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Community Workshop #1 Summary
December 6, 2008

Introduction

Project for Public Spaces (PPS) and McFarland-Johnson facilitated a community workshop on December 6, 2008, to assess and brainstorm improvement ideas for Route 40 in the Town and Village of Schaghticoke. Following a presentation on the qualities of great public spaces, the workshop attendees were broken into four groups that each focused on one of the following locations.

1. Route 40 & Route 67
2. Stewarts/Schag A Val
3. Route 40 & Lower Main Street (plus A.E. Diver Library)
4. Hamlet of Melrose

The groups evaluated their assigned site using the “Place Game.” The Place Game ignites a creative process about how to make a place vital and how to improve the experience of people in a place. This structured exercise asks participants to use common sense and intuition, along with structured observation and interview skills, to allow them to very quickly see the good and bad qualities of a place using the characteristics listed below under the following four attributes: comfort and image, access and linkages, uses and activities and sociability.

Comfort & Image
- Overall attractiveness
- Feeling of safety
- Cleanliness/quality of maintenance
- Comfort of places to sit

Access & Linkages
- Visibility from a distance
- Ease in walking to the place
- Transit access
- Clarity of information/signage

Uses & Activities
- Mix of stores/services
- Frequency of community events/activities
- Overall busy-ness of area
- Economic vitality

Sociability
- Number of people in groups
- Evidence of volunteerism
- Sense of pride and ownership
- Presence of children and seniors

Once participants evaluated their site, they were then asked to formulate improvement recommendations and summarize their group’s ideas for:

- What they liked best about the site;
- Short-term improvements;
- Long-term vision; and
- Partnerships and local talent to help implement these ideas.

Finally, each group reported back to all workshop participants, describing the issues and opportunities they identified for their specific area. These workshop outcomes are described in detail below.

**Site 1 – Route 40 & Route 67**

**Site Assessment**

Comfort & Image:
The intersection of Route 40 and Route 67 serves as a gateway into the Village of Schaghticoke. Its country-like atmosphere contributes to the small-town image of the Village. However, the lack of sidewalks and crosswalks, combined with heavy traffic in that area, creates feelings of unease and discomfort for pedestrians. Poor lighting and a lack of seating also contributes to a poor pedestrian environment in an area with a large amount of commercial activity. The fence around the fairgrounds also deteriorates the image of the Village and conveys a sense of exclusion. The shopping plaza is predominately asphalt and is used solely for parking. It is a monotonous hardscape that is unfriendly and unattractive.

Access & Linkages:
Pedestrian accessibility is a major concern for students and those walking from the shopping mall to Stewarts or the Schaghticoke Fairgrounds. The lack of crosswalks, poor signage and weak connections to other destinations discourage people from walking.
Uses & Activities:
The Hoosic Valley Center retail, the Hoosic Valley Central Schools and the Fairgrounds generate a busy area with a mix of stores and services. However, with very few non-retail activities or programmed community events, especially for students, the economic vitality of the area suffers. The infrequency of the Schaghticoke Fair contributes to this issue.

Sociability:
Despite a strong sense of pride and ownership amongst local stakeholders, pedestrian activity in general is minimal. Even with the High School so close, there’s a low level of social interaction because there are no amenities or activities that would encourage people to spend time outdoors.

Opportunities for Improvement

Short-term:
- Provide benches and movable seating, especially in front of the pizza store
- Create a community bulletin board
- Stripe crosswalks at the intersection
- Improve retail and wayfinding signage
- Create an opening in the fence between the schools and the shopping plaza
- Install temporary school art displays
- Create a stronger police presence or install security cameras
- Enhance landscaping in the parking lot
- Remove/replace fence around the Fairgrounds
- Create a "Park and Ride" area, perhaps locating it in the Shop N Save parking lot and creating a formal bus stop in this location

Long-term:
- Change the intersection to roundabout, rather than signalized, control
- Enhance a possible bus stop with lighting, informational signage and a shelter structure
- Enhance/improve street lighting to be pedestrian-scaled
- Build sidewalks and curbs
- Create an entrance/gateway that signals to motorists that they have entered a pedestrian area

Partnership Ideas

- Hoosic Valley Center
- Stop N Save
- Capital District Transportation Authority
- Schaghticoke Fairgrounds
- Hoosic Valley Central Schools – student involvement
- Community service groups

**Site 2 – Stewarts/ Schag A Val**

**Site Assessment**

**Comfort & Image:**
The area around Stewarts and Schag A Val offers a pleasant village feel with residential homes and a mature tree canopy. The outdoor seating provided by Stewarts is well utilized; however, the quality of storefront maintenance is poor and the Fairgrounds fence weakens the overall attractiveness of the place. The lack of sidewalks, crosswalks and curbs, in addition to speeding traffic, creates many pedestrian safety concerns.

**Access & Linkages:**
Northbound visibility is limited by a horizontal curve in Route 40 that obstructs the view of the southern driveway into Stewarts. The proximity of these two businesses makes it convenient for people to walk between them, but the lack of sidewalks and crosswalks makes this difficult. Snowmobiles actively use this area in the winter, and any proposed design changes should consider and accommodate these roadway users.

**Uses & Activities:**
The mix of uses and services provided by Stewarts and Schag A Val allows for a vibrant commercial node and the presence of people. As a result, economic vitality thrives and the area remains busy.

**Sociability:**
Popular commercial and food destinations attract people in groups. This is one of the site’s greatest assets and explains why there is a variety of people here, including seniors.

**Opportunities for Improvement**

**Short-term:**
- Replace the Fairgrounds fence or plant trees/shrubs in front of it
- Paint a crosswalk between the businesses
- Enhance retail signage
- Clean up litter outside Stewarts
- Provide picnic tables for motorcyclists and snowmobilers traveling through the area
- Improve landscaping
• Provide on-street truck parking

Long-term:
• Implement sidewalks and curbs, beginning with the east side of Route 40
• Improve highway drainage
• Install pedestrian-scaled lighting (energy-efficient lighting would save money on operations)
• Manage driveways to reduce vehicle-pedestrian conflicts
• Implement a 30 MPH speed limit and a speed indicator
• Change roadway design to slow traffic
• Gateway element to enhance entrance to the core of the Village

**Partnership Ideas**

• Hoosic Valley Central Schools
• New York State Department of Transportation
• Village of Schaghticoke
• Business community
• Rensselaer County
• Schaghticoke Fairgrounds
• Rotary Club
• American Legion
• Local churches
• Community groups

**Site 3 – Route 40 & Lower Main Street (plus A.E. Diver Library)**

**Site Assessment**

Comfort & Image:
The small town atmosphere and architecture add to the positive image and overall attractiveness of the Village of Schaghticoke. Traffic entering and exiting the Mobil station, however, creates conflicts between cars and pedestrians. The overall lack of wayfinding signage, pedestrian amenities and seating makes this area unwelcoming and uncomfortable. The roads are in poor condition and, without crosswalks, crossing them is dangerous because vehicles often speed through this area. The small park and the lawn in front of the library are well kept and aesthetically pleasing, but the little seating that is provided is oddly located.

Access & Linkages:
Despite being the historical and logical center of the Village, there is insufficient indication from a distance that motorists are entering the heart of the community. There is also poor signage
directing people to businesses on Lower Main Street, which was diminished as the village “core” when Route 40 was shifted to its current alignment. Further, the lack of a continuous sidewalk, crosswalks or traffic controls make walkability in this area difficult and unsafe, especially for children going to the library and people trying to cross between the Village Hall and the Post Office. The narrow sidewalks on the Hoosic River Bridge and its poor aesthetic quality are also deterrents to walking and biking between different parts of the Village and Town of Schaghticoke.

Uses & Activities:
A good selection of stores and services at the intersection creates a small community feel yet there is little evidence of community activities or events. The overall busyness of this site is generated by vehicular traffic, not pedestrians.

Sociability:
Some evidence of volunteerism and town pride can be seen in the well maintained pocket park. However, besides attractive landscaping and a sculpture, there is no reason to spend time in this public space. It appears underutilized, and no children, seniors or groups are present. There may be more activity in this location during the summer when Chrissy's is open for business.

