

June 8, 2026

Christian K. Miller  
City Planner  
1051 Boston Post Rd  
Rye, NY 10580  
Delivered via email only: [cmiller@ryeny.gov](mailto: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 Letter 8**  
**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. The initial 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.

The applicant has satisfied all outstanding comments with two (2) comment topics requiring further review at time of permit submission shown below in **bold**. Please submit a digital copy in .pdf format of a complete set of plans prepared by all design professionals with each page in the approved set stamped "FINAL" via email at [building@ryeny.gov](mailto:building@ryeny.gov). Please also provide one (1) "FINAL" full size paper set of all drawings to the City Building Department at 1051 Boston Post Road, Rye, New York 10580. A building permit will be issued by the City upon submission to the Building Department of the required digital and paper drawings, payment of all fees, contractor licenses and insurances and any other documents or information required by the City.

- Response to comments and supplemental stormwater calculations, dated May 29, 2026.
- Grading and Drainage plans and details, prepared by DTS Provident, last revised May 29, 2026.

### SWPPP Narrative

1. See subcomments below: *Abbreviated for Clarity (06/04/2026)*
  - a. Refer to Comment #26.
  - b. The underground detention system has a bottom of stone elevation at elevation 100'. The primary outlet (15" HDPE) is set at the bottom of chamber 100.75'. Orifice controls are provided for the primary outlet with the lowest orifice at 101.25'. This would result in permanent water stored in the system between elevations 100' and 101.25'. The primary outlet and orifice should be



revised to be at elevation 100' or storage within the stone removed and the primary orifice elevation set at 100.75'.

- c. Modeling of the filtration bioretention should be revised. The modeling is assuming the node is filling from the bottom (99.99) upward rather than top down which is why the peak elevation is below the bioretention surface. The model should be revised to eliminate storage below the mulch surface and add an exfiltration device at 0.5 inches/hour to account for the bioretention media that then discharges to the primary device.
- d. A detail should be provided for the bioretention.
  - i. *Response: The proposed outlet control structure for the underground detention system has been revised to eliminate the creation of a permanent pool within the system. The outlet configuration, including the low-flow orifice controls and overflow weirs, has been modified to maximize the available storage volume within the system while regulating the discharge rates and allowing the system to fully drain following each storm event.*

*Additionally, the invert elevations of the primary 15-inch outlet pipe and low-flow orifice have been adjusted to correspond with the bottom elevation of the storage chambers. No storage volume within the gravel bedding layer has been included in the detention calculations. Accordingly, the revised SWPPP appendix reflects updated peak storage elevations and reduced discharge rates based solely on the effective storage volume provided within the underground detention system.*

*The proposed filtration bioretention basin has been reconfigured to ensure that stormwater runoff generated from the proposed driveway and parking area is accepted, stored and filled from the top down, consistent with the intended operation of the practice. The hydrologic and hydraulic modeling has also been revised to eliminate any storage volume below the mulch surface from the routing calculations. In addition, the model utilizes an exfiltration discharge rate of 0.5 inches per hour to account for flow through the filter media layers discharging to the primary outlet device. The revised design provides a standard operating pond depth of 12 inches within the bioretention basin, while allowing for a maximum temporary ponding depth of 18 inches during extreme storm events. Refer to the enclosed revised Appendix E for the updating modeling and supporting calculations*

*A detail for the Filtration Bioretention Basin has been provided. Refer to Grading and Drainage Details, Drawing No. C-623 (detail number 3).*

1. Comment addressed.

11. A Question 50 should be revised to "No" as the project results in an increase in impervious area. Selecting "No" will trigger the water quantity criteria, as required by GP-0-25-001, to be populated in the eNOI. *Abbreviated for Clarity (06/04/2026)*
  - a. *Response: Question 50 of the eNOI has been revised from "Yes" to "No" to reflect the proposed increase in impervious surface associated with the project. As a result, the water quantity criteria under NYSDEC General Permit GP-0-25-001*



has been incorporated into the eNotice of Intent. The information provides the required comparisons for Channel Protection Volume (CPv) as well as the Overbank Flood Control and Total Extreme Flood Control peak rate of flow evaluations for both existing and proposed conditions. Refer to the revised Draft eNOI attached to Appendices.

- i. Comment addressed.

## Water Quality Criteria

18. See subcomments below: *Abbreviated for Clarity (06/04/2026)*
  - a. The sheet provided regarding reciprocity for the CDS units is specific to Rhode Island. A similar document should be provided demonstrating reciprocity in New York either by NYSDEC or Contech.
  - b. The calculation sheet indicates that the hydrodynamic unit is not an off-line practice. The internal bypass capacity of the unit should be provided.
    - i. *Response: The device being considered for primary treatment has been replaced with a Contech Jellyfish Filter Manhole. The unit is found on the NYSDEC list of Verified Proprietary Practices for New Development. The treatment and bypass capacities of the unit devices are provided on a summary sheet found in the enclosed Appendix D of the SWPPP.*
      1. Comment addressed.

