



Architecture Planning Design

a collaborative network alliance

Central Studio 100 White Plains Road, Tarrytown, New York 10591

January 25, 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 (including Lighting Plan & Tree Removal / Landscape Plan
2. Engineering response letter addressing Kellard Sessions comments
3. Revised Civil Drawings
4. Stormwater Maintenance Agreement
5. Pool Consultant letter (pre-dated Beth Evans clarification memos previously submitted)
6. Wetlands Report

Below are our responses to the open items in the memos received by both AKRF and TBLD. The letter supplied by ALP Engineering, the applicant Engineer, provides responses to Kellard Sessions Memo.

AKRE

1. Per the Engineering Plans, the wetlands delineation was performed by Evans Associates 12/20/10. Although the NYSDEC jurisdictional determination is still required, the Planning Board can proceed with the wetland boundary for the purposes of Village permits. Approvals should be contingent on the Applicant obtaining NYSDEC wetland permits prior to construction.

Response:

The applicant team is currently in communication with a DEC representative to obtain the requested jurisdiction letter.

2. The revised site plan shows that the pool has been rotated 90 degrees and that the pool size has been reduced from 392 sf (14 x 28 ft) to 351 sf (13 x 27 ft). The deck has also been rotated. It appears that the deck may have been reduced in size; however, given its irregular shape, it is difficult to compare the square footage of the original and revised decks.

Response:

The original deck square footage was: 1,233 SF

The proposed total (upper and lower) deck square footage is: 869 SF (including 117 sf of stepping stones). The proposed sf of the decks is now indicated on the architectural plans (A-1 and A2).

3. Based on the illustrations, it appears that the proposed pool will not occupy more than 40% of the rear yard. However, the calculations should be included on the site plan.

Response:



Architecture Planning Design

a collaborative network alliance

Central Studio 100 White Plains Road, Tarrytown, New York 10591

The proposed pool rear yard coverage is 2.5% and has been included in the zoning chart on sheet C-1.

4. At the HCZMC meeting of 12/21/2022, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with the LWRP. The Planning Board should consider setting the public hearing for the wetland permit.

Response:

Given the determination of compliance by HCZMC and submission of the additional requested material, the applicant is requesting the Planning Board set the public hearing for the wetland permit.

5. Applicant's submission includes a new Sheet A-11 which shows proposed lights interior to the pool; exterior lighting is not shown. The Applicant should confirm whether exterior lighting is proposed – if so, a lighting plan should be provided.

Response:

A new sheet has been included in the submission (E-1) to include a lighting plan and proposed light fixtures.

6. No screening or landscaping is indicated on the drawings. If any is proposed, it should be added to a drawing. Given the elevated nature of the pool, screening on the ground may be insufficient.

Response:

Note – the elevated pool comment appears to be a comment that was included prior to relocating the pool to the ground level and is no longer applicable.

A new sheet has been included in the submission (L1). The Tree replacement plan and landscaping plan address the screening and landscaping within the perimeter of the site.

7. The proposed pool equipment pad has been added to Sheets A-0.2 and C-101. Screening has not been added. Sheet A-0.2 continues to note that landscaping beyond the wetlands buffer will be presented to HCZMC; however, it appears that this was not done.

Response:

As noted in item 5 above, the landscape plan on L1 includes screening at the pool equipment pad.

The note included on A-0.2 was a note remaining from the initial submission to HCZMC and was intended to be removed. It has now been removed from the sheet and landscape plan submitted.

Items included in the comments for section 300-4 are all items relating to obtaining a building permit for the swimming pool and reads as follows in the Village of Mamaroneck code:

Application for such a permit shall be signed by the owner of the premises and shall be made to the Building Inspector of the Village of Mamaroneck, who shall furnish the necessary forms for such application. Specifications and data for the construction of such swimming pool shall be submitted with such application, including but not limited to:



Architecture Planning Design

a collaborative network alliance

Central Studio 100 White Plains Road, Tarrytown, New York 10591

All comments will be addressed and information will be supplied to the building department to obtain a permit. The open comments in the memo are as follows:

- A. A profile showing levels and depths of water at all points. *This information should be added to sheet A-4 of the architectural drawings (or added to another suitable drawing).*

Response:

The pool is one continuous level with the exception of the steps. Depth of pool was previously indicated on A-12 – the water height does not exceed a 42” max. depth within the pool and the dimension has been updated to read 42” max. water level.

