



411 Theodore Fremd Avenue
Suite 206 South
Rye, NY 10580
T: 914.967.6540
www.hardestyhanover.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Russell Klein, Chairman,
and the Village of Pleasantville Planning Commission

Date: December 17, 2024

Subject: **The Landmark at 444 – 444 Bedford Road – Special Permit, Site Plan and Subdivision Applications**

The Applicant has submitted the following materials for review as part of the proposed Application for Special Permit, Site Plan and Subdivision for the property located at 444 Bedford Road:

1. The following set of plans entitled, “The Landmark at 444” prepared by ARQ Architecture, P.C. last revised 12/6/2024:
 - a. Sheet T-100, “Title Sheet,”
 - b. Sheet S-100, “Existing & Proposed Site Plan, Development Plan, Zoning Data and Images,”
 - c. Sheet S-101, “Exist. And Prop. Schematic Plan & Drone Photo”
 - d. Sheet S-102, “Vehicle Maneuverability Proposed Civic Space,”
 - e. Sheet S-103, “Key Plan and Tables,”
 - f. Sheet S-104, “Exist. & Proposed Pervious Area and Landscaping Plan,”
 - g. Sheet S-105, “Phase Plans and Construction Sequence,”
 - h. Sheet S-106, “Key Plan & 3D Views.”

2. The following set of architectural plans entitled, “The Landmark at 444” prepared by ARQ Architecture, P.C. last revised 12/6/2024:
 - a. Sheet A-100, “Exist. & Proposed Floor Plans,”
 - b. Sheet A-101, “Exist. & Proposed Floor Plans,”
 - c. Sheet A-102, “Typical Duplex & Schematic Interior 3D,”
 - d. Sheet A-200, “Exist. & Proposed 3D Views,”
 - e. Sheet A-201, “Exist. & Proposed Elevations,”
 - f. Sheet A-202, “Exist. & Proposed Elevations,”
 - g. Sheet A-203, “Proposed Fenestration and Schematic Details,”
 - h. Sheet A-300, “Schematic Sections,”
 - i. Sheet A-400, “Neighborhood Analysis of Transitional Materials,”
 - j. Sheet A-401, “Neighborhood Analysis,”
 - k. Sheet A-402, “Drone Pictures,”
 - l. Sheet A-403, “Existing & Proposed 3D Views,”



m. Sheet A-500, "Exist. & Proposed Street Parking Design."

3. Photometric plans prepared by NY Lighting Group dated 11/7/24.
4. Density Bonus Incentive Narrative dated 9/25/24.
5. A response prepared by LaBella regarding sight distance comments with attachments dated 10/16/24.

We provided the following comments based on our review of the submission:

Vehicle Maneuverability, Parking Plan & Traffic Assessment Letter Report

1. Review of the Wheeler Avenue on-street loading area indicated that the revised location is a similar distance from the intersection as the existing northbound on-street parking (approximately 23 feet closer than the existing parking space). The Applicant is proposing to remove the first on-street parking space on the southbound side of the road, which will create a 22-foot section just to the south of the crosswalk that is approximately 29 feet wide. Approximately 21 feet of travel way is provided for another approximately 11 feet south before reaching the loading area, which provides 18 feet travel way (9-foot lanes), which is similar to today's conditions. The loading area plan for Wheeler Avenue appears to be sufficient.
2. The Applicant needs to provide the available ISD on an engineering plan to scale that is sealed and signed by a Professional Engineer. The exhibits that have been provided are not acceptable nor are they industry standard. ISD field observations for sight lines with vertical curvature issues are acceptable for preliminary driveway location analysis; however, the final plans need to be based on roadway profiles to confirm the measurements observed in the field are appropriate. The roadway profiles need to be submitted for review to confirm the available sight lines provided are correct.

As previously noted, there is a concern with vertical curvature in the roadway along Bedford Road; therefore, roadway profiles along the sight line should be provided to confirm both ISD and SSD results. Initial review of the sight lines provided indicate that the sight line to the right from the Bedford Road travels over the adjacent property and may be blocked by the bushes on the property line. The sight line must travel within the right-of-way and not on private property. As previously noted, the Bedford Road ISD to the right is short of the requirements, as well as the Wheeler Avenue ISD to the left, which are concerns.



