



445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, New York 10601
T 914 761 1300
F 914 761 5372
cuddyfeder.com

William S. Null, Esq.
wnull@cuddyfeder.com

10.31.2023

BY E-MAIL AND OVERNIGHT MAIL

Hon. Nicola Armacost, Mayor
and Members of the Village Board of Trustees
Village of Hastings-on-Hudson
Municipal Building
7 Maple Avenue
Hastings-on-Hudson, New York 10706

RE: Electric Owl Holdings, LLC: Petition to Amend the Code of the Village
Supplemental Submission
Subject Premises: One South Broadway, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York

Dear Mayor Armacost and Members of the Village Board of Trustees:

On behalf of Electric Owl Holdings, LLC (the "Applicant"), we respectfully submit this letter and the enclosed materials in furtherance of the pending Application and to respond to questions raised at the September 21, 2023 Joint Meeting of the Village Board and Planning Board, and comments received thereafter.

For ease of review, the comments or questions appear below in ***bold italics*** with the responses set forth thereunder.

Comments from September 21, 2023 Joint Meeting and Applicant's Responses:

- 1. Do the setbacks contained in Section 295-85.1 of the Zoning Law, entitled Gateway Cluster Overlay District, apply to the proposed Multimedia Production Studio?***

The Gateway Cluster Overlay District does not apply to a two-lot commercial/institutional subdivision as proposed for this site. Instead, the Gateway Cluster Overlay District was conceived as a method to require a cluster subdivision to encourage detached, semi attached and attached housing units in a residential subdivision. The development standards proposed for the Gateway Cluster Overlay District include a 150-foot front yard setback and a 50-foot perimeter setback.

While the Multimedia Production Studio would not be subject to the Gateway Cluster Overlay requirements, the Petition filed to amend the Zoning Ordinance sets dimensional constraints that include a 150-foot setback from South Broadway and a 50-foot setback

from other property lines, as further detailed below. The existing Matthews Cottage and the existing brick walls are proposed to remain in-place, or to be reconstructed substantially in the same location (adjusted to improve sightlines). These improvements are currently located less than 150 feet from South Broadway.

It is noted that under the Zoning Ordinance the property would be considered a “corner lot” with two (2) front yards, which conclusion was not identified when the Petition was filed. Accordingly, rather than the Petition proposing a 150-foot front yard setback, such a 150-foot setback distance for buildings would need to apply only to the South Broadway frontage. Along the Dudley Street boundary line, the proposed setback would be 50-feet as stated in the Petition, but (also as noted in the Petition) there is a single, studio building along the southerly portion of the property that cannot meet that 50-foot setback. Instead, it would have a setback of about 30 feet from the southerly property line, where that portion of the property is not close to Dudley Street. Other than that exception, all of the other proposed buildings would be setback 50-feet along Dudley Street.

The existing driveway is proposed to be modified and used for vehicular access to the Multimedia Production Studio with a new, separate driveway created for the School. Given the position of the existing Administration Building, its preservation together with other existing buildings, would not be feasible with use of the existing driveway if a 150-foot setback were required from Dudley Street, as fire truck circulation and a driveway width of 26-feet could not be accommodated.

2. *How has New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) responded to the proposed removal of buildings at the property given the history of the site?*

In 2022, SHPO determined that the Graham School campus is National Register-eligible; the campus is significant under Criterion A in the areas of Social History and Education for its association with efforts to care for disadvantaged children. The organization is considered the oldest childcare agency in New York State.

The campus is also among the earliest, if not the first, to adopt a “cottage plan,” where groups of children lived in separate residences supervised by house parents. This successful innovation became a model for childcare institutions across the country. Moreover, the Graham campus is significant under Criterion C in the area of Architecture for its collection of Beaux-Arts buildings, most notably its Administration Building designed by architect James B. Baker.

Based on an exhaustive Alternatives Analysis requested by SHPO, it has advised that the proposed action, which will preserve the iconic Administrative Building and three of the functional cottages, is considered to be a prudent and feasible alternative to preserving all the buildings. In addition, we understand that SHPO is satisfied that the revised parking garage plans with a reduced footprint, more easterly location, and evergreen landscaping will not negatively impact the Old Croton Aqueduct Trail.

