[^0]December 3, 2015
To: The Planning Board for consideration at their Dec. $17^{\text {th }}$ meeting
Re: Washington Mews Project
We enclose a reissue of all drawings on this project.
Issues raised at the November meeting and our responses are as follows:
(1) Show solution to openings in west walls of $W$ units to meet state code

We are proposing a full height tilt turn operating door/window flanked by two sidelites of fixed PyroLite 60 min rated glass. Total frame area is 56 SF . See drawings. Also see note on Drawing \#10
(2) Elaborate on detail of grade transition from garage entrance to street, operation of signal system etc.
See revisions on drawing \#1 including description of signaling system and garage access control. Also see new drawing 18 showing all of lower Washington Avenue and the impact of the project on existing street parking and vehicle waiting space.
(3) Provide detailed drawings of the North Exit way and details of the easement agreement proposed for these facilities

See new drawing \#16 which illustrates all proposed changes on Village property and includes a draft of the essential parts of the proposed easement agreement. We are proposing that a steel stair supported on posts link our pathway which descends 3 ' along the north P.L. of our site to the $+70^{\prime}$ grade adjacent to the commuter lot. This in order not to disturb the root systems of the only significant trees on these lands which are adjacent to it. There are two trees immediately north of our proposed building which cannot survive the construction activity. We propose to replace these with 5 new trees which we have shown on the plan.
(4) Provide lighting plan and fixture cuts for exterior "public" areas

See new drawing E-1 which shows all proposed exterior lighting. Also see new drawing \#16 which describes the North Exitway and its proposed lighting.
(5) Erect additional flags marking location and heights of SW corners of all $S$ units
These were put in place on November $24^{\text {th }}$. Surveyor retained by the village verified heights of old flags as follows: Northernmost (NE corner W-1) flag $2=1.7$ ' too low, Center (north face of W-5) flag $1=2.1$ ' too high, Southernmost (SE corner $\mathbf{W}-7$ ) flag 3 = $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ ' too low.
(6) Provide a drawing describing the retaining wall at the NE corner of E-1 and the "fan room" under E-1
See new drawing \#16 and revisions to drawings \#1 and \#2. This wall projects
Only 4' from E-1 as we wish to keep it away from the root system of the very large oak further along on the property line. We wish the existing grades here to be maintained and spill around this short wall. This is illustrated on our north elevation on drawing \#7.

On drawing \#5 Roof Plan , Terrace and Garden Elevations, we have added more details for these gardens including the division fences.
(8) Provide more clarity on the site coverage being proposed and insuring that all paving, whether pervious or impervious and whether on natural grade or
over a subterranean structure, be treated as coverage
We are providing new drawing $\# 9$ showing all coverage based on these terms. The results are as follows: total coverage equals $19,676.56$ sf out of total site 20,440 sf or $96.21 \%$. If the pervious brick paving on grade is removed, this falls to $\mathbf{1 8 , 6 4 1}$ sf or $\mathbf{9 1 . 2 \%}$. If the mews area of 5357.61 sf is added it drops to $71.56 \%$. We believe our visible coverage to be consistent with other properties in the district.
(9) Correct minor errors in the SWPPP and transmit these to Hahn Engineering

This has been done but as of this date we have not had a response.
Obtain approval from the Westchester County Department of Environmental
Facilities for the project and notably the garbage structure placed over their trunk sewer

We met with Mr. Marian Pompa, director of their waste water division who saw no problems with the proposal and agreed to supply a written confirmation of this before your meeting.
(11) Itemize the proposed responsibilities of the condominium corporation with
respect to maintenance of vegetated roofs, snow removal, etc. Also outline the
proposed restrictions on the buyers use of their roofs
We have added notes on these conditions and restrictions on the roof plan drawing \#5.
(12) Re-examine designation of bedrooms in units containing supplemental spaces which could be used as bedrooms to insure that parking and open space
requirements reflect the maximum possible BR count.
Drawing 10 has been revised and we found that if Family Rooms were counted as bedrooms it added 4 (W-2,W-3,W-4,S-1) However we had overstated the BR count by 2 (S-2 and S-3) so that the net increase is only 2 however this raises the parking requirement for the 4 units by $1 / 4$ space per unit $x 4$ or one space while the 2 units being reduced from 4 to 3 do not effect their parking needs, therefore our total parking requirement goes from $29 \frac{1}{4}$ to $301 / 4$ increasing our variance from 4 to 5 spaces 2 of which are for the maintenance office. Open space requirements rise by 400sf but this is provided for in each of these units.

