



Comprehensive Plan Public Forum Summary November 2020

As part of the NCC2050 Comprehensive Plan process, the New Castle County Department of Land Use held a forum on November 18, 2020 to solicit public discussion about the vision for the future of New Castle County. Due to the covid-19 pandemic, this Forum was held virtually, using videoconferencing and small group discussion in breakout rooms. Volunteer Comprehensive Plan Ambassadors, including members of the Youth Advisory Board and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, assisted in taking notes and supporting technology use in the breakout rooms.

Approximately 125 members of the public participated in this Forum (176 registered). During the Image Dialogue discussion in the breakout rooms, participants viewed a series of images and discussed the elements in the images reflected aspects that they want to see and do not want to see for the future of New Castle County. Following the Forum, all participants were invited to take an Image Preference Survey to select their three most and least favored images.

This report presents the results of both the image dialogue discussion and image preference survey, including the following sections:

Image Survey Results: quantitative results of survey

Image Dialogue Overview: brief summary of notes related to most popular, least popular, and most conflicted images from the survey

Image Dialogue Summary: summary of notes from all breakout groups for each image, sorted in order of most to least popular

The summary of notes in this report is a selection of comments written during the workshop in participants' own words (written either by participants directly or by the Ambassadors). Comments were selected to capture the range of opinion and issues discussed, but do not include every single comment (for all comments see the raw notes at <https://ssl02.nccde.org/gisfiles/images/ncc2050/ForumImageDialogueNotes.pdf>). The transcript of the live chat during the forum is also available here: https://ssl02.nccde.org/gisfiles/images/ncc2050/forum1_chat.pdf.

Public Forum Image Dialogue Summary

Most Favored Images

The images on this page scored the highest on the Image Preference Survey



Select Positive Comments



Select Negative Comments



- ✓ A place you want to be
- ✓ Bustling market place - Lots of nice small shops
- ✓ LOVE LOVE LOVE the brick pavers/sidewalk
- ✓ Healthy trees, shade - Flowers in trees

- ✗ Bricks look uneven - could be dangerous or trip hazard
- ✗ Would like a bench for resting, sitting
- ✗ Limited parking space
- ✗ Could be busy



- ✓ Don't let it change!
- ✓ Lots more of this - LOVE IT!
- ✓ Green is good
- ✓ A place I can take my friends and family... good place to bring friends/family/tourists. Walk along a trail and have a good time

- ✗ Phragmites? Non-native species plants are a concern
- ✗ Is there a pathway? Want people to be able to walk safely
- ✗ Is this walkable from anywhere?



- ✓ The wave of the future - Like the EV chargers and autonomous vehicle all still at pedestrian scale
- ✓ Porous pavement
- ✓ Native grasses, greenery, visible nature
- ✓ Very walkable

- ✗ Doesn't look like Delaware
- ✗ Too futuristic/modern
- ✗ Everything - Don't like the structure or charging stations - adding more traffic; don't like the building behind
- ✗ Driving on cobblestone not fun



- ✓ Cozy! Cute! Love this!
- ✓ Family friendly - Could be a senior living area
- ✓ Sense of community, welcoming, neighborly
- ✓ Compact, walkable
- ✓ Porches, landscaping, car free

- ✗ Where is the parking?
- ✗ Requires respectful neighbors
- ✗ Bad stormwater drainage
- ✗ Not much room for children to play - pretty tight
- ✗ Too high density - ok somewhere, but not everywhere

Public Forum Image Dialogue Summary

Least Favored Images

The images on this page scored the lowest on the Image Preference Survey



Select Positive Comments



Select Negative Comments



- ✓ Pavement in good condition, clean roadway
- ✓ People who want to walk
- ✓ Small local businesses, not chains
- ✓ Access to several businesses for basic needs

- ✗ No sidewalks
- ✗ Hazardous to pedestrians
- ✗ No bike lanes
- ✗ No connections
- ✗ Overhead utilities
- ✗ No street trees
- ✗ Nothing - Hate it



- ✓ A mobile community with beautiful trees. Opportunity for affordable living
- ✓ Close to neighbors
- ✓ Lots of trees
- ✓ Organized and neat

- ✗ Social injustices
- ✗ Low income housing should be integrated in all development.
- ✗ How close to other amenities/resources? More connections needed
- ✗ Flooding would be a problem



- ✓ Jobs - Good for economy, might be providing a lot of jobs
- ✓ Necessary
- ✓ Separated from residential
- ✓ Active, not run down

- ✗ Looks likely to be highly polluting -- unsafe to live or work nearby - Air pollution and emissions are bad - Noisy, odors, unhealthy - Water pollution
- ✗ Looks like a chemical plant-- that's awful. We have enough chemical things here



- ✓ We need shopping centers
- ✓ Apartments close to grocery stores
- ✓ Ample access to parking - Tons of parking, convenient
- ✓ Parking lot surface well maintained - no potholes
- ✓ Fairly clean parking lot

