

## April 12, 2023

Attn: Chairman O'Rourke and members of the Board Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board

RE: 921 Soundview Drive

Dear Chairman O'Rourke and Board Members,

Please find attached the following items:

- 1. Revised Architectural Package
- 2. Revised Tree Preservation Plan
- 3. Revised Landscape Plan
- 4. Revised Civil Drawings
- 5. Earthwork Calculation Memo
- 6. Neighborhood comparison Chart

Below are our responses to the open items in the memo from TBLD.

## <u>TBLD</u>

A Tree replacement and landscape plan have been requested. Response: Please see L1 and responses below associated with said plan.

The information necessary on a Tree Preservation Plan is to be conveyed visually, not just in written form, and is to include the following:

- The Tree Preservation Plan, once renamed, includes the required information. Response: The tree preservation plan has been renamed.
- 2. It should be noted that construction is planned within the drip line of an Oak tree located on the adjoining property to the south. Since half of the root zone of this tree is located within the Limits of Disturbance, ANSI guidelines for the pruning of tree roots must be followed and can be found on pages 3 and 4 of this memo. No construction equipment or materials shall be stored, even temporarily within, the protected dripline of trees, such as the soil stockpile indicated on ALP Engineering Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (C-103). Response:

The ANSI notes have been added to sheet. The Civil plan has been revised to relocate the soil stockpile.

 Since tree protection is now indicated on the ALP Engineering plans, as requested, the Village's Tree Protection Standard shall be added to their Construction Details C-111, C-112, or C-113. Response:



Architecture Planning Design a collaborative network alliance Central Studio 100 White Plains Road, Tarrytown, New York 10591 The tree protections standard was added to the ALP Engineering plans.

## Planning Board Requested Items:

- DEC jurisdiction / Army Corps of Engineers determination Response: The team is working with a DEC representative to obtain the requested letter.
- 2. Site/Assessor record comparison between the proposed residence and the residences in the neighborhood.

Response:

The submitted chart compares the data for the proposed project at 921 Soundview to the surrounding properties as requested by the Planning Board at our last appearance. It was noted while compiling the chart that our application included the SF of a 'basement' in the habitable area calculations. Upon further review, 'basement' is classified as a 'cellar' by definition of the Village of Mamaroneck's zoning ordinance similarly to many of the residences located along Otter Creek. As a result, our habitable area has been adjusted on our submission as well as relabeling the basement to cellar.

It is our understanding based on the definitions in the ordinance that the FAR of the residences should utilize the total area of the residences, however, we have provided an additional column for the FAR based on livable area. Note that the zoning ordinance utilize habitable area in lieu of livable area, utilized on the accessor records.

FAR of the proposed residence is in the median range for the 24 lots compared - see below with the proposed residence highlighted.

0.503; 0.467; 0.448; 0.410; 0.401; 0.371; 0.346; 0.312; 0.301; 0.300; 0.279; 0.271; 0.266; 0.262; 0.261; 0.261; 0.258; 0.231; 0.219; 0.213; 0.209; 0.196; 0.156; 0.180

Relevant market comparisons which speak to similar lot size new home program and square foot desires yield the following:

Current market desires have significantly evolved over the past 10 years and to an even greater degree during Covid/post-Covid experiences. Where a leveling of house size has occurred in general market terms over the past 10 years, desires and demands of the market are driven more by home-centric activities. 'The house is more of a hub than ever before'. Live/work/play at home has become a common program thread.

Below is a current example located in proximity to the neighborhood:

## 530 Oakhurst Comparison:

Prior Livable SF: 2,452	Proposed Livable SF: 4,703 sf
Prior Total SF: 2,692	Proposed Total SF: 7,011 sf
Prior FAR: 0.15	Proposed FAR: 0.28 (permitted max = 0.287)



In addition, we reviewed the current code referenced by Beverly Sharon at our last Planning Board appearance. We also had a follow up conversation with Mr. Freeman where the root system / earth stabilization concern was reiterated. In lieu of providing new screening at the North property line, the application has been revised for the existing trees to remain and the new trees located elsewhere in the site (in locations that have been reviewed for proper root ball planting depth). In reviewing the code, we did confirm that 3" trees were considered to be protected trees, but the replacement chart still indicated replacement for trees 8" or higher based on our observations.

We look forward to continuing the discussions with the Planning Board on our application in a few weeks.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you!

Best,



Jaclyn A. Tyler, AIA, LEED AP bd+c Principal – Nexus Creative

Copy: Inez D'Arcangelo