Opportunities for Improvement

Short-term:
- Locate crosswalks near pedestrian generators
- Create a unique gateway treatment
- Enhance traffic enforcement, potentially with radar
- Paint roadway markings the better delineate the Route 40/Lower Main Street intersection
- Provide Wi-Fi Internet access in the park
- Enhance park programming
- Install sidewalk benches
- Create signage that directs people to the businesses on Lower Main Street
- Create a community bulletin board in the park

Long-term:
- Provide sidewalks on both sides of the street
- Widen sidewalks
- Use traffic calming to slow traffic
- Create on-street parking spaces for the library
- Reconfigure the intersection of Main Street and School Street
- Manage access to the Mobil station
- Improve lighting
• Replace the Hoosic River Bridge as a pedestrian-friendly destination in the Village (look to South Glens Falls Bridge as a design model)
• Relocate the bridge to intersect Lower Main Street farther to the south (near the Legion Hall)
• Create an overlook area at the foot of the bridge for pedestrians and motorists
• Use the old bridge as a bicycle trail

Partnership Ideas

• Chrissy's
• Presbyterian United Church
• Legion Hall
• Dave D'Ambrose
• Local children – Boy and Girl Scouts
• Hoosic Valley students – government class
• Hoosic Valley PTO

Site 4 – Hamlet of Melrose

Site Assessment

Comfort & Image:
Speeding vehicles approaching Melrose create an unsafe and uncomfortable pedestrian environment. The Esquire Food & Drug site and the Getty site in particular are in poor shape and not well maintained, and the Getty site creates an image of abandonment and lack of ownership. Commercial and institutional signage is generally poor and detracts from the aesthetics of the Hamlet. However, the green memorial park is well maintained and litter free.

Access & Linkages:
There is no sense of entrance into the Hamlet, and visibility from a distance is poor. The lack of sidewalks and crosswalks discourage pedestrian activity and accessibility to local destinations, such as the Post Office. Narrow shoulders do not accommodate bicyclists well. Esquire Food & Drug, located at the Route 40/Church Street intersection has poorly managed access and confusing parking patterns. Vehicles parked at Esquire limit sight distance at the Church Street intersection and create numerous potential conflict points. The geometry of the Route 40/ Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection also creates potential traffic safety issues.

Uses & Activities:
Despite the presence of a range of pedestrian generators, including Esquire, a gift shop, the Methodist church and a post office, there are no community events or activities that create a
busy, economically and socially thriving place. Poor visibility and the lack of synergy between these destinations and services contribute to this feeling of inactivity.

Sociability:
A lack of pedestrian amenities and community events limits group activity. However, the well maintained pocket park suggests evidence of volunteerism and community pride. The speed and noise of passing traffic, however, limit its attractiveness as a gathering place.

Opportunities for Improvement

Short-term:
- Lower the speed limit
- Provide benches outside the church and in public spaces
- Improve Esquire’s signage
- Talk to Esquire owner about improving the condition of the site
- Slow traffic at the blinking light at Church Street and Route 40
- Paint a crosswalk for pedestrians
- Create a formal bus stop

Long-term:
- Reconfigure the Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection
- Install a roundabout to slow traffic and address difficult intersection designs
- Change the blinking light to a regular stop light, which is controlled by detection sensors
- Make better use of Getty property for a bus stop, park space or intersection improvements
- Install sidewalks and curbing
- Provide formal on-street parking
- Improve drainage at the old railroad overpass
- Continue more extensive improvements of the Esquire site

Partnership Ideas

- Hoosic Valley Central Schools
- Community and neighborhood groups
- Fire House/Department
- Melrose Methodist Church
Community Workshop #2 Summary
October 8, 2009

Introduction

McFarland Johnson led a community workshop on October 8, 2009 to present and explain the transportation and land use recommendations that had been developed over the course of this study for the Route 40 corridor. It was noted that many of the recommendations originated from residents’ ideas generated at the December 6, 2008 Community Workshop, and that these ideas had been further developed and refined based on input received from the Study Advisory Committee.

The primary tool used to gather feedback from this workshop was a comprehensive “Resident Opinion Survey” that attendees were asked to complete, with the option of submitting the completed surveys before they left that evening, or returning them to McFarland Johnson by mail or email before October 22. Residents unable to attend the workshop were also offered an opportunity to complete the surveys based on their review of the draft report, copies of which were made available for viewing at the A.E. Diver Library and the Schaghticoke Town Hall. The completed surveys were used to compile a summary of the group’s general feelings regarding the corridor recommendations presented (i.e., “strongly in favor,” “somewhat in favor,” “neutral,” “somewhat oppose” and “strongly oppose”), but they also offered an opportunity to provide general or specific comments regarding transportation and land use issues along the Route 40 corridor. A total of 18 completed surveys were received from Town and Village residents; summaries of the surveys can be found at the end of this Appendix.

Summary of Survey Results

In general, the corridor recommendations presented were well received. Although most of the recommendations received some negative ratings (i.e., “somewhat oppose” or “strongly oppose”), in all cases those ratings were offset by a greater number of positive ratings (i.e., “strongly in favor” or “somewhat in favor”), and in most cases the positive ratings far outweighed the negative ratings. It should also be noted that non-responses were combined with ratings of “neutral,” so the actual percentage of positive ratings out of all responses received for a particular corridor recommendation was a little higher in many instances.

Recommended improvements that received an overwhelming positive response (i.e., greater than 80% positive ratings) are tabulated on the following page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Recommendations Receiving the Highest Percentage of Positive Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet of Melrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet of Melrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet of Melrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One desired outcome of the survey was to determine community preferences regarding a new crossing location for the bridge carrying Route 40 over the Hoosic River, a structure that is scheduled to be replaced by NYSDOT in 2012. Residents were asked to choose between two possible crossing options – Crossing Option #1 involves a heavily curved bridge that creates a new, four-leg intersection at Lower Main Street and Second Street; while Crossing Option #2 would replace the bridge on a shifted/curved alignment just north of the existing crossing.

No clear community preference emerged as a result of the survey. Based on all surveys received, 41% preferred Crossing Option #1 compared to 59% for Option #2. Taking into account surveys completed by Village residents only, the results were split 50/50.

**Resident Comments**

The following is a compilation of written comments received during and after the second Community Workshop.

Resident, Hamlet of Melrose
- “The Melrose (Firemen?) are opposed to any move.” (hard to read; comment may be referencing the relocation of the veteran’s memorial located near the Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road)
Resident, Hamlet of Melrose
- “The town should acquire the former Getty gas station in Melrose. It is an eyesore that has had numerous spills reported over the years. If Getty refuses to give the property to the town, the town should sue Getty for natural resources damages. Once the town has the property, the intersection could be reconfigured, landscaped, and a bus stop gazebo constructed.”
- “The old abandoned post office in Melrose needs to be removed.”

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke
- “I feel that moving the bridge to the south (option #1) is a great idea.” (referencing the relocation of the Hoosic River crossing)
- “Should not allow parking in front of Esquire.” (referencing parking patterns in front of Esquire Food & Drug)
- “Put (roundabouts) at both intersections of 40 & 67.”
- “Excellent location for a roundabout.” (referencing northern Route 40 / Route 67 intersection)
- “Excellent – a lot of students walk this area.” (referencing recommended extension of sidewalks north of Stewarts to shopping plaza and schools)

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke
- “I’m not a proponent of roundabouts.”

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke
- “Oak Street?” (referencing recommendation to construct a shared use path between Route 40 and School Street, opposite of Fifth Street)

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke
- “Extend 45 MPH speed zone to Tomhannock Creek.” (referencing recommendation to implement a 45 MPH speed zone south of the Village)
- “45 MPH – Wiley Bros to 40/67 intersection.” (referencing recommended speed reduction measures at north approach to Village)
- “Community bulletin board.” (referencing recommended enhancements to area in front of Village Hall and adjacent church)

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke
- “Need wide lanes all along Route 40; no on-street parking.”
- “We need to accommodate the existing businesses and gathering sites, especially our churches. Parking and Church property must not be reduced but rather enlarged to accommodate the many uses of the church – religious gatherings, community dinners, concerts, quilt shows, etc.”
• “All electrical distribution/communication lines should be buried.”
• “Move village water line out from under Route 40 / Main Street.”

Resident, Town of Schaghticoke
• “Bridge is most important issue. Group should be fully informed in all stages of replacement. DOT should be continually aware of the impact on the Village and flow of traffic on NY40.”
• “Village speed limit reduced to 30 mph.”
• “Improve law enforcement for traffic control.”
• “Provide weight limits for trucks.”

Resident, Town of Schaghticoke
• “I have three hopes/desires/wishes for the Village of Schaghticoke. First is to have a complete and usable sidewalk extending all the way to the intersection of Routes 40 & 67. Second is to have a community space in front of the library, along with improved fencing between Route 40 and the bank down to Electric Lake. Third is improving the bridge.”