Re study design of south elevation for $S$ units and Café to improve its
relationship to the project as a whole and to reduce its "commercial, hotel like" image
See revised drawing \#6. We have separated the floor structures and balconies so that each house reads as an individual "house". We have also reduced the amount of exposed concrete dramatically and substituted materials and details used elsewhere on the $E$ and $W$ units. We have also added a north elevation of these units on drawing 7 with the same objectives in mind.

We attach a revised list of recommendations being sought for variances.
BALDWIN \& FRANKLIN ARCHITECTS

Edward R. Baldwin
cc: Alex Cheng, Charles Minozzi
encl: Updated list of recommendations for variances being sought

## Washington Mews Variances

## COVERAGE:

Relief from Article 295-18 and 295-72-2 E-4 restricting coverage to 80\% in this MRC district to allow coverage of $96.21 \%$ on this site.

## Applicant's argument:

Site coverage as defined in 295-5 does not refer to subgrade structures. Structure as also defined in 295-5 refers only to structures above grade. If the Mews area is considered open space which it is, then the project complies.

## PARKING:

Relief from the strict application of 295-36A to permit the provision of 25 spaces in lieu of the 30 required.

Relief from 295-29B requiring that maneuvering aisles be $25^{\prime}$ to permit a 24 ' standard width in this instance.

Applicant's argument:
$\mathbf{2}$ spaces are required only due to the existence of a small administrative/maintenance office within the common area of the project. This will be used for very short periods of time. 25 spaces is very adequate for 16 dwelling units.

## YARD REQUIREMENTS:

Relief from the application of 295-72.2(e)1 and 295-20G interpreted by the Building Dept to require a 27 ' setback on the west side of the site and 25 ' on the east.
Applicant's argument:
No set back is required as an MR-C district is not a residential district as defined under 295-5.
Of the $\mathbf{2 2}$ properties that comprise the MR-C district none comply with this interpretation and only 3 have any side yard setbacks at all.

## USE OF VILLAGE LANDS:

The board is requested to recommend to the BOT that an easement be granted to permit development of a pedestrian path and steps across village lands north of the site to provide a means of egress for, and a public pedestrian route through, the project.

## APPROVAL AFFORDABLE UNIT DESIGNATIONS

Units E-5 1 BR and W-6 2BR

## LISTOF DRAWINGS:

| S | ....... Survey |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ....Parking Floor Plan |
| 2 | .........Mews Level Plan |
| 3 | ........Second Floor Plan |
| 4 | ....Third Floor Plan |
| 5 | .....Roof Plan, Terrace \& Garden Enlarged Plan |
| 6 | ........ Washington Avenue South Elevation \& West Elevation of West Building |
| 7 | ........North Elevation from Parking Lot, West Elevation of East Houses seen from the Mews \& South Elevation of East Houses Including Elevator/Garbage/Mail Building |
| 8 | ........ Longitudinal \& Transverse Sections, <br> North Elevation of 'S' Units |
| 9 | ........Site Analyses |
| 10 | ... Zoning Analysis |
| 11 | Landscape Design Proposal |
| 12 | ........ Diagram of Plan Sections per 295-5-B(2), Diagram of Front \& Rear Property Extensions \& Table of Building Heights \& Limits |
| 13 | .........Plan Showing Building Height Limits <br> (Section 295-5 "Height, Building" B (2)) |
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# WASHINGTON MEWS 

