August 29, 2025

Christian K. Miller
City Planner
1051 Boston Post Rd
Rye, NY 10580
Delivered via email only: cmiller@ryeny.gov

RE: 101 Theall Road, Rye, NY 10580
S/B/L: 146-13-1-8
City of Rye
Limited Site Plan Application Review
Project 2254028

As requested by the City of Rye, LaBella Associates (LaBella) has performed a review of the tree clearing and site plan application documents with regard to stormwater management, traffic, and construction impact; in connection with the proposed redevelopment project located at 101 Theall Road, Rye, NY 10580. Documents reviewed as part of this application, prepared by DTS Provident Design Engineering, LLP, are listed below. Our review of the documents provided resulted in 83 comments as shown below.

Please note that while we have made every effort to identify all items requiring revision, if an exception is not listed it is not an approval of a non-compliant condition or deficiency and may be required to be corrected upon re-review. Additional comments may be generated based on redesign, revisions, or updates made.

The applicant should provide written responses to each comment and revised plans and documents with updated revision dates in .pdf format to the City of Rye Building Department via email at building@ryeny.gov and this office at rshaw@labellapc.com . All items requested in this review letter shall be addressed prior to review. Please forward this review to all members of your project team that may be responsible for providing the appropriate response and plan revisions. Please resubmit all revised plans using the same filename as the original submittal with a suffix indicating the revision date unless otherwise noted.

- Stormwater Management Assessment Report & Appendices, revised August 5, 2025
- Traffic Evaluation prepared by Hardesty & Hanover (H&H) dated July 7, 2025
- Site Plan Approval plan set entitled "THE OSBORN" (Cover – PDS-100, 56 pages), prepared by DTS Provident, revised July 8, 2025
- Osborn Preliminary Construction Phasing and Logistics prepared by Pike Residential

SWPPP Narrative

1. GP-0-25-001 Part III.A.1. – The SWPPP must document the selection, design, installation, implementation and maintenance of the control measures and practices that will be used to meet the effluent limitations in Part II.B. and the SMP requirements in Part II.C.
2. GP-0-25-001 Part III.A.2. – The SWPPP must demonstrate consideration in narrative format of the future physical risks due to climate change pursuant to the Community Risk and Resiliency Act (CRRA), NYCRR Part 490, and associated guidance. The owner or operator must consider the following physical risks due to climate change: increasing temperature, increasing precipitation, increasing variability in precipitation including chance of drought, increasing frequency and severity of flooding, rising sea level, increasing storm surge, and shifting ecology; for each of the following: overall site planning and location, elevation and sizing of control measures and practices, conveyance system(s), and detention system(s).
3. GP-0-25-001 Part III.A.3. – The SWPPP must describe the erosion and sediment control practices and SMPs that will be used and/or constructed to reduce the pollutants in stormwater discharges and to assure compliance with the requirements of GP-0-25-001. In addition, the SWPPP must identify potential sources of pollution which may reasonably be expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges.
4. GP-0-25-001 Part III.A.4. – The SWPPP must be stamped by a qualified professional, as defined by NYSDEC in Appendix A of GP-0-25-001. #5 should say GP-0-25-001 Part III.A.7. – The SWPPP appendices should include the certification statement in GP-0-25-001 that each of the contractors and subcontractors responsible for implementing the SWPPP sign.
5. GP-0-25-001 Part III.A.7. – The SWPPP appendices should include the certification statement in GP-0-25-001 that each of the contractors and subcontractors responsible for implementing the SWPPP sign.
6. GP-0-25-001 Part III.B.1 – The SWPPP must include erosion and sediment control practices designed in conformance with the NYSDEC Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (Blue Book).
7. GP-0-25-001 Part III.B.1.c. – At a minimum, the erosion and sediment control component of the SWPPP must including:
    a. A phasing plan for the project and sequencing plans for all phases, both of which must address clearing and grubbing, excavation and grading, utility and infrastructure installation, final stabilization, and any other construction activity at the site that will result in soil disturbance. The phasing plan must include a map delineating and labeling the limits of soil disturbance for all phases of a project; and a table identifying the order and intended schedule of when each phase will begin and end its sequencing plan. The table must identify the total disturbed area for each phase at any one time and the total disturbed area for the overall project at any one time all on one timeline showing all overlapping quantities of disturbed area at any one time.
    b. A sequencing plan for a specific phase must include a table indicating the order and intended schedule of construction activities within a phase, and corresponding construction drawings with a description of the work to be performed; and all permanent and temporary stabilization measures.
    c. A description of the minimum erosion and sediment control practices to be installed or implemented for each construction activity that will result in soil

