

# **Appendix C**

## **Decision Matrix**

Follow-Up Survey  
CDRPC LTCP  
Codes Local Law Review  
Gap 1 Parking Lot Design

CITY OF COHOES	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 1 Parking Lot Design																					
EXAMPLE (Anywhere, USA)	x								x						x				We are currently in the process of updating our codes to include language on shared parking, yet language provided here is insightful and necessitates further review of our planned updates. Current code is progressive in terms of parking ratios, so no change anticipated. Other language presented in this document will be strongly considered.	Complete, with exceptions as noted.	Implementation of shared parking regulations required additional survey of both urban core business owners and residents, as well as a thorough review of vacant/abandoned parcels available for shared use as needed. This additional effort, and coordinating between parties, was necessary for buy-in and feasibility yet significantly added to the implementation schedule and required deviations from the original language. Final language is attached. Reducing minimum off-street parking was met with friction by some business owners and several residents, specifically within the downtown core. For this reason, we are undergoing additional strategic meetings with a small group of stakeholders to determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether their needs can be met via the shared parking ordinance. If not, we may forego implementation of this device. Attached are stakeholder meeting minutes. All other measures were implemented, as previously noted, and all relevant language is attached.
1.0 Purpose and Objectives		X																			
2.0 Parking Ratios.		X																			
2.1 Determination of Required Off-Street Parking.	x			285-84	2															x	
Schedule A Required Off Street Parking Spaces		X				matches existing code															
Notes to Schedule A:			X						X						X						
2.2 Shared Parking.	X				2.2015	285-86			X						X					x	Helps with large City buildings that lack off-street parking
2.3 Maximum Off-Street Parking.	x				2	285-88	x						x				2	285-88a		x	preserves greenspace - some developers were asked to bank spaces instead
2.4 Proximity to Mass Transit.			X						X						X						
2.5 Credits for On-Street Parking.			X																		
2.6 Reduction of Minimum Off-Street Parking for Certain Residential Uses.													x				2	285-88b		x	same
2.7 Land Banked Parking.	X				2.2015	285-88c	X						X							x	same
3.0 Parking Lot Design.	x				2.2015	285-89			X						X					x	shrunk space sizes

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 1 Parking Lot Design

3.1 Bicycle Parking.	x						X					X						
Schedule B Required Bicycle Parking Spaces	x						X					X						
4.0 Landscaping.	x			2.2015	Article IX		X	Pushes Parking lot out further		x			2	Article IX		x		preserves greenspace and improves aesthetics

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 2 Rooftop Runoff

CITY OF COHOES	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies	
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments			
<b>Gap 2 Rooftop Runoff</b>																						
<b>1.0 Purpose and Objectives</b>	X				Spring 2014			X							X							
<b>2.0 Control of Rooftop Runoff</b>			X		Spring 2014	Limited because amending dry soils is lost prohibitive			X						X							

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 3 Vegetated Open Channels

CITY OF COHOES	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 3 Vegetated Open Channels																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives	X				Spring 2014		X						X								
2.0 Vegetated Open Channels	X				Spring 2014		X						X								
2.1 a. New Developments and Redevelopment of Previously Developed Properties	X				Spring 2014		X						X								
2.1 b. Improvement of (Town, Village, or City) Roads			X		Spring 2014				X						X						
2.2 a. New Developments and Redevelopment of Previously Developed Properties	X				Spring 2014		X						X								
2.2 b. Improvement of (Town, Village, or City) Roads			X						X						X						
2.3 In addition to the standards in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, municipalities may...			X						X						X						

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 4 Locating Sites-Sens Areas

CITY OF COHOES	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 4 Locating Sites in Less Sensitive Areas/Clearing and Grading																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives	X				2014				X						X						
2.0 Avoiding Sensitive Areas			X						X						X						
2.1 Site Plan Contents.	X								X						X						
2.2 Site Plan Review Standards.			X						X						X						
2.3 Site Plan Review Standards.			X																		
2.4 Natural Resource Buffers.			X																		
2.5 Tree Protection.	X				2014																

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 5 Open Space Mgmt-Cluster

CITY OF COHOES	No Action Level					Previous Comments	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
Gap 5 Open Space Management/Cluster Subdivisions	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?			
Introduction (Italics)			X					
1.0 Authority				X	Spring 2014			
2.0 Purpose	X							
3.0 Definitions	X							
4.0 Eligibility for Cluster Development	X							
5.0 Design Criteria	X							
6.0 Open Space Requirements	X							
7.0 Open Space Management	X							

