

January 27, 2022

James J. Oberst, PE

MRB Group

585-381-9250 | joberst@mrbgroup.com



Re: Tefft Meadows Subdivision and Site Plan Review
Marcellus, NY

Dear Mr. Oberst,

Our office has reviewed your comments related the Tefft Meadows Subdivision. Below is our response to each comment received. Your comments are listed below followed by the design team response in bold italics.

Comments received via email on January 26, 2022

A. General Comments

1. Chapter 63 of the Village Code provides requirements for demolition of buildings within the Village. With respect to buildings that are proposed to be demolished as part of this project, the applicant should review this section of the code and coordinate with the Village Code Enforcement office regarding any applicable permits and procedures. Additionally, if any environmental assessment reports have been completed for this property, copies should be provided to the Village.

RESPONSE: Agreed. KFA and Construction Manager will coordinate with code enforcement and Village prior to any demolition work.

2. Please provide an updated Neighborhood Plan (Drawing L0.00), reflecting the most updated site layout.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised drawings, Neighborhood Plan has been updated.

3. Easement mapping and descriptions should be provided for any proposed easements to the Village.

RESPONSE: Easement mapping and description underway. KFA will forward to Village for their review and comment upon completion.

4. Has NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) issued a letter of no effect for this project?

RESPONSE: A report was prepared by Alliance Archeological Services in October of 2014. That report stated no cultural materials or cultural features were identified during the phase IB field investigation and no further investigation was warranted. This report has been provided within the SWPPP as appendix L. Refer to attached "Letter of No Effect" that was recently obtained.

5. Dimensioned building elevations plans, indicating colors and materials, will need to be provided. This drawing should also include details for the dumpster enclosure.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised building elevations and waste enclosure detail 2/L3.00.

6. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control plan needs to be provided a part of the plan set.

RESPONSE: Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been added. Refer to revised drawings.

B. Site Preparation Plan (L1.00)

7. Tax map information (owner, address, t.a. number) for the project parcel and adjacent parcels should be labeled on the plans. The R.O.W. for Paul Street should be labeled as well and be denoted by a different line type.

RESPONSE: Tax map information has been added and R.O.W. has been labeled. Refer to revised drawings.

8. Refer to Section 250-24: Geometric Requirements of Article VIII in the Village Code. All setback, building height and coverage requirements must be shown and labeled on the plans.

RESPONSE: Refer to Layout Plan and zoning data chart.

9. The properties to the west of the proposed project show overlapping building outlines. Please revise.

RESPONSE: Correction has been made. Refer to revised drawings.

10. Show all adjacent property lines on the east and south of the proposed project.

RESPONSE: Adjacent property lines have been added. Refer to revised drawings.

11. Clearly label the 100 Year Base Flood Elevation line.

RESPONSE: Labels has been added. Refer to revised drawings.

12. Clarify what 'IT' symbol stands for. IT is placed next to some of the test pits (TP-#).

RESPONSE: "Infiltration Test". Refer to infiltration test results in SWPPP document.

13. Label bearings and distances for proposed parcel boundaries.

RESPONSE: Bearings and distances have been added.

C. Grading, Drainage, and Utilities Plan (L2.00