disturbance. Include a schedule that identifies the timing of initial placement or implementation of each erosion and sediment control practice and the minimum time frames that each practice should remain in place or be implemented; and

d. A site map/construction drawing(s) showing the specific location(s), size(s), and length(s) of each erosion and sediment control practice; and
e. The dimensions, material specifications, installation details, and operation and maintenance requirements for all erosion and sediment control practices. Include the location and sizing of any temporary sediment basins and structural practices that will be used to divert flows from exposed soils; and
f. A maintenance inspection schedule for the contractor(s) and subcontractor(s) identified in Part III.A.7. to ensure continuous and effective operation of the erosion and sediment control practices. The maintenance inspection schedule must be in accordance with the requirements in the Blue Book technical standard; and
g. A description of the pollution prevention measures that will be used to control litter, construction chemicals and construction debris from becoming a pollutant source in the stormwater discharges.

8. GP-0-25-001 Part III.B.2.a – SMPs must be designed in conformance with the applicable sizing criteria in Part II.C.2.
9. GP-0-25-001 Part III.B.2.b – SMPs must be designed in conformance with the performance criteria in the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual dated July 31, 2024 (DM).
10. GP-0-25-001 Part III.B.2.e – The SMP component of the SWPPP must include the following:
    a. Identification of all SMPs to be constructed as part of the project. Include the dimensions, material specifications and installation details for each SMP; and
    b. A Stormwater Modeling and Analysis Report that includes:
        i. Summary table, with supporting calculations, which demonstrates that each SMP has been designed in conformance with the sizing criteria included in the DM.
    c. Soil testing results and locations (test pits, borings); and
    d. Infiltration test results; and
    e. An operations and maintenance plan that includes inspection and maintenance schedules and actions to ensure continuous and effective operation of each SMP. The plan must identify the entity that will be responsible for the long-term operation and maintenance of each practice; and
11. A draft electronic Notice of Intent (eNOI) and MS4 SWPPP Acceptance Form should be included in the appendices of the SWPPP.
12. GP-0-25-001 Part I.A.3 – A statement should be included in the SWPPP documenting whether the project may adversely affect a species that is endangered or threatened.
13. GP-0-25-001 Part I.A.4. – A statement should be included in the SWPPP documenting whether the project is within an archaeological buffer area indicated on the sensitivity map, and that the construction activity is not located on or immediately adjacent to a property listed or determined to be eligible for listing on the National or State Registers of Historic Places, and that there is no new permanent building on the construction site within the following distances from a building, structure, or object that is more than 50 years old, or if there is such a new permanent building on the construction site within those parameters that NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP), a Historic Preservation Commission of a Certified Local

Government, or a qualified preservation professional has determined that the building, structure, or object more than 50 years old is not historically/archaeologically significant within 50 feet. Documentation should be included in the appendices.