Resident, another town (previous Town of Schaghticoke resident for 33 years)
• “Unfortunately, the study does not look at the entire Hamlet of Melrose. Melrose goes from Pinewoods Avenue in the north to Pineview Avenue in the south.”
• “Sidewalks should continue on the west side (of Route 40) to Avenue A.”
• “Cars speed up coming out of Grant Hollow, which is why they’re pushing 55 when they hit downtown Melrose. Traffic calming should start soon after Mineral Springs Road.”
• “The Town should look towards working with the Town of Brunswick and the City of Troy and study Route 40 between Melrose Valley Falls Road & NY 142, where the worst problems are.”
• “Won’t be able to see coming out of church.” (referencing recommendation to establish community gathering space in front of the Methodist Church in the Hamlet of Melrose)
• “(This would make it a) super highway! 4 to 6 feet sufficient.” (referencing recommendation to widen pavement between the Hamlet and the Village to provide 8-foot shoulders)
• “You wouldn’t know it was there going south until you came upon it.” (referencing recommendation to reconstruct the southern Route 40 / Route 67 intersection as a modern roundabout)
• “Destroys historic fabric, (would need to) widen Lower Main Street to fit traffic.” (referencing Hoosic River crossing location Option #1)
• “Preferred, maybe just replace on site with improved design.” (referencing Hoosic River crossing location Option #2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident Opinion Survey: Summary of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hamlet of Melrose</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Bold numbers indicate most common choices.
2. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H1</strong> Reconstruct Route 40 in the hamlet area with context sensitive cross section elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Narrower travel lanes, curbs and closed drainage, street trees, on-street parking in front of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquire Food &amp; Drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H2</strong> Improve intersection safety within the Hamlet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Route 40 / Melrose Valley Falls Road: reconfigure intersection as a conventional &quot;T&quot; intersection (relocate memorial and pocket park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H3</strong> Address existing drainage issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Hillside runoff problem south of Route 40 / Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection; ponding problem in vicinity of old railroad bridge abutments (at north end of hamlet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H4</strong> Improve pedestrian accommodations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Install new concrete sidewalks, pedestrian crosswalks and ADA-compliant curb ramps in hamlet area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H5</strong> Transit improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Install bus stop and shelter in center of hamlet along CDTA Route 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H6</strong> Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at north and south approaches to hamlet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Examples: gateway signage/landscaping, roadway center islands, radar speed feedback signs, speed zone warning signage, and special pavement markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H7</strong> Community enhancements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Establish community gathering space in front of Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| - Redevelop abandoned gas station for community or commercial use |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| - Enhance appearance/usage of area in front of Esquire Food &amp; Drug |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| - Expand municipal water system throughout hamlet to enable denser development |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| - Extend municipal sewer system to/throughout hamlet to enable denser development |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| - Additional businesses along Route 40 in hamlet |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| - New street connection between Route 40 and Melrose Valley Falls Road (north of fire station) with additional residential development |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resident Opinion Survey: Recommended Improvements

### Rural Segment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Strongly in Favor</th>
<th>Somewhat in Favor</th>
<th>Neutral/Didn’t Respond</th>
<th>Somewhat Opposed</th>
<th>Strongly Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1 Increase Route 40 shoulder width to better accommodate bicyclists and farm equipment</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Widen pavement to provide 8-foot shoulders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 Improve rural intersection safety</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Route 40 / Northline Rd / Gutbrodt Rd: adjust roadway profile and/or cut back slopes to increase intersection sight distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Route 40 / Bracken Road: reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other intersections: special pavement markings on Route 40 to reduce mainline vehicle speeds</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 Speed reduction / traffic calming measures at south approach to Village</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institute a 1/2-mile-long 45 MPH speed zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic calming measures such as radar speed feedback signs, speed zone warning signage, and special pavement markings</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reconstruct Route 40 / Route 67 intersection as a modern roundabout</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESIDENT OPINION SURVEY: SUMMARY OF RESULTS

### Village of Schaghticoke

**Notes:**
1. Bold numbers indicate most common choices.
2. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly in Favor</th>
<th>Somewhat in Favor</th>
<th>Neutral/Don't Respond</th>
<th>Somewhat Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Replace/relocate Hoosic River crossing with an attractive bridge and approaches that calm traffic and better accommodate all roadway users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option #1: Curved crossing that forms a four-leg intersection at Lower Main Street and Second Street</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option #2: Replace bridge on shifted/curved alignment just north of existing crossing, with reconfigured Route 40 / Lower Main Street intersection</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>Reconstruct Route 40 in the Village with context sensitive cross section elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curbs and closed drainage, street trees, on-street parking where space permits</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>Improve intersection safety within the Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 40 / Chestnut Street: adjust Route 40 profile to improve intersection sight distance</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 40 / School Street (by church): reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 40 / Pleasant Ave: reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Address existing drainage issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase number of inlets in hill section; increase number of inlets between Stewarts and Shop-n-Save</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian accommodations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extend sidewalks from Stewarts to shopping plaza and schools</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade existing pedestrian facilities in Village: replace deteriorated/missing sidewalks; install new pedestrian crosswalks and ADA-compliant curb ramps</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct shared use path between Schaght and a Val restaurant and Route 40 / Route 67 intersection</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct shared use path between Route 40 and School Street (opposite Fifth St)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>Transit / ridesharing improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install bus stop(s) and shelter(s) at one or two locations in Village along CDTA Route 96</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocate park-and-ride lot to shopping plaza or nearby</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at north approach to Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: gateway signage/landscaping, radar speed feedback signs, speed zone warning signage, and special pavement markings</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct Route 40 / Route 67 intersection as a modern roundabout</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resident Opinion Survey: Summary of Results

### Village of Schaghticoke

#### Notes:
1. Bold numbers indicate most common choices.
2. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V8 Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at entrances to residential district</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Center island with crosswalk between Stewarts and Schag a Val</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Center island (without crosswalk) just south of Chestnut Street</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V9 Community enhancements</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improvements to pocket park in front of Village Hall; enhancements to area in front of adjacent church</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creation of a scenic lookout area along Hoosic River, next to church (in conjunction with Item V1, Option #1)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community gathering spaces in front of library and/or Chrissy's</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Resident Opinion Survey: Summary of Results

## Village of Schaghticoke  
**Village Residents Only**

| Notes: |  
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Bold numbers indicate most common choices.  
2. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding. | strongly in favor | somewhat in favor | neutral/didn't respond | somewhat oppose | strongly oppose |

### V1 Replace/relocate Hoosic River crossing with an attractive bridge and approaches that calm traffic and better accommodate all roadway users
- **Option #1:** Curved crossing that forms a four-leg intersection at Lower Main Street and Second Street  
  - 50%  
  - 38%  
  - 13%
- **Option #2:** Replace bridge on shifted/curved alignment just north of existing crossing, with reconfigured Route 40 / Lower Main Street intersection  
  - 50%  
  - 13%  
  - 38%

### V2 Reconstruct Route 40 in the Village with context sensitive cross section elements
- Curbs and closed drainage, street trees, on-street parking where space permits  
  - 50%  
  - 38%  
  - 13%

### V3 Improve intersection safety within the Village
- Route 40 / Chestnut Street: adjust Route 40 profile to improve intersection sight distance  
  - 75%  
  - 13%  
  - 13%
- Route 40 / School Street (by church): reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees  
  - 38%  
  - 50%  
  - 13%
- Route 40 / Pleasant Ave: reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees  
  - 50%  
  - 13%  
  - 25%  
  - 13%

### V4 Address existing drainage issues
- Increase number of inlets in hill section; increase number of inlets between Stewarts and Shop-n-Save  
  - 38%  
  - 50%  
  - 13%

### V5 Improve pedestrian accommodations
- Extend sidewalks from Stewarts to shopping plaza and schools  
  - 75%  
  - 25%
- Upgrade existing pedestrian facilities in Village: replace deteriorated/missing sidewalks; install new pedestrian crosswalks and ADA-compliant curb ramps  
  - 63%  
  - 13%  
  - 25%
- Construct shared use path between Schaghticoe Valley restaurant and Route 40 / Route 67 intersection  
  - 50%  
  - 13%  
  - 50%
- Construct shared use path between Route 40 and School Street (opposite Fifth St)  
  - 38%  
  - 50%  
  - 13%  
  - 13%

### V6 Transit / ridesharing improvements
- Install bus stops/and shelter(s) at one or two locations in Village along CDTA Route 96  
  - 38%  
  - 25%  
  - 38%
- Relocate park-and-ride lot to shopping plaza or nearby  
  - 38%  
  - 38%  
  - 25%

