

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Carolyn Stevens, Chair, and Members of the Town of Ossining Planning Board

**CC:** Christie Tomm Addona, Esq. / Katherine Zalantis, Esq.  
Valerie Monastra, AICP  
Daniel Ciarcia, PE

**From:** Bonnie Von Ohlsen, AICP, PLA  
John Canning, PE  
Kimley-Horn Engineering and Landscape Architecture of New York, P.C.

**Date:** September 3, 2024

**RE:** *Responses to Comments*  
*Crotonville Conference Center, 1 Old Albany Post Road, Ossining NY*

On behalf of the Applicant, the following responses are offered to the comment letters received from the Town of Ossining Planning Board's Consultants dated August 8, 2024 and August 13, 2024.

### Memorandum dated 8/8/24 from Osman Barrie, PE (Nelson + Pope)

1. The overall study methodology followed standard traffic engineering practice.

*Response: Comment noted.*

2. The traffic impact study assess the potential impacts of the proposed hotel and conference center on adjacent streets during the weekday AM (7-9 AM), weekday PM (4:15-6:15 PM), and Saturday midday (12:30-2:30 PM) peak hours. However, the peak activity times for hotels do not align with these studied peak hours. Most hotel check-ins occur between 12 PM and 3 PM, and check-outs between 11 AM and 12 PM. Therefore, the study should be updated to include weekday midday counts from 11 AM to 3 PM and extend Saturday counts from 12:30-2:30 PM to 11 AM-3 PM to accurately quantify the potential impact of the hotel.

*Response: The study performed weekday midday analysis, existing traffic volumes approximated based on continuous count station data. Saturday traffic data review extended from 11AM-3PM using continuous count station data (Saturday analysis revised also).*

*For the Saturday analysis a review of the background traffic volumes and individual uses (discussed later) indicated that the project has the greatest potential to impact traffic conditions from 2 to 3 PM. Based on a review of NYSDOT continuous count station data on NYS 9A over the Croton River, it was determined that the 2-3 PM peak*

***hour volumes are 7% higher than the previously studied 12:30 – 1:30 PM volumes. Therefore, to evaluate the 2-3 PM hour the existing Saturday peak hour volumes were increased by 7%.***

***For the weekday midday analysis a review of the background traffic volumes and individual uses (discussed later) between 11 AM and 3 PM, indicated that for every hour, the traffic volumes at the key intersection of Route 9 and Old Albany Post Road and the traffic volumes that will be generated by typical activities at the Conference Center will both be lower than the corresponding values at the PM peak hour. Therefore, it was determined that if the project does not impact traffic at the PM peak hour it will not impact traffic at any hour between 11 and 3 PM.***

***The results of this analysis are included in the revised Traffic Study.***

3. The existing traffic counts were conducted in June 2024, with future conditions analyzed for 2025, both with and without project completion. The estimated time of completion, however, appears too short. If this project is expected to be completed within a year, provide justification in the report for using this one-year timeframe for the No-build and Build analysis.

***Response: The Traffic Study has been revised to indicate that the one-year timeframe is related to the request to simply permit the proposed usage of the existing buildings, as is, for a public facing hotel and conference center. This is expected to occur by 2025 if not before.***

4. The existing traffic volumes have been projected to the year 2025 using a 1% annual growth factor. The report states that this growth factor is based on NYSDOT historical traffic growth rates for roadways of similar classification in Westchester County. Provide historical data and spreadsheet calculations supporting the 1% annual growth rate.

***Response: See NYSDOT Average Annual Growth Rate Data for 2023 through 2050.***

5. In the project description section of the report, it is stated, “This traffic impact study evaluates the prospective use of the current facility to a 300-room hotel and conference center, as well as a conference center with 300 senior living residential units or some combination thereof, where the combined hotel rooms and senior living units does not exceed 300.” However, the report does not include a traffic impact analysis for the 300 senior living residential units and the combination of both hotel rooms and senior living residential units at the study intersections, or at least a trip generation comparison of the potential development options was not conducted to ensure the worst-case scenario was analyzed. The report should be updated to include an analysis of all three scenarios discussed in the project description section.

***Response: A trip generation comparison has been included in the Traffic Study for the potential senior living development options. A comparison of these two options to the proposed public facing hotel and conference center revealed that the hotel and***

***conference option is the worst-case scenario. Therefore, the hotel conference center was evaluated in the Traffic Impact Study.***

6. As stated in the report, the anticipated traffic generated by the proposed development was determined using data from the ITE publication, 11<sup>th</sup> Edition, for a Hotel (LUC 310). While the trip generation source is acceptable, the trips used to anticipate the potential impact of the proposed project are inappropriate. The ITE trips used to project the site volume were based on the lower numbers of the Average Rate, whereas the Fitted Curve equation indicates higher trip numbers. For example, the applicant used 138 trips (based on the Average Rate) for the weekday AM peak hour, while the ITE Fitted Curve indicates 143 total trips. Similarly, the applicant used 177 trips for the weekday PM peak hour, while the ITE Fitted Curve indicates 194 total trips. To ensure a conservative analysis, the applicant should revised the Build condition analysis using the highest anticipated trips from the ITE.

