



Engineers  
Planners  
Surveyors  
Landscape Architects  
Environmental Scientists

400 Columbus Avenue, Suite 180E  
Valhalla, NY 10595  
T: 914.347.7500  
F: 914.347.7266  
www.maserconsulting.com

June 22, 2020

**VIA EMAIL**

Mr. Ed Manley  
Village Administrator  
Village of Dobbs Ferry  
112 Main Street  
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522

Re: 43-45 Cedar Street  
Village of Dobbs Ferry, New York  
MC Project No. 121000181A

Dear Mr. Manley:

As requested in your June 16, 2020 email, we have reviewed the memorandum to the Village from Provident Design Engineering (PDE), dated September 16, 2019. Our comments on this submission are summarized below and are numbered according to the previous review comments and responses.

1. See Attachment B for Summary of Stopping Sight Distances and Intersection Sight Distances as well as Sight Distance Diagram. As shown in the Table and Diagram, the sight distance is adequate for the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds and there is no need to eliminate any on-street parking.

***Response: The Applicant's engineer provided summaries of the Stopping Sight Distances and Intersection Sight Distances for 25 MPH as their observed 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed was identified as 24 MPH. They indicate the Stopping Sight Distances in tabular form. This appears reasonable however, the Applicant should indicate how the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed information was established, i.e., is it based on just peak hours or data collected over the course of the entire day? This may be important since the speeds along this section of road may vary significantly depending on time of day. A clarification should be provided. It would also be helpful to show in the tabular form the Stopping Sight and Intersection Sight Distances for both***



*25 and 30 MPH Design Speed for comparison purposes to what will be available at the exit driveway by showing an actual diagram (see also Item 5 below). This information will help determine whether all on-street parking can be maintained as indicated in the response.*

2. See Attachment C for Turning Tracks of vehicles entering/exiting the site as well as circulating the site. As shown, the 17-foot aisle is adequate for two-way traffic flow.

*Response: Figures No. 1 and 2 provided by Provident Design Engineering (PDE) indicate the turning radius for passenger cars arriving to and from both directions of Cedar Street. Figures No. 1 through 5 also show the vehicles turning into various parking spaces on the site. Also, indicated on Figure No. 5 is the side-by-side treatment for passenger cars on the 17-foot-wide exit drive demonstrating that a vehicle can pass if one is stopped along this area. Note that the other areas of the site do have a full 24-foot drive aisle for vehicles maneuvering into and out of the various parking spaces. These are all acceptable. However, the fire and emergency services department should also review the access and circulation to provide any comments or concerns on access.*

*The positioning of the on-street parking space No. 25, as well as the parking space immediately to the south of the exit driveway, should still be reviewed relative to sight lines exiting the driveway. This should consider the possibility that a van or larger delivery vehicle parked there could block the driveway exiting sight lines.*

3. Applicant is coordinating with emergency personnel with regards to emergency site access.

*Response: Any input and correspondence from emergency services regarding the emergency site access as well as the turning tracks should be provided to the Planning Board.*

4. Delivery and loading will be conducted in the designated loading zone already provided on Cedar Street.

*Response: The designated loading area along the area of Cedar Street has been demonstrated.*



5. See response number 1. Based on the measured sight distances in the field and the required sight distances for the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed from AASHTO, there is no need to eliminate any on-street parking.

***Response:*** *See previous response. The sight distance table should be amended to include a figure clearly showing the relationship of both Stopping Sight Distance and Intersection Sight Distance based on the AASHTO criteria at the driveway. It should be presented on an aerial photograph or method that would give the Board a better understanding of how the sight lines are being accomplished. This will assist in making the final determination on any need for on-street parking removal.*

6. Due to the minimal increase of traffic caused by the proposed Project, it is the opinion of PDE that no additional locations are needed to be studied relative to traffic conditions in the area. See Attachment D for the Trip Generation Table that summarizes the trips associated with the two uses.

***Response:*** *Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip estimates, the volumes indicated appear to be reasonable. Although, for this size development the residential unit generation could be slightly higher if the ITE peak hour of generator rates were used. This would equate to approximately 4 or so additional peak hour trips, which would not be significant in terms of the driveway operation. The determination on the need to evaluate other adjacent intersections should be made by the Board. While a detailed analysis may not be necessary, the Applicant should at least review these adjacent intersections qualitatively to determine their functionality relative to pedestrian crossings, vehicular maneuvers, and if any new signing is needed since additional traffic from the project will be passing through these locations. Any such recommendations should be provided to the Board.*

7. See Appendix E for Traffic Figures and Capacity Analysis Worksheets.

***Response:*** *The Applicant's analysis was completed in accordance with accepted standards and does indicate Levels of Service B or better will be experienced at the driveway. However, some discussion of the existing queuing of traffic along Cedar Street in this vicinity should be provided based on actual observations.*



8. The information contained in table No. 3.1 is for the subject application. Attachment F summarizes the parking demand associated with each of the land uses.

***Response:*** *Table 3.1 of the PDE report provides a summary of typical parking demand factors based on ITE criteria. The on-site residential parking based on these ITE rates are reasonable however, due to the limited on-street parking in the area, the Board will have to make a determination on the adequacy of overall parking for the commercial space.*

9. Design details will be coordinated with the Building Department prior to construction.

***Response:*** *Due to the complexity of pedestrian and vehicular movements at this location, and the location of the proposed site driveway relative to the adjacent church, final details on the reconstruction of the sidewalks and driveway intersection should be provided for review by the Village Engineer and any signing or pavement striping improvements should be identified by the Applicant's engineer.*

If you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

MASER CONSULTING P.A.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to read 'Philip J. Grealy', is written over the typed name.

Philip J. Grealy, Ph.D., P.E.  
Principal/Department Manager

PJG/ces  
cc: G. Pommer, P.E.