



GAINES, NOVICK, PONZINI, COSSU & VENDITTI, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
11 MARTINE AVENUE, 8TH FLOOR
WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK 10606
Tel. (914) 288-9595
Fax (914) 288-0850

David E. Venditti, Partner
E-mail: dvenditti@gainessllp.com
Direct Dial: (914) 831-6249

Service Not Accepted by Fax or Email

November 9, 2015

By Hand

Chairperson Ingrid Richards and
Honorable Members of the
Town of Ossining Planning Board
101 Route 9A
PO Box 1166
Ossining, New York 10562

Re: Audubon Manor Co., LLC, Applicant
Parth Knolls, LLC – Project
87 Hawkes Avenue
Ossining, New York 10562
November 18, 2015 Meeting

Dear Chairperson Richards and Member of the Planning Board:

We represent the above Applicant in connection with the Parth Knolls, LLC Project. In connection with the submission of even date herewith of revised Plans and drawings to the Planning Board, please accept this as an addendum thereto. The purpose of this letter is to attempt to address for the record certain issues, as best that we can recollect, from Members of the Planning Board with respect to certain site plan issues. For future ease of reference, I have numbered the issues and responses:

1. Issue: Plan of Child Recreation area of 21,200 square feet, as per Zoning Requirement of 400 sq. ft. per unit:

Response: An Open Space and Recreation Plan was provided for this submission. It indicates where the required recreation area is provided.

Chairperson Ingrid Richards
Honorable Members of the Planning Board
Town of Ossining
November 9, 2015
Page -2-

2.Issue: Zoning table must address square footage of BMR units:

Response: This will be provided in a subsequent submission.

3.Issue: As per Zoning Code 200.16C(3)(a), 1/3 of net site must be permanent open space and/or sites for suitable recreation. Undeveloped permanent open space shall be provided at the rate of 1,500 sq. ft. per bedroom. Please indicate:

Response: An Open Space and Recreation Plan was provided for this submission. It indicates where the required permanent open space area is provided.

4.Issue: Revise Zoning Schedules on Sheet 101:

Response: Sheet C-1 is no longer part of the Plan set, and the zoning table on C-101 is updated to show the correct information.

5.Issue: Please provide 3rd floor Apartment Plan, as required.

Response: This will be provided in a supplemental addendum.

6.Issue: Provide tree removal plan, along with Steep Slopes and Wetlands Disturbance information on Plans:

Response: This information has been provided on two sheets added to the plan set. The tree plan shows all of the trees above 12" diameter that will be removed or protected. The Environmental constraints map show the wetland location and buffer disturbance. It compares the existing and the proposed disturbance to the buffer. It also shows the locations and proposed disturbance to steep slopes on the site. A Conceptual Wetland Mitigation Plan is provided with this submission. No wetlands are proposed to be disturbed. Some areas of Town-regulated wetland buffer will be disturbed as shown, therefore areas of wetland and buffer enhancement, restoration and expansion are shown. Structural practices such as the use of porous pavement and gravel driveways are also shown within the buffer areas to mitigate the impacts of these activities. Stephen Coleman, a wetlands expert representing the Town of Ossining, has walked the site with the applicant's consultant and confirmed the wetland/watercourse boundaries and buffer determinations as shown on the current plan.

Chairperson Ingrid Richards
Honorable Members of the Planning Board
Town of Ossining
November 9, 2015
Page -3-

7.Issue: Please address overflow parking, as appropriate:

Response: The proposed parking layout meets the required number of parking spaces designated in the code. No additional parking is required. Tim Miller Associates, Inc., by James A. Garofalo, AICP CCTP, Director of Transportation Division, in his letter to the Planning Board dated October 9, 2015, addresses the issues of Capacity Analysis Threshold and Parking Availability, which we incorporate by reference herein. Mr. Garofalo, through zoning analysis and use of Authoritative references such as the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Parking Generation*, 4th Edition, Washington DC, 2010, and posted errata Nov. 2, 2011, concludes in his profession opinion that "[t]he proposed 53 apartments have a zoning requirement of 106 spaces. **The site has a proposed 108 parking spaces** (105 standard spaces and three accessible spaces) **meeting the zoning requirement** (Site Desing Consults, Parking Schedule, Drawing #C-101, September 25, 2015)." [emphasis added]. As per the authoritative guide cited, "parking demand [is] ... 0.68 to 1.94 vehicles per dwelling unit with a **95 percent confidence level of peak parking demand of 1.10 to 1/37 vehicles per dwelling unit. This is well within the zoning code.**" [emphasis added]. The Table for the town of Ossining "fits in the low range of 95 percent confidence level found in *Parking Generation* for peak parking demand and is also below the town code for this site of two vehicles per dwelling unit." Accordingly, parking is statistically sufficient as per recognized guidelines and as per the Zoning Code of the Town of Ossining and Overflow parking should not be needed.