14. GP-0-25-001 Part I.A.5. – A statement should be included in the SWPPP documenting that the project is subject to SEQR and that the owner or operator must obtain documentation the SEQR has been satisfied. Documentation should be included in the appendices.
15. GP-0-25-001 Part I.E.6 – The SWPPP narrative states that the proposed disturbance is 17 acres. The SWPPP should include a statement as to whether the owner or operator will pursue a five acre waiver request to disturb greater than five acres at any given time during construction. If a five acre waiver is pursued, refer to Part I.E.6.b.
16. The Executive Summary states that the stormwater management design follows the five step process outlined the DM. The DM utilizes a six-step process. The narrative should be revised to outline each of the six steps in order, including evaluation of planning measures (Step 1). Refer to Section 3.6 of the DM and the NYSDEC 2024 DM GI Worksheet.
17. Section E of the SWPPP narrative should include the total parcel size, the proposed area of disturbance, the existing impervious cover to be disturbed and the proposed impervious cover as these values will be used for calculating the required water quality volume (WQv) and in the eNOI.

Water Quality Criteria

The project is considered a redevelopment project with an increase in impervious cover. The redevelopment portion of the project is considered the existing disturbed impervious area. The new development portion of the project is considered as any new impervious that exceeds the amount of existing disturbed impervious area. Construction projects, that include both new development and redevelopment activity, must use SMPs that meet the sizing criteria calculated as an aggregate of the sizing criteria in Part II.C.2.a. for the new development portion of the project and Part II.C.2.c. for the redevelopment activity portion of the project.

18. GP-0-25-001 Part II.C.2.a. Sizing Criteria for New Development
    a. Reduce the total WQv (100% of the WQv) by application of RR techniques and standard SMPs with RRv capacity. The total WQv must be calculated in accordance with the criteria in Section 4.2 of the DM; or
    b. Minimum RRv and Treatment of Remaining Total WQv: Construction activities that cannot meet the requirements in Part II.C.2.a.i.1. due to site limitations must direct runoff from all newly constructed impervious areas to a RR technique or standard SMP with RRv capacity unless infeasible. The specific site limitations that prevent the reduction of 100% of the WQv must be documented in the SWPPP. For each impervious area that is not directed to a RR technique or standard SMP with RRv capacity, the SWPPP must include documentation which demonstrates that all options were considered and for each option explains why it is considered infeasible. In no case shall the runoff reduction achieved from the newly constructed impervious areas be less than the Minimum RRv as calculated using the criteria in Section 4.4 of the DM. The remaining portion of the total WQv that cannot be reduced must be treated by application of standard SMPs.
19. GP-0-25-001 Part II.C.2.c. Sizing Criteria for Redevelopment Activity

c. The WQv treatment objective for redevelopment activity must be addressed by one of the following options, as outlined in Section 9.2.1.
    i. Capture and treat 100% of the required WQv, for a minimum of 25% of the disturbed redevelopment impervious area, by implementation of standard SMPs or reduced by application of runoff reduction techniques; or
    ii. Capture and treat 100% of the required WQv, for a minimum of 75% of the disturbed redevelopment impervious area, by implementation of a volume or flow based alternative SMP, as defined in Section 9.4 of the DM; or
    iii. Application of a combination of the above that provide a weighted average of at least two of the above methods. Application of this method must be in accordance with the criteria in Section 9.2.1(A)(V) of the DM.

20. The NYSDEC 2024 DM GI Worksheet should be used for water quality calculations based on the tributary area to each practice.
21. Given the amount of disturbance and the proposes 3 acre increase in impervious cover, it appears that the treatment practices provided would be insufficient to capture and treat the required water quality volume.

Water Quantity Criteria

22. Channel Protection Volume (CPv): Provide 24 hour extended detention of the post-developed 1-year, 24-hour storm event, remaining after runoff reduction. Where a CPv control orifice is provided, the minimum orifice size must be 3 inches, with acceptable external trash rack or orifice protection. If one of the exclusions in Part II.C.2.a.ii is met, the SWPPP narrative should include the exclusion. The SWPPP narrative should include an evaluation of the required and provided CPv.
23. Overbank Flood Control Criteria (Qp): Requires storage to attenuate the post-development 10-year, 24-hour peak discharge rate (Qp) to predevelopment rates. If one of the exclusions in Part II.C.2.a.iii is met, the SWPPP narrative should include the exclusion. Updated flow rates need to be provided based on the comments provided in this letter.
24. Extreme Flood Control Criteria (Qf): Requires storage to attenuate the post-development 100-year, 24-hour peak discharge rate (Qf) to predevelopment rates. If one of the exclusions in Part II.C.2.a.iv is met, the SWPPP narrative should include the exclusion. Updated flow rates need to be provided based on the comments provided in this letter.