Imposing a minimum 150-foot building setback from Dudley Street would eliminate the ability to preserve the Administration Building, overall campus structure and 4 eligible buildings as described to SHPO, not meeting any of its objectives.

3. *Can the parking deck be reduced in size? Can the parking lot for the School be reduced? Can bus loading be located under the garage?*

In response to Village comments, the parking garage has been reduced in size. The Applicant has coordinated with the School to allow a smaller footprint for School parking within the garage. For the Studio, the Applicant will rely on “valet” style parking to accommodate projected peak demand, which occurs infrequently. These changes will reduce the size of the parking structure by one bay, reducing the footprint, and will shift the garage to an area where less excavation is required.

- For the Studio, there will be 361 total vehicles able to be accommodated on-site: 262 parking spaces in the garage; 19 spaces along the internal driveways; and 80 additional vehicles able to be accommodated in the garage using “valet” style parking on peak days. Based upon the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance a total of 351 parking spaces would be required.¹ The Zoning Amendment would authorize the Planning Board in connection with Site Plan Approval to allow “valet” parking to minimize the size and number of parking spaces to be constructed for such use.
- For the School, there will be 212 parking spaces, as compared to the initially proposed 225 parking spaces.²

The parking lot in front of the School cannot be reduced in size. This surface parking lot has been designed to accommodate bus loading and queuing, as well as to provide

¹ Studio requires parking at a ratio of 1 space / 1,000 square feet x 202,270 square feet; and the Studio office use requires parking at a rate of 1 space / 250 square feet x 36,967 square feet = 351 spaces.

² The School requires 212 parking spaces as follows: 1 parking space for every 12 students = 28 parking spaces for 336 students; and 1 parking space per staff member = 184 parking spaces.

convenient parking proximate to the School. However, as noted above, the plans have been revised to reduce the number of School spaces in the parking structure.

The bus drop-off and pick-up area cannot be relocated to the first level of the garage, nor can a structured garage be located on the area of the site where the School's proposed parking lot is shown. The structure of the garage and its columns, the height of the buses and the proximity of the at-grade parking lot to the School buildings render that option infeasible to implement.

4. ***Can further architectural information be provided, such as Sections to show adjacent grades to better enable an understanding of the full height of the studio walls as viewed from the south? It would help to have perspectives looking down from Dudley Street from Broadway, back up, and from the Lenoir Preserve parking lot toward the Studios.***

Additional architectural plans are enclosed, including those prepared to respond to these Sections to show the grade difference between Dudley Street entitled, "Electric Owl Studios, 1 S. Broadway, Hastings on Hudson, NY," prepared by Granoff Architects, dated October 30, 2023, consisting of the following sheets:

- a. (L.3.0) "Site Sections A"
- b. (L.3.1) "Site Sections B"
- c. (L.3.2) "Site Sections C"

In addition, enclosed is a duplicate set of images in an eighteen-page binder previously submitted to the Village Board of Trustees, consisting of "Before" and "After" photo-simulations from multiple viewsheds identified by the Village's Planning Consultant, which include (View 2-3) "View from Lenoir Preserve parking lot entry on Dudley Street."

5. ***How will trucks travel to the Site and how many trucks will be routed through the Village along South Broadway?***

As provided in the September 6, 2023 Kimley-Horn Response to Sam Schwartz's TIS Review (p. 2-3), it is expected there will be between 4 and 5 trucks coming to the site on a typical day. The Applicant advises the only trucks that would come to the site daily would deliver mail, FedEx, and UPS. Garbage trucks for trash removal are expected to come to the site two times per week and landscaping maintenance trucks are expected to come to the site one time per week. All these vehicles would be box trucks (tractor trailer truck arrivals and departures are infrequent and not regular).