### V7 Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at north approach to Village
- Examples: gateway signage/landscaping, radar speed feedback signs, speed zone warning signage, and special pavement markings  
  - 50%  
  - 50%
- Reconstruct Route 40 / Route 67 intersection as a modern roundabout  
  - 38%  
  - 13%  
  - 50%
## Resident Opinion Survey: Summary of Results

**Village of Schaghticoke | ** Village Residents Only **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Notes:</strong></th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bold numbers indicate most common choices.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8 Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at entrances to residential district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Center island with crosswalk between Stewarts and Schag a’Vail</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Center island (without crosswalk) just south of Chestnut Street</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9 Community enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvements to pocket park in front of Village Hall: enhancements to area in front of adjacent church</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creation of a scenic lookout area along Hoosic River, next to church (in conjunction with Item V1, Option #1)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community gathering spaces in front of library and/or Chrisays’</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Draft Access Management Guidelines

The benefits of good access management are well-documented. The National Highway Institute reports that an effective access management program can reduce crashes as much as 50 percent, increase roadway capacity by 23 to 45 percent, and reduce travel time and delay as much as 40 to 60 percent. The benefits of good access management affect all roadway users, however. The Transportation Research Board’s Access Management Manual describes many of these benefits, including:

- Motorists face fewer decision points and traffic conflicts, which simplifies driving and increases safety.
- Cyclists can choose alternative travel routes as supporting roadway systems are developed and face fewer conflicts with motorists which increases safety.
- Pedestrians face fewer and less frequent access points where motorists enter and exit the roadway making it safer to walk along major roadways.
- Transit riders experience reduced delay and travel times and more convenient access to transit stops as connectivity is improved.
- Business persons experience a more predictable development environment served by a more efficient roadway system that captures a broader market area.
- Communities have a safer transportation system with less need for road widening thereby avoiding displacement of existing businesses and residences.

The following guidelines\(^1\) are provided for managing access to land development while preserving the flow of traffic in terms of safety and capacity. These guidelines balance the rights of reasonable access to private property with the rights of all people to safe and efficient travel along the Route 40 corridor. In conjunction with the proposed transportation and land use recommendations included in the Route 40 Corridor Study, these guidelines will help the Town and Village of Schaghticoke advance their vision for the Route 40 corridor.

With legal assistance these guidelines can be adopted into the Town and/or Village of Schaghticoke’s local laws.

---

\(^1\) Adapted from “Model Land Development & Subdivision Regulations That Support Access Management”, Florida Department of Transportation/University of South Florida Center for Urban Transportation Research; and “Access Management Model Ordinances for Pennsylvania Municipalities Handbook”, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation/US Department of Transportation.
A. Access Connection and Driveway Design

The New York State Department of Transportation requires driveways to adhere to minimum design standards in the design and location of access connections or other traffic control features. These standards are contained in the latest editions of the following technical documents:

- NYSDOT Highway Design Manual;
- Policy and Standards for the Design of Entrances to State Highways, commonly referred to as the “Driveway Design Policy” (NYSDOT Highway Design Manual Appendix 5A); and,
- National Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (National MUTCD) and 17 NYCRR Chapter V (New York State Supplement)

The minimum standards for driveway design and location are as follows:

1. Driveway grades, widths and flares/radii should conform to the requirements contained in the NYSDOT’s Policy and Standards for the Design of Entrances to State Highways.

2. Driveway approaches must be designed and located to provide an exiting vehicle with safe sight distance for all permitted turning movements, in accordance with the requirements contained in the NYSDOT’s Policy and Standards for the Design of Entrances to State Highways.

3. The length of driveways or “throat length” should be designed in accordance with the anticipated storage length for entering and exiting vehicles to prevent vehicles from backing into the flow of traffic on the public street or causing unsafe conflicts with on-site circulation. General standards are provided below. Variation from these may be permitted for good cause upon approval of the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT.

   a. For minimum use commercial driveways (less than 25 vehicles/day), the throat length should be a minimum of 25 feet.
   b. For low volume driveways (25-750 vehicles/day), the throat length should be a minimum of 50 feet, or as determined by queuing analysis.
   c. For medium volume driveways (750-1,500 vehicles/day), the throat length should be a minimum of 125 feet, or as determined by queuing analysis.
   d. For high volume driveways (more than 1,500 vehicles/day), the throat length should be a minimum of 150 feet, or as determined by queuing analysis.
B. Number of Driveways

The number of driveway locations to be permitted to serve a property should be based on preserving the flow of traffic and highway safety along Route 40, while considering the amount and type of traffic the driveway is expected to serve, in addition to the location, type, and density of the development.

1. Only one access should be permitted for a property.

2. An additional access or accesses may be permitted if the applicant demonstrates that an additional access or additional accesses are necessary to accommodate traffic to and from the site and it can be achieved in a safe and efficient manner.

3. The Town or Village of Schaghticoke or NYSDOT may restrict access to right turn only ingress and egress, or to another state maintained road or local road if safe and efficient movements cannot be accommodated.

4. For a property that abuts one or more roadways in addition to Route 40, the Town or Village of Schaghticoke or NYSDOT may restrict access to only that roadway that can more safely and efficiently accommodate traffic.

C. Access Spacing

Driveway spacing standards limit the number of driveways on a roadway by mandating a minimum separation distance between driveways. Adequate driveway spacing facilitates smoother traffic flows, reduces the number of potential conflict points that must be monitored by motorists, and helps preserve the capacity of the roadway. It also reduces the number of conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians and bicycles.

1. Separation between access points on Route 40 will be based on the posted speed limit as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posted Speed Limit</th>
<th>Driveway Spacing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 mph or less</td>
<td>125 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>250 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 mph or greater</td>
<td>450 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Driveway spacing shall be measured from the closest edge of pavement to the next closest edge of pavement. The access spacing requirements may be reduced in situations where they prove impractical.
2. Driveways should be aligned with other driveways and roadways on the opposite side of Route 40 in order to meet spacing requirements.

3. If these access spacing guidelines cannot be achieved, then a system of joint use driveways and cross access easements may be required in accordance with subsequent sections.

D. Corner Clearance

Corner clearance is the distance from an intersection of a public or private road. The provision of adequate corner clearance minimizes driveway-intersection conflicts and affords a greater distance for vehicles to merge into through traffic.

1. Corner clearance for connections should meet or exceed the minimum access spacing requirements for that roadway. Driveway spacing shall be measured from the closest edge of pavement for the driveway to the next closest edge of pavement for the intersection.

2. New connections on Route 40 should not be permitted within the functional area of an intersection area (i.e., the area beyond the physical intersection that comprises decision and maneuver distance, plus any required vehicle storage length) unless:
   a) No other reasonable access to the property is available; and,
   b) The Planning Board and NYSDOT determine that the connection does not create a safety or operational problem upon review of a site-specific study of the proposed connection prepared by a registered engineer and submitted by the applicant.

3. Where no other alternatives exist, the Planning Board and NYSDOT may allow construction of an access connection along the property line farthest from the intersection. In such cases, directional connections (i.e. right in/out, right in only, or right out only) may be required.

4. In addition to the required minimum lot size, all corner lots should be of adequate size to provide for required front yard setbacks and corner clearance on street frontage.

E. Joint and Cross Access

Joint and cross access driveways reduce the number of driveways accessing the roadway, thus reducing the number of conflict areas along the roadway, as well as the number of conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians and bicycles. They are a safe and more efficient way to provide access to
two or more adjacent land uses because motorists do not have to exit one driveway, merge into traffic on the intersecting roadway, and then enter another driveway. These types of driveways allow municipalities and state transportation agencies to maintain driveway spacing standards along corridors that have several parcels with limited roadway frontage. For undeveloped parcels, the easements for joint and cross access should be implemented during the land development approval process.

1. Adjacent commercial or office properties should provide a cross access drive and pedestrian access to allow circulation between sites wherever feasible.

2. A system of joint use driveways and cross access easements should be established wherever feasible along Route 40 and should incorporate the following:
   a) A continuous service drive or cross access corridor extending the entire length of each block served to provide for driveway separation consistent with the access spacing standards.
   b) A design speed of 10 mph and sufficient width to accommodate two-way traffic, including the largest vehicle expected to regularly access the properties;
   c) Stub-outs and other design features to make it visually obvious that the abutting properties may be tied together to provide cross access via a service drive;
   d) A unified access and circulation system plan that includes coordinated or shared parking areas is encouraged wherever feasible; and,
   e) Sidewalks on one or both sides to increase pedestrian safety and access.