- ✗ Not pedestrian friendly, community friendly
- ✗ Ugly - Stark
- ✗ Very little greenery - Want trees
- ✗ Too much surface parking !!!! no landscaping

Public Forum Image Dialogue Summary

Most Conflicted Images + Theme Summary

The image on this page had the most conflicted score on the Image Preference Survey



Select Positive Comments

- ✓ Green space built into center, breaks up paving, architectural/sculptural features
- ✓ Oasis feeling
- ✓ Corporate, plentiful jobs
- ✓ Modern architecture



Select Negative Comments

- ✗ Neutral aesthetic
- ✗ Don't like the pillar lights- don't look natural
- ✗ Size of building (too large)
- ✗ May be less of a need for office space as people work from home

Areas of agreement

What people want

Open space and trees: There is strong, almost universal support for open space, trees, greenery, landscaping, recreation space, etc.

Affordability: There is general support for a mix of housing types and sizes to make housing affordably available to a wide range of people and families.

Maintenance: There are frequent positive comments about maintenance and things being neat and orderly. These comments are made about streets and infrastructure, houses, and landscaping, so it is a value that extends across topics.

Aesthetics & appearance: There are frequent comments about aesthetics (attractive, beauty, aesthetically pleasing versus ugly, unattractive). [But note the lack of consensus about Design and Modernism versus Traditionalism below.]

Utilities underground: There are frequent comments about wanting utilities underground and not liking visible wires.

Accessibility: There are frequent comments supporting accessibility, aging in place, and ADA.

What people DON'T want

Crime and safety: There are concerns about crime and safety. The concern about safety is much broader than just crime – it includes concern about children, safety of roadways/biking, lighting/walking at night, etc.

Topics with a lack of consensus

Suburban versus Urban: In general, there are some people who have a strong preference for a more “suburban” lifestyle (easy parking, lots of open space, quiet, distance from neighbors) while others have a preference for a more “urban” lifestyle (walkable/bikable, closer together, more activity).

Parking: Some people like lots of easily available parking; other people want more walkable, compact, mixed-use development and recognize that too much parking interferes with this goal.

Density: Very similar to the lack of consensus about parking, there is a lack of consensus about desirable densities for housing and commercial development. There are frequent comments about something being too “crowded” or “congested” on the same image where there are other comments praising it for being “compact” or “walkable” and using land “efficiently.”

Planned Design vs Less Control: Some comments indicate a desire for coherent, cohesive design in planned communities; other comments indicate a preference for individuality, things not all looking the same, and less control of property.

Modernism versus Traditionalism: There generally seems to be stronger support for more traditional architecture and more traditional building materials (brick, stone). However, there are also comments supporting more modern, innovative design.

Image Preference Survey

Quantitative Results

Number	Image	WANT to see Responses	do NOT want to see Responses	Sum want - do not want	Total Responses
20		19	0	19	19
8		16	0	16	16
2		15	0	15	15
11		16	2	14	18
4		9	0	9	9
5		7	1	6	8
23		4	0	4	4
24		5	2	3	7
6		3	1	2	4
18		3	1	2	4
21		3	1	2	4
13		1	0	1	1

Number	Image	WANT to see Responses	do NOT want to see Responses	Sum want - do not want	Total Responses
9		1	1	0	2
19		0	0	0	0
10		1	3	-2	4
16		0	5	-5	5
17		2	7	-5	9
15		0	6	-6	6
3		2	10	-8	12
14		0	8	-8	8
22		0	11	-11	11
7		0	15	-15	15
12		0	18	-18	18
1		0	19	-19	19

green indicates MOST popular images

red indicates LEAST popular images

purple indicates MOST CONFLICTED images

Notes:

Highlighted images include only those that had at least 5 total responses.

37 respondents completed the survey between November 18 and December 2, 2020.



- ✓ Very vibrant - active walking and shopping
- ✓ A place you want to be - Sense of place - Engaging communal atmosphere
- ✓ People out and about, pedestrian-friendly
- ✓ Bustling market place - healthy retail - Lots of nice small shops
- ✓ Diverse cuisine
- ✓ LOVE LOVE LOVE the brick pavers/sidewalk - Cobblestone makes it more inviting than concrete - Brick path wide and pleasing - Wide sidewalks
- ✓ Parked cars act as a buffer between traffic and pedestrians
- ✓ Sidewalks well maintained
- ✓ Healthy trees, shade - Flowers in trees
- ✓ Diverse building architecture
- ✓ Varied buildings, different door heights
- ✓ Mixing of people / cultures
- ✓ Flags on light poles - Lights with flowers, banners, hanging baskets
- ✓ Don't change this area

- ✗ Bricks look uneven - could be dangerous or trip hazard
- ✗ Would like a bench for resting, sitting
- ✗ Limited parking space
- ✗ Could be busy
- ✗ Congested sidewalks, maybe
- ✗ Sidewalk sandwich signs make the environment less inviting