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 7 Cul-de-Sac Design

CITY OF COHOES	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 7 Cul-de-Sac Design																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives	X																				
2.0 Cul-de-Sac Design			X																		
2.1 No title..."Internal roads..."			X			Needs traffic Review			X						X						
2.2 No title..."In addition to the standards...."															X						

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 8 Sidewalks and Curbs

CITY OF COHOES	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 8 Sidewalks and Curbs																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives	X																				
2.0 Sidewalks and Curbs	X						X						X								
2.1 Sidewalk Design	X						X						X								
2.2 Curb Design	X						X						X								
2.3 Design and Maintenance of Permeable Strips	X						X						X								

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 1 Parking Lot Design

VILLAGE OF GREEN ISLAND	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 1 Parking Lot Design																					
EXAMPLE (Anywhere, USA)	x								x						x				We are currently in the process of updating our codes to include language on shared parking, yet language provided here is insightful and necessitates further review of our planned updates. Current code is progressive in terms of parking ratios, so no change anticipated. Other language presented in this document will be strongly considered.	Complete, with exceptions as noted.	Implementation of shared parking regulations required additional survey of both urban core business owners and residents, as well as a thorough review of vacant/abandoned parcels available for shared use as needed. This additional effort, and coordinating between parties was necessary for buy-in and feasibility yet significantly added to the implementation schedule and required deviations from the original language. Final language is attached. Reducing minimum off-street parking was met with friction by some business owners and several residents, specifically within the downtown core. For this reason, we are undergoing additional strategic meetings with a small group of stakeholders to determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether their needs can be met via the shared parking ordinance. If not, we may forego implementation of this device. Attached are stakeholder meeting minutes. All other measures were implemented, as previously noted, and all relevant language is attached.
1.0 Purpose and Objectives				Yes					X												
2.0 Parking Ratios.										X											
2.1 Determination of Required Off-Street Parking.										X											
Schedule A Required Off-Street Parking Spaces										X											
Notes to Schedule A:				X																	
2.2 Shared Parking.				X																	
2.3 Maximum Off-Street Parking.				X																	
2.4 Proximity to Mass Transit.				X																	
2.5 Credits for On-Street Parking.				X																	
2.6 Reduction of Minimum Off-Street Parking for Certain Residential Uses.				X																	
2.7 Land Banked Parking.				X																	
3.0 Parking Lot Design.																					
3.1 Bicycle Parking.		X																			
Schedule B Required Bicycle Parking Spaces		X																			
4.0 Landscaping.				X																	

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 2 Rooftop Runoff

VILLAGE OF GREEN ISLAND	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies	
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments			
Gap 2 Rooftop Runoff																						
1.0 Purpose and Objectives				X																		
2.0 Control of Rooftop Runoff				X																		

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 3 Vegetated Open Channels

VILLAGE OF GREEN ISLAND	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 3 Vegetated Open Channels																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives				Yes																	
2.0 Vegetated Open Channels				Yes																	
2.1 a. New Developments and Redevelopment of Previously Developed Properties				Yes																	
2.1 b. Improvement of (Town, Village, or City) Roads				Yes																	
2.2 a. New Developments and Redevelopment of Previously Developed Properties				Yes																	
2.2 b. Improvement of (Town, Village, or City) Roads				Yes																	
2.3 In addition to the standards in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, municipalities may...				Yes																	

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 4 Locating Sites-Sens Areas

VILLAGE OF GREEN ISLAND	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 4 Locating Sites in Less Sensitive Areas/Clearing and Grading																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives				Yes																	
2.0 Avoiding Sensitive Areas				Yes																	
2.1 Site Plan Contents.				Yes																	
2.2 Site Plan Review Standards.					Yes																
2.3 Site Plan Review Standards.					Yes																
2.4 Natural Resource Buffers.					Yes																
2.5 Tree Protection.				Yes																	

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 5 Open Space Mgmt-Cluster

VILLAGE OF GREEN ISLAND	No Action Level					Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
Gap 5 Open Space Management/Cluster Subdivisions	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	
Introduction (Italics)				Yes			
1.0 Authority				Yes			
2.0 Purpose				Yes			
3.0 Definitions				Yes			
4.0 Eligibility for Cluster Development				Yes			
5.0 Design Criteria				Yes			
6.0 Open Space Requirements				Yes			
7.0 Open Space Management				Yes			

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 7 Cul-de-Sac Design

VILLAGE OF GREEN ISLAND	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 7 Cul-de-Sac Design																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives				Yes																	
2.0 Cul-de-Sac Design				Yes																	
2.1 No title..."Internal roads..."				Yes																	