As stated on page 49 of the Electric Owl Studios EAF Supplement, dated September 14, 2023, it is expected that 60% of trucks visiting the site will travel via Executive Boulevard, which connects with I-87 via other roadways. The remaining trucks will be travelling through the Village of Hastings, which are estimated to be about 2 trucks daily.

6. *Are sightlines safe for vehicles entering and exiting the site? Is a left-turn lane planned along South Broadway?*

As provided in the September 6, 2023 Kimley-Horn Response to Sam Schwartz's TIS Review (p. 10; see sheets SD-1.1 and SD-1.2 on p. 34-35), sightlines have been reviewed at both driveways. The provided sightlines at both driveways are designed to meet or exceed the AASHTO-required intersection sight distances to allow motorists to enter and exit safely.

The Applicant is willing to install a left-turn lane, but its implementation is dependent upon New York State Department of Transportation ("NYSDOT") approval. The Applicant has requested a NYSDOT meeting to discuss site access and improvements.

7. *To evaluate traffic after construction, can a post-impact study be required to be conducted to see whether the projected traffic counts were accurate?*

The Applicant is willing to commit to providing a post-impact study after construction to determine whether traffic projections were based on accurate calculations and if there are any issues to be mitigated.

8. *Can all proposed sidewalks be shown in renderings and is a sidewalk proposed along S. Broadway?*

Preliminary site plans have been revised to incorporate a sidewalk along S. Broadway from the existing bus stop at the south end of the site to the new Graham School driveway entrance, continuing internally along the School's driveway to provide pedestrian access from South Broadway to the School building. The proposed sidewalk along South Broadway also will provide separate pedestrian access to the Studio site passing adjacent to Matthews Cottage at the entry gate.

9. *Will there be green roofs on the Mill buildings and the Wardrobe building? Where will green roofs be provided?*

Extensive green roofs are proposed on both the Mill and the Wardrobe buildings. With a combined footprint of 55,020 square feet, and assuming an extensive green roof buildup of 3" of growing media over a capillary retention mat, the green roofs have the potential to

manage a volume of 71,455 gallons, which is equivalent to a 2-inch rainstorm hitting the impervious rooftop area.

An extensive green roof can support plants such as *Sedum spp.*, *Delosperma spp.*, *Orostachys spp.*, *Talinum calycinum*, *Allium schoenoprasum*, *Aesclepias tuberosa*, *Dianthus carthusianorum*, etc. All these plants attract pollinators like bees and butterflies and other insects.

While rain is not entirely retained by the green roof system, the green roof will significantly help stormwater management by capturing and detaining rain until the system is fully saturated. Any volume that exceeds the absorption capacity of the green roof will be discharged with a time lag at a lower flow rate over an extended period. Once rainwater that has percolated through the system starts to find its way to the building's drains, the overall volume of stormwater runoff will have effectively been reduced and delayed, helping to shrink peak intensity. The civil engineering plans will incorporate the proposed green roof systems into the stormwater management plan.

10. How will stormwater reduction be maximized? Can permeable pavement be used on the site?

I urge you to examine how the Electric Owl team is planning to address storm water drainage issues and their effect on the property's neighbors, particularly going south.

The Project will not create any significant adverse impact to the floodplain, stormwater, or flooding, and new stormwater management facilities, which include improvements to stormwater quantity and quality controls will result in beneficial impacts from the Proposed Action. Overall, the proposed condition flowrates result in pre- vs. post-development reductions of the 24-hour 1-year, 10-year, 25-year, and 100-year storm events. The proposed stormwater management improvements are designed to comply with NYSDEC stormwater management guidelines, and local MS4 (Hastings) requirements, satisfying the runoff reduction, water quality, and water quantity requirements.

The project proposes to implement various green infrastructure practices such as green roofs, porous pavement, infiltration basins, and other water quality systems as best practices. See EAF 3 section II.C and Appendix P.

Specific to the neighboring property south, the pre vs. post stormwater volumes will be reduced by approximately 30%. Nearly all the runoff from the proposed site will be conveyed away from discharging south, mitigating impacts to the storm sewer systems,

drainage swales, and slopes adjacent to Dudley Street. Refer to Existing and Proposed Drainage area exhibits in the Preliminary SWPPP (EAF3 Appendix P).