3. Shared parking areas are strongly encouraged and should facilitate a reduction in required number of parking spaces if peak demand periods for proposed land uses do not occur at the same time periods.

4. Pursuant to this section, property owners shall:
   a) Record an easement with the deed allowing cross access to and from other properties served by the joint use driveways and cross access or service drive;
b) Record an agreement with the deed that remaining access rights along the thoroughfare will be dedicated to the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and pre-existing driveways will be closed and eliminated after construction of the joint-use driveway; and,

c) Record a joint maintenance agreement with the deed defining maintenance responsibilities of property owners.

5. The Planning Board may reduce required separation distance of access points where they prove impractical, provided all of the following requirements are met:

a) Joint access driveways and cross access easements are provided wherever feasible in accordance with this section.

b) The site plan incorporates a unified access and circulation system in accordance with this section.

c) The property owner enters into a written agreement with the Town or Village of Schaghticoke, recorded with the deed, that pre-existing connections on the site will be closed and eliminated after construction of each side of the joint use driveway.

6. The Planning Board may modify or waive the requirements of this section where the characteristics or layout of abutting properties would make development of a unified or shared access and circulation system impractical.

F. Requirements for Outparcels and Phased Development Plans

Outparcels are parcels of land, generally located on the perimeter of a larger parcel of commercial land, that are subordinate to the larger parcel for access, parking and drainage purposes. This section is intended to encourage driveway consolidation for outparcels and phased development plans by way of coordinated internal circulation. Adjacent properties under single ownership will be treated as one property unless the applicant can show the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT that the two properties should have separate access due to safety concerns. Marketing of the two properties is not a valid reason to have them treated as separate properties.

1. In the interest of promoting unified access and circulation systems, development sites under the same ownership or consolidated for the purposes of development and comprised of more than one building site should not be considered separate properties in relation to the access standards of these guidelines. The number of connections permitted should be the minimum number necessary to provide reasonable access to these properties, not the maximum available for that frontage. All necessary easements, agreements, and stipulations required under the Joint and Cross Access Section should be met. This should also apply to phased development plans. The owner and all lessees within the affected area are responsible for compliance with the requirements of this code and both should be cited for any violation.
2. All access to the outparcel must be internalized using the shared circulation system of the principal development or retail center. Access to outparcels should be designed to avoid excessive movement across parking aisles and queuing across surrounding parking and driving aisles.

3. Outparcels should have a minimum lineal frontage of 300 feet per outparcel, or greater where access spacing standards for that roadway require. This frontage requirement may be waived where access is internalized using the shared circulation system of the principal development or retail center. In such cases the right of direct access to the roadway should be dedicated to the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and recorded with the deed.

G. Reverse Frontage

Reverse frontage lots (also called “double frontage lots” and “through lots”) are lots with generally opposite ends that both abut streets. These standards are effective in reducing safety hazards and congestion caused by direct access to Route 40; they also serve to reduce the number of local trips using the state highway.

1. Access to reverse frontage lots should be required on the street with the lower functional classification.

2. When a residential subdivision is proposed that would abut Route 40, it should be designed to provide reverse frontage lots along Route 40 with access from a frontage road or interior local road. Access rights of these lots to Route 40 should be dedicated to the Village or Town of Schaghticoke and recorded with the deed. A berm or buffer yard may be required at the rear of reverse frontage lots to buffer residences from traffic on Route 40. The berm or buffer yard should not be located within the public right-of-way.

3. Pedestrian easements can be utilized to connect pedestrian traffic from residential development to Route 40.
H. Flag Lot Standards

Flag lots are parcels of land shaped like a flag; the staff is a narrow strip of land providing vehicular and pedestrian access to a street, with the bulk of the property lying to the rear of the other lots. Where the narrow frontages for flag lots abut Route 40, they afford inadequate spacing between driveways and increase safety hazards from vehicles turning on and off Route 40.

1. Flag lots should not be permitted when their effect would be to increase the number of properties requiring direct and individual access connections to Route 40.

2. Flag lots may be permitted for residential development, when deemed necessary to achieve planning objectives, such as reducing direct access to thoroughfares, providing internal platted lots with access to a residential street, or preserving natural or historic resources, under the following conditions:
   a) Flag lot driveways should be separated by at least twice the minimum defined in the Access Spacing section.
   b) In no instance should flag lots constitute more than 10% of the total number of building sites in a recorded or unrecorded plat, or three lots or more, whichever is greater.
   c) The lot area occupied by the flag driveway should not be counted as part of the required minimum lot area of that zoning district.
   d) No more than one flag lot should be permitted per private right-of-way or access easement.

I. Lot Width-to-Depth Ratios

Minimum lot frontage and maximum lot width-to-depth ratios prevent the creation of long and narrow or irregularly shaped lots that can lead to access and circulation problems.

1. To provide for proper site design and prevent the creation of irregularly shaped parcels, the depth of any lot or parcel should not exceed 4 times its width.
J. **Shared Access via New Local Streets**

The provisions for shared access are intended to prevent a proliferation of driveways on Route 40. Provisions for shared access also promote land development patterns that are more compatible with the rural character of the Town and Village of Schaghticoke.

1. Subdivisions with frontage on Route 40 should be designed into shared access points to and from the highway. A maximum of two accesses should be allowed regardless of the number of lots or businesses served.

2. More than two accesses may be permitted if the applicant demonstrates that additional access(es) are necessary for proper site circulation and it can be achieved in a safe and efficient manner.

K. **Connectivity**

The provisions for connectivity are intended to encourage trips between adjoining developments and fewer trips on Route 40. This provision strives to maintain a balance between enhancing accessibility and limiting excessive through traffic in residential areas.

1. The street system of a proposed subdivision should be designed to coordinate with existing, proposed, and planned streets outside of the subdivision as provided in this Section.

2. Wherever a proposed development abuts unplatted land or a future development phase of the same development, street stubs should be provided as deemed necessary by the Village or Town of Schaghticoke to provide access to abutting properties or to logically extend the street system into the surrounding area. All street stubs should be provided with temporary turn-around or cul-de-sacs unless specifically exempted by the Town or Village of Schaghticoke.
Schaghticoke, and the restoration and extension of the street should be the responsibility of any future developer of the abutting land.

3. Collector streets should intersect with collector or arterial streets at safe and convenient locations.

4. Sub-collector and local residential access streets should connect with surrounding streets to permit the convenient movement of traffic between residential neighborhoods or facilitate emergency access and evacuation, but such connections should not be permitted where the effect would be to encourage the use of such streets by substantial through traffic.

L. Nonconforming Access Features

Nonconforming access features may continue in the same manner after adoption of land development regulations – a process known as “grandfathering.” This protects the substantial investment of property owners and recognizes the expense of bringing those properties into conformance. Opportunities to bring nonconforming features into compliance occur after specific events when the costs of required improvements may be amortized in the business loan or mortgage, thereby minimizing financial hardship.

1. Permitted access connections in place as of (date of adoption) that do not conform with the standards herein should be designated as nonconforming features and should be brought into compliance with applicable standards under one of the following conditions:

   a) When new access connection permits are requested;
   b) Substantial enlargements or improvements;
   c) Significant change in trip generation;
   d) Property ownership changes; or,
   e) As roadway improvements allow.

2. If the principal activity on a property with nonconforming access features is discontinued for a consecutive period of 365 days, or discontinued for any period of time without a present intention of resuming that activity, then that property must thereafter be brought into conformity with all applicable connection spacing and design requirements, unless otherwise exempted by the Planning Board.

3. For uses that are vacant or discontinued upon the effective date of this code, the 365 day period begins on the effective date of this code.
M. Site Plan Review Procedures

The subdivision and site plan review process provides the Town or Village of Schaghticoke with the most effective opportunity for addressing access considerations and preventing access problems before they occur. Effective coordination with the New York State Department of Transportation and other agencies is essential to ensure conformance with land division and access requirements.

1. Applicants should submit a preliminary site plan for review by the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT. At a minimum, the site plan should show:

   a) Location of access point(s) on both sides of the road where applicable;
   b) Distances to neighboring constructed access points, median openings, traffic signals, intersections, and other transportation features on both sides of the property;
   c) Number and direction of lanes to be constructed on the driveway plus striping plans;
   d) All planned transportation features (such as auxiliary lanes, signals, etc.);
   e) Trip generation data or appropriate traffic studies;
   f) Parking and internal circulation plans;
   g) Plat map showing property lines, right-of-way, and ownership of abutting properties; and,
   h) A detailed description of any requested variance and the reason the variance is requested.