***Response: The Traffic Study has been revised to reflect the 143 and 194 trips.***

7. As stated in the parking analyses, it is highly likely for the hotel to operate independent of the conference facilities, restaurants and other amenities that will be open to patrons that are not guests of the hotel. Hence on a day that a major conference or banquet event occurs on site, the anticipated. trip generation of the use including the hotel rooms would be significantly higher than the trips estimated from ITE LUC 300 (hotel). A more comprehensive trip generation analyses taking these scenarios (as presented in the parking analyses) into consideration should be conducted.

***Response: A more comprehensive trip generation analysis taking into consideration event days at the hotel conference center, has been included in the revised Traffic Impact Study. A sensitivity analysis has been provided showing the potential impacts on these days.***

8. Based on the Trip Distribution and Assignment, it is anticipated that 10% of the site traffic will use the northbound Old Albany Post Road, white 15% is expected to utilize the southbound Albany Post Road (US Route 9). The projected 10% traffic volume on northbound Old Albany Post Road may be high given that this is a local street with a curved horizontal alignment and is surrounded primarily by residential land uses. However, South Albany Post Road (US Route 9) is a principal arterial road directly connecting to downtown Ossining, which features numerous public attractions, a train station, and the Ossining-Haverstraw Ferry Port. Given these factors, South Albany Post Road is likely to experience higher traffic volumes than the 15% projected in the study. Please provide justification for the 15% allocation to South Albany Post Road and the reasoning for the 10% allocation to North Old Albany Post Road.

***Response: Although not known by many, Old Albany Post Road connects to NYS 129 which connects to the Taconic Parkway. Based on the possibility that a travel app might direct a motorist to use this route, it was originally assumed that 10% of project traffic might use Old Albany Post Road.***

*Since the Croton-Harmon train station is considerably closer to the site than the Ossining train station, and because there are considerably more trains at Croton-Harmon than Ossining, it was determined that most, if not all, visitors or employees to the site, who took the train, would use the Croton-Harmon station and not the Ossining Station. Also, based on our familiarity of the roadways in the area, the majority of north-south traffic beyond the Village of Sleepy Hollow use Route 9A instead of Route 9 (which has multiple village traffic signals). For these reasons it was originally assumed that only 15% of south-bound traffic would use Route 9.*

*To provide a conservative analysis, the revised Traffic Study assumes only 5% of project traffic would use Old Albany Post Road to and from the north, and that 20% of project traffic would use Route 9 to and from the south.*

9. The intersection of Albany Post Road (US Route 9) at Old Albany Post Road/Mystic Drive is controlled by a traffic signal and includes pedestrian facilities such as crosswalks, ramps, pedestrian signal heads with countdown timers, and push buttons. Mystic Drive serves as the main access to a large residential community, which includes playgrounds, St. Augustine School, and St. Augustine Roman Catholic Church. These factors contribute to significant pedestrian activity at this intersection. However, the traffic impact analysis conducted did not include pedestrian counts or analyze their effects in the Synchro models. To ensure pedestrian safety and accurately assess the intersection's operation, it is crucial to incorporate pedestrian counts into the analysis. It is recommended that the Synchro models be updated to reflect existing and future pedestrian traffic in order to better quantify the intersection's performance and any associated delays.

*Response: Pedestrian activity has been included in the revised Traffic Study. Pedestrian traffic counts are included in the traffic study appendix.*

10. In the descriptive summary of the Synchro analysis for the intersection of Albany Post Road (US Route 9) at Old Albany Post Road/Mystic Drive, it is stated that under the No-Build condition, the intersection will continue operate at LOS C during the weekday AM peak hour. However, the existing condition shows the intersection operating at LOS B during the same period. The change in delay from LOS B to LOS C indicates an increase in overall intersection delay. It is important to accurately describe this change in delay. Update the report to state correct change in delay.

*Response: Comment noted, Traffic Study has been updated and issue has been addressed appropriately.*

11. The Existing 2024 Traffic Volume figure does not accurately reflect the traffic volumes compared to the Synchro model for the intersection of Shady Lane Farm Road and the NY 9A WB Off-Ramp. The figure incorrectly shows the northbound through traffic as "0" during the weekday PM peak hour, while the Synchro report indicates "1" vehicle for the same period. Update the Synchro model and report to ensure the traffic volumes are correctly represented.

