



VILLAGE OF DOBBS FERRY BOARD OF TRUSTEES AGENDA

MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 27, 2020
AGENDA ITEM SECTION: PUBLIC HEARING
AGENDA ITEM NO. : 2
AGENDA ITEM: CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING FOR REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION OF 100 MAIN STREET
ITEM BACKUP DOCUMENTATION: 1. LETTER DATED OCTOBER 19, 2020 FROM MR. PADDY STEINSCHNEIDER/GOTHAM DESIGN & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LTD. TO MAYOR ROSSILLO AND THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

ITEM BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. LETTER DATED OCTOBER 19, 2020 FROM MR. PADDY STEINSCHNEIDER/GOTHAM DESIGN & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LTD. TO MAYOR ROSSILLO AND THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

GOTHAM

RECEIVED

OCT 19 2020

by the Village Clerk
Village of Dobbs Ferry, NY

Padriac Steinschneider

Gotham Design & Community Development Ltd.

329 Broadway

Dobbs Ferry, New York 10522

(914) 693-5093 ■ Fax: (914) 693-5390

(914) 906-4802 ■ arch329@gmail.com

October 19, 2020

Dobbs Ferry Mayor and Board of Trustees
112 Main Street
Dobbs Ferry, New York 10522

RECEIVED

OCT 19 2020

Village of Dobbs Ferry
Building Department

Re: 100 Main Street Site Plan Review

Dear Mayor Rossillo and Trustees:

This is to request that you continue your Public Hearing on 100 Main Street at your October 27, 2020 meeting. You voted to continue the Hearing at your October 13, 2020. We are not submitting any additional drawings or documents.

At the October 13 Hearing, we presented an alternative design that reduced the fourth floor almost as much as possible and increased the third floor to the limits of the building footprint approved by the Planning Board and the Architectural and Historic Review Board (AHRB) in the Resolutions that were submitted to the Board of Trustees. Our intent with submitting the alternative design was to address the specific comments and requests asked for at the September 8, 2020 Public Hearing. The Public Hearing was continued at the September 22, 2020 meeting due to the drawings submitted showing the alternative were not received by the Village until September 16, 2020, which put them past the Village's deadline for submissions to the Board of Trustees.

As I noted at the October 13 Hearing, it would be possible to reduce the width of the fourth floor by approximately 4 feet, making the set back to the sides 5 feet instead of 3 feet. While this would reduce the size of the fourth floor by 144.5 square feet, the fourth floor would still exceed 50% of the third floor. As was stated at the October 13 Hearing, the Board indicated that it would not consider the application favorably, if a variance is required. It should be noted that no variance would be required for this, since the Board of Trustees has the responsibility and authority to waive the zoning requirements, if it believes that doing so is in the best interests of the Village.

It was our hope that, seeing the alternative design, the Board of Trustees would acknowledge that the work that the Planning Board and the AHRB did on this application was of value. As Steve Tilly said, when he commented on the comparison of the alternative to the design recommended for approval by both Boards, the design recommended by the Planning Board and the AHRB is the better of the two.

As I noted at the Public Hearing, the issue with this project is not that the fourth floor is too big: it is the reality that the third floor is very small. This site permits a building with a site coverage of 80%. The building proposed with the addition that expands the third floor has a site coverage of 51.1%. A fourth floor of 1,353 square feet does not meet the needs of the program.

The current project began in 2014. Since then, the Planning Board and AHRB spent significant time on this project from 2014 to when they each made their final recommendations.

Letter to Mayor Rossillo and Board of Trustees
Re: 100 Main Street
October 19, 2020
Page 2 of 2.

The Planning Board originally proposed a project on this site in 2016. That was sent back to the Planning Board by the Board of Trustees due to the fact that the recommendation made by the Planning Board was for the design without the fourth floor originally proposed. We returned to the Planning Board, which made the revised recommendation. The Board of Trustees then requested that the AHRB opine on the design, which took the project in the direction of having the historic significance of the garage evaluated.

The AHRB requested that the Village retain an consultant on historic architecture and preservation. The Village's consultant determined that it did not have significance. A revised site plan design was recommended for approval by the Planning Board in 2017. Unfortunately, by that point in time, the Board of Trustees had changed the Code as it applied to this property.

A revised design compliant with the new Code was prepared and submitted to the Planning Board for consideration at its December 2018 meeting. The Planning Board explained that it believed that only a project that retained the existing garage would be considered favorably by the AHRB and the Board of Trustees. We agreed to prepare a design the saved the garage. The design that was submitted to the Board of Trustees in February 2020, recommended for approval by the Planning Board and AHRB, restores the garage and reduces the project from six units to four units.

This design was also presented to the Board of Trustees at its two meetings in April 2019, during the Planning Board's review, specifically to determine whether a fourth floor exceeding 50% of the third floor in area, while set back 10 feet from Main Street, would be received favorably by the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees took a vote at that time agreed by a vote of 6 to 1 that preserving the garage justified the fourth floor as proposed.

At this point, respecting for the time and attention that has been invested by the members of the Planning Board and the AHRB, we request that you make your decision on the design that those two Boards have recommended to you. If there is a feeling that a fourth floor, particularly one that exceeds the 50% of the third floor, is not justified given these circumstances, you could approve instead the design that was presented in December 2018, which is consistent with the previous design recommended for approval by the Planning Board, but with the changes to the Code made in 2017 implemented; specifically it is set back 10 feet from the property line shared with the Aqueduct. That design is superior in our opinion and it better serves both the needs of Village and the intent of the property owner.

We look forward to a decision being made at your October 27, 2020 meeting at which the Public Hearing on this application is scheduled to be continued.

Thank you for you time.

Sincerely,



GOTHAM DESIGN & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LTD.
Paddy Steinschneider, Land Use Planner, President
As Agent for L.M. Sutton Management Company