

Ad Hoc Working Group on the Code Update  
 Recommendation to Village Board of Trustees  
 As of 5/10/2023

	A	B	C
1	<b>Question</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Answer</b>
2	<b>Marathon Site</b>		
3	Pg. 134-42. We recommend that “the development may authorize a departure from the density or intensity of use established for the entire project for each phase to be developed” should read, “the development should be required to reduce the density of any subsequent phase should any phase when combined with previously constructed phases, exceed the approved overall project density....”	Jack Goldstein on behalf of Planning Board chair.cspb@gmail.com	The Ad Hoc Working Group thinks that the idea makes sense and recommends that the Trustees consider this modification.
4			
5	<b>Residential Districts</b>		
6	Can we allow 3-story buildings in R-L because existing buildings in that district are already 3 stories and would be nonconforming under the proposed code.	Michael Armstrong	The working group thinks that the idea makes sense and recommends that the Trustees consider this modification.
7	Under accessory housing, I suggest you ease up on the requirement that there cannot be a change to the existing foundation or roofline. We should be encouraging more accessory units, & if they meet all the other requirements, why not allow some changes?	Judith K. Rose jrose@aya.yale.edu	Ad Hoc Working Group Recommendation to Trustees: remove first sentence from 134-17.G.12; this will allow Judith's request. The text recommendaed for deletion is shown in red.  [No exterior changes or expansion which may alter the existing foundation of the One-family dwelling, its existing roofline, or existing façade, may be made to the principal One-Family Dwelling except for the installation of a separate entrance to serve the Accessory Apartment.] The Structure in which the Accessory Apartment is located shall have only one (1) front entrance and only one (1) entrance from any other façade of the Structure. An exterior entrance leading to a foyer with interior entrances leading from the foyer to the Dwelling Units will be acceptable pursuant to this requirement.
8	Consider allowing higher height on waterfront to accommodate flood-ready construction.	Michael Armstrong	Ad Hoc Working Group Recommendation to Trustees: This is a proposal that merits deeper consideration and should be addressed as part of a Comprehensive Plan Update.
9	<b>All Districts</b>		
10	In the proposed Code, accessory structures of 2 1/2 stories are permitted in R-O, R-L, B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4. An accessory structure of 2 1/2 stories is particularly inappropriate in any R district. The height of such an accessory structure would be overwhelming in scale in most zoning districts. You might want to reconsider the allowable height.	Marie Early mearly240@gmail.com	Recommendation to Board of Trustees: This Ad Hoc committee concurs and recommends a max height of 1.5 stories.
11	134-14 describes the Scenic Viewshed Overlay District. In the Table of Contents, it is identified as “SV-O”. In 134-3, it is referred to as “SC-O”. In 134-14, it is referred to as “SV-O”. In the EAF, it is referred to once as “SV-O” and three times as “SC-O”. I believe the correct acronym is “SV-O”.	Marie Early mearly240@gmail.com	SV-O is the correct designation, and the Ad Hoc Working Group advises the Trustees to revise the text to reflect as such.
12	§134-16.1 refers twice to “Superintendent of Highways”. I believe the correct term (from Ch. 108) is “Highway Crew	Marie Early	Recommendation to the Board of Trustees:
13	What about the reuse of the highway parcel?	Mike Armstrong	This is a proposal that merits deeper consideration. The Ad Hoc Working Group recommends to the Board of Trustees that it be addressed as part of a Comprehensive Plan Update.
14	<b>Zoning Map</b>		
15	The western most area of the Village extending into the Hudson River. In the current zoning map, this area is not labeled. However, this is marked on the Proposed Map as “Municipal Boundary”. This raises the question - Is this the Municipal Boundary or some other boundary? From the LWRS, it would seem as if it is the LWRA. If that is the case, should the boundary be labeled at all?	Marie Early mearly240@gmail.com	Some PDF viewers fail to show the stripes in versions of the map up to version 16. Starting with version 17, the map has been modified so that the stripes should appear in all viewers.
16	The Zoning map’s color legend makes it difficult to differentiate between the 2 different gray colors (R-L and ERC) and the orange and salmon colors (C and MF).	Marie Early mearly240@gmail.com	Color differentiation enhanced.
17	<b>Chapter 76 (Noise)</b>		
18	Annotated comments in document need to be removed	Marie Early mearly240@gmail.com	This comment is correct and the Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the text should be modified in the draft.
19	76-11B “place in the city” is incorrectly copied from another ordinance	Marie Early mearly240@gmail.com	This comment is correct and the Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the text should be modified in the draft.
20	<b>Chapter 104 (Signs &amp; Placards)</b>		
21	Changing the name of chapter 104 has repercussions for chapters with cross-reference: 59 (littering); 64 (HDRB); 81 (outdoor lighting standards); 108 (streets & signwalks)	Marie Early mearly240@gmail.com	This is a fair point, and justifying the chapters requires public hearings for such a minute issue that makes no substantive, material difference to the content of the chapter and its intended regulation. The simple solution, which the Ad Hoc Working Group recommends to the Trustees, is to leave the title as is.