- ✓ Don't let it change!
- ✓ Lots more of this - LOVE IT!
- ✓ Beauty
- ✓ Green is good - Preservation of green space
- ✓ A place I can take my friends and family... good place to bring friends/family/tourists. Walk along a trail and have a good time
- ✓ We need green building: like what they're doing in Germany for insulation, low energy use, also LEED certified buildings
- ✓ Native trees, native plants
- ✓ In favor of protected land - Hopefully the water is protected; it looks like it is protected
- ✓ Nature that's accessible to people in a responsible way
- ✓ If we want people to enjoy it, it should be a pleasant place (no poisonous species)
- ✓ Biodiversity - Rich critter habitat
- ✓ Trees in the background
- ✓ Make sure if people come they aren't given the opportunity to litter
- ✓ No houses

- ✗ Phragmites is bad
- ✗ Phragmites? Non-native species plants are a concern
- ✗ Is there a pathway? Want people to be able to walk safely
- ✗ Would like to see the river being accessed
- ✗ Conservation, if private, it should be taxed accordingly
- ✗ Is this walkable from anywhere?



- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The wave of the future - charging stations! Like the EV chargers and autonomous vehicle all still at pedestrian scale ✓ Porous pavement - Adequate drainage for water runoff by building - Permeable surfaces help with flooding - Love the cobblestones everywhere -- can't say enough good things about the cobblestones! ✓ Mobility, flexible transportation, carpooling ✓ Native grasses, greenery, visible nature ✓ Very walkable ✓ Windmills! Renewable energy - Will cut down on fossil fuels and help with air pollution ✓ Sustainable way to develop - Good for the environment ✓ Looks put together - good color scheme ✓ Looks convenient ✓ Progressive area -- want more of this in DE (talking about the energy tech, windmill, etc) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ Doesn't look like Delaware ✗ Too futuristic/modern ✗ Strange-looking windmills ✗ Don't see it respecting the history/culture of DE area
We want the area to maintain the history of the area while keeping this up to date with the times/modern ✗ The environmental impact of buying and using new buses will really harmful. It would be more environmentally conscious to use the buses until they break down and then replace them with new electric vehicles ✗ Back up plan if no electricity? ✗ Too much concrete - A lot of impervious cover ✗ Everything - Don't like the structure or charging stations - adding more traffic; don't like the building behind ✗ Driving on cobblestone not fun |
|--|---|



- ✓ Cozy! Cute! Love this!
- ✓ Family friendly - Could be a senior living area
- ✓ Sense of community, welcoming, neighborly
- ✓ Compact, walkable - Efficient land use, compact, and seems to accomodate multi-member housing
- ✓ This has the feel of a small community, where everyone would know their neighbors
- ✓ Looks like a place you'd like to live and get acquainted with people
- ✓ Porches, landscaping, car free
- ✓ Reduced lawn space - easy maintenance
- ✓ Attractive community with houses fronting open space instead of a street
- ✓ Don't see parking, which is good
- ✓ Attractive community homes that look nice to live in while not using up an unsustainable amount of land and resources
- ✓ Attractive, highly dense but livable community. Probably appropriate for near center city areas to maximize population near the city center to reduce need for cars



XX

- ✗ Where is the parking?
- ✗ Requires respectful neighbors
- ✗ Bad stormwater drainage
- ✗ Suburban sprawl
- ✗ Not much room for children to play - pretty tight
- ✗ Too high density - don't want every community to be the same - ok somewhere, but not everywhere
- ✗ Might be too close - too close for comfort
- ✗ Don't want everything to look the same
- ✗ Can have too much noise and crime
- ✗ High density housing brings traffic - need infrastructure to support it
- ✗ Tax on service accordingly
- ✗ Reminds me that more population is moving into Delaware
- ✗ Pervious pavers for walkway would be great
- ✗ Solar panels on roofs would be great
- ✗ Hopefully there's a park nearby



- ✓ Protected open space - Maintain the protected lands we have
- ✓ Well-designed sports fields - variety of fields
- ✓ Plenty of parking
- ✓ Encourages people to be active, experience nature, play sports
- ✓ Forest - Lots of trees
- ✓ Yay green space and lots of trees
- ✓ Green between paths
- ✓ Areas for people to sit, watch sports, walking paths
- ✓ Community gathering spots
- ✓ Want more planned recreational facilities
- ✓ Farmland
- ✓ Calming
- ✓ Lovely
- ✓ Road is appropriate size
- ✓ Well maintained