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 8 Sidewalks and Curbs

VILLAGE OF GREEN ISLAND	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level						Model Community Action Level						No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 8 Sidewalks and Curbs																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives				Yes																	
2.0 Sidewalks and Curbs				Yes																	
2.1 Sidewalk Design				Yes																	
2.2 Curb Design		X																			
2.3 Design and Maintenance of Permeable Strips			X																		

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTGP  
 Codes' Local Law Review  
 Gap 1 Parking Lot Design

CITY OF WATERVLIET	Minimum Action Level					Best Management Action Level					Model Community Action Level					No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies				
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe				Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments
Gap 1 Parking Lot Design																						
EXAMPLE (Anywhere, USA)	x							x							x					We are currently in the process of updating our codes to include language on shared parking, yet language provided here is insightful and necessitates further review of our planned updates. Current code is progressive in terms of parking ratios, so no change anticipated. Other language presented in this document will be strongly considered.	Complete, with exceptions as noted.	Implementation of shared parking regulations required additional survey of both urban core business owners and residents, as well as a thorough review of vacant/abandoned parcels available for shared use as needed. This additional effort, and coordinating between parties, was necessary for buy-in and feasibility yet significantly added to the implementation schedule and required deviations from the original language. Final language is attached. Reducing minimum off-street parking was met with friction by some business owners and several residents, specifically within the downtown core. For this reason, we are undergoing additional strategic meetings with a small group of stakeholders to determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether their needs can be met via the shared parking ordinance. If not, we may forego implementation of this device. Attached are stakeholder meeting minutes. All other measures were implemented, as previously noted, and all relevant language is attached.
1.0 Purpose and Objectives																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Did not use wording in new Zoning Ordinance		
2.0 Parking Ratios.																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Did not use wording in new Zoning Ordinance		
2.1 Determination of Required Off-Street Parking.																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Did not use exact wording but used some concepts that fit the city's needs.	Similar concepts used in the city's zoning were linking seat capacity, # of employees, floor area to # of spaces needed.	
Schedule A Required Off-Street Parking Spaces																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Did not use exact wording but used some concepts that fit the city's needs.	The city used these ratios as a starting point but ended up conforming them to better fit the city's structure.	
Notes to Schedule A:																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Did not use		
2.2 Shared Parking.																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Did not use exact wording but used some concepts that fit the city's needs.	A Version of the Written Binding agreement was used along with added verbiage from the city	
2.3 Maximum Off-Street Parking.																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	2.3 (a) was used and city's own similar version with respect to credit for bicycle parking.	2.3 (a) was used as written by this analysis. Also added was encouragement to used green practices in place of 2.3 (a). Bicycle Parking Incentives used in new Zoning.	
2.4 Proximity to Mass Transit.																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Did Not Use		
2.5 Credits for On-Street Parking.																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Did Not Use		
2.6 Reduction of Minimum Off-Street Parking for Certain Residential Uses.																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Did not use		
2.7 Land Banked Parking.			x	x																	Did not use	
3.0 Parking Lot Design.			x	x											x				The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.		Did not use	
3.1 Bicycle Parking.	x	x																	The city's Zoning is not required but it does encourage it.	Stayed the same	The City still encourages it and doesn't require it but cleaned up how incentive works in relation to credit for parking lot reduction.	
Schedule B Required Bicycle Parking Spaces																			The city's Zoning is not required but it does encourage it.	Did not use		
4.0 Landscaping.																			The City of Watervliet was in the process of updating the zoning while these model local laws were being developed. Watervliet was able to use some of the language from this and apply it to their zoning.	Just used 4.0 (b) did not incorporate any other aspects.	4.0 (b) used similar language	

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 2 Rooftop Runoff

CITY OF WATERVLIET	Minimum Action Level						Best Management Action Level					Model Community Action Level					No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies			
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments			
Gap 2 Rooftop Runoff																						
1.0 Purpose and Objectives			X	X																	Did not use	I'm not sure why it's not incorporated into zoning codes.
2.0 Control of Rooftop Runoff			X	X		Possibly use it more towards commercial			X	X		Possibly use it more towards commercial			X	X		Possibly use it more towards commercial		Did not use	I'm not sure why it's not incorporated into zoning codes.	