A MID-BLOCK INFILL MEWS HOUSING DEVELOPMENT S E C TION 4.70 - BLOCK 48 - LOTS 37 \& 38


| TABULATION OF SPACES BY USE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UNIT |  | Level | net fa. | ${ }^{\text {bR's }}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { oprospace } \\ & \text { PRovided }\end{aligned}\right.$ | ${ }_{\text {GARER }}^{\text {Roof }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { OFF STREET } \\ \text { PARKING SPACES } \\ \text { REQUIRED } \end{gathered}$ |
| E-1 | R | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { MEWS } \\ \text { LowER } \\ \text { Lend fe. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{396}$ s.F. | No | 1.75 |
| E-2 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | mews | ${ }^{470} 5.5$. | $\bigcirc$ | S. | ${ }^{257} 5$ S. . | No | ${ }^{1.5}$ |
|  |  | $\frac{2 \mathrm{Laft}}{\text { Total }}$ | ${ }^{360}$ S. S.E. | 1 |  | ${ }_{3}^{3375 \text { S.E. }}$ |  |  |
| E-3 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{MEws} \\ 2 \mathrm{ndf} \mathrm{fL} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \mathrm{~S} \cdot \mathrm{~F} \\ 8800 \\ \hline 8 \mathrm{~F} . \end{gathered}$ | - | ${ }_{\text {200 S.E. }}^{200}$ |  | No | 1.75 |
|  |  |  | 1040 S. . |  | 2008 S. ${ }^{\text {e }}$. | ${ }^{337}$ S.F. |  |  |
| E-4 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{2}$ | 200 S.E. |  | No | ${ }^{1.75}$ |
|  |  | Total | 1040 S.F. | 2 | 2008 S.E. | ${ }^{337}$ S.E. |  |  |
| E.5 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | , Mews | $\xrightarrow{470 \text { s.e. }}$ | $\stackrel{0}{1}$ | 100 S.E. | $\underbrace{257.5 .5 .}_{80}$ | No | 1.5 |
|  |  | Total | 880 S.F. | 1 | 100 S.E. | 337 S.F. |  |  |
| w-1 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ |  | $\square$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100 S.F. <br> 100 S.F. | 124 S.F. 124 S.F. 124 S.F. | yes | 2.0 |
|  |  | Total | 2542 s . | 3 | 400 S.E. | 496 S. F. |  |  |
| w-2 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & { }_{1}^{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 89 \text { S.F. } \\ & 89 \text { S.F. } \\ & 89 \text { S.F. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { syros } \\ \text { included } \end{array}$ | ${ }^{2.00}$ |
|  |  | Total | 1237 S. | 3 | 3300 S.E. | 267 S.F. ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |
| w-3 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 89 \text { S.F. } \\ & 89 \text { S.F. } \\ & 89 \text { S.F. } \end{aligned}$ | yes | 1.75 |
|  |  | total | 1255 5.E. | 2 | 200 S.E. | 267 S.E. |  |  |
| w-4 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | No | 1.75 |
|  |  | OTAL | 255 S.E. | 2 | 2005 S.E. | 267 S.E. |  |  |
| W-5 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { MEWS } \\ \text { Snd FL } \\ \text { LowER } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{200}$ S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & 89 \text { S.F. } \\ & 89 \text { S.E. } \\ & 89 \text { S. } . \text {. } \\ & \hline 267 \mathrm{~S} \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | No | 1.5 |
|  |  | Total | 1128 S.E. | 2 | 2005 S.E. | 267 S.E. |  |  |
| w-6 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEWS } \\ & \text { 2nd FL. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | ${ }^{200}$ S.E. |  | Yes | 1.75 |
| W-7 |  |  |  |  |  | , |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEWS } \\ & \text { 2nd FL. } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4995 \text { S.F.E. }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & i \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{2005.5 .}{200.5 .}$ | $\underset{\substack{89 \\ 89.5 . E . E}}{\substack{\text { g }}}$ | VES | ${ }^{1.5}$ |
