



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Stephen Hunter, Chair and Members of the Village of Dobbs Ferry Planning Board

**FROM:** Valerie Monastra, AICP

**RE:** 49 Clinton Avenue, The Masters School

**DATE:** May 24, 2021

**CC:** Ed Manley, Building Inspector  
George Pommer, P.E., Village Engineer  
Dan Pozin, Planning Board Attorney  
Richard Leins, Esq. Village Administrator  
Lori Lee Dickson Esq. Village Attorney  
Mayor Rossillo and Members of the Village Board of Trustees

---

The Masters School (the “Applicant”) is seeking Site Plan approval to construct a three-story (plus cellar), approximately 22,361 square foot Innovation and Entrepreneurship Center (“IEC”) on its campus in front of the Middle School Building. The IEC would be a new, educational and workshop building for the School’s engineering and computer science curriculum. The engineering and computer science classes are already offered at the Masters School, and therefore, the development of IEC is for existing students and the project would not increase the student body population or faculty. The project would not require additional new parking because the building is being built to centralize these classes into one building.

The project would also include the installation of green stormwater management practices, including a bioretention pond and subsurface controlled-flow stormwater detention. The project proposes new landscaping and a vegetated buffer along the nearby parking area. Views to and from the nearby historically designated Estherwood Mansion and Carriage House would be preserved.

The project also proposes to merge the 6 tax lots comprising the property into a single tax lot and this is being undertaken administratively by the Town of Greenburgh.

The property is located at 49 Clinton Avenue, Section Block and Lot 3.90-66-1 (“Project Site”) and is located in the EI, Educational/Institutional, zoning district.

This Application is before the Planning Board for a recommendation and the Village Board for Site Plan approval. This planning review covers the site plan approval process and planning considerations for both the Village Board and Planning Board.

---

### General and Procedural Comments

1. SEQR. The Village Board declared itself Lead Agency and designated the project as an Unlisted action under SEQRA at its April 13, 2021 Village Board meeting. Uncoordinated SEQR review is being conducted. See SEQR comments below.
2. Site Plan Approval. This application requires Site Plan approval by the Village Board of Trustees and a recommendation by the Planning Board per Section 300-52 of the Zoning chapter. A public hearing conducted by the Village Board will be required for Site Plan approval.
3. Zoning. The Applicant provided a zoning table that asserts compliance with Table B-10 in the Zoning chapter. The Applicant should confirm that the calculation for lot coverage and impervious coverage were calculated based on the footnote in the table which requires that these coverages be calculated based on the net lot area following deductions for any designated open space.
4. Architectural and Historic Review Board. This application will require Architectural and Historic Review Board approval and falls within the area covered by the Downtown Design Guidelines.
5. Local Waterfront Revitalization Consistency. The Village Board will need to make a consistency determination with the Village's LWRP per §300-52(D) as part of the final Site Plan approval. The Applicant has provided a Coastal Consistency Form.

### SEQR/Environmental Review Comments

1. EAF Revisions. The following revisions are recommended:
  - a. Section B. Government Approvals – The Applicant should list that approval is required by the Architectural and Historic Review Board. It currently reads only a recommendation is required.
  - b. Question D.2.e states 0.38 acres of impervious coverage will be created as a result of the proposed project and Question E.1 states 0.2 acres of impervious surface. Please confirm which one is the accurate calculation.
2. Threatened or Endangered Species. The EAF identified the following threatened or endangered species: Shortnose Sturgeon and Atlantic Sturgeon. These species are related to the Hudson River and not the Project Site. However, a consultation with NYS DEC is recommended as part of this SEQR review.
3. Archeological Site. The Project Site is substantially contiguous to the Estherwood and Carriage House and is within an archeologically sensitive area. Consultation with SHPO is required as part of this SEQR review. Preparation of the SWPPP and coverage under a SPDES for General Construction Activities also requires consultation.

4. Construction. The project will take 18 months to complete. The Applicant should provide additional information on construction impacts including daily truck trips and truck routes.
5. Excavation. Question D.2 of the EAF states that no excavation is required during construction. The Applicant should confirm that this information is accurate and if not please provide information on the proposed excavation and how much material is proposed to be removed from the site.
6. Stormwater. The project will disturb more than one (1) acre. The Applicant has provided a stormwater report and the Village Engineer will review it for compliance with Chapter 262, Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control.

#### Site Plan Comments

1. View Protection. The Applicant provided a view protection analysis as required by §300-46(D). The analysis shows minimal view impacts to and from Estherwood Mansion and Carriage House. The proposed IEC would also be set back a substantial distance from Clinton Avenue (approximately 500 feet) and would not be visible from the surrounding public roadways.
2. Parking. Parking requirements for educational uses are determined by the Board of Trustees during site plan review (Table C-1). The Applicant asserts that the proposed IEC will not cause an increase student enrollment or the need for additional faculty. Therefore, no new parking is needed for the development of this project. However, the Applicant should provide additional detail as to what will occupy the space that is currently occupied by the uses that will be housed in the new building.
3. Emergency Access. It is recommended that this plan be reviewed by emergency services to confirm the proposed building access and fire hydrants are adequate.
4. Lighting. The Applicant provided a lighting plan and noted that the lighting will comply with §300-41 of the Zoning chapter. The Applicant provided a photometric analysis that demonstrates the proposed lighting will comply with the zoning requirements.
5. Landscaping. The Applicant provided a landscaping plan per §300-44 of the Zoning chapter. The Applicant proposes numerous native species in its planting plan. Periwinkle is on the “watch plant list” for the Lower Hudson Partnership for Regional Invasive Species Management. The Planning Board may want to consider recommending the Applicant replace this species with a native species.
6. Trees. Tree removal will be required as a result of the proposed project and therefore, the Applicant will need a tree permit.

### Submission Materials

The following materials were submitted by the Applicant and examined by our office for the preparation of this review:

- Site Plan Application Form dated April 1, 2021
- Full Environmental Assessment Form February 16, 2021
- Coastal Assessment Form dated April 1, 2021
- Stormwater Memorandum, prepared by MFS Engineers & Surveyors
- Site Plan Drawings all dated February 17, 2021
  - Survey, prepared by Kenneth B. Salzmann
  - Civil Drawings, prepared by MFS Engineers & Surveyors
  - Architectural and Landscape Drawings, as well as Cross Sections and Elevations, prepared by Marvel
  - View Analysis by Marvel
  - Lighting Plan, prepared by Dot Dash Lighting Design