Stormwater from existing impervious areas is captured by inlets and conveyed by storm drainpipes or sheet flows off the site to existing flow paths that ultimately outfall at the Hudson River.

A preliminary geotechnical soils investigation was performed by GZA Environmental. Per the report (April 2023 in EAF3 Appendix E), limited portions of the site were observed to be feasible for subgrade infiltration. Additional field investigations will be performed based on the final design to confirm if permeability will achieve the minimum required infiltration rates per code. The plans show permeable pavers in selected walkways within the interior campus and within the proposed school surface parking lot. The area around the parking garage is not conducive to permeable pavement.

11. Are vegetated swales to be utilized for stormwater management?

Vegetated swales are proposed in the rear of the property, south of the sound stage buildings as shown on the Stormwater Management drainage plans.

12. Have the civil engineering plans been developed sufficiently to indicate the limits of grading? Will the upper campus be re-graded? Will this impact larger trees on this portion of the Site?

Limits of grading are shown on the grading and drainage plans in Appendix H and Exhibit 15, Steep Slope Disturbance. Please refer to Tree Removal Plan (Exhibit 16) prepared by Granoff for impacts to existing trees and locations of the 417 trees proposed to be planted.

The number of trees proposed to be removed and an updated list of which specific trees are proposed to be removed has been generated and is included in this submission.

Exhibit 7 provides a Schematic Site Plan with Overall Landscape. Landscape Plans are provided in Appendix G.

13. Clarify on the tree survey which trees are to be removed from the property, or indicate which trees are to be kept.

- 14.** An updated Tree Removal Plan, prepared by Granoff Architects, together with a detailed Tree Inventory, prepared by Sav-A-Tree Consulting Group, are enclosed for review. It is important to note that, according to the certified arborist who conducted the survey, 271 trees are proposed to be removed of which 186 trees (i.e., 68.6%) are dead, or in poor or critical condition. As noted above, 417 trees are proposed to be planted on the site.

Further, the trees to be removed include 172 trees considered to be invasive, as follows:

- Black Locust (28)
- Callery Pear (14)
- Norway Maple (107)
- Siberian Elm (1)
- Sycamore Maple (19)
- Tree of Heaven (3)³

15. *Is there a Glenwood Water Treatment Center, as referenced in the EAF, or is another location identified for water treatment?*

The Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant is located on Fernbrook Street in Yonkers. The references to Glenwood Water Treatment Center have been removed from the EAF report.

16. *Yonkers utilizes a combined stormwater and sewer system – will this project lead to wastewater being let out into Hudson River?*

The property has existing and proposed segregated storm and sanitary sewer systems, rather than such services being combined. The project is located within a MS4 District, where storm and wastewater discharge will comply with local MS4 (Hastings) and NYSDEC stormwater requirements.

17. *How will water be provided to the site?*

The City of Yonkers currently provides water service to the Graham School site. The Applicant would prefer that Yonkers continue to supply service to the School. However, the Applicant did submit a request for water service to Veolia Water New York in July 2023 for both the Studio and School uses to explore both options. (Applications are included in EAF3 Report Appendix O). Subsequent additional information and clarifications have been provided to Veolia, as requested. At this time Veolia has not concluded their review, nor provided a determination of service.

18. *Is blasting proposed for the development?*

As described in EAF3 p. 30, rock blasting is not anticipated to be required, as rock excavation will be accomplished through mechanical methods.

³ The Tree of Heaven (*Allanthus altissima*) is a vigorous invasive species recognized host plant to the Spotted Lantern Fly.

The reduction in the size of the parking deck also beneficially reduces the extent of excavation on the site from an estimated 104,000 cubic yards to approximately 81,000 cubic yards.