- ✗ Middle of nowhere - not near houses
- ✗ People have to drive to get here. Not walkable from residential areas
- ✗ Mostly accessed by car
- ✗ Big parking area
- ✗ Wide street
- ✗ Bad accessibility
- ✗ We need less grass--more planting for the animals
- ✗ Grass doesn't look good
- ✗ Ballfields need to be better maintained
- ✗ More stands for spectators
- ✗ Parking might be an issue (amount of land compared to the amount of parking)
- ✗ Where are the people? Where is the human life in this?
- ✗ Could use more trees



✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓



✗

- ✓ Every community should have this
- ✓ Play space, close to housing
- ✓ Safe for kids, sand good for child safety
- ✓ Lack of cement
- ✓ Trees with benches - Shade and sun - Pleasant area, Trees
- ✓ Playgrounds are nice, especially with trees
- ✓ Colorful
- ✓ Active
- ✓ Gathering space
- ✓ Social interaction for children near home
- ✓ I have seen one of these children's parks in GA where large toys are left for multiple kids to use. Very popular. Kids seemed to have no problems finding something to play with.
- ✓ Kids around - Love to see kids playing
- ✓ Playground is enclosed -- makes elopement less likely and makes it harder for the bad folks (possible kidnappers) to take kids
- ✓ Day care is necessary - Daycare center, good for families and it's a thriving business, good for economy

- ✗ Very close to parking lot
- ✗ Cars visible - park near road; seems dangerous for access to park
- ✗ Need a better fence, safety
- ✗ Safety
- ✗ The ground should have some sort of mats for safety. None of the playground equipment looks usable by kids in wheelchairs. (Not ADA compliant.)
- ✗ Does the surface need care?
- ✗ Grassy area to play
- ✗ More hard but soft areas to play on, not sand. So children keep their balance
- ✗ No babysitter for little kid! Messy, with stuff everywhere
- ✗ Lots of artificial landscaping which is not sustainable
- ✗ More variety in the park activities



✓✓✓✓



- ✓ Wide sidewalks, wide crosswalks - Safe crosswalks, handicap accessible
- ✓ Looks busy with event sign
- ✓ Pulls your eye along the vista
- ✓ Attractive buildings providing jobs
- ✓ Vertical mixed use allows for better utilization of land
- ✓ High quality design standards lead to an attractive community
- ✓ Coherent look
- ✓ Pedestrian friendly
- ✓ Downtown kind of look - Pleasant for a downtown
- ✓ College town feel
- ✓ Nicely laid out. Be interested in seeing what is nearby
- ✓ Bike lanes
- ✓ Parking looks efficient and well placed - all of it. Neat and orderly
- ✓ Architectural variation - Variety of facades
- ✓ Trees/greenery, landscaping - Like integrated stormwater in tree and green stormwater treatment
- ✓ Street lighting

- ✗ Overdevelopment
- ✗ 202 could have a better look to it (with better materials)
- ✗ Possible need for recycling?
- ✗ Deserted
- ✗ Lacking life



✓✓✓✓✓



xx

- ✓ Green space built into center, breaks up paving, architectural/sculptural features
- ✓ Oasis feeling
- ✓ Like the common park area for lunch/ walking. Also means potential corporate jobs
- ✓ Large open area in a dense area is key
- ✓ These buildings look repurposed
- ✓ Corporate, plentiful jobs - Buildings likely to indicate presence of jobs
- ✓ Urban corporate environment
- ✓ Still plenty of greenery/recreational areas near
- ✓ Clean crisp
- ✓ Interspersing nice green with high rises - Like the trees
- ✓ Modern architecture
- ✓ Energy efficient
- ✓ Inviting, warm
- ✓ Gathering place - community
- ✓ Good integrated stormwater management to offset hard surface runoff
- ✓ Well maintained
- ✗ Neutral aesthetic
- ✗ Don't like the pillar lights- don't look natural
- ✗ Size of building (too large)
- ✗ Buildings look a little dingy
- ✗ Too tall for the suburban areas
- ✗ May be less of a need for office space as people work from home
- ✗ What we don't want is empty businesses buildings that nobody uses and crowd our community spaces. There would need to be a focused projection of what kind of business innovation or industry is intended to come to the county for community development such as a colleges, or similar projects
- ✗ Need metropolitan planning with the City of Wilmington to coordinate density within the city. This would allow for more walkable communities with access to transit
- ✗ May be appropriate in certain areas where there is good access to transit (City of Wllmington, North Claymont, Churchmans Crossing)



✓✓✓

- ✓ Walkways and trails - Walking trails and bike paths - Lovely nature trail
- ✓ I like the greenery and roads for access and travel, makes an easy commute - Multimodal transportation
- ✓ More accessibility - Multiple points of access
- ✓ Didn't disrupt too much of wetland/ blended in with surroundings
- ✓ Preserving wetlands close to downtown and also have recreational space in the wetland
- ✓ Revitalization of city spaces is a good thing
- ✓ Bringing business in so bringing more resources into the community - Jobs and technology
- ✓ No heavy industry
- ✓ Lots of green space which is good for mental health of the community and global warming/health
- ✓ Lovely spot - Picturesque
- ✓ The river - Access to water - opportunities on how it can be used
- ✓ The nature feel - Trees surround
- ✓ Want development controlled to save the environment, be aesthetically pleasing