Stormwater Modeling

25. The modeling provided appears to utilize the NRCC distribution curves incorporated into the HydroCAD software. Section 4.9 of the DM requires that projects create local IDF curves based on the project sites location and then convert the IDF curves into rainfall distribution curves. Section 4.9 outlines the step-by-step process to create this file and import into HydroCAD.
26. The subatchments should be revised such that an unedited description with the HSG is provided for each area entry rather than one all encompassing entry.
27. The subcatchments should be revised to provide sheet flow, shallow concentrated flow, pipe flow, etc. for the time of concentration rather than a direct entry. Direct entry

should only be used for times of concentration below 6 minutes. Per TR-55 (page 3-4) the minimum Tc used in TR-55 is 0.1 hours (6 minutes).

28. The post-development model shows the underground infiltration systems and ponds. However, their respective summaries are missing from the storm report. Modeling and summaries for all proposed stormwater management facilities should be provided.

Infiltration Systems

29. DM Section 6.3.1 – To be suitable for infiltration, underlying soils shall have an infiltration rate of at least 0.5 in/hr, as confirmed by field geotechnical tests. The minimum geotechnical tests shall be consistent with Appendix D. Refer to Design Testing Requirements in Appendix D of the DM. Test pits/boring shall be to a depth of at least four feet below the proposed practice bottom, to the depth of bedrock, or to the seasonal high water table, whichever is less. Permeability tests shall be conducted to a depth of two feet below the bottom of the proposed SMP.
30. DM Section 6.3.1 – Infiltration practices shall meet the minimum separation requirements listed in Table 6.10. Vertical separation shall be taken from the bottom of stone.
31. DM Section 6.3.1 – The construction requirements should be included on the plans.
32. DM Section 6.3.2 – Infiltration practices shall be sized to store and infiltrate the required WQv. If inflow exceeds the storage capacity under larger storm events, then an adequate outlet pipe or overflow shall be designed to provide safe conveyance.
33. DM Section 6.3.3 – Prior to entering an infiltration practice, the appropriate pretreatment volume based on underlying soil infiltration rate shall be provided.
34. DM Section 6.3.4.1 – All infiltration practices shall be designed to fully drain within 48 hours of the maximum storm event for which it was designed.
35. DM Section 6.3.4.2 – For Design I-4, the system shall be sized using hydrologic modeling, hydrologic calculations or calculations provided by the manufacturer, to demonstrate that the water quality and quantity objectives have been met.
36. DM Section 6.3.4.2 – For Design I-4, the bottom of the stone reservoir shall be laid level, so that runoff will infiltrate through the entire bottom surface.

Plans

37. Sheet C-201 – A detail should be provided showing the trench drain connection to the 12" RCP outlet pipe.
38. Sheet C-201 – Confirmation should be provided that the two 12" proposed inlet pipes into EX DI C-1 would not conflict due to their size, invert and angles into the structure.
39. Sheet C-201 – The proposed contours in the lawn areas should be labeled. It appears some contours are not tied off.
40. Sheet C-201 – All drain inlets and storm pipes should be labeled.
41. Sheet C-201 – The storm network adjacent to the underground infiltration system appears very close to the system. Confirmation should be provided that the pipes and trenches can be installed without conflicting with the underground infiltration system.
42. Sheet C-201 – It is unclear how larger storm events are outlet from the infiltration system. An outlet control structure is labeled but appears that everything is controlled through a 15 inch pipe.
43. Sheet C-201 – HDS A-6 appears to be missing an outlet pipe into the infiltration system.
44. Sheet C-201 – There appears to be an existing underground infiltration system in the footprint of the proposed parking lot reconfiguration work. Clarification should be

provided as to whether this system will remain, if the tributary area to the system is increasing due to the proposed project and where this system discharges to.

