

July 27, 2020

Via E-Mail

Village of Larchmont Planning Board
120 Larchmont Avenue
Larchmont, New York 10538

***Re: Centro Larchmont – Site Plan Approval
108-114 Chatsworth Avenue***

Dear Chairman Parkinson and Members of the Board:

We write in response to the Memorandum to the Board of Trustees dated July 23, 2020, concerning the above referenced matter (the “Review Memo”). In addition, the Applicant has received a review memorandum of the Village Engineering Consultant dated July 1, 2020 (the “Salanitro Memo”).

We understand the Board has scheduled a meeting for August 13, 2020. Accordingly, the Applicant, Elk Chatsworth LP, respectfully submits the supplemental information and materials attached hereto and requests that you schedule a public hearing for this matter prior to your regularly scheduled meeting on September 15, 2020, due to the anticipated public interest in this project.

Specifically, submitted herewith are the following:

- Detail Sheets prepared by Perkins Eastman:
 - Traffic Controls Along Easement
 - Alternative Garage Access Plan
 - Pedestrian Access Walkway
 - Revised Rear Elevation Schematic Design and Perspectives
- Garage Access Letter prepared by Kimley Horn dated July 27, 2020;
- Responsive to the Salanitro Memo and revised SWPPP prepared by Bibbo Associates dated July 27, 2020.

The Review Memo raised a handful of items for which the Planning Board had further comments or requested additional information. Specifically: (i) the pedestrian walkway; (ii) the vehicular access easement; (iii) the automated parking system; (iv) security of the parking garage; and (v) the aesthetics of the rear façade. In addition, the Salanitro Memo requested further

modifications and information. For your convenience, an executive summary of the Applicant's responses are set forth below.

I. Pedestrian Walkway

The Applicant agrees with the Planning Board that the aesthetics of the pedestrian walkway are important. As depicted on the attached Pedestrian Access Walkway detail sheet, the Applicant is contemplating utilizing a stamped concrete for the walkway and a textured metal screen along the shared edge with the Larchmont Tavern. There will be a retaining wall along the driveway to allow for the change in grade required for the handicap access and there will be a series of safety bollards installed in concrete to prevent vehicles on the driveway from entering the walkway. The ceiling of the walkway will be trimmed in beadboard, the building side of the walkway will continue the brick installation consistent with the building as will the structural columns on the East side of the walkway. The entire walkway will have a dry sprinkler system as a fire prevention control and the walkway will be well lit. The walkway and related improvements will be maintained at the sole cost and expense of the property owner.

II. Vehicular Access Easement

The Review Memo highlighted interest over the utilization of the existing 10-foot access easement and a potential alternative access point. In fact, the use of the access easement has a long history within the Village without any known problems or issues. The easement has been used by not only the Applicant's property but also 1912 Palmer Avenue and 65 Wendt Avenue for many decades without record of any incidents. Most recently, the easement has seen increased activity for the construction of 1912 Palmer Avenue without any issue. Accordingly, the Applicant foresees no issue with the continued use of the easement for access to and from the Applicant's property.

Despite the easement's historical use that demonstrates the appropriateness for the proposed use, the Applicant has extensively studied the easement to ensure the Planning Board's comfort with this conclusion. Submitted herewith is a letter report from the Applicant's traffic engineer, John Canning of Kimley Horn, addressing the garage access over the easement (the "Canning Letter"). As set forth in the Canning Letter, there will be no increase in trip generation along the easement during peak hours from its historical utilization. In fact, the trip generation for the proposed residential use is far less than fully reoccupying the existing retail area (which is twice as large as the proposed retail area). Further ensuring the vehicular and pedestrian safety, the Applicant is proposing a detailed traffic control and pedestrian warning system. Indeed, the 10-foot wide easement is comparable in width to many other active driveways in the area including the ascending ramp at 3-5-7 East Avenue and the nearby municipal parking lot on Wendt Avenue (which certainly has more trips per hour than the proposed development).¹ The sight lines at the

¹ As an aside, pursuant to § 381-41.K(4)(B) the maximum width of a shared driveway in residential districts is only 2 feet wider than the existing 10 foot wide easement.

end of the easement are better than those at the exit to the municipal lot, which has entirely obscured views looking west towards Palmer Avenue by a combination of the building at 65 Wendt Avenue and a large evergreen.

The existence of many long standing, comparable or even less desirable conditions in nearby driveways without issue demonstrates that the ongoing use of the easement should not cause any safety concerns. The evidence is clear that the access easement will continue to function in a safe manner. This is demonstrated by the Canning Letter, the absolute absence of any incident history at the access easement or the more compromised municipal lot exit. Furthermore, the additional traffic and pedestrian safety measures proposed by the Applicant will only improve this already fully functioning driveway.

Despite the longstanding history of safe usage of the easement and the additional improvements the Applicant is proposing, as requested, the Applicant studied alternative vehicular access to the garage. The attached diagram prepared by Perkins Eastman demonstrates the undesirability of providing access to the new building through the Village parking lot. The Village will lose at least 3 parking spaces in an already overcrowded lot. The Applicant will lose at least 7 parking spaces in its building. The drive lane access to the new building entrance is already substandard and additional impacts would need to be more fully considered. Most significantly, and as described above, the egress from the municipal parking lot is no improvement from the current egress from the easement as they are approximately the same width. Finally, any access to the new building would need to be permanent and would limit the Village's ability to modify the existing lot in perpetuity.

III. Automated Parking System

While we understand the automated parking system is new to the Planning Board, the proposed system is widely used around the United States and the world without safety problems. We have previously provided details and specifications of the system and inherent safety protocols built into the system. There are redundant safety measures that include safety gates, infrared beams, limit switches, and visual and audible warning devices.

IV. Parking Garage

The fully enclosed parking garage will be secured from the general public including access control measures. The garage doors, both for vehicular and pedestrian access will be locked with access limited to a keypad with a camera for the door and garage door openers provided to residents/tenants.

V. Rear Façade

As you can see from the revised schematic rear façade elevation, the Applicant significantly enhanced the original design and addressed the questions raised by the Planning Board during previous meetings.

VI. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

The Applicant has addressed all of the comments of the raised in the Salanitro Memo. Notably, the revisions to the contemplated stormwater management practices include the utilization of the precast concrete drywells rather than Cultec units as requested by the Salanitro Memo. See the attached SWPPP and letter from Bibbo Associates for additional details. The Applicant has provided substantial information on the impact of the project on the Village infrastructure and has had numerous discussions with the Consulting Engineer and Village officials. We do not know of any open concerns on this subject; however, as the Planning Board does know the stormwater system will be a significant improvement over existing conditions.

VII. Other Items.

The Review Memo noted the Applicant would be installing two public bike racks to accommodate two bikes each recommended the Applicant find space for one additional bike. As previously stated at the Board meetings, as the bike racks will be installed on the Village sidewalk, the Applicant will provide and install any reasonable bike rack configuration selected by the Village.

In addition, the Review Memo questioned what LEED measures would be incorporated into the project. As described in our meetings and to be included in the detailed permit set filed with the Building Department, the project will include many measures outlined in the Zoning Code amendment. The Applicant will fully comply with spirit and intent of the law.

We look forward to the scheduling of a public hearing for this matter and to continue the dialogue with the Planning Board. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,
HARFENIST KRAUT & PERLSTEIN, LLP

By: Jonathan D. Kraut
Jonathan D. Kraut

Cc: Board of Trustees
Patrick Cleary
Benedict Salanitro