

February 14, 2023

Valerie Monastra, AICP  
Nelso Pope Voorhis  
156 Route 59, Suite C6  
Suffern, New York 10901

Re: Giglio Residence  
0 North Mountain Drive  
3.10-1-3

Dear Ms. Monastra:

This letter is to respond to the comments in your Memorandum prepared for the above referenced project, noted as Site Plan Review - 0 North Mountain Drive, Village of Dobbs Ferry, New York, dated January 28, 2022.

The items in your General and Procedural Comments have either been addressed elsewhere or do not require further response. We are in agreement with your items 1, 2, 4, and 5. Item 3.a. has already been discussed and is currently pending before the Zoning Board of Appeals. Items 3.b. and 3.c. have been address in a separate Memorandum prepared by Gotham Design Planning & Development Ltd., which will be dated February 15, 2023.

The following address the items in your Outstanding Site Plan Comments. The enumeration below follows that in your Memorandum. Our responses are in *italics*:

1. Regrading and Rock Removal. The Applicant provided a regrading plan and anticipated rock removal plan. The Applicant should provide for the record the calculations provided by Hudson Engineering. The Applicant provided a memorandum from another engineering firm that reviewed the architect's memorandum, but we recommend that the calculations be provided and verified by the Village's engineer. There will be extensive regrading on the Project Site.

*Response: The volumes to be excavated were computed by Hudson Engineering and are included on their drawings. As we have noted in our response to Mr. Oliveri's Memorandum, there is a plan for how to approach all excavation on the site. We agree that there is extensive regrading proposed for the project. We have no objection to the Village's consulting engineer verifying the calculations and the methods proposed.*

2. Retaining Walls. An extensive amount of retaining walls will be required to construct the house. The Applicant provided construction details for the "dry boulder retaining wall with railing." The Applicant also notes the possible use of rock ledge. Sheet SP 1.5 displays a retaining wall of 2 feet in height. Is this height proposed for all retaining walls on-site? If not, please provide the height of all of the retaining walls.

*Response: The extent of retaining walls shown on the Site Plan drawings are the maximum that would be required and are the height necessary, if all of the material behind the retaining walls is soil. As everyone is aware, there is significant ledge rock on this site. It has been our experience that, as the soil is removed to expose the rock to be removed, the actual rock formation is exposed and the extent of retaining walls being required can be adjusted. As has been done on other projects of ours in Dobbs Ferry, our preference is to remove all of the soil to either proposed grade or to the top of ledge and then assess the best approach. For example, on the subject property if it were revealed that there is a solid ledge in the area of the proposed pool that would benefit from raising the top elevation of the pool to reduce the quantity of rock to be removed and provide a better relationship to the rock, we would notify the Building Department and have a site meeting to discuss the options. If the Building Department were to determine that a modification was appropriate, we would follow the Building Departments instructions, which could be simply to provide as-builts of the modified plan or to return to the Planning Board for a revised Site Plan with the modifications integrated. It is our experience that, most of the time, if the result is a reduction in impacts, we are directed to provide the as-builts. We also understand that the Building Department may have a preference for the approved Site Plan, in which case, we would be instructed to follow the plan approved.*

*The detail on Sheet SP-1.5 is an example. The governing factors in any retaining wall that we have proposed for this project is that there will be a 2:12 batter on both the front and the back of the wall and that the base of the wall will be not less than 2/3 the height. If the rock ledge can be used to reduce the amount of retaining walls required, we are assuming that all are in agreement that we would minimize the retaining walls by maximizing the use of the rock ledge. On some projects, we have been able to eliminate almost all of the retaining walls by using the rock ledge. We have cited 1 Myrtle Avenue as an example where this worked out well.*

*There is a top of wall and a bottom of wall indicated along all of the retaining walls indicating the maximum height of the walls. Again, those dimensions are based on all excavation being in soil and no reduction in the extent of retaining walls.*

3. Driveway Grade. The driveway grade is proposed to have a maximum grade of 12%. Will the house be easily accessible with that driveway grade by emergency services?

*Response: Blends have been provide at both the top and bottom of the section of the driveway that is at 12%. There are many driveways in Dobbs Ferry with longer and steeper driveways. The best way to confirm our answer to the question is to ask the Fire Department and Ambulance Corps, which we will do. We will request a response in writing.*

4. Utilities. The Village Engineer will need to review and provide comments on the proposed utilities.

*Response: Agreed. This was previously confirmed with the Westchester County Department of Health. Hudson Engineering has included the details of the water service and sanitary sewer service on their Sheets of drawings and all utilities will be installed in accordance with the requirements of the agency having jurisdiction.*

5. Lighting. The Applicant included exterior light fixtures on sheet A-3.1. Since lighting is proposed, the Applicant should provide a plan for all proposed lighting that meets §300-41 of the Zoning and Land Use chapter.

*Response: Agreed. The light fixtures have been located and specified, and the required notes stipulating that all lighting will to comply with Section 300-41 have been included on the Sheets of drawings.*

6. Landscaping. The Applicant provided a revised landscaping plan as set forth in §300-44 of the Zoning chapter.

*Response: Agreed.*

7. Trees. The Applicant is proposing the removal of eight trees. The Village of Dobbs Ferry recently adopted new tree removal regulations. The Applicant will need to provide a tree replacement plan that meets §300-51(i), Tree Valuation. Please provide the total aggregate diameter of trees proposed for removal and the total aggregate diameter of trees proposed to be planted. Fifty percent of the total aggregate diameter of trees proposed for removal must be replaced.

*Response: Agreed. We have requested that Susan Jainchill, the Landscape Architect on the Project provide her calculations and recommended trees for review. This project will be in full compliance with Section 300-51(J).*

8. Stormwater Management Plan. The Applicant provided a revised stormwater management plan. The Village Engineer will need to review and provide comments on this information.

*Response: Agreed.*

9. Erosion and Sediment Control. The Applicant has provided a proposed erosion and sediment control plan. The Village Engineer will need to review and provide comments on this information.

*Response: Agreed.*

Response to Monastra Memorandum  
Re: 0 North Mountain Drive  
February 14, 2023  
Page 4 of 4.

10. Threatened or Endangered Species. The EAF identified the following threatened or endangered species: Bald Eagle. A consultation with the NYS DEC is recommended.

*Response: Agreed, although I am not sure what we will be able to do on this site to protect Bald Eagles.*

This February 14, 2023 Response Memo has been provided to address the comments in the January 27, 2023 Monastra Memorandum.

---

Please let me know if you have any questions or if there is anything else that you need at this point in the process.

Thanks,

Gotham Design Planning & Development Ltd.  
Padriac Steinschneider, President  
As Agent for Applicant