✗

- ✗ Overhead utilities - The overhead powerlines ruin it - Skyline would be prettier without the lines
- ✗ Bridge is scary high
- ✗ Noise from trains
- ✗ Difficult to do: need money!
- ✗ Power lines and road going through not conducive to pleasant living. Too congested.
- ✗ Taken over by phragmites which forces out wildlife
- ✗ Need clean water along river
- ✗ Make sure it is clean



✓✓✓



✗

- ✓ Convenient shopping for residents
- ✓ Architecture is nice, but maybe too much shade for the winter- variation to height and facade may allow for more light for the winter
- ✓ Variety of products in ones store, grocery, pharmacy and beverages? - Variety of resources, mailbox etc all in one spot convenient for people
- ✓ Urban availability of necessities
- ✓ I like the access to housing and commercial areas close by
- ✓ Commercial shops, entertainment, lots of poeple
- ✓ Variety (Whole Foods & Acme) - appeals to many income levels
- ✓ Incorporated trees and parking above the stores
- ✓ Ways for nature and people to share the space
- ✓ Access to transit - might not need a car to get to it
- ✓ Shows that grocery stores do not require a sea of parking. This will preserve open space and allow the mixing of uses
- ✓ Like integrated stacked parking (above and around the store)
- ✗ Future underground electrical lines would make it a better place
- ✗ Whole foods is boarded up. Unsure how feel about that if it's crime related we don't like it if it's competition and a growing economy then it's good
- ✗ No bike lanes
- ✗ Possibility of congestion
- ✗ Boring
- ✗ Not enticing
- ✗ Urban area, made for cars in the city
- ✗ May not be appropriate for suburban New Castle County
- ✗ Parking garage above supermarket
- ✗ Fast - paced



✓✓✓

- ✓ Space for outdoor dining, planters provide comfort/aesthetics
- ✓ Definitely love the outdoor seating
- ✓ Outdoor dining and plants, umbrellas create nice environment
- ✓ Outdoor dining brings communities together too. It can bring people to connect more and help people come out more (talking about quality of life and meeting neighbors)
- ✓ Outside, enjoying Main St., nice wide sidewalk
- ✓ Wide sidewalks allow for outdoor seating
- ✓ Pedestrian friendly scale, buildings
- ✓ Sidewalk, building frontage create nice community feel
- ✓ More outdoor spaces/restaurants in the case another pandemic occurs
- ✓ The mural on the side of the building
- ✓ Looks like sidewalks have been well maintained and are safe to walk on
- ✓ Lighting - street lighting safe to walk at night
- ✓ Local businesses thriving



✗

- ✗ Tables should be closer to the building for safety
- ✗ Pop-up dining, looks like an extension of the road
- ✗ Concern about dining in street, there should be a buffer
- ✗ Potentially dangerous
- ✗ Safety level is questionable
- ✗ A buffer would come in handy
- ✗ Don't like eating in the street--gas emissions
- ✗ Clean air?
- ✗ Sidewalk needs to be re-done
- ✗ Looks mismatched
- ✗ Needs more trees, solar powered covers
- ✗ Important aspect would be accountability to keep dining street areas clean is important though



- ✓ Well-maintained
- ✓ Neat and uniformed community
- ✓ Organized clean neat quiet
- ✓ More housing affordable to many people
- ✓ Good starter neighborhood
- ✓ Neighborhood feel
- ✓ Good place to walk a dog
- ✓ Sidewalks
- ✓ One - level (accessible for seniors, ADA), universal design
- ✓ 2 car driveway, helps keep street clear
- ✓ Maybe a senior community...one level. Cute homes
- ✓ Brick wraps around the edges - adds dimensionality
- ✓ Front porches
- ✓ Landscaping nice
- ✓ Inviting like grandma's house
- ✓ Underground utilities--no overhead wires
- ✓ Neighborhood looks bike friendly

- ✗ Cookie-cutter
- ✗ Too much concrete. Old american dream
- ✗ Too much of the same
- ✗ Excessive pavement
- ✗ Little boxes
- ✗ Ticky tacky houses
- ✗ No lights (need to bring a flashlight to walk at night)
- ✗ Trees should be located closer to the street
- ✗ Would like more diverse architecture not just copy and paste neighborhoods
- ✗ Neighborhoods built on open land
- ✗ More native plants needed
- ✗ Clear they leveled the land and didn't think to work around the environment
- ✗ Not for every neighborhood