2. Subdivision and site plan review should address the following access considerations:

   a) Is the road system designed to meet the projected traffic demand and does the road network consist of hierarchy of roads designed according to function?
   b) Does the road network provide an appropriate level of connectivity with the surrounding existing, proposed, and planned streets?
   c) Does the road network follow the natural topography and preserve natural features of the site as much as possible? Have alignments been planned so that grading requirements are minimized?
   d) Is access properly placed in relation to sight distance, driveway spacing, and other related considerations, including opportunities for joint and cross access? Are entry roads clearly visible from the major arterials?
   e) Outside of the Village and Hamlet, do units front on residential access streets rather than major roadways?
   f) Is automobile movement within the site provided without having to use the peripheral road network?
   g) Does the road system provide adequate access to buildings for residents, visitors, deliveries, emergency vehicles, and garbage collection?
h) Have the edges of the roadways been landscaped? If sidewalks are provided alongside the road, have they been set back sufficiently from the road, and has a landscaped planting strip between the road and the sidewalk been provided?

i) Does the pedestrian sidewalk system link buildings with parking areas, entrances to the development, open space, and recreational and other community facilities? Where the street layout makes walking distances to nearby destinations inconvenient and circuitous, are pedestrian connections provided?

3. The Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT reserve the right to require traffic and safety analysis where safety is an issue or where significant problems already exist.

4. After 30 days from filing the application, the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT must notify applicants if any additional information is needed to complete the application.

5. Upon review of the access application, the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT may approve the access application, approve with conditions, or deny the application. This must be done within 90 days of receiving the complete application.

6. Any application that involves access to Route 40 must be reviewed by the New York State Department of Transportation. It should be noted that the recommended time frames in this section are local time frames and do not apply to the required NYSDOT review.

7. If the application is approved with conditions, the applicant should resubmit the plan with the conditional changes made. The plan, with submitted changes, will be reviewed within 10 working days and approved or rejected. Second applications may only be rejected if conditional changes are not made.

8. If the access permit is denied, the Town or Village of Schaghticoke or NYSDOT should provide an itemized letter detailing why the application has been rejected.

9. All applicants whose application is approved, or approved with conditions, have thirty days to accept the permit. Applicants whose permits are rejected or approved with conditions have 60 days to appeal.
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Introduction

The following design guidelines are intended to direct new construction and renovations in accordance with existing development within the Village of Schaghticoke and Hamlet of Melrose.

These guidelines are intended to create walkable centers with engaging pedestrian environments; walking is beneficial to physical and mental health, saves money, encourages social interaction and is environmentally-friendly. The following guidance will also help preserve the unique visual aesthetics that make the Village and Hamlet special, which translate into both intangible and tangible benefits, like increased tourism revenue and property values.

Overall, application of these guidelines will prevent the type of unremarkable architecture and development that has become commonplace in cities across the US. Such mediocre, auto-oriented buildings have been built in recent decades in both the Village and Hamlet, but these can and should be avoided in the future so as not to dominate the area’s historic urban fabric.

In an effort to fulfill these goals, all new development should be perceived based upon applicability to the following goals:

1) Encourage architecture and site planning practices that reflect historic development patterns and beautify the corridor

Design should reflect the proportions, roof forms, details and materials, as well as vegetation, of nearby buildings. Historic elements of a place are always preferred above other architecture. For the Village and Hamlet, these generally include one- to three-story wood or brick construction, front porches, pitched roofs, small building setbacks, and orientation towards the street.
2) Encourage a mix of compatible land uses to enhance accessibility to goods and services
Avoid large areas of single-use development to create gathering places near residences and allow people to access goods and services without driving long distances.

3) Promote sustainability
Development and design should prioritize environmental sustainability, particularly regarding water and energy conservation as well as utilization of renewable energy sources. Sprawling land use patterns should be avoided. Use of sustainable building materials is also preferred.

4) Support a multi-modal transportation system
The sidewalk environment should be complemented by building designs which results in a safe, convenient, and attractive setting for various modes of transportation, especially pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders. Paving materials, landscape, lighting and site furnishings should contribute to the character and scale of the pedestrian environment without adding excessive cost, maintenance or security concerns.

5) Diversify housing options and increase density where appropriate
In an effort to diversify the Village/ Hamlet’s housing options, multi-family and rental housing is encouraged. New development should occur in existing centers and strengthen connections to neighboring developments to encourage non-vehicular travel, conserve open space, enhance the viability of transit and preserve historic development patterns.
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Applicability

The following design guidelines shall apply to all new development within the Village of Schaghticoke and Hamlet of Melrose, heretofore referred to as Village/Hamlet. They are not intended to replace any existing zoning laws, but rather to work in conjunction with them in an effort to preserve the existing character and enhance the communities as new development occurs. Any new contract documents should meet the requirements of all other public agencies and all permits and bonds required by such agencies should be secured.

These guidelines are designed for the long-term protection of the architectural and historical assets of the Village/Hamlet.

They are intended for both commercial and residential buildings, unless specifically noted.
Section I: Site Layout

A. Uses

Objective: New and infill mixed-use development is encouraged to increase density, activate the streetscape, and enhance walkability and housing affordability.

Guidelines:

- Adaptive reuse of historic structures is encouraged.
- New construction should feature mixed-use development (residential above commercial) in urban areas.
- Auto-oriented uses, such as gas stations and auto repair shops, are strongly discouraged in Village/Hamlet cores.
- Heavy manufacturing is undesirable in predominately residential areas.

Upper-floor residential units can create “eyes on the street” and enhance round the clock street life activation.

Auto-oriented uses like service stations are undesirable in Village/Hamlet setting where creating an interesting pedestrian environment is the priority.
B. **Block Size**

*Traditional block size in the Village of Schaghticoke is approximately 150’x200’-400’.*

Traditional block size in the Village of Schaghticoke is approximately 150’x200’-400’.

Objective: Blocks should be small and varied to improve connectivity and improve the pedestrian experience.

Guidelines:
- Street grid connections should be established where absent.
- Blocks of 200’ x 400’ or less are ideal for walkability, but the predominant pattern of the Village/Hamlet should be followed where this is not possible.
- If street connections are not possible on long blocks, pedestrian pathways should be created.

C. **Set Backs**

*Consistent building setbacks create a sense of order and unity.*

Consistent building setbacks create a sense of order and unity.

Objective: Buildings should form a consistent, distinct edge, spatially delineating the public street through uniform building setbacks.
Guidelines:
  • The appropriate setback should be determined by consistency with adjacent properties.
  • If infill development occurs between inconsistent adjacent setbacks, the new development’s setback shall be determined by following the typical pattern of the block.
  • If the appropriate road setback is uncertain, the general guideline is to keep buildings close to the road, as is typical of traditional Village and Hamlet development.
  • Emphasis should be given to appropriate proximity to the street in an effort to enhance the quality and character of the streetscape.

D. Lot Coverage, and Spacing

Objective: Building size and placement should be consistent throughout the block.

Guidelines:
  • Primary physical structures are limited to 35% of total lot coverage. If lots are less than 20,000 sf, primary structures may cover up to 45%.
  • Secondary structures such as a shed or guest house are not to exceed 5% of lot coverage.
  • Residential buildings should be centrally located within lot and feature side-yards which fall within the established range of the block in order to create equal spacing. Side-driveways are considered a portion of the side-yard.
E. Density, Mass and Scale

Objective: New construction should complement the density and character of the Village/Hamlet and increase density in urban centers to enable open space preservation, walkability and affordability.

Guidelines:
- **Density by area:**
  - Minimum: two dwellings units per acre
  - Desirable: four dwellings units per acre*
  - Maximum (multi-family dwellings): 20 dwelling units per acre*
    * Density may be limited if necessary utilities are not available. It is recommended that new systems are explored and constructed to expand development density.
- Buildings should not exceed three stories without a variation permit.
- Mass and scale should mimic historic styles in that:
  - A variety of building forms is encouraged
  - Side/ Rear additions should step down in scale
  - Buildings abutting historic properties should step down to emphasize the historic structure
- In an effort to enhance the pedestrian experience, building widths are limited to 40’. Larger buildings are permitted if façade variation occurs at least at every 25’ using the following techniques:
  - Building step-backs and articulation
  - Variation in façade materials
  - Windows
  - Separate entrances and entry treatments

Variations in building mass and scale create visual interest.
F. Entrances

Objective: Buildings should have a clear orientation to the street to create a safe and engaging public realm. Designs should be consistent in scale and style with surrounding buildings.