19. *How will noise impacts from excavation be mitigated?*

As described in EAF3 p. 55, construction equipment will incorporate noise mitigation, including functioning mufflers. Construction hours will comply with the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson Village Code, Chapter 217, Section 7, entitled “Permitted noises.” Therefore, construction will only occur between the hours of 7:30 AM and 8:00 PM, Monday through Saturday, or between the hours of 10:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Sunday. As may be required, the Applicant will prepare an Excavation Work Plan, Blasting Plan, and Construction Management Plan to comply with Village regulations associated with short-term construction noise impacts.

20. *How will the Studio use mitigate any noise to be generated?*

The buildings involved with the Studio, such as sound stages and mill buildings, have substantial acoustical insulation to minimize internal and external sound. See EAF3 section II.O for discussion of Noise, as well as Appendix N, Sound Study and Appendix F, Operations and Construction.

21. *What is proposed for refuse collection to address the pickup of catering waste and general trash?*

Solid waste and recycling will be managed by a licensed private waste removal company. See EAF3 p. 65 and Appendix F, Operations Plan. Productions will not use or dispose of harmful chemicals.

To reduce the amount of solid waste being removed from the site, some of the food waste will be processed with food dehydrators and used as mulch on site. The small amount of organic food refuse that is not dehydrated and other refuse will be securely contained to avoid odors and minimize vermin. A recycling program will be implemented in accordance with Westchester County guidelines.

22. *What is the anticipated timing and phasing for construction?*

A Construction Management Plan has been provided by Griffco Design Build, which will be managing the construction. This narrative provides further information on the sequence and location of construction.

The preliminary Stormwater Management Plan (SWPPP) prescribes soil erosion and sediment control practices in a series of stages of construction in accordance with

NYSDEC design manual and will be reviewed for acceptance by the Village engineer for MS4 compliance. The SWPPP is included in EAF3 Appendix P, and the Construction Management Plan is included in EAF3 Appendix F.

23. Will honey be produced on site? If so, how much will be able to be produced?

Honey can be produced on site and the amount cannot be predicted with certainty. The Applicant will collaborate with partners who can host several hives. One example of New York Green Roofs partnership with honeybee keepers is at the Javits Convention Center where a green roof of 6.75 acres has several bee hives. There, Astor Apiaries tends 5 hives and each year they harvest about 100 lbs. of honey to use in event catering and in honey jars for giveaways at the Convention Center.

Comments following Village's Joint Meeting and Applicant's Responses thereto:

A. *Electric Owl and the others in the region like Kaufman are in the business of "four walling" i.e., just renting an empty box studio with minimal services (electricity, hvac, security) to production companies. Will the stages have built in dressing rooms and catering facilities or be like Kaufman, Silvercup, Steiner who have trailers for dressing rooms and portalets, and food trucks for crew catering that are parked on the street or across road. In addition, there are grip trucks that supply all the lighting equipment needed for the production that stay on site for the duration to supply any emergency needs. Is there room on the service roads of the compound for these vehicles?*

Electric Owl will have first rate green rooms and dressing rooms inside the buildings minimizing the use of "star trailers" or dressing trailers. It is possible though that productions will use "trailers" for this purpose. However, such use would be more limited than is typical at other studios. If any of these types of trailers are used, the Applicant will designate locations on site for them and they will not be allowed to park off-site. The Applicant will encourage the use of solar-powered trailers, which are common throughout the industry.

Electric Owl will direct production tenants to use the existing catering facilities in the bottom of the administration building, which has 2 full kitchens available to tenants that can accommodate multiple productions.

There will not be any portalets needed, as the Applicant has designed adequate bathroom facilities throughout the site located inside buildings.

Electric Owl will maintain lighting and grip equipment on site for rental by productions thereby minimizing the need for deliveries of lighting and grip equipment.

- B. *It was discussed at the meeting that the number of parking spots is supposed to be reduced by 60 to 80. Will that result in any reduction in the size of the parking structure?***

Please see Item 3 above, which responds to this question.

- C. *How long would it take to mechanically breakdown 20,000 CY of bedrock? The footprint of the parking structure is 40,000 SF (presume 100' x 400') and going 20' to 35' below grade. Just trying to understand what the neighbors might experience.***

It is estimated that the mechanical breakdown and extraction process for the bedrock removal will take between 40 to 60 days.