| s-1 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { MEws } \\ \hline \text { nd FL. } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 559 \text { S. F. } \\ \hline 599 \text { S. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{1000}$ S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 99 \mathrm{SFF} \\ \hline 163 \mathrm{~s} . \mathrm{F} . \end{gathered}$ | Yes | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| s-2 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | Mews | ${ }^{625} 5 . \mathrm{F}$. |  | 100 S.E. | 127 S. . ${ }^{\text {che }}$ | ves | 2.0 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {L }}^{\text {LewER }}$ |  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3 rdfL f. | 625 s.F. | 2 | 200 S.E. | 1915 S. F. |  |  |
|  |  | Total | 2500 S.R. | 3 | 300 S.E. | 636 S. E . |  |  |
| s-3 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | ${ }_{\text {cole }}^{\text {MEWS }}$ |  |  | 100 S.E. |  | Yes | ${ }^{2.0}$ |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {Lnder }}^{\text {Lew }}$ |  | \% |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3 crdL F. | 625 S. F . |  | 200 S.E. | 1915 .r. |  |  |
|  |  | total | 2500 S. . | 3 | ${ }^{3009}$ S.E. | ${ }^{6365 \text { s.e. }}$ |  |  |
| s-4 | ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | Mews | ${ }^{545.5 .}$ |  |  |  | No | ${ }^{1.75}$ |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{0}$ | 200 S.E. |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total | 1314 S. ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 2 | 2005 S.F. | ${ }^{3285.5 . E .}$ |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Cafe }}$ | c | M MES |  | : |  |  | vo | 。 |
|  |  | Lotal | ${ }^{14212 \mathrm{S.E}}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {Efe }}{ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{2 n d} \mathrm{fL}$. | 231 s.f. | $\bigcirc$ | NoNE | None | No | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Garage | ${ }^{\text {GE }}{ }^{6}$ | Lower | 9082 5.F. | 0 | vone | Nove | No | 0 |
| (inad |  |  | 34,353 s.r. |  | 3600 S.E. | 6075 s.F. |  | $301 / 4 \mathrm{sPaCL}$ |
| NOTE: Under the NYS building code, all R uses are R-2 occupancies, the office is B occupancy and the garage (enclosed) is S-2 occupancy. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| ZONING ANALYSIS MR-C DISTRICT LOTS 37 \& 38, SECTION 4.70, BLOCK 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| discussion points | item | REQUI | ED | existing | proposed | REQUIRED VARIANCES |
| COVERAGE CALCULATIONS <br> (SEE dRAWING SHowing coverage on sheet 9) <br> Total project coverage exceeds the $80 \%$ permitted by 295-72-2 e (4) only because the Hastings Building Dept has deemed the portion of the Mews over the subgrade garage to constitute building coverage. The basis for this interpretation is that the garage constitutes a structure and that structures constitute coverage. <br> We have reviewed the definition of structure in 295-5 and very clearly it refers only to items placed above grade. The Mews is located at a grade very close to that now existing. We do not believe it should be considered as building coverage. If the Mews area was replaced by pervious pavement at $50 \%$ total only $6.4 \%$ or $11.6 \%$ if the portion of the mews on natural grade is also included. | Lotarea |  |  | 20,440 SF/ 0.4692 acres | 20,440 SF |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MINMUM AREA PER } \\ & \text { DWELLING UNTT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 2500 \text { SF } \\ \hline 500 \mathrm{SF} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | N.A. | ${ }^{1278}$ SF |  |
|  | BUIDVING <br> coverace above <br> GRADE | N.a. |  | 5296 SF or $25.9 \%$ | 12,293 SF or 60.1\% |  |
|  | TOTAL COVERAGE BY ALL 'STRUCTURES' | 80\% MAX |  | 5596 SF or 27.3\% | 17,944 SF or 87.8\% | Relief from 295-72-2 E 4 <br> 87.8\% in lieu of $80 \%$ |
