

Following are excerpts of comments and responses associated with Peer Architectural Review of Westchester County's new Sewage Treatment Plant at LeFevre Lane in New Rochelle.

*Peer comments are italicized.*

**County responses are bold-faced.**

#### *LOCATION OF SITE ENTRY*

*The location of the site entry at the northern perimeter is not ideal from a community planning standpoint. Significant traffic is routed adjacent to the proposed pedestrian walk with little buffer. We would encourage the investigation into relocating the entry point away from the perimeter of the site. Alternatively, if the entry could be made one way (entry only) it could be narrowed to accommodate a larger landscaped berm buffer and would reduce traffic by 50%. A one way exit would be required at the southeast corner of the site.*

**The relocation of the plant entry road to the central part of the site or to make it "one-way" with a separate exit road in the east central part of the site is not practical from an operational, safety or security standpoint. The site as designed has the final destinations of employees, visitors, methanol and other chemical deliveries on the northern part of the site nearest the current entrance. To relocate the entrance would require all the vehicles to circulate through the process areas of the site many of which are narrow and subject to truck backing and turning movements creating numerous conflict and potential safety hazards. In addition the site survey and the entry gate location indicate that LaFevre's Lane just south of the current plant entrance is within the Park where additional truck traffic would not be desirable.**

#### *BERMING NEAR SITE ENTRY*

*The scale of the building is significant. We encourage every opportunity to raise the grade at the building perimeter to minimize the apparent bulk. Specifically, at the northeast corner adjacent to the entry drive it appears that there is an opportunity to raise the grade so that planting will be higher and will more effectively screen the building from the high school.*

**The grade at the northeast side of the BNR building adjacent to the drive will be raised so that the plantings can be higher. Because the available area in this location is narrow a series of stepped retaining walls may be required to**

**accomplish this.**

#### *ARTICULATION OF VOLUMES*

*While we appreciate the effort to break up the mass of each of the project's components, we feel that the architectural reading of the project would be enhanced by having the different functional components each have a primary material expression. For example:*

*Utility spine: Masonry as you currently shown.*

*BNR volume 1: Metal panels and glass spandrel panels (back painted opaque or shadow box). The masonry you currently show could be eliminated or significantly cut back.*

*BNR volume 2: Same as BNR volume 1.*

*Low structure to the north of the BNR volumes: Masonry and green walls as you currently show. Administration: Masonry as you currently shown.*

**The BNR Volume 1 the height and extent of the Masonry can be reduced and cut back and metal panels and glass spandrel panels can be used in its place. The masonry in BNR Volume 2 can be reduced somewhat but not to the extent of BNR Vol. 1 due to its lower height.**

#### *ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION OF THE BNR VOLUMES*

*We feel that the breakdown of scale at the low volumes on the north side, via a reading of "vertical masonry townhouses" separated by recessed green walls, is fairly successful. We question the effectiveness of this same strategy as a way of breaking down the scale of the massive BNR volumes. As noted above, if the primary materials for these volumes are metal panels and spandrel glass, there are other ways to then break down the scale. One suggestion is to lower the perceived height of these "boxes" by using metal panels at the lower portions, and all opaque glass at the upper portions, effectively dematerializing the building as it gets higher. This perceived lightening of the building as it gets higher will be reinforced by the open curved trellis on the roof. These volumes can also be broken down in other ways, but by using just the metal panel and glass vocabulary (not masonry).*

**See response above.**

## ROOF TRELLIS

*We feel the current design of this element could be lightened up a little in order to present a fairly delicate profile against the sky. If there is a band of glass below this as discussed above, then the profile of this floating curved rooftop element will be what is most visible from adjacent neighborhoods (not a big solid box).*

**The roof trellis element will be lightened by using unconnected bars instead of the Trellis.**

## ADMINISTRATION WINDOWS

*We noted that all the masonry elements in the project had a vocabulary of small square windows. We feel the administrative offices could benefit from larger glass areas and that a more open glassy expression may be appropriate and functional in the administrative offices.*

**The windows in training room section of the building are 4'0" wide by 4'0" high and will remain as shown. Large windows are not desirable in training rooms. However, the windows in the upper lobby entry area will be enlarged or additional glass wall may be substituted for some of the Masonry.**

## MATERIAL SELECTION

*We believe that the presented selection of materials is too monochromatic. The essentially beige palette will read as a big industrial box. As discussed above the inclusion of more glazing will help. In addition, the accent colors need to be less subtle so they read clearly. Please consider modifying the color and texture of the CMU within the large monolithic blocks. The articulation of the square recesses in the large block walls will be too subtle to effectively give texture to the façade and additional visual texture is important within the large expanses of CMU.*

**The masonry on the low volumes will remain the same, however changes in the color and texture of the recesses will be made to present more contrast. The large mass of similarly colored masonry may have its color changed or an additional color added.**

## PEDESTRIAN TRAIL CONNECTOR

*A new east-west pedestrian trail appears to be shown in brown along the northern boundary of the WWTP site on the March 2010 Site Plan. With the proposed widening of the WWTP entry road described above, the trail appears to have been located between the existing fence and the boundary line (see space between fence and boundary shown on attached Pedestrian Trail Concept Plan 2) and is limited to a narrow corridor between the existing and what appears to be a new boundary fence. Locating the trail on the outside of the existing fence would result in the removal of some of the existing trees currently providing summer screening in this area (see attached photos). It would be helpful to see detailed grading and landscape plans for this area to understand how the trail connector would look and feel for pedestrians. This was discussed at the meeting and the county indicated area will be replanted with a mixture of coniferous and deciduous mature trees. A fence is in place except for one stretch.*

**Grading and landscaping for the area within the fence including the addition of trees within the fence line will be shown on the landscape plans. The grading and landscaping of the trail area will be developed later by the developer and/or City. The Pedestrian Trail as shown in Concept Plan 2 is not feasible. There are vital plant infrastructure and utilities located in this area that cannot be relocated to other plant areas.**

#### *GREEN ROOF*

*Consider additional green roofs over the garage area.*

**The garage area in the current design is covered with green roof to the maximum extent possible.**