- D. *The applicant should perform a traffic signal warrant analysis at the intersection of S Broadway and Dudley Street to determine if a traffic signal would be warranted. Although the results of the traffic Level of Service (LOS) analysis at this intersection show that this intersection will continue to operate at acceptable LOS with the proposed development, Dudley Street is the only entry/exit point serving over 170 households in the area and the Village has received complaints from residents about delays they experience while attempting to access S Broadway from Dudley Street. There have been concerns raised about how an increase in traffic along S Broadway due to the proposed development may further exacerbate this problem. Hence, a traffic signal warrant analysis should be performed at this intersection to determine if a traffic signal would be warranted under the 'build' and the 'atypical' conditions.***

Kimley-Horn conducted a Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis at the corner of South Broadway and Dudley Street to determine whether a traffic signal would be warranted. The Analysis yielded the following results, which confirm a traffic signal is not warranted:⁴

- Warrant 1: Condition A

Required: At least 120 vehicles on the minor street for 8 hours

Existing Peak-hour Volume 47 vehicles – *Warrant not satisfied*

Build Peak-hour Volume 49 vehicles – *Warrant not satisfied*

⁴ For review by Sam Schwartz, the raw data on which these Warrant analyses are based is enclosed.

- Warrant 1: Condition B

Required: at least 60 vehicles on the minor street for 8 hours

Existing Peak-hour Volume 47 vehicles - Warrant not satisfied

Build Peak-hour Volume 49 vehicles - Warrant not satisfied

- Warrant 2:

Required: At least 80 vehicles on the minor street for 4 hours

Existing Peak-hour Volume 47 vehicles - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build Peak-hour Volume 49 vehicles - *Warrant not satisfied*

- Warrant 3:

Required: At least 100 vehicles on the minor street for 1 hour

Existing Peak-hour Volume 47 vehicles - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build Peak-hour Volume 49 vehicles - *Warrant not satisfied*

- Warrant 4: Condition A

Required: At least 107 pedestrians crossing Broadway for 4 hours

Existing Peak-hour Volume 1 pedestrian - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build Peak-hour Volume 1 pedestrian - *Warrant not satisfied*

- Warrant 4: Condition B

Required: At least 133 pedestrians crossing Broadway for 1 hour

Existing Peak-hour Volume 1 pedestrian - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build Peak-hour Volume 1 pedestrian - *Warrant not satisfied*

- Warrant 5: Condition B

Required: At least 20 school children crossing Broadway for 1 hour

Existing Peak-hour Volume 0 school children - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build Peak-hour Volume 0 school children - *Warrant not satisfied*

- Warrant 6: Condition A

Required: A one-way street (or predominantly one-way street)

Existing: A two-way street with predominantly two-way traffic - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build: A two-way street with predominantly two-way traffic -
Warrant not satisfied

- Warrant 6: Condition B

Required: Adjacent traffic control signals do not provide the necessary degree of platooning and the proposed and adjacent traffic control signals will collectively provide a progressive operation

Existing: Adjacent traffic control signals provide the necessary degree of platooning - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build: Adjacent traffic control signals provide the necessary degree of platooning - *Warrant not satisfied*

- Warrant 7:

Required: Five or more reported crashes of types susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal, have occurred within a 12-month period, each crash involving personal injury or property damage apparently exceeding the applicable requirements for a reportable crash

Existing: No crashes in 5 years - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build: No crashes in 5 years - *Warrant not satisfied*

- Warrant 8: Condition A

Required: The intersection has a total existing, or immediately projected, entering volume of at least 1,000 vehicles per hour during the peak hour of a typical weekday and has 5-year projected traffic volumes, based on an engineering study, which meet one or more of Warrants 1, 2, and 3 during an average weekday

Existing: 706 entering vehicles per hour during the peak hour of a typical weekday - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build: 829 entering vehicles per hour during the peak hour of a typical weekday - *Warrant not satisfied*

- Warrant 9:

Required: A grade crossing exists on an approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign and the center of the track nearest to the intersection is within 140 feet of the stop line or yield line on the approach

Existing: No grade crossing exists on an approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign with the center of the track nearest to the intersection within 140 feet of the stop line or yield line on the approach - *Warrant not satisfied*

Build: No grade crossing exists on an approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign with the center of the track nearest to the intersection within 140 feet of the stop line or yield line on the approach - *Warrant not satisfied*

- E. *The applicant should coordinate with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYS DOT) and other applicable stakeholders to determine the feasibility of incorporating a left-turn storage lane from S Broadway into the proposed development while accounting for a plan to install bike lanes along S Broadway based on the 2018 Route 9 Active Transportation Conceptual Design Plan.***

Kimley-Horn has reached out multiple times to the NYSDOT to request a meeting to determine the feasibility of incorporating a left-turn storage lane from South Broadway into the proposed development, while accounting for a plan to install bike lanes along South Broadway based on the 2018 Route 9 Active Transportation Conceptual Design Plan. The Applicant is continuing its outreach and is confident that a meeting can be set up to coordinate with NYSDOT.

- F. *Given the ‘atypical’ nature of the proposed development in the area and the irregular traffic patterns it may create, the Village may at its discretion request that the applicant develop a post-opening traffic monitoring plan to be implemented when the proposed development is completed and operational. The post-opening traffic monitoring plan may require the applicant to do either one or a combination of the following:***

- Perform traffic observations and qualitatively review traffic operations to and from the development.*
- Collect traffic data and compare them against the volume forecasts developed in the TIS.*
- Perform post-opening traffic operational analysis at specific locations of concern and quantitatively assess the results to determine if there are any traffic impacts caused by the development.*

Please see Item 6 above, which responds to this comment and confirms that the Applicant is willing to undertake a post-opening traffic monitoring plan, the exact parameters of which will be coordinated with the Village and Applicant to address the above-noted concerns.

- G. Dudley Street is the only entry/exit point for over 170 households (the residents of 3 Riverpointe Road (15 households) and Riveredge (158 households). During peak morning hours, when school buses are approaching on Broadway from the south and trying to make a left turn to drop off students at the Graham property, the two lanes on Broadway leading north become blocked which in turn prevents any vehicle coming from Dudley Street from making a left turn on Broadway. This problem gets exacerbated even further when the neighboring school has events and the usual number of cars and buses trying to enter the school property increases significantly.***

Given Electric Owl's plans (directing all of their vehicles to come from Broadway, two entrances on Broadway instead of one, anticipated number of cars parking at the garage of the studios well as at the school's garage), the situation at the intersection of Dudley and Broadway for anyone exiting Dudley will become significantly worse, if the project is approved. The current occasional inconvenience will turn into a daily nightmare for over 170 families who are trying to get to school and work on time.

I would like to ask you to explore with the Electric Owl team how they are planning to solve for this issue, if their project gets approved.

It is important to note that the location of the driveway to Dudley Street is proposed to change relocating the school driveway almost 200 feet further north, which should significantly improve any existing issues experienced by vehicles exiting Dudley Street. The new, wider school driveway should also make it easier for school buses to turn into the site. Additionally, the driveway to the Studio is proposed to be located approximately 85 feet further north from the current school driveway location, thus being farther north from Dudley Street than the existing configuration.

A review of two days of traffic counts at the existing Graham School driveway on South Broadway revealed a maximum of 16 cars and 8 school buses turning left into the site (opposed by 115 southbound vehicles on Broadway) during the busiest 15-minute period in the morning. The intersection capacity analysis conducted for the project did not indicate that this level of traffic activity compromises operating conditions on South Broadway.

A maximum of 36 vehicles were observed to enter or exit the Andrus School in the busiest 15-minute period (which did not coincide with the busiest 15 minutes at the Graham School), which is on the other side of Dudley Street from the school.