✓

- ✓ Mixed use. Creates a walkable community which will limit traffic
- ✓ So compact
- ✓ Efficient use of space. Looks like walking distance but I can't tell if there are sidewalks or bike lanes
- ✓ We do need more new construction to handle new residents in DE
- ✓ Close to the water
- ✓ School in walkable distance
- ✓ Lots of trees - Even with houses, can still see lots of trees
- ✓ Not too much impervious cover
- ✓ Variety of housing sizes - Varied housing types
- ✓ Cute little town
- ✓ Looks clean
- ✓ Positive that the houses might have good views
- ✓ Seems like there is nice green space!
- ✓ If redevelopment and turned into mixed space, that's a good thing
- ✓ Helpful for those who are aging and/or have mobility issues



✗

- ✗ Middle of no where means cars and traffic. Are there stores in this community? - Would not want development in the middle of nowhere - Not connected to amenities - seems out in middle of nowhere
- ✗ Urban sprawl, not good
- ✗ Overdeveloped - Too many buildings - Too congested
- ✗ Looks kind of boring - not a lot of character - monoculture look; gray and white
- ✗ Could they have just redeveloped another space that has been abandoned rather than using open/natural space?
- ✗ Maintain more of the natural environment... can't just replant and fix the damage done
- ✗ Doesn't look like it was designed with the local environment in mind... why aren't there any trees?
- ✗ Severe impacts to wildlife, ecosystem as a whole
- ✗ Built in a greenfield - probably former agricultural land; would like to see robust agricultural production for local food supply (not for chicken feed)
- ✗ Forced town
- ✗ Looks a little run-down, but overall nice!



- ✓ Love this! More of this!
- ✓ Neat, quaint, quite livable area for shopping
- ✓ Preservation of historic buildings while allowing commercial uses - Has an old-time (historic) feel
- ✓ Please don't modernize this area-- it has such a lovely atmosphere
- ✓ Well-maintained storefronts. Inviting for shopping
- ✓ Resembles our Main Streets. Please preserve
- ✓ "Looks like DE"
- ✓ Different storefronts/ different colors/ individualize
- ✓ Walkable, peaceful, quaint
- ✓ Very cute
- ✓ The sidewalk
- ✓ On street parking
- ✓ The trees - maturity and shade provided
- ✓ The lights
- ✓ Good retail options - Economically productive
- ✓ We like safe and clean streets. A culture of a healthy lifestyle is important

- ✗ Keep it affordable
- ✗ Lacking life detracts from inviting nature
- ✗ Streets are narrow
- ✗ Parking should be well defined - Parking regulation/ restriction signs unwelcoming - confusing and not positive



- ✓ Like everything
- ✓ Big beautiful homes
- ✓ 'Chateau country'
- ✓ Homes not too crowded - Not packed in with the neighbors - Like the large amount of land between houses - Love open space; houses not jammed together
- ✓ We need a variety of different housing options in the county
- ✓ Spacious
- ✓ Peaceful
- ✓ Private
- ✓ A lot of green space
- ✓ Preserved Private Green Space. I know this will be an unpopular view but this space is being preserved in its natural state. That someone owns it means that someone is taking care of it
- ✓ Preserved forest/trees around site - Mature trees



- ✗ No, no, no
- ✗ We do not need any additional McMansions. We have enough.
- ✗ Need affordable housing for everyone
- ✗ Visualization of what sprawl looks like
- ✗ High cost for infrastructure needed to access low density development - if this is what people want, they should pay more for the price of the infrastructure
- ✗ Houses so big - huge carbon footprint without any indication of alternative energy source - are the owners paying a fair price for the impacts of their choices?
- ✗ Want mixed use in the future (mix of people, old/young, families/singles)
- ✗ Why does a house need that much property?
- ✗ Prioritize redevelopment, not developing natural space
- ✗ So little native planting -- need more than just decorative plants. Need plants that support the healthy and ecology of the area, not just for looks
- ✗ We need less grass--we need more greens, shrubbery - Needs more trees around the houses - Avoid turf grass



XXXXXX

- ✓ Not too overcrowded - enough parking room to move around - Plenty of parking
- ✓ Relatively affordable
- ✓ Mixed use housing a positive
- ✓ Provides more homes in a smaller area - Medium density-goldilocks zone
- ✓ Good small footprint homes for seniors
- ✓ Balconies
- ✓ Masonry on the bottom level/first floor
- ✓ Patios
- ✓ Not all in a straight line
- ✓ Underground utilities, aesthetically pleasing
- ✓ Good landscaping

- ✗ Looks like it could be anywhere
- ✗ Huge parking lot - Too much parking
- ✗ Too much impervious surface
- ✗ Parking should be hidden behind the buildings
- ✗ We want secure parking spaces for apartment complexes. There is crime taking place constantly with cars parking from out state. Cars being robbed. We need developments to be more accountable to create an infrastructure that is safer for renters
- ✗ Don't like parking in the center
- ✗ Layout buildings better
- ✗ Lots of turf grass, not enough trees
- ✗ Connect it to green space
- ✗ Rent vs own
- ✗ Auto oriented, not transit oriented
- ✗ Sidewalk not wide enough
- ✗ Not much landscaping
- ✗ May be affordable but not accessible for aging or disabilities
- ✗ Needs more trees, storm water run off management, solar carports