|  | TOTAL PERVIOUS <br> PAVING COVERAGE |  |  | 952 SF or 4.6\% | 1053.11 SF or 5.2\% |  |
|  | total development coverage | not stipulated |  | APPROX. $57.89 \%$ | 91.6\% | MAXIMUM IS NOT STIPULATED. 295-72-2 E 4 DOES NOT MENTION PERVIOUS PAVEMENT |
| OPEN SPACE <br> Required open space 295-72.2 a (2) <br> Except for five east units which have $13^{\prime}-9$ "deep gardens at grade, all units will have open space created within the footprint of the unit by a combination of balconies and roof terraces. <br> The Hastings Building Department has deemed that the mews is not a 'court' as defined in 295-5 and therefore that 295-21 C does not apply to this project. |  |  |  | N.A. |  | NoNE |
| OFF STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS <br> The new curb cut will be $22^{\prime}$ in width less than the 24 ' allowed. <br> The existing $12^{\prime}$ curb cut will be removed. <br> The entry will be restricted to right turn in \& right turn out. <br> The ramp connecting the sidewalk within the garage will permit 2 way traffic. However by means of <br> signal lights we will avoid this. <br> One vehicle may wait off the street not obstructing traffic while the entry door is in operation. Cars <br> exiting the garage will be aware of such a vehicle and be able to wait until the ramp is clear. Ramp grade <br> is well within the $5 \%$ maximum stipulated in 295-31. |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{W}-5 & 1 & 1 / 2 \\ \mathrm{~W}-6 & 1 & 3 / 4 \\ \mathrm{~W}-7 & 1 & 1 / 2 \\ \mathrm{~S}-1 & 1 & 3 / 4 \\ \mathrm{~S}-2 & 2 \\ \mathrm{~S}-3 & 2 \\ \mathrm{~S}-4 & 1 & 3 / 4 \\ \text { CAFE } & 0 \\ \text { OFFICE } 2 \end{array}$ | N.A. | Total: 25 spaces | RELIEF FROM 295-36A TO ALLOW THE PROVISION OF 25 SPACES IN LIEU OF $291 / 4$ |
| YARD REQUIREMENTS <br> When this project was first reviewed by Mr. Sharma in August of 2007 all yard requirements were deemed to be zero and were so shown on the schedule in the code. Mr. Minozzi advised us on May 29th that all side yards in this district are required to be 10 ' as all properties abut lands in the same MR-C additional set backs after the first $50^{\prime} @ 1^{\prime}$ per $10^{\prime}$ as required by 295-20 G would be added to the 10 ' yard This results in a 27 ' side yard at the west side of the site and 25 ' on the east side. Up until this time we thought 295-72.2 e(1) referred to residential only R districts and also that $295-20 \mathrm{G}$ compliance with this requro setback. Of the 22 properties that coll. 3 . provisions would naturally eliminate the possibility of a Mews development and instead lead to an Since the purpose of districting is to maintain the historirale starter of the existing building (295-2 K) \& (295-109 a\&b), it seems inconsistent to apply 295-72.2 (e) to any building in this district. Site plan proposed meets all criteria outlined in 295-109. |  |  |  |  | FRONT: 0 REAR: 1 EAST: 13 -9" WEST:0 | RELIEF FROM 295-72E (1) RELIEF FROM 295-20G <br> ENCROACHMENTS TOTAL IS 7,194 SF <br> SEE DWG 9 |
| HEIGHT LIMITS <br> (SEE SHEETS 12, 13 \& 14) <br> 295-5 "HEIGHT, BUILDING" B (1) \& B (2) $+295-72-2$ (E) 3 (a) \& (b) limiting height to $40^{\circ}$ | All builiding are in ompliance will 295,72 |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXITWAY/CONNECTION TO TRAIN STATION We propose a aravel pathay approximately 4 wide to connect the exit stair on the northend of the develomen tover <br>  asking the village to enter into a reciprocal easement agreement with RTB Wastington LLLC or their <br>  the Mews at the Mevs level to Washington Avenue <br>  exit into a 4 wide path in ilien of the 10 ' wide laneway prescribed by the code. Enica thought this likely. | Exit to train station |  |  |  |  | A recommendation from the PB \& ZBA to the B of T that such an easement be granted. |