45. Sheet C-202 – There is a callout to replace an existing 15" RCP with an 18" RCP. The replaced pipe should be shown.
46. Sheet C-202 – There appears to be a hydrant in the middle of the road that should be relocated.
47. Sheet C-202 – DMH D-3 appears to have less than 2' of cover to the inside top of pipe.
48. Sheet C-202 – There appears to be contours missing based on the contours shown and the structure top of frames provided at DI E-1-2.
49. Sheet C-202 – The existing manhole near the entrance appears to have an invert in (92.37) lower than the invert out (92.45) heading toward the detention basin. Consideration should be given to replacing one of the pipes to promote positive drainage.
50. Sheet C-202 – The plan shows the existing detention system being regraded. The existing 15" RCP pipe should be pulled back to the appropriate contour based on the invert.
51. Sheet C-202 – An overflow weir elevation should be provided for the detention basin.
52. An enlarged plan should be provided to show the regrading for the western detention basin.
53. Sheet C-303 – An underground infiltration system is shown proposed. However, there are no storm connections to the system.
54. Concrete washouts should be shown on the erosion and sediment control plans, in conformance with the Blue Book.
55. Multiple sediment basins are shown on the erosion and sediment control plans. Each sediment basin needs to be designed and sized in accordance with the Blue Book Standards and Specifications for Sediment Basin (Page 5.19).
56. Detail 2/C620 calls for a square/rectangular drain inlet. The pipe alignments shown on C-201 and C-202 should be evaluated against the structures to confirm that the angle the pipes are entering are acceptable with the square/rectangular structure or if the structure needs to go to a round structure to make the angles work. In addition, the detail should provide the minimum cover from top of frame to top of pipe.
57. Detail 3/C620 provides a detail for "Area Drain (Bioretention/Rain Garden Areas). Clarification should be provided as the SWPPP, C-201 and C-202 do not identify bioretention or rain gardens.
58. Detail 4/C620 provides a detail for an underdrain under pavement and topsoil/turf. Clarification should be provided as C-201 and C-202 do not show underdrains.
59. Detail 6/C620 provides a detail for a dry swale with an underdrain. Clarification should be provided as the SWPPP, C-201and C-202 do not identify a dry swale. In addition, if this detail is being used, the check dam should be in conformance with the Blue Book.
60. Sheet C620 – a detail for a pipe trench should be provided.
61. Sheet C640 – a detail for a concrete washout, designed in conformance with the Blue Book, should be provided.
62. A detail should be provided for the underground infiltration system. The detail should label the top of stone, top of chamber, bottom of chamber and bottom of stone elevations.
63. A detail should be provided for the pretreatment hydrodynamic unit. It should be confirmed with the manufacturer the maximum number of inlet pipes the unit can accommodate and in acceptable inlet pipe angle(s).
64. A detail should be provided for the outlet control structure.