✓✓



XXXXXXX

- ✓ Nice colors
- ✓ Good use of space
- ✓ Very unusual - I've never seen any place like that
- ✓ Very youthful; young professional
- ✓ Interesting, intriguing architecture while still compressing space, allowing a denser population
- ✓ Attractive, unique architecture, give spaces for architects and artists to express their creativity
- ✓ I like the architectural features but needs to be ADA compliant.
- ✓ European feel
- ✓ Not too tall
- ✓ Varied design, not cookie cutter - has character
- ✓ Likely different price ranges
- ✓ Walkable, compact - Sidewalks
- ✓ Small yards but they have trees -- making use of the space
- ✓ Roof use, plus white roofs for reduced energy use
- ✓ Tree-lined street for canopy cover
- ✓ Best near center cities

- ✗ The materials of the home; the colors/design/ construction. Need to use things that will last -- brick/ stone
- ✗ Ugly, result of gentrification
- ✗ Color doesn't feel like it's from the same palet
- ✗ Brick one looks out of place with arch on roofline
- ✗ Depressing looking, bare trees, stairs are not friendly for ADA and elderly folks, maneuverability
- ✗ Steps up are a problem - not ADA accessible
- ✗ Very narrow sidewalk, maybe <5' - needs to be wider
- ✗ Steps may not be accessible for people with disabilities or aging in place
- ✗ More one-story housing for handicapped and older people
- ✗ Not a lot of ranch houses
- ✗ Has not come to life
- ✗ Tiny yards
- ✗ Trash collection?



✓



XXXXXX

- ✓ Accessible, necessary
- ✓ Greenery/vegetation/wellmaintained
- ✓ Relatively low congestion
- ✓ Grass and trees at the front of the gas station
- ✓ Available grass for dog walking
- ✓ Ample space for cars, and decent number of pumps
- ✓ Local gas station/ character
- ✓ Decent for a gas station
- ✓ I LOVE THESE GAS PRICES!!
- ✓ We need gas stations (but no one's making them like Frank Lloyd Wright anymore)
- ✓ Looks vintage/ retro
- ✓ Suburban
- ✓ Like the amount of green around the gas station
- ✓ Opportunity to walk, and provide employment

- ✗ None -- we all need gas
- ✗ Hopefully it changes in the future
- ✗ Rather see the wires buried
- ✗ No EV charging
- ✗ Ugly
- ✗ Dated
- ✗ Gas canopy should be hidden behind the store. No attempt to design an attractive structure
- ✗ Open space could be used for a community space
- ✗ Awnings should have solar panels



✓✓

- ✓ Wearing helmet
- ✓ Reducing carbon footprint
- ✓ Wider street - there's space for biker
- ✓ Yay for bicycling! We want to see more of this in the county
- ✓ Alternative transportation option
- ✓ Variety of transportation options



XXXXXXXXXX

- ✗ No safe zone for cyclists - Need a biking path - Get this guy a bike lane!!
- ✗ Need better protections / clear markings for bike path
- ✗ Prefer bike paths to the side of the road - trails are great
- ✗ Road in terrible condition
- ✗ Unsafe - dangerous for both bike rider and drivers
- ✗ Could use less, better quality paving. Seems to have an entire wasted lane.
- ✗ Congested
- ✗ Emissions
- ✗ Not conducive to clean transport
- ✗ Don't want dead bicyclists or deteriorating road



- ✓ More affordable housing, effectively using space and leaving more open space.
- ✓ Affordable housing that can be improved with required design standards
- ✓ Good to have mixed housing -- different types of housing
- ✓ Need to fit all types of families and different styles of living arrangements - Can't be all single homes
- ✓ Like how many houses they were able to fit in a small space--it will provide more families and people with housing
- ✓ Nice, small homes. Great yard
- ✓ Well-maintained
- ✓ Has brick - durable
- ✓ Ramped entrances
- ✓ Don't look overcrowded
- ✓ No overhead wires
- ✓ Nice option for those who prefer townhome living and communities



XXXXXXXXXX

- ✗ Too stark
- ✗ Not inviting
- ✗ Pretty typical
- ✗ Grass--where's the shrubbery? - Need trees, native plants
- ✗ Looks like public housing
- ✗ Ugly
- ✗ No awnings
- ✗ No variation in facades
- ✗ No investment from residents
- ✗ No flowers
- ✗ Lack of individuality
- ✗ Poor design for communities; no beauty to this design!
- ✗ There are no stairs at entrance, but still two story building, may be a concern for aging in place, accessibility
- ✗ I would not want to live there
- ✗ Better like your neighbors