8. Roof terraces on S and W houses have $1^{1}-6^{\prime \prime}$ high planter boxes running bond adding color and a non institutional,
non commercial feeling which conventional concrete modular
units can never achieve. 7. Paving throughout the Mews we propose be a clay brick in a
running bond adding color and a non institutional, 6. For the east houses we propose a self supporting green wall at
the rear of each garden extending to the height of the concrete
wall. A system such as Tremco's VR MOD would be appropriate as it
is as close to being maintenance free as any system on the 5. For the vegetated roofs on the East Houses, W-4 and S-4 we
would propose a modular system employing a variety of Sedums
mixed with short meadow grasses be used. 4. At numerous window boxes we would propose annual
flowering plants.
 At each of these planters we would propose English Ivy (Hedera
helix) as a ground cover which hopefully would flow over the
edges of the planters. These we propose be Honey Locusts (Gleditsia Tricanthos) $21 / 2$
caliper as their small leaves and high visual transparency will no
overly shade the Mews space nor dominate or fill it excessively.
At each of these planters we would propose English Ivy (Hedera

 Live plantings proposed for the public domain of the project will
be as follows:
LANDSCAPE DESIGN PROPOSAL


| Baldwin \& Franklin Architects <br> 73 Washington Avenue <br> Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y. 10706 <br> Tel.: (914) 6935324 Fax: (914) 6935676 | Project: | WASHINGTON MEWS RTB WASHINGTON LLC | Sheet Tille: |  | Project No.i 1405 | $11$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Landscape Design Proposal |  | Date Dec 3rd, 2015 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Scale: 1 " $=15.90$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Dram: GA |  |





| Baldwin \& Franklin Architects <br> 73 Washington Avenue <br> Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y. 10706 <br> Tel.: (914) 6935324 Fax: (914) 6935676 | ${ }^{\text {Prop }}$ |  | Plan Showing Building Height Limits | Project No. 1005 | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | WASHINGTON MEW |  | Date: 6avgust 2015 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Scale ${ }^{12}=10^{\circ}$ |  |







| Baldwin \& Franklin Architects <br> 73 Washington Avenue <br> Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y. 10706 <br> Tel.: (914) 6935324 Fax: (914) 6935676 | Project: | WASHINGTON MEWS RTB WASHINGTON LLC | Lower Washington Ave. Plan | Prject No.: 1405 | $18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Date: Dece 3 rct, 21015 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Scale: 1/6" $1.1 .0{ }^{\circ}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | Drawn: GA |  |






| Baldwin \& Franklin Architects 73 Washington Avenue Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y. 10706 Tel.: (914) 6935324 Fax: (914) 6935676 | ${ }^{\text {Projetet }}$ | WASHINGTON MEWS RTB WASHINGTON LLC | Sheet Tule | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Roof Plan } \\ & \text { Terrace and Garden } \\ & \text { Elevation } \end{aligned}$ | Proicet Na: 1405 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Datc: Decerc, 2015 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Salke 18s=1.7 |  |




| Baldwin \& Franklin Architects <br> 73 Washington Avenue <br> Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y. 10706 <br> Tel.: (914) 6935324 Fax: (914) 6935676 | Project | WASHINGTON MEWS RTB WASHINGTON LLC | Sheet Title: <br> North \& East <br> Elevations | Project No. 1405 | Sheet ${ }_{\text {No }}$7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Date 3 $\mathbf{~ D E C E M B E R ~} 20$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | Scale: $118^{\prime \prime}=1.00^{\prime \prime}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | Dram: GA |  |










| Baldwin \& Franklin Architects 73 Washington Avenue Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y. 10706 Tel.: (914) 6935324 Fax: (914) 6935676 | Project | WASHINGTON MEWS RTB WASHINGTON LLC | View Preservation |  | Prijet Na: 1095 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Datc: anfeth, 2015 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Salte ssthom | VP2 |
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