## Water Quantity Criteria

22. Modeling for the 1-year storm has not been included. Refer to Comment #26. *Abbreviated for Clarity (06/04/2026)*
  - a. *Response: The 1-year storm event has been modeled for both the existing and developed site conditions at each analyzed design point. A comparative analysis of the results is provided on the Summary Analysis sheet included in the revised enclosed Appendix E of the SWPPP.*
    - i. Comment addressed.

## Stormwater Modeling

26. See subcomments below: *Abbreviated for Clarity (06/04/2026)*
  - a. The modeling appears to include the 90% event and the 100-year storm event. The modeling for the 1-year and 10-year storm events should be included.
  - b. Based on the 100-year model, it appears that the basin is flowing out the emergency overflow. Per table 6.12 the infiltration basin is required to have 1ft min. freeboard measured from the top of the extreme flood elevation (100 year storm event) to the top of the embankment.
    - i. *Response: The HydroCAD stormwater modeling and analysis has been performed and includes the 1-year, 2-year, 10-year, 50-year, and 100-year storm events. The modeling, supporting calculations, and summary tables are provided in the enclosed Appendix E of the SWPPP.*

*The design of the Infiltration Basin IB-1 has been updated to provide an increase in the infiltration surface area, total basin storage volume, and minor adjustments to the outlet control configuration.*



*The updated HydroCAD modeling demonstrates that the revised basin configuration maintains the proposed infiltration practice while providing the required minimum 1-foot freeboard between the peak water surface elevation associated with the 100-year storm event and the top of the basin embankment, in accordance with Table 6.12 of the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual.*

*The revised basin details, grading, and supporting hydrologic/hydraulic calculations are included in the updated SWPPP and supporting plan set.*

1. Comment addressed.

## **Infiltration Systems**

32. Refer to Comment #26. *Abbreviated for Clarity (06/04/2026)*
  - a. *Response: The proposed infiltration practices have been sized to store and infiltrate the required Water Quality Volume. During larger storm events, the outlet control structures have been designed with different stages to safely convey flow toward the Design Points.*
    - i. Comment addressed.

## **Plans**

51. Sheet C-204 shows the 12' wide maintenance access extending to the western infiltration basin. A 15" RCP is shown extending an existing drainage path under the access. The provided cover over the 15" pipe should be confirmed as the pipe appears to conflict with the maintenance access. *Abbreviated for Clarity (06/04/2026)*
  - a. *Response: The proposed drainage culverts have been revised to minimize site disturbance and avoid impacts to existing trees while maintaining the intended maintenance access.*

*The 15-inch and 24-inch culverts have been lowered to accommodate the 12-foot-wide maintenance path crossing. This adjustment provides the minimum required cover over the culverts, allowing the access path to cross the drainage infrastructure without conflict. The revised configuration ensures that both culverts have adequate cover and protection.*

- i. Comment addressed.

## **Site Development Plan Review**

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. *Abbreviated 2/11/2026*
  - a. *Response: Figure No. VM-1, VM-2, VM-3, and VM-4 were provided as part of the Site Plan Set 2025.11.10.pdf.*
    - i. Right-turn Fire Truck access to the site from Old Post Road is shown to be made as a turn from the southbound left-turn lane. LaBella recommends review by the fire department.



1. Per Rye FD: "Triangle" at site entrance to be flat or have mountable curbs and remove sign to allow FD apparatus access.
  - a. Response: The existing curb around the concrete island "triangle" at the site entrance will be replaced with with a mountable curb to facilitate access by emergency vehicles. The curb detail will allow fire apparatus to cross over the island area as necessary without obstruction, as shown on the enclosed updated sheet Fire Truck Vehicle Maneuvering Plan (VM-2). In addition, the existing sign currently located within the island will be relocated. This modification will eliminate any obstruction within the island and ensure unobstructed access for emergency vehicles entering the site.
    - i. Comment addressed.
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. *Abbreviated 2/11/2026*
  - b. *Response: As noted in its October 7, 2025 response, the Applicant does not believe that a sidewalk extension is necessary based on the needs of its residents, visitors, and staff. However, the Applicant will provide the Planning Commission with a schematic plan showing an approximately 280 linear foot sidewalk from the main entry gate to the Osborn buildings. The construction the sidewalk along the main entry drive would require the removal of an existing 16" tree to extend two existing parking spaces utilized by security personnel to provide pedestrian access outside of the driveway. Additionally, existing landscaping, shrubs, and light poles adjacent to the main entry drive would need to be removed and/or relocated.*
    - i. Comment to remain open until applicant provides aforementioned schematic plan.
      1. *Response: As noted in its October 7, 2025 response, the Applicant does not believe that a sidewalk extension is necessary based on the needs of its residents, visitors, and staff. However, the enclosed schematic plan shows an approximately 280 linear foot sidewalk from the main entry gate to the Osborn buildings. The construction the sidewalk along the main entry drive would require the removal of an existing 16" tree to extend two existing parking spaces utilized by security personnel to provide pedestrian access outside of the driveway. Additionally, existing landscaping, shrubs, and light poles adjacent to the main entry drive would need to be removed and/or relocated.*
        - a. *Comment addressed.*