During the typically busy shooting phase of production, a maximum of 15 vehicles are expected to turn left into the Studio site from South Broadway and, except on rare occasions, none of these vehicles will be trucks or buses. In the future with the proposed project, the intersection capacity analysis conducted for South Broadway indicated that the operating conditions would continue to be acceptable and will not adversely impact Dudley Street.

Revised and Supplemental Materials

In further support of this Application and the responses set forth above, we respectfully submit the following documents for consideration by this Board:

1. Plans entitled, “Electric Owl Studios, 1 S. Broadway, Hastings on Hudson, NY,” prepared by Granoff Architects, dated October 30, 2023, consisting of the following sheets:
 - a. (L 1.0) “Schematic Site Plan – Overall Landscape”
 - b. (L 1.1) “Schematic Site Plan – Main Entrance Focus”
 - c. (L 1.1A) “Entry Wall Elevation” – showing the detail of the proposed entry gate
 - d. (L 1.2) “Schematic Site Plan – The Graham-Windham Garden”
 - e. (L 1.3) “Schematic Site Plan – Admin Entrance Focus”
 - f. (L 1.4) “Schematic Site Plan – Northern Recreation Area”
 - g. (L 1.5) “Schematic Site Plan – Southern Recreation Area”
 - h. (L 1.6) “Schematic Site Plan – Parking Garage Focus”
 - i. (L 1.7) “Schematic Site Plan – Dudley Screening”
 - j. (L 2.0) “Tree Removal Plan”
 - k. (L.3.0) “Site Sections A”
 - l. (L.3.1) “Site Sections B”
 - m. (L.3.2) “Site Sections C”
 - n. (L.4.0) “Schematic Site Plan – Landscape Lighting”
 - o. (L.5.0) “Schematic Parking Structure RCP -LVL 1”
 - p. (L.5.1) “Schematic Parking Structure RCP -LVL 2”
 - q. (L.5.2) “Schematic Parking Structure RCP -LVL 3”
 - r. (L.5.3) “Schematic Parking Structure RCP -LVL 4”

2. A plan prepared by Kimley-Horn New York, dated October 23, 2023, entitled “Overall Site Plan, Electric Owl Studios,” among other things, showing the current design for the Electric Owl Studio project including:
 - a. The reduced footprint for the parking structure;
 - b. Increased open space area situated between the northerly Mill Shop and parking structure;
 - c. Revised Zoning Table with Front Yard Setback and Side Yard Setback consistent with the descriptions above; and
 - d. Sidewalk extending along Broadway, including an extension into the School and Studio parcels.
3. A plan prepared by Kimley-Horn New York, dated August 3, 2023, entitled “Conceptual Subdivision Plat, Electric Owl Studios,” (C-1.2) showing the proposed configuration of the new lots and indicating “Conceptual School Access Easement,” “Conceptual Studio Stormwater Easement,” and “Conceptual Studio Sewer Easement;”
4. An eighteen-page (18-page) Binder previously submitted to the Village Board of Trustees, consisting of “Before” and “After” photo-simulations from multiple viewsheds identified by the Village’s Planning Consultant, which include (View 2-3) “View from Lenoir Preserve parking lot entry on Dudley Street.”
5. Two (2) photo-simulations showing aerial views of the Site and proposed project:
 - a. View from Northeast; and
 - b. View from Southwest; and
6. Tree Inventory, prepared by Sav-A-Tree Consulting Group; and
7. Kimley-Horn New York Memorandum containing the raw traffic data on which the Warrant analyses are based.

We respectfully submit these responses and this documentation to fully address questions that have arisen during this review by the Village.



10.31.2023

Page -18-

We look forward to appearing before the Board of Trustees to further discuss this proposal. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William S. Nul', written over the typed name.

William S. Nul

Enclosures

cc: Mary Beth Murphy, Village Manager; Linda Whitehead, Esq., Village Attorney; Patrick Cleary, Village Planner; Michael Hahn & Dan Rosenfelt, Electric Owl Holdings, LLC; Granoff Architects; Griffco Design/Build, Inc.; Kimley-Horn Engineering and Landscape Architecture of New York, P.C.; Maximillian R. Mahalek, Esq.; and Graham-Windham School