*Response: The correct value was 0 however if you enter 0 the analysis encounters an error, possibly a dividing by 0 error and fails to provide a result. If you enter 1, the analysis provides a result.*

12. From the review of the parking analyses memorandum, the ITE parking generation numbers presented are significantly lower than what is contained in the ITE Parking Generation Handbook for the Land Use codes. Please provide us with the ITE parking generation worksheets supporting the parking numbers in the memorandum.

*Response: The ITE Parking Generation worksheet supporting the parking generation numbers have been provided in the revised parking memorandum.*

13. The parking demand calculation was based on the average rates. The parking study should be updated to reflect parking demand based on the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile parking demand.

*Response: As indicated in the updated parking memo, event parking has been based on a detailed review of the highest parking generation data points, the median and the standard deviation, and effectively reflects the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile values.*

14. The proposed parking supply will not meet the peak parking demand. A more detailed parking management plan showing how the applicant intends to meet the peak parking demand should be provided.

*Response: A more detailed Parking Management Plan, showing how the applicant intends to meet the peak parking demand, has been provided.*

**Memorandum dated 8/13/24 from Valerie Monastra, AICP (Nelson, Pope and Voorhis)**

**General and Procedural Comments:**

1. **SEQR.** This project is categorized as a Type I action under SEQR because the project proposes “the adoption of changes in the allowable uses within any zoning district, affecting 25 or more acres of the district.” The Town Board sent a Notice of Intent to be Lead Agency. This will be a coordinated review process with the Planning Board acting as an Involved Agency.

*Response: Comment noted.*

2. **Site Plan Approval.** This application requires Site Plan approval from the Planning Board and a public hearing is scheduled for the August 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

*Response: Comment noted.*

3. **Planning Board Recommendation.** The applicant is seeking a zoning text amendment for the uses of the site, which requires a recommendation from the Planning Board.

*Response: Comment noted.*

4. **Zoning Amendment.** The Applicant provided revised zoning based on input received from the Planning Board and Town Board. This item will be discussed at the August 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.  
*Response: Comment noted.*

#### Site Plan Comments

While the applicant is not proposing any interior or exterior renovations at this time, we offer the following operational site plan comments:

1. **Uses.** We note that the Applicant intends to potentially conduct interior renovations to some building to increase the number of units within the buildings, with no exterior renovations proposed at this time. The site plan and narrative have been updated accordingly to reflect the existing 248 rooms and the proposed maximum of 300. This comment has been addressed.  
*Response: Comment noted.*
2. **Accessory Uses.** The Applicant has clarified which uses are proposed and which are existing. For both the primary uses and accessory uses, please include on the table what will be open to the public and what will only be open to guests. Also, the narrative states that the Greenhouse will include a spa, pool, and personal service establishment as new accessory uses, however it also states that no alterations are proposed for this building. Are these facilities that already exist and are going to be repurposed? Please clarify how there will be no alterations yet there are these very specified accessory uses proposed.  
*Response: The table includes which uses are proposed to be open to the public (The Village, Croton Hall, and Café 56). Regarding the Greenhouse accessory uses, the spa, pool, personal service establishment are not existing uses. They are not proposed at this time but the Applicant has indicated they might be contemplated in the future so therefore are indicated as permitted accessory uses. Any future proposal/request for these uses would be subject to review requirements as per the Town Code.*
3. **Parking.** The Applicant has provided a parking table based on the proposed uses and the anticipated need per §200-24(A)(2) for the BE District. A parking management plan (PMP) has been submitted to reflect the capacity of the current parking lots to sustain the proposed uses. The PMP describes the possibility of a valet service to accommodate for larger events on site, however this is not referenced in the narrative. As per §200-24(A)(2) of the Town Code, the Planning Board must make a determination as to whether the submitted PMP is suitable for the proposed uses on the site. We recommend that the PMP be reviewed by the Town's traffic consultant. However, the Town's traffic consultant already provided comments to the Applicant, and it is suggested that the Applicant reply to their comments prior to review of this submission. We believe some of the information may change based on the zoning edits and the traffic comments.  
*Response: The project narrative, and EAF Part 3 response has been revised to reference the Parking Management Plan and the potential for valet parking. Responses to*

*comments on the Parking Management Plan and the Traffic Study are addressed above and revised documents are included in this submission.*

4. **Traffic Study.** The applicant provided a traffic impact study. Comments were provided by the Town's traffic consultant, and we are awaiting responses to those comments from the Applicant.

*Response: Responses to the town's traffic consultant comments on the Traffic Study are addressed above.*

5. **Lighting.** The Applicant indicates that the lighting and illumination periods is not proposed to change from the existing conditions.

*Response: Comment noted.*

6. **Signs.** The Applicant is not intending for any new signage on site.

*Response: Comment noted.*