Guidelines:

- Primary entrances shall face the street, be easily identifiable, and incorporate lighting and variations in mass, surface or finish for emphasis with the primary structure.
- Where rear parking is provided, buildings should feature aesthetically pleasing rear entrances and facades.
- Buildings located on a street corner should engage both streets by featuring entrances, large windows, porches, and other treatments on each street.
- Loading and service entrances should be located on secondary streets. Where secondary street placement is not possible, visual impact must be minimized through architectural consistency with the rest of the building.

G. Driveways, Parking, and Garages

A detached garage behind the primary building is ideal.
Objective: Driveways, off-street parking, and garages should be designed and positioned to minimize visibility from the public realm.

Guidelines:
- On-street parking is encouraged to calm traffic and service local businesses.
- Surface parking should be located behind buildings. If site constraints prohibit a rear location, parking may be located to the side of the building.
- Where parking lots front onto streets, screening is required.
- If attached to a primary structure, garages must be set back from the build to line.
- Private driveways shall be a maximum of 12 feet wide. Commercial drives shall be a maximum of 24 feet wide.
- Shared or joint use driveways are encouraged to minimize vehicular intrusions into the pedestrian realm.
- Sidewalk treatments, such as pavement variation, should be maintained across driveways.

H. Sidewalks

With appropriate enhancements, sidewalks can become community gathering places.
Objective: Continuous sidewalks must be located in front of all buildings to provide safe, wheelchair and stroller accessible and continuous pedestrian connections throughout the Village/Hamlet.

Guidelines:

- When a redevelopment project disrupts existing streetscape elements, those items must be replaced with approved streetscape elements.
- Sidewalks shall be a minimum of five-feet wide and extend continuously along the entire length of the frontage.
- Sidewalks must be fully accessible for people with disabilities, which includes the provision of curb ramps at all intersections. ADA compliance also improves access for strollers and walkers.
• Where space permits, a three-foot landscaped or textured pavement strip shall be provided between the street and the sidewalk.
• Sidewalk material shall extend across driveways or alleys.
• Usage of materials such as bricks, concrete pavers, stamped concrete, and stone are encouraged to add character.

I. Trash, Service, and Utility Equipment Screening

Objective: Residential and commercial utility equipment should be positioned to minimize visual impact while maintaining convenience and function.

Guidelines:
• Trash receptacles, recycling receptacles, HVAC units, loading docks, utility equipment and other similar service items should be located in the rear of buildings and should be screened to minimize sound and visibility.
• Screening should be architecturally compatible with the primary structure’s architecture.
• Wooden fencing and landscaping are encouraged means of screening.

In addition to utility equipment, parking lots fronting streets should be screened.
Section II: Architectural Style

A. Roof Types

Objective: Roofs should complement and accentuate the architectural character of buildings.

Guidelines:

- Roofs should be made of long-lasting materials and consistent with traditional styles of the Village/Hamlet.
- Residential roofs should be pitched and articulated with dormers, chimneys, gables, cupolas, fascias, and other embellishments.
- Structures of at least two stories are permitted to have flat roofs (slightly sloped to drain) where appropriate. Parapets and cornices are encouraged for visual effect.

Inconsistently designed roofs detract from the overall Village/Hamlet character.

Conversely, intricate and embellished roof designs evoke traditional vernacular architecture.
B. Windows

Objective: Commercial buildings should contribute to the pedestrian experience with large transparent windows. Residential windows should protect privacy while avoiding blank walls and maintaining “eyes on the street.”

Guidelines:
- Windows should be vertically aligned and regularly spaced. Decorative molding, cornices, and other architectural enhancements are encouraged.
- A minimum of 40% of the ground level façade and sides of commercial buildings adjacent to public right of ways shall be transparent (windows and doors). A minimum of 15% of the building's rear façade facing a public right of way, parking area or open space shall be transparent. Reflective or glass tinted more than 40% is not allowed.

C. Awnings

Objective: Awnings are encouraged on commercial buildings to enhance the human scale of the Village/Hamlet while providing protection for the elements, and signage opportunities for businesses.

Guidelines:
- Awnings should correspond with window and door openings beneath.
• They should be constructed of durable, water repellant material, such as canvas, and complement the color scheme and style of their buildings.
• Awnings must project a minimum of 36”- 48” from the building.

D. Porches, Stoops, and Decks:

Objective: Porches are strongly encouraged to define entrances, provide a sense of scale to building fronts and create street life.

Guidelines:
• Porches and stoops are permitted to encroach 5’ beyond the primary build to line.
• Open porches are preferred, but enclosed porches may be considered if enclosure is justifiable.
• Decks (uncovered) and patios should be located at the rear or side of a building. Design should be compatible with the primary structure.
• Landscaping surrounding both porches and decks is encouraged.

E. Fencing

Fences should be discouraged for residential sites. Where fences are strongly desired, they should be architecturally compatible, low in height, and partly transparent.
Objective: Fencing that fronts public right of ways should be considered an important architectural feature, not merely an afterthought to preserve community aesthetics.

Guidelines:
- Fencing should be a maximum of 4ft tall. Concrete block walls and chain link fences are prohibited, and treatments that match the architectural palette of adjacent buildings are recommended.
- Fences are not desirable in the front yard area of residential sites; shrubs and hedges are recommended. If fences are unavoidable, an open-style fence in combination with landscaping is encouraged. Front yard fences should not be higher than 4 feet.

F. Architectural Treatments

Wood and brick should continue to be used as a primary building material in order to maintain the character of the Village/Hamlet.

Hollow concrete block construction is not consistent with traditional architectural treatments.

Chain link fences and fences taller than 4’ detract from the pedestrian experience.
Objective: Material choice can help new development complement historic buildings and reflect the character of the Village.

Guidelines:
- Traditional materials including brick, stone and wood should be used as the primary building materials.
- Materials should be long-lasting.
- Infill development should reflect surrounding architectural detailing including window and entryway shape, cornice lines and brick work.
- Building renovation and alterations should restore architectural details of cornices, brickwork, transom, display windows and bulkheads.
- The following materials are not allowed on the façades or sides of buildings adjacent to public right of ways:
  - Concrete block or brick larger than 4" in height, 12" in length
  - Aluminum, vinyl or fiberglass siding or roofing materials
  - Concrete masonry units
  - Materials that attempt to mimic traditional materials. An example would be fiberglass panels that are molded to look like brick
- Buildings should be of varied but complimentary colors. Bright colors may only be used as accents.

G. Franchise Architecture

This McDonald’s restaurant in Freeport, Maine was forced by local regulations to conform to local architectural styles.

Objective: To preserve the unique village character of Schaghticoke, franchise corporations must conform to local architectural styles.
Guidelines:

- Franchise architecture (building design that is trademarked or identified with a particular chain or corporation and is generic in nature) is not allowed.
- Drive-through businesses, such as banks, pharmacies and fast food restaurants, are strongly discouraged. Where these are unavoidable, driveways should be minimized, located on side streets, if possible, and follow the driveway design guidance outlined above.

H. Lighting

Objective: Lighting should enhance the safety and aesthetics of the Village/Hamlet.

Guidelines:

- Pedestrian-scaled street lighting (12 to 14’ in height) should be added to streets, especially on corners, be placed next to benches, and below tree canopies.
- Lighting fixtures can be attached to cobra head light poles, introduced as stand alone fixtures, and added to building facades, canopies, and awnings, to both illuminate store entranceways and the street.
- Halogen light bulbs, rather than high pressure sodium bulbs, should be used, as they cast fewer shadows and are perceived to provide superior illumination.
- Light sources (light bulbs) should be obscured and directed by using shielded or full-cut style fixtures to eliminate glare and light pollution.
- Building and signage lighting should be indirect.
- Commercial lighting should illuminate signage rather than entire storefronts.
I. Street Furniture and Amenities

Objective: Benches, fountains, café seating, bike racks, planters, bus stop shelters, community bulletin boards, and other similar amenities are encouraged to enhance the comfort and image of the streetscape.

Guidelines:

- Urban areas should feature public, accessible seating at least every 500’.
- New developments should provide street furniture and amenities.
- Matching funding should be made available for existing businesses to upgrade and/or install street furniture.

J. Signage

Objective: Signs should be appropriately scaled to provide adequate business identification without creating distractions for drivers and pedestrians. Design should complement architectural style and not obscure important architectural features.