As for the concept raised of "banked parking," there appears to be no reason for same, as per the sufficiency outlined above, and would constitute a hardship on the particular site. Typically, "banked parking" are spaces that are designated on a site plan and which have received approval but which are not immediately installed. A structure may not be built in an area designated as banked parking. Again, typically, the concept is to accommodate an anticipated future expanded need or further development. Neither element has presented itself in this project and the site constraints and building envelopes, particularly given the establishment of the wetlands buffer and required permanent open space, as per Code, make banked parking a programmatic difficulty not warranted by the project parameters.

8.Issue: Progression of Landscaping Plan and tree removal/replacement to be shown:

Response: A detailed Landscaping Plan will be provided for the December meeting.

9.Issue: Please show the Lighting Plan in greater detail:

Chairperson Ingrid Richards
Honorable Members of the Planning Board
Town of Ossining
November 9, 2015
Page -4-

Response: This has not been prepared for this submission and will be addressed in a subsequent submission.

10. Issue: Provide an analysis of sight distance and access/egress plan:

Response: Sight distance analysis has been included and addressed in the Plan set.

11. Issue: Discuss the Traffic Impact Analysis:

Response: This analysis was provided in the letter from James A. Garofalo, AICP CCTP, Director of Transportation Division, of Tim Miller Associates, Inc., referred to in "7" above. Based upon NYS DEC guidelines, the Trip Generation Rates, Site Trip Generation, and Average Annual Daily Traffic (shown in Tables 1, 2 and 3 of that letter) lead to the conclusion that "[t]rip generation for the 53 apartments peak at 46 trips (See Table 2). For the proposed project, **the estimated traffic generated will be slightly less than 50 percent of the threshold for a capacity study,**" making one unnecessary since the purpose of this established NYS threshold is "to avoid unnecessary traffic impact studies where the traffic models are not going to show substantial change in traffic operations." [emphasis added]. In fact, the studies conducted, as displayed in "Table 3 shows the route 9A traffic has been declining since about 2003. Even if all the daily site generated trips were destined for NYS Route 9A and distributed in one direction on NYS Route 9A they would compromise less than ten percent of the decline in traffic that has occurred." Accordingly, a more detailed analysis does not appear warranted.

12. Issue: Site Plan showing signage with color, size and location:

Response: Location has been indicated on the Plan. Details have not been developed yet.

13. Issue: Provide rim and inverts elevations for all drainage and sewer structures:

Response: This has been provided on the Utility Plan.

14. Issue: The feasibility of entering pump stations at lower elevations or alternative plans:

Response: We have had a preliminary meeting with Dan Ciarcia and based upon preliminary calculations it appears that capacities exist and we will be scheduling a meeting

at the two pump stations for a more detailed analysis.

15. Issue: Detail design modifications to lift pump stations:

Response: See note 14 above.

16. Issue: Are looping of water mains feasible for water system plan:

Response: Looping the existing water main was looked into. It is problematic in that it would require obtaining easements through the adjacent properties, which we cannot create as of right.

17. Issue: Provide details of Plan of Driveway crossing to Pool House:

Response: A detail has not been provided for this submission. The proposed structure is an open arch culvert. It will not disturb the wetland and have an open bottom. A detail will be provided at a later date.

18. Issue: Provide details of upstream and downstream inverts of pipes running through the property:

Response: These have been added to the plans.

19. Issue: Provide SWMP/SWPPP:

Response: To be provided in detail prior to December meeting.

20. Issue: Provide Plan showing modified access as requested by Fire Inspector:

Response: The current Site Plan submitted reflects that comments and requests made by the Fire Inspector.

21. Issue: Data Sheet required calculating base density:

Response: This will be provided in a supplemental addendum.

22. Issue: Show, with calculation, the minimum distance between buildings as per Code

Chairperson Ingrid Richards
Honorable Members of the Planning Board
Town of Ossining
November 9, 2015
Page -6-

section 200-16(C)(1)(b) ("the minimum distance between a principal buildings shall equal to two times the height of the highest building, and the minimum distance between a principal and an accessory building shall be 20 feet."):

Response: This will be provided in a supplemental addendum.

23. Issue: Satisfy requirement for suitably Play Area:

Response: This was addressed on the open space recreation plan.

24. Issue: Investigate elimination of pump station; elimination of dead ends on water system; show SWPPP Plan; Illustrate Piping Stream:

Response: Addressed in responses 14, 16, and 19. Stream piping no longer applicable.

We look forward to answering any of these issues in greater details at upcoming Planning Board meetings.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Venditti

DEV/rh

cc: Audubon Manor Co., LLC