

Dolph Rotfeld Engineering, P.C.

M E M O

TO: VILLAGE OF RYE BROOK PLANNING BOARD CHAIRMAN
ROBERT GOODMAN

FROM: Anthony Oliveri, P.E.

**SUBJECT: 900 King Street Redevelopment
PUD Concept Plan and Preliminary Site Plan**

DATE: November 29, 2017

With regard to the above mentioned project, this office has received and reviewed the following:

1. Plan entitled: "PUD Concept Plan and Preliminary Site Plan, 900 King Street Redevelopment", prepared by JMC, dated 10/26/2017;
2. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan prepared by JMC, dated 10/26/2017;
3. Draft Technical Memorandum, dated 10/26/2017;

Our preliminary comments are as follows:

1. Zoning and parking analysis was not reviewed by this office and should be reviewed by the Village Building Department and Village Planner.
2. The proposed water main would be required to be a public water main extension due to the fact that multiple units are being served. The water main will need approval from the Westchester County Department of Health and Suez Water. At this time no additional information or analysis has been provided with regard to pressure and water capacity available to the site and the impact on "The Arbors".
3. Existing water / sewer demand calculations (30,000 gpd) are incorrect in that it assigns 15 gpd per employee plus an additional 15 gpd per employee of the building due to food service being offered. However the NYS Design Standards only assign additional sewer demand for food services based on seat count not the entirety of the building employee count; this would reduce the existing water demand estimates to less than 20,000 gpd.
4. The proposed water / sewer demand calculations (49,570 gpd) are incorrect in that it should utilize a more conservative estimate of 150 gpd per living unit in addition to the 15 gpd per employee. Also consideration should be given to any food use proposed for employees. This would result in a total of at least 67,410 gpd for the proposed project. This estimate along with the adjusted existing

conditions estimate yields a potential increase of over 40,000 gpd in water demand and sewage flows.

5. It is unclear who has produced the "Technical Memorandum". The engineering data must be submitted by a licensed professional engineer and provided as appendices to the report similar to the SWPPP.
6. The proposed sewer main would require Westchester County Department of Health approval as a public sewer main extension. A detailed engineering report and analysis of the downstream sewer capacity is required to confirm the statement in the Technical Memorandum that " The existing main....is expected to be able to serve the proposed project". This analysis may require video inspection as well as flow monitoring to accurately determine capacities available.
7. A much more detailed phasing and construction sequence must be included on the plan and in the SWPPP. the project appears to propose the disturbance of approximately 13+ acres in one phase. Sediment and erosion control measures for such a large disturbance (>>5 acres) must be carefully planned and detailed on the plan. Consideration can be made to phase parts of the construction such as the town houses, to limit open disturbance. This plan must be further developed.
8. The sediment and erosion control plan seems to lack any means of temporary sediment filtering as well as other standard BMP's such as concrete wash out areas.
9. Percolation tests as well as deep test pits must be performed to demonstrate the viability of the proposed infiltration galleries with respect to infiltration properties and groundwater elevations. Minimum infiltration rates must be demonstrated for infiltration practices to be viable.
10. The SWPPP should contain pertinent soil maps in the report.
11. The SWPPP must address the downstream condition and discharge point of the existing storm system to ascertain it's current state of repair and functionality. Impacts on downstream areas must be analyzed.
12. The SWPPP hydrologic calculations seem to leave out an existing 15" diameter culvert at the existing detention pond outlet control structure.
13. A more detailed site plan review will be completed upon submission of a site plan application and responses to the above comments.

We will be happy to continue our review once additional information is received,

Thank You

C: M. Nowak
C. Bradbury
J. Gray

M. Mohamed
M. Izzo