Follow-Up Survey  
 GDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 3 Vegetated Open Channels

CITY OF WATERVLIET	Minimum Action Level					Best Management Action Level					Model Community Action Level					No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies			
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 3 Vegetated Open Channels																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives																					Opportunities for this gap in the city, while possible, are few and far due to cities ultra urban built out setting. If this were to arise in a project it would be dealt on a case by case scenario probably in a site plan review. So no specific language was added to zoning codes.
2.0 Vegetated Open Channels																					
2.1 a. New Developments and Redevelopment of Previously Developed Properties			X	Yes		Possibly use it more commercial														Did not use in new zoning	
2.1 b. Improvement of Town, Village, or City Roads																			N/A for City roads	N/A for City roads	
2.2 a. New Developments and Redevelopment of Previously Developed Properties									X	yes										Did not use in new zoning	
2.2 b. Improvement of Town, Village, or City Roads																			N/A for City roads	N/A for City roads	
2.3 In addition to the standards in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, municipalities may...															X	Yes				Did not use in new zoning	

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPG LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 4 Locating Sites-Sens Areas

CITY OF WATERVILLE	Minimum Action Level					Best Management Action Level					Model Community Action Level					No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies					
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments				
Gap 4 Locating Sites in Less Sensitive Areas/Clearing and Grading																							
1.0 Purpose and Objectives																				did not use			
2.0 Avoiding Sensitive Areas																				did not use			
2.1 Site Plan Contents.																			N/A for city	City used parts from this list in the codes	The cities site plan checklist pertaining to related topic are 1 ) Existing watercourses, wetlands, and floodplains 2 ) grading and drainage plan and methodology used to project stormwater quantities and peak flow conditions		
2.2 Site Plan Review Standards.																			N/A for city	City used parts from this list in the codes	Similar language used were Steep slopes greater than 25%, Protection of natural resources (the Hudson River) and adequacy of stormwater and drainage facilities as required.		
2.3 Site Plan Review Standards.																			N/A for city	did not use			
2.4 Natural Resource Buffers.																			N/A for city	did not use	Due to ultra urban setting city doesn't have any real opportunities to implement this.		
2.5 Tree Protection.																X	Yes			The city does use encouragement for tree protection language in their codes.	Just not to this detail as described in this gap.		

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTCP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 5 Open Space Mgmt-Cluster

CITY OF WATERVLIET	No Action Level					Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?		
Gap 5 Open Space Management/Cluster Subdivisions							
					Previous Comments		
Introduction (Italics)		X			N/A for city	N/A for city	Due to cities ultra urban environment this gap is unrealistic and therefore doesn't pertain to the city.
1.0 Authority		X			N/A for city	N/A for city	
2.0 Purpose					N/A for city	N/A for city	
3.0 Definitions		X			N/A for city	N/A for city	
4.0 Eligibility for Cluster Development		X			N/A for city	N/A for city	
5.0 Design Criteria		X			N/A for city	N/A for city	
6.0 Open Space Requirements		X			N/A for city	N/A for city	
7.0 Open Space Management		X			N/A for city	N/A for city	

Follow-Up Survey  
 GDRPC LTCP  
 Codess Local Law Review  
 Gap 7 Cul-de-Sac Design

CITY OF WATERVLIET	Minimum Action Level					Best Management Action Level					Model Community Action Level					No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies				
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments			
Gap 7 Cul-de-Sac Design																						
1.0 Purpose and Objectives		X																	N/A for city	N/A for city	The City has no Cul-de-sacs or open land to add them within city boundaries	
2.0 Cul-de-Sac Design		X																	N/A for city	N/A for city		
2.1 No title... "Internal roads..."		X																	N/A for city	N/A for city		
2.2 No title... "In addition to the standards..."		X																	N/A for city	N/A for city		

Follow-Up Survey  
 CDRPC LTGP  
 Codes Local Law Review  
 Gap 8 Sidewalks and Curbs

CITY OF WATERVILLE	Minimum Action Level					Best Management Action Level					Model Community Action Level					No Action Level	Implementation Status	Implementation Successes & Strategies			
	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Previous Comments	Previous Comments		
Gap 8 Sidewalks and Curbs																					
1.0 Purpose and Objectives																				No change to our zoning.	The only thing that changed when the zoning code was updated was for multi-family, commercial and other non residential lots. And it only pertains to sidewalk width minimums and when they are to be placed on the property.
2.0 Sidewalks and Curbs																				No change to our zoning.	
2.1 Sidewalk Design			X	Yes																No change to our zoning.	
2.2 Curb Design			X	Yes				X						X						No change to our zoning.	
2.3 Design and Maintenance of Permeable Strips			X	Yes																No change to our zoning.	