Traffic Engineering Review

65. Two study intersections were counted and included in the Traffic Evaluation discussion. Weekday morning, weekday afternoon, and weekday evening peak-hour volumes were collected as part of the study. LaBella concurs with the selection of these intersections but recommends that H&H provide peak hour traffic counts at the two other driveways that provide access to the site and at the intersection of Osborn Road and Boston Post Road. Figure 1 in the Traffic Evaluation notes that the two staff and resident-only driveways are closed but LaBella conducted a site visit on August 4, 2025, and observed traffic entering and exiting the site from both driveways on Theall Road. Traffic counts at these additional intersections would provide greater insight into the total site trip generation and potential trips added to the two intersections on Osborn Road adjacent to the Osborn School.
66. H&H states that the study peak hours are in the morning from 7:45 AM to 8:45 AM, in the afternoon from 3:00 PM to 4:00 PM, and in the evening from 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM. LaBella concurs with the morning and afternoon peak hours but believes the evening peak hour is from 4:15 PM to 5:15 PM and suggests that H&H confirm during which peak hour the traffic volume are greater.
67. The Traffic Evaluation utilized the Institute of Transportation Engineering (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*, 11th Edition, to determine the number of trips generated by the proposed expansion at The Osborn. Table 1 of the Traffic Evaluation presents trip generation calculations based on Land Use Code (LUC) 254 "Assisted Living" and LUC 252, "Senior Adult Housing". LaBella concurs with these assumptions and calculations but suggests that H&H review the existing trip generation of the site based on the traffic counts at the three project driveways to confirm that the trip generation rates from ITE are representative. If the existing site trip generation exceeds trip generation estimates based on the ITE trip rates, H&H should use the more conservative trip rates based on existing operations.
68. The Traffic Evaluation concludes that the proposed expansion would not result in any traffic impacts based on a qualitative review of field observations at two study intersections, trip generation estimates, and an expected increase in traffic at the study intersections based on existing travel patterns. LaBella concurs with the methodology and findings of the Traffic Evaluation pending the possible changes due to the previous comments. While the proposed expansion is not projected to result in a large increase in traffic at the study intersections, The Osborn could consider managing shift changes so that they occur outside school peak arrival and dismissal periods.
69. LaBella suggests that H&H include additional information and figures in the Traffic Evaluation for clarity purposes:
    a. Provide detail on the existing and future number of assisted living beds and independent senior housing units.
    b. Provide figures that illustrate the arrival and departure distributions and total assignment for the development.

70. LaBella suggests that the Traffic Evaluation provide a crash data summary for the study intersections.
71. LaBella suggests that the Traffic Evaluation provide a summary of on-site parking spaces provided during the existing and proposed conditions.

Site Development Plan Review

72. LaBella conducted a site visit on August 4, 2025. Sight distances for drivers exiting left onto Theall Road may be obstructed by the stone wall surrounding the project site. LaBella recommends that H&H conduct a sight distance evaluation at all driveways to ensure proper sight distance is available based on the 85th percentile speeds on Theall Road and Boston Post Road. If necessary, H&H should propose mitigation measures to address site distance concerns. LaBella also recommends that stop signs and stop bars be provided at all site driveways.
73. LaBella recommends that the parking garage layout provide adequate room for vehicle maneuvers. Specifically, the last two spaces along the west wall of the Building 1 parking garage do not appear to provide adequate room for drivers to back out. Two parking spaces may need to be removed; however, since the total proposed parking supply would exceed the zoning requirements, the loss of two parking spaces should not be an issue.
74. The AutoTurn analysis should include trucks entering the main driveway on Theall Road from the south, making a right-turn onto the site. All AutoTurn figures in the site plan demonstrate turning movements only from the north.
75. Item 7 of the July 14, 2025, letter from the Westchester Planning Board discusses recommendations to extend the interior sidewalk network to connect to sidewalks that front the surrounding streets, as well as sidewalk extensions along the project frontage to connect with neighboring medical buildings. LaBella agrees with these recommendations and suggests that additional sidewalks be provided where possible.

Construction Impact

76. Has a geotechnical investigation been performed, and has a rock profile been created? This should be provided to determine if rock removal will be included in this project.
77. Please provide additional details for the provisions for dust control.
78. Indicate type of security fencing proposed.
79. Indicate FD access modifications, as needed for existing site structures.
80. Please provide more detail about contractor parking vehicles/availability, both on-site and off-site, as well as any provisions for shuttle service.
81. Provide more detail for construction staging area, security booth, office trailers, and equipment during each phase of construction as applicable (civil, foundation, superstructure, etc.)
82. Indicate tenant safety provisions for building (old and new) connection points (dust control, worker access, barriers, etc.)

83. Enabling Phase Sheet: A more detailed plan should be prepared for job trailers, parking, lay down and logistics. Please also include estimated truck quantities for during excavation phase.

Respectfully submitted,

LaBella Associates

Robert Anic, NYSCCEO
Manager, Building Code Services

cc: Ed Larkin, LaBella
Rachel Shaw, LaBella
File