional Questions email: eadams@rwu.edu or bboisvert976@g.rwu.edu