## 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.

c. *Response: Geotechnical investigations, including both recent testing and historical reports, have been performed for the site. These reports are included in Appendix G of the SWPPP.*

i. The intent of this comment is to determine whether subsurface rock removal, including potential rock blasting, is anticipated as part of the proposed work, and to identify any additional construction impact mitigation measures that may be necessary if such activity is required. Please clarify whether rock removal is expected based on available geotechnical data or site conditions. If it is, provide a detailed description of the steps that will be implemented to mitigate associated impacts, such as noise, vibration, dust, and potential effects on adjacent structures or utilities. This should include proposed methods of rock removal (e.g., mechanical excavation, controlled blasting), monitoring and notification procedures, and any protective measures planned to safeguard nearby properties and public safety.

1. Comment remains open. No response provided.

a. *Response: Based on the geotechnical investigations conducted on the Site, it is not expected that subsurface rock removal will be required. Near areas of the proposed sewer main and stormwater measures, rock was not encountered or was located below the proposed utility trench. In the areas of the proposed garage parking and basements, rock was encountered 10 feet to 25 feet below the lowest floor elevation.*

i. Comment addressed.

79. Indicate FD access modifications, as needed for existing site structures. *Abbreviated 2/11/2026*

d. The Fire Department apparatus stabilization comment has been addressed at the rear based on the response provided above; however, the initial comment remains open. Construction phase logistics must clearly demonstrate Fire Department apparatus access within 150 feet of all sides of all structures. The plans shall include provisions for access gates where construction fencing is proposed, as well as defined access pathways within fenced areas to maintain required emergency access throughout construction.

i. *Response: Comment noted.*

1. Comment to remain open for permit.

a. *Response: Comment noted.*

i. **LaBella has no further comments on this item at this time. Design details to be provided for review prior to permit issuance.**



80. Please provide more detail about contractor parking vehicles/availability, both on-site and off-site, as well as any provisions for shuttle service. *Abbreviated 2/11/2026*

e. *Response: The Applicant has prepared an updated Construction Sequence Plan, which indicates the location of on-site contractor staging and field office that will be established during the Enabling Stage. As previously discussed, the Applicant also proposes to provide additional contractor parking through a mix of off-site agreements with shuttles to take workers to and from the Site.*

i. Please indicate on plan approximate number of on-site and off-site parking spaces. Describe how workers will arrive at the construction site from off-site parking locations.

1. *The Applicant has prepared the enclosed updated Construction Sequence Plan, which indicates the location of on-site contractor staging and field office that will be established during the Enabling Stage. The staging area will provide an area for on-site construction employee parking. Additionally, construction employees delivering tools, equipment, or materials will be able to park within the construction fencing areas adjacent to the proposed north campus and central campus buildings. As previously discussed, the Applicant also proposes to provide additional contractor parking through a mix of off-site agreements with shuttles to take workers to and from the Site.*

a. Comment addressed.

82. Indicate tenant safety provisions for building (old and new) connection points (dust control, worker access, barriers, etc.). *Abbreviated 2/11/2026*

f. *Response: The Applicant has prepared the enclosed preliminary Resident Safety Plan, which will be further refined during the building permit review process. The updated Construction Sequence Plan (see response to Comment 81) also provides additional information regarding staging and storage areas. The Applicant provided estimated truck quantities in its October 7, 2025 submission as follows: Buildings 7 and 8 parking garage and basement will include approximately 28 trucks per day for 34 days. Building 10 parking garage will include approximately 28 trucks per day for 9 days. Buildings 1A/B and 3 parking garages will include approximately 28 trucks per day for 64 days.*

i. Comment deferred to building permit application review. A tenant protection plan will be needed.

1. *Response: Comment noted. A preliminary Resident Safety Plan is enclosed, which will be further refined during the building permit review process.*

a. Comment deferred to building permit application review.

i. *Response: Comment noted.*

**1. LaBella has no further comments on this item at this time. Design details to be**



provided for review prior to permit  
issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

**LaBella Associates**

Robert Anic, NYSCCEO  
Manager, Building Code Services

cc: Ed Larkin, LaBella  
Rachel Shaw, LaBella  
File