

MEMO

Title: Village of Dobbs Ferry Planning Board , Planner Comments design team responses

Project: The Masters School Innovation and Entrepreneurship Center

Date: July 22, 2021

To: Valerie Monastra, AICP
Nelson Pope Vooris

From: Jennifer Olson, AIA, LEED AP, Director, Marvel
Cc: Edward Biddle, The Masters School

Upon receipt of the comments from Ms Monastra dated June 21,2021, the design team offers the following responses:

General and Procedural Comments

Planner Comment:

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.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment is noted.*

Planner Comment:

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 and a public hearing is scheduled for July 1, 2021.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: The first public hearing occurred on July 1, 2021 and the Planning Board has also scheduled a continuation of the public hearing for August 5, 2021.*

Planner Comment:

3. Zoning. The Applicant provided a zoning table demonstrating compliance with the Zoning chapter.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment Noted.*

Planner Comment:

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.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment is noted. The applicant is scheduled to appear before the AHRB on July 26, 2021.*

Planner Comment:

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.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment noted.*

SEQR/Environmental Review Comments

Planner Comment:

1. EAF Revisions. The following revisions are recommended:
 - a. The applicant confirmed that 0.33 acres of impervious area will be created from the project. Question E.1 still states 0.2 acres – Please update the EAF form to ensure the consistency regarding the amount of impervious surface area created from the project.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: EAF document has been updated to reflect the 0.33 acres.*

Planner Comment:

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.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment noted. A letter has been sent to DEC requesting review, but no response has been offered at this time.*

Planner Comment:

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.

- *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment is noted. The project has been reviewed by the Division for Historic Preservation of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). It is the OPRHP's opinion that the project will have No Adverse Impact on historic or archaeological resources. See the attached letter signed by Derek Rohde, dated 07.16.2021. SWPPP has been submitted to Village Planner and Engineer for review.*

Planner Comment:

4. Construction. As requested, the Applicant has provided a construction schedule. The construction staging area and all construction equipment will be located on the Project Site. It is anticipated that construction trucks will travel to the Project Site using Broadway and Clinton Avenue. The construction schedule estimates a peak of 15 daily construction deliveries anticipated from months 6-12. The truck traffic for months 12-18 will average about 4-8 daily deliveries. The applicant did not provide the anticipated truck trips for months 2-5 when excavation and construction of the foundation will be taking place. Please provide that information. What is the anticipated size of the construction delivery trucks?

- *Team response July 22nd: See the amended response provided by Construction Manager, Yorke Construction Company:*

The first month of the project will involve setting up a perimeter fence around the entire construction zone and a temporary site entrance will be created from Clinton Avenue. Inside a parking area/gravel driveway will be created over the existing ballfields with a truck wash station located adjacent to the entrance. The current plan was created to separate the public and students from the construction area as much as possible. For a visual image you can refer to the site layout on drawing C-502. Trucks will be using Broadway onto Clinton as the primary route through the Village. There will be no queuing on Clinton Ave.

Months 2 thru 5 of the schedule will focus on excavation and foundation construction. During this time earth moving equipment will be on site, dump trucks/delivery trucks will be entering and leaving the site along with concrete delivery trucks. We do not anticipate any situation where trucks will have to wait on Clinton Ave, there is a significant area within the site fence to house all waiting vehicles. Estimate peak around 30 truck visits/day, average around 15/day. Note - none of the excavation will require blasting or pile driving, so noise levels will be just like any other commercial site.

Months 6 thru 12 of the schedule will focus on the steel structure and skin/roof of the building. During this time, a truck crane will be present on site, the bulk of construction materials will arrive on flatbed trucks to be hoisted into place. Truck traffic during this period will be less intense, it will come in waves, at the peak we may have as many as 15 deliveries a day but the average over this period will be much less. Again, we do not anticipate any circumstance where trucks have to wait outside our fenced construction zone.

Months 12 thru 18 of the schedule will focus on the interior fit out of the building. During this timeframe, the bulk of materials will be delivered in box trucks, unloaded by forklifts and loaded directly into the building. Truck traffic will be constant with 4 – 8 deliveries arriving every day. Final site grading will commence in months 17 and 18, delivery trucks with gravel/dirt/topsoil will be arriving at the site.

During all phases of the work, the construction crews will be parking within the site fenced areas, so all vehicle traffic will use the same entrance on Clinton Ave.

Delivery trucks will range in size from tractor + flat beds loaded with things like excavators and steel, to tractor trailers, to 12 yard concrete trucks, smaller box trucks down to vans and pickup trucks.

Planner Comment:

5. Excavation. Question D.2 of the EAF has been updated to include the excavation cut amount during construction, which is estimated to be 2,950 cubic yards.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment noted.*

Planner Comment:

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.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment noted.*

Site Plan Comments

Planner Comment:

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.
 - *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment is noted. View Protection analysis is resubmitted for record for the August 5, 2021 public hearing.*

Planner Comment:

2. Parking. Parking requirements for educational uses are determined by the Board of Trustees during site plan review (Table C-1). The Applicant indicates that the current use is being conducted in an area previously used for student reception, gathering, and recreation space. Once these uses are transferred to the proposed IEC building, the original purpose for this area will be

restored. Thus, the proposed project will not impact student enrollment or a demand for additional parking.

- *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment noted.*

Planner Comment:

3. Emergency Access. The Applicant has submitted the site plan to emergency services to confirm the building access and fire hydrants are adequate.

- *Team response July 22, 2021: Emergency services has reviewed the access plan and provided the approval on the letter signed by Chief Osborne, dated 7/1/2021.*

Planner Comment:

4. Lighting. The Applicant provided a lighting plan. It is noted that §300-41(C) requires that lighting for the building entries cannot exceed 5.0 foot candles and lighting for the pedestrian walkways cannot exceed 3.0 foot candles. Several light fixtures appear to exceed footcandle limits and the Applicant should consider revising their lighting plan to comply with §300-41(C) or request a waiver per §300-52 of the Zoning chapter.

- *Team response July 22, 2021: Landscape lighting has been updated to not surpass the maximums for entries and pedestrian walkways by revising fixture optics and reducing the wattage/lumen packages accordingly. All fixtures are dimmable and light levels will be verified and set during the commissioning period.*

Planner Comment:

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 and has removed species that are included on the Lower Hudson Partnership for Regional Invasive Species Management list. The proposed quantities have not been provided for the perennials and groundcover plantings. Please provide those, especially for the bioretention area.

- *Team response July 22, 2021: The current submission includes an understory planting plan which identifies the total quantities of all plants proposed for the immediate area of the new construction.*

Planner comment:

6. Trees. Tree removal will be required as a result of the proposed project and therefore, the Applicant will need a tree permit.

- *Team response July 22, 2021: Comment is noted. The project team will work with the Village regulatory agencies to ensure we follow all requirements for tree removals.*