Mobility Checklist:

Guidelines for Efficient, Livable Communities

This checklist provides guidelines to create efficient and livable communities where walking, cycling, and public transportation options are convenient and viable. This guide will help municipalities and developers make informed decisions about transportation infrastructure during the site plan review process. Some of the benefits of transportation-friendly development include:

- Better quality of life
- Less sprawl
- Reduced carbon dioxide emissions
- Reduced traffic congestion, car accidents, and injuries
- Reduced household spending on transportation
- Healthier lifestyles
- Increased transit ridership
- Reduced dependence on foreign oil

Upper Valley TMA

Working to Reduce Reliance on Driving Alone

A. PROXIMITY TO SERVICES, EMPLOYMENT, AND TRANSIT: The most effective way to encourage efficient transportation is to co-locate housing, services, employment, and transit routes.

Does the development proposal include:	Yes	No	N/A
1. Development proximate (within a 10-minute walk) to an employment center or downtown area?			
2. Development proximate (within a 10-minute walk) to an existing or proposed transit stop?			
3. Bus and/or van stops with shelters for protection from the weather?			
4. Safe, convenient pedestrian & bicycling network connections to bus routes and/or van stops?			
5. Input from local transit providers, including school district, social service agencies and public transportation providers?			
6. Input from regional transportation authorities (Regional Planning Commissions, Upper Valley Trails Alliance, Upper Valley Transportation Management Association)?			

B. MAKE IT EASY TO WALK & CYCLE: These features encourage people to walk and cycle instead of getting into their automobiles. Routes for pedestrians and cyclists within the proposed development should be convenient, attractive, and safe. The design should provide for the easy use of strollers, scooters, skateboards, roller-skates, walkers, and wheelchairs.

Does the development proposal include:	Yes	No	N/A
1. Buildings scaled and designed to create an attractive environment for pedestrians and cyclists?			
2. Streets designed to promote slow vehicular traffic? A compact, grid-based street network with small blocks (300-500 feet) that offer alternative route options is ideal. Dead-ends, cul-de-sacs and large blocks are not desirable.			
3. Paths or sidewalks with adequate widths, sight lines, and, where appropriate, lighting?			
4. Paths or sidewalks separated from the street by a landscaped area with trees, where appropriate?			
5. Barrier-free pedestrian and cycling routes? With key connections to existing external networks (e.g. transit, parking lots, etc.)?			
6. Ample, convenient, sheltered, and secure bicycle parking?			
7. Access or rights-of-way to connect with future developments, neighborhoods, or trails?			
8. Trails, sidewalks, bike lanes, or transit routes from the proposed development to typical destinations (i.e. school, recreational facilities, business district, multi-use trail system)?			

C. PARKING: Parking should be minimized and the site designed to encourage active transportation.

Does the development proposal include:	Yes	No	N/A
1. A plan to reduce reliance on the single occupancy vehicle (i.e., a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan)?			
2. Parking located to the side or to the rear of buildings, rather than in front?			
3. A reduction in the number of parking spaces provided for residential buildings based on proximity to transportation options and/ or if it can be demonstrated that spaces are unnecessary?			
4. Both minimum and maximum parking standards?			
5. Shared and complementary parking and/or park and ride lots among different land uses types?			
6. Secondary entrances and/or loading spaces located to the side or rear of buildings to minimize sidewalk crossings?			
7. Structured parking instead of surface lots in high density areas?			
8. Preferential carpool parking and facilitated rideshare facilities?			

D. REGULATORY OBSTACLES: Even if the development and the community want enhanced mobility, often there are regulatory obstacles preventing the desired mobility from happening.

Does the municipality allow or enable:	Yes	No	N/A
1. Incentives for a development that promotes better mobility?			
2. Language in the land use codes and incentives for mixed use areas (e.g., density credits)?			
3. A taxation structure that promotes revitalization of existing mixed use areas?			
4. Flexible zoning and site plan standards to allow infill, higher density development, and development consistent with historic patterns?			
5. Maximum parking standards instead of minimum requirements? Do regulations allow a parking buy-back provision for unnecessary capacity?			
6. Shared parking with other private and public entities (e.g. public parking spaces counting toward minimum parking requirements)?			
7. A tax structure that promotes structured and garage parking in lieu of surface parking (cf. assessment value of a parking garage versus equivalent surface lot arrangement)?			

Checklist continues on back . . .

E. DENSITY/LOCATION: Concentrated development supports pedestrians, cyclists, and public transportation opportunities.

Does the proposal promote density (relative to context):	Yes	No	N/A
1. Does the development efficiently use the environment, such as through more compact built space?			
2. Is the site located as closely as possible to existing development?			
3. Are the units sited in a compact pattern, maximizing open space and enabling transit services to make limited stops?			
4. Does the development connect to or preserve green space or green infrastructure?			

F. MIX OF USES: "Villages" at transit stops should have a mix of residential, civic and commercial land uses, as well as other land uses in close proximity. The mix should offer people opportunities to live and work close to transit, to obtain at least basic goods and services locally, and to use transit to travel to other places.

Does the development proposal include:	Yes	No	N/A
1. A mix of housing types and/or housing unit sizes?			
2. A horizontal or vertical mix of residential, civic and commercial (office/retail) land uses?			
3. An additional mix of uses within an already mixed-use area?			
4. A mix of uses that enables shared and complementary parking as well as park and ride arrangements (e.g. church allowing park and ride on weekdays)?			
5. Attractive public and private open spaces with amenities (e.g., landscaping, benches, waste receptacles, lighting, and public art)?			
6. Commercial uses that benefit residents and are compatible with the neighborhood (e.g., neighborhood store, coffee shop, cinemas)?			

SOURCES: Center for Transit Oriented Development. www.reconnectingamerica.org • Frequently Asked Questions at www.SmartGrowthPlanning.org • Bikeability Checklist prepared by Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, US Department of Transportation • Walkability Checklist prepared by National Center of Safe Routes to School, Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, US Department of Transportation, and US Environmental Protection Agency. • Transit-Oriented Development Guidebook, City of Austin, Texas.,April 2006. • Transit 2020 Report, Appendix E Transit-Oriented Development Checklist, August 2002. • Guide for Transit-Oriented Development prepared by Twin Cities Metropolitan Council, Minneapolis, Minnesota, August 2006. • Smart Choices Program – TOD Checklist, City of Edmonton, Planning and Development Office, August 2006

This checklist is a project of the Upper Valley Transportation Management Association and members of the Upper Valley professional planning community.

Upper Valley TMA
Working to Reduce Reliance on Driving Alone

Working Together for
VITAL COMMUNITIES
VitalCommunities.org