Lastly, as previously requested, the parking space to the south of the Wheeler Avenue driveway should be a minimum of 25 feet away from the driveway to allow for better sightlines exiting the driveway.

3. As previously requested, turning templates should illustrate all pavement markings on Bedford Road and Wheeler Avenue to confirm vehicles are turning from/to the correct lanes. As currently presented, it appears that turning vehicles may not be in the correct lanes. This condition can be confirmed with the inclusion of the roadway pavement markings.

SEQRA

4. Questions E.2.a,b,c,d,e and f of the EAF should be answered. As further details of the project are finalized, the EAF should be updated accordingly.
5. The EAF notes that the property may contain or be adjacent to properties eligible for the National or State Historic Register. The Applicant has noted that the project has been submitted to the NYS Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for review. The SHPO has provided a response dated 10/15/2024 with a recommendation regarding the windows in the existing building for the Commission's consideration as part of the SEQRA review.

Subdivision

6. The preliminary subdivision plat should be revised to indicate the lot lines to be abandoned. In addition, the notes on the plat should be revised to reference the "Village of Pleasantville Planning Commission."

Site Plan

7. The Stormwater Plan and Report should be provided and reviewed by the Village Engineer.
8. The Zoning Data table on Sheet S-100 should be revised to note the proposed FAR and the requested density bonus.
9. The Applicant may want to consider changing the ground surface in the area of the civic space along the frontage of Bedford Avenue to provide pavers or stamped concrete in the area around the planters and bike rack to distinguish the area from the sidewalk. The change in ground surface may encourage



pedestrians to walk further out from the façade of the building to prevent conflicts between pedestrians and cars existing the garage.

Lighting Plan

10. The photometric plans indicate that there is only one type of fixture proposed for all lighting on the site. Based on the density bonus narrative, the sconces are to provide accent lighting. The plans will need to be revised to include all lighting proposed on the site including, but not limited to, building entrances, garage entrances, light “spilling” out of garage entrances, civic space, green space, and pool area. The photometric plans should include the proposed footcandles at ground level and manufacturer specification sheets for all proposed fixtures. The spec sheets should indicate the color temperature and BUG rating of the fixture. As has been the past practice of the Planning Commission, a color temperature of 2700K to 3000K is preferred and the BUG ratings should be in keeping with Dark Sky recommendations.
11. The Development Incentives in the Central Business A-1 District (Section 185-19.H(8)(a)[3][c][i]) notes that all lighting shall be directed downward. The proposed sconces should be replaced with fixtures that have an “uplight” rating of zero. The proposed fixtures have an “uplight” rating of 4 (5 is highest).

Landscaping Plan

12. The proposed boxwood plantings (*Buxus microphylla*) should be replaced with a native species. It should also be noted that boxwood is mildly toxic and should not be used for planters that are also seating areas.
13. The proposed plantings shown for the green space on the architectural renderings (Sheet A-200) do not match the plantings proposed on the Landscaping Plan (Sheet S-104). The renderings show small trees in the center of the green space; however, according to the Landscaping Plan, small, flowering perennials are proposed in that area. There are currently no trees proposed for the site. It is our recommendation that the Landscaping Plan be revised to propose native trees for the green space. The Landscaping Plan should also be revised to note the quantity of plantings proposed.
14. Sheet A-101 notes plantings on the 4th level of the building by pool. These plantings should be included in the landscaping plans.



15. The location of the proposed Green/Blue Roof should be shown on the plans. Details of all proposed features and plantings should also be provided on the plans. The stormwater management components of the roof will need to be reviewed and approved by the Village Engineer.

Construction Plan

16. The Construction Sequence notes rock removal in Phase 3 and 4. We question if the rock removal will involve blasting or chipping. If it does, the Full EAF should be revised to note the blasting/chipping and a noise mitigation plan will need to be provided. Additionally, the number of truck trips required for the removal of materials from the site should be provided.

Architectural Plans

17. A detail for the “Proposed Rooftop Semi-Private Screen” has been provided on Sheet A-101. The Applicant should confirm that the screening is only needed on the portion of the building that will be constructed. It appears from the renderings that the mechanicals for the roof of the existing bank building will be screened by the existing parapet.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sarah L. Brown, AICP
Principal Planner

Steven T. Cipolla, PE
Senior Traffic Engineer

cc: Robert Hughes, Building Inspector