- B. Cross sections showing scum gutters and skimmers with all structural details. (Not Provided - Comment not Addressed)

Response:

We understood from the memo issued in November 2022 from AKRF that the structural information submitted was sufficient for approvals and that the remaining items would be finalized with the building department. This level of detail is requested for a building permit as noted in the Village of Mamaroneck code section 300-4 noted above. We have included a typical skimmer diagram on sheet A-13 and will provide the model information when submitting a building permit.

- C. A site plan showing the proposed location of the pool, all accessory equipment, fences, screening and landscaping, accessory buildings and any other items deemed to be pertinent by the Building Inspector.

The location of the proposed equipment pad and fencing have been added, but not screening and landscaping. The Applicant should confirm whether the fence is intended as screening on the northern side, and if so, provide additional details. Screening on the southern side should be addressed.

Response:

As noted in item 5 above, the landscape plan on L1 includes screening at the pool equipment pad.

The fence location and note has been added to the architectural site plan (A-0.2), basement plan (A1), landscape plan (L1) and lighting plan (E1). We have also included a fence detail to L1 indicating the design intent.

We have provided additional tree screening to the North side of the property on the submitted Landscape Plan in addition the fence previously indicated.

TBLD

- 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:



Architecture Planning Design

a collaborative network alliance

Central Studio 100 White Plains Road, Tarrytown, New York 10591

1. Chart calculating the Tree Replacement Count
Response:
A chart is indicated on L1
2. Contours of entire plot at intervals of not more than two feet
Response:
2' Contours are indicated on the Tree Replacement Plan
3. The location, species, diameter at breast height, and condition of all trees 8" DBH or greater.
Response:
All trees 6" DNH or greater are indicated including their location, species, diameter. Any proposed trees to be removed have their condition noted.
4. All existing trees proposed to be removed, identified in their location on plan.
Response:
All trees to be removed are indicated with an X and have their description indicated as noted in item 3 above.
5. Indicate individual tree protection for all trees that are to remain, and the methods and practices to be used to protect these trees from injury during construction. The Village of Mamaroneck Tree Protection Standard (SD1L), attached to this memo for convenience. This standard states that the circle of protection should be located at the "furthest extent of tree driplines".
Response:
Individual tree protection has been included for all relevant trees within 25' of the extended area of construction protection fence. The requested detail has been included on sheet L1.

Tree protection should be evident and coordinated on all plans.

Response:

The tree protection has been updated on the site plan, civil plans, landscape plan and Lighting plan.

Planning Board Requested Items:

1. DEC jurisdiction / Army Corps of Engineers determination
Response:
The team is working with a DEC representative to obtain the requested letter.
2. Pool Consultant letter – submit letter that went to HCZMC
Response:
The pool consultant letter has now been submitted, however, it should be noted that Beth Evan's memo which was previously submitted was more relevant and included additional information requested by the HCZMC after the reviewed the letter provided by the pool consultant.



Architecture Planning Design

a collaborative network alliance

Central Studio 100 White Plains Road, Tarrytown, New York 10591

3. 2019 Flagging – need report submitted or information.

Response:

Beth Evans visited the site on January 5, 2021 to confirm the previous wetlands delineation. We have provided a copy of her revised report indicating the additional site visit.

4. Photo of Perk tests if available

Response:

ALP Engineering has included a photo of the Perk test being conducted in their response memo.

We have provided all of the items included in the consultant memos as well as items requested by the Planning Board at the January 11th meeting with the exception of the DEC jurisdiction letter which we are confident we will obtain prior to the February 8th meeting. We look forward to setting a date for the public hearing.

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