- ✓ We need shopping centers
- ✓ Food Store - access to healthy food
- ✓ Apartments close to grocery stores
- ✓ Ample access to parking - Tons of parking, convenient
- ✓ A positive thing about this big lot is that it could be changed into a mixed use development
- ✓ Parking lot surface well maintained - no potholes
- ✓ Fairly clean parking lot
- ✓ Lighting and clear pavement marking (arrows)
- ✓ Trees in the background
- ✓ Doesn't take over the skyline
- ✓ Good traffic direction



XXXXXXXXXXXX

- ✗ Not everyone has access to a full scale supermarket, but don't like design
- ✗ Should be landscaping buffer between parking lot and building when parking is in front of building
- ✗ Not pedestrian friendly, community friendly - No room for pedestrians to walk safely
- ✗ Ugly - Stark
- ✗ Very little greenery - Want trees
- ✗ Too much surface parking !!!! no landscaping
- ✗ Endless parking lot - Is such a huge parking lot really necessary? Could this land be used more effectively?
- ✗ Concrete, old fashioned shopping
- ✗ Unwelcoming
- ✗ Large flat pavement will lead to flooding, needs more trees/plants to catch stormwater
- ✗ Likely contributor to heat island effect
- ✗ Where is ADA parking or senior parking?
- ✗ Typical of land use today in NCC. Not good
- ✗ I would like for the county to have more community markets with local fresh produce and parking lots spaces with trees so it feels like a community



- ✓ Jobs - Good for economy, might be providing a lot of jobs
- ✓ We need cleaner air. Less cancer. But we have to preserve jobs.
- ✓ Necessary
- ✓ Separated from residential
- ✓ Active, not run down
- ✓ We do need industry. Need to control pollution. Need to figure out how to revamp these areas after.



XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

- ✗ Wouldn't like this in my back yard - Industrial uses should not be located near residential - What communities are close to this? What is the impact on the neighborhood?
- ✗ Looks likely to be highly polluting -- unsafe to live or work nearby - Air pollution and emissions are bad - Noisy, odors, unhealthy - Water pollution
- ✗ Looks like a chemical plant--that's awful. We have enough chemical things here
- ✗ Not sure what kind of factory this is but we need to reconsider our priorities of the economy over the protection of our environment. Especially when considering this is what we are leaving for the next generation
- ✗ Very off-putting - Austere
- ✗ Old, worn down factory - Needs updating, lighting, signage etc
- ✗ Better design - trees, etc to conceal industrial spaces - Too close to road - Should hide heavy industry better
- ✗ Traffic congestion
- ✗ Untended area of snow in the roadway
- ✗ Even worse if it's an abandoned factory



- ✓ A mobile community with beautiful trees. Opportunity for affordable living
- ✓ This housing looks more affordable than many other single-family homes
- ✓ We have a lack of affordable housing in New Castle County so this addresses that but they could be prettier
- ✓ Want to have affordable (but well-designed) houses
- ✓ Close to neighbors
- ✓ Lots of trees
- ✓ Organized and neat
- ✓ Well-maintained, nice spacing



XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

- ✗ Social injustices
- ✗ Not the best; a lower step
- ✗ Low income housing should be integrated in all development. We need to move away from having "low income" subdivisions
- ✗ How close to other amenities/resources? More connections needed
- ✗ Trailer parks should be limited. No visible signs, fire hydrants, no play area for children. Looks like military bunkers
- ✗ Flooding would be a problem. Also ownership of the land can be an issue
- ✗ This housing doesn't look like it would survive the occasional hurricanes/tornados that come through Delaware
- ✗ Maybe too close to the trees...what if the trees fell?



- ✓ Pavement in good condition, clean roadway
- ✓ People who want to walk
- ✓ Small local businesses, not chains
- ✓ Like the commercial retail; lots of stores and booming economy... no empty stores or abandoned buildings. See the tax dollars to beautification.
- ✓ Access to several businesses for basic needs
- ✓ Access to a bank
- ✓ Accessibility of shops
- ✓ Parking off road
- ✓ Easily accessible by mass transit
- ✓ No traffic in this picture
- ✓ Convenient--everything seems to be right there; not having to travel far by car, distance
- ✓ Clean air - no smog
- ✓ Can see the sky (not built up)



XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

- ✗ No sidewalks
- ✗ Not pedestrian friendly / hazardous to pedestrians
- ✗ No walkability - road crossing
- ✗ No bike lanes
- ✗ No connections
- ✗ Overhead utilities - need to bury
- ✗ No street trees
- ✗ Nothing - Hate it
- ✗ Not a nice aesthetic - Tacky - Cluttered
- ✗ Looks polluted - litter
- ✗ No sense of place - could be anywhere in the country
- ✗ Not cohesive - should look like it belongs together
- ✗ Old fashioned traffic lights, not well built
- ✗ Not clear how stormwater being managed with so much impervious surface