Guidelines:

- Perpendicular projecting signs are encouraged. They should not exceed 12 square feet and must provide at least 8 feet of clearance between the sidewalk and lowest point of the sign.
• Permanently painted window signs and neon window signs are permitted but may not take up more than a 1/3 of the window.
• Exterior neon signs and internally illuminated signs are prohibited.
• Signage should have the capability of being lit in the evening, although the source of light must not be visible to motorists or pedestrians.
• Signs constructed of natural materials such as metal or wood are preferred.
• Buildings with multiple storefronts should coordinate signage throughout the building.

K. Landscaping

Objective: Sustainable landscaping should be used to enhance the pedestrian experience, complement architectural features and screen service areas.

Guidelines:
• The setback area between street and building should be landscaped to provide character and visual enhancement.
• The use of flower boxes, planters and hanging flower baskets is encouraged.
• Native and xeric species are encouraged.
• Landscaping should be used in parking lots to soften the hardscape and enhance the pedestrian environment.
• Existing street trees should be maintained. Street trees must be planted in conjunction with new construction.
Route 40 Corridor Study

Appendix D

Transit/Ridesharing Survey and Summary of Results
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Alternative Transportation Survey Results for the Schaghticoke Route 40 Corridor Study

The Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC) and the Capital District Transportation Authority (CDTA) conducted a survey of commuters from mid-February through April 2009 in the greater Schaghticoke area in northern Rensselaer and southern Washington Counties. The intent of the survey was to inform the Town, Village, CDTC and CDTA about the market for alternative transportation options and the feasibility of a park and ride lot. The park and ride lot might be in the vicinity of the Route 40 and 67 intersection (at Schaghticoke Fairgrounds) and could be served by transit, carpools or vanpools. The survey was available on the CDTC website through Survey Monkey and was available in paper form at the Town and Village Halls.

The survey questionnaire (see Figure 1) was 26 questions long and 33 individuals responded. Some of the key findings from the survey are as follows (note the number in parentheses represents the number of respondents):

1) 39% (13) commute to the City of Albany on a daily basis. 12% (4) commute to the City of Troy.
2) 58% (19) are scheduled to arrive at work between 8 and 9 AM.
3) 60% (20) are scheduled to leave work between 5 and 6 PM.
4) 81% (27) indicated at least some flexibility in their work hours.
5) 67% (20) currently drive alone, 10% (3) carpool and another 20% (6) drive alone sometimes and use other modes like transit and carpool at other times.
6) 70% (21) indicated they would consider some form of carpooling, ridesharing or vanpooling to work.
7) 57% (17) of those driving to work have free parking.
8) 6.7% (2) currently ride the CDTA route that serves Route 40.
9) 73% (21) use their personal vehicle during the workday occasionally or once or twice a week.
10) 79% (24) indicated they would or would be willing to consider vanpooling to work.
11) 37% (11) indicated they would participate in a vanpool pilot project.
12) 76% (23) spend more than $25 per week on transportation to work (over $100 per month on gas alone).
13) 50% (15) indicated that $10-$20 per week would be reasonable to pay for a weekly bus pass.

These results indicate that there is interest in using alternative forms of transportation in the Schaghticoke area but for any of them to be feasible, a park and ride lot would need to be either created or formalized in the Village. The similar hours of the respondents and the fact that most commute to Albany or Troy indicates that there is a potential market for a vanpool and carpools. Additional marketing of transit and carpooling would be necessary. The Town and Village can promote www.ipool2.org.
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The Capital District Transportation Committee, in partnership with the Town and Village of Schaghticoke, is exploring the feasibility of a park and ride lot in the vicinity of the Route 40 and 67 intersection (near Schaghticoke Fairgrounds) in the Village of Schaghticoke. This effort is being undertaken as part of the Schaghticoke Route 40 Corridor Study. This survey will inform us about the market for alternative transportation options in the greater Schaghticoke area and therefore the need for the park and ride lot. The park and ride lot could be served by transit, carpools or vanpools. This survey should only take 10 minutes of your time. Residents from throughout northern Rensselaer County and southern Washington County are encouraged to participate. Thank you for your time and your responses will be completely anonymous.

In order to progress through this survey, please use the following navigation links:

Click the "Next" button to continue to the next page.
Click the "Previous" button to return to the previous page.
Click the "Exit" button if you need to exit the survey.
Click the "Submit" button to submit your survey.

Questions marked with asterisk (*) require an answer.

If you have any questions, please email Sandy Misiewicz smisiewicz@CDTCMPO.org

Thank you for taking our survey!

**Questions about your work:**

* 1. Do you work outside your home?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

* 2. What company do you work for?

* 3. What city/town/village is your place of work located in?
   (Note: If your answer is not on the list, please type in your answer in the text box below)

* 4. What time do you usually arrive at work?
   (select from drop-down menu)

* 5. What time do you usually leave work?
   (select from drop-down menu)

* 6. How flexible are your hours of work?
   - [ ] Not flexible at all
   - [ ] Somewhat flexible
   - [ ] Flexible
   - [ ] Very flexible

* 7. What days do you typically work?

   - [ ] Sunday
   - [ ] Monday
   - [ ] Tuesday
   - [ ] Wednesday
   - [ ] Thursday
   - [ ] Friday
   - [ ] Saturday
Rural Transit in Schaghticoke

* 8. Does your company offer alternative work schedules (example: compressed work week)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure

Questions about your commute:

* 1. What is your usual commute mode?
   - Drive Alone
   - Bus
   - Carpool
   - Bicycle
   - Walk
   - Telecommute
   - Combination of modes (please specify)

* 2. Would you consider using some form of ridesharing, such as carpooling or vanpooling for your commute?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure
   - Maybe. It would depend on

* 3. If you drive or carpool to work, do you pay for parking?
   - Yes
   - No, my employer provides free parking
   - Partially, my employer subsidizes my parking
   - I don't drive or carpool
   - Other (please specify)

* 4. Are you aware of existing transit service in your area (CDTA Route 96)?
   - Yes
   - No
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5. How often do you currently ride CDTA Route 96?

- Never
- Occasionally
- 1-2 times per week
- 3-4 times per week
- Everyday
- Other (please specify) ______________

6. How often do you use your car for personal or work business during the workday?

- Never
- Occasionally
- 1-2 times per week
- 3-4 times per week
- Everyday

7. Would you consider commuting by (check all that apply):

- [ ] Carpooling
- [ ] Vanpooling
- [ ] Bicycling
- [ ] Walking
- [ ] Taking a bus
- [ ] None of the above
- [ ] Other (please specify) ______________

www.iPool2.org - The First Stop for Commuter Information for people who live or work in the Capital District
8. Are you aware of the regional commuter information website www.ipool2.org?
   - Yes
   - No

9. Are you currently registered with ipool2?
   - Yes
   - No

10. Vanpooling is a type of ridesharing that usually uses rented vans. Most vanpools are self-supporting - operating costs are divided among members.

Would you be interested in participating in a vanpool pilot project if it was available?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure
   - Other (please specify)

11. What would influence your decision to take a bus?
 (check all that apply):
   - Park and Ride lot available
   - No transfers (one-seat ride)
   - Schedule and frequency
   - Length of the trip
   - "Affordable" fare
   - No car available
   - None of the above
   - Other (please specify)
12. If CDTA were able to provide a service that fit your definition of "convenient", how often do you think you would use it?

- Daily (5 days/week)
- 2-3 times per week
- 1-2 times per week
- 2-3 times per month
- Rarely
- Never

13. Please estimate how much you currently spend on transportation to work in a typical week.

- $25 or less
- $25-$40
- $40-$50
- More than $60
- Don't know/refused

14. Would you be willing to pre-purchase a monthly or multi-ride debit pass to use transit service?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe. It depends on [blank]

15. What do you think a reasonable cost for a weekly bus pass that would provide transportation for your commute to work would be?

- No opinion
- $10 or less
- $10 to $20
- $20 to $30
- $30 to $40
- It depends (please specify) [blank]
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16. What is the best way to get schedule and other information regarding transit, carpools, vanpools and park and ride lots to you? (Check only one)

- Website
- Direct mailing
- Road signs
- Community bulletin boards
- At place of work/through employer
- Other (please specify)

Additional information:

1. What city/town/village do you live in?
   (Note: If your answer is not on the list, please type in your answer in the text box below)

   [Select city/town/village]

2. Please, provide any additional information about your commute preferences:

   ____________________________________________________________

3. If you would like to be placed on a mailing list to receive future information about public transit and ride-matching services in the area please provide your name and address.

   Name:
   Company:
   Address:
   Address 2:
   City/Town:
   State:
   ZIP/Postal Code:
   Country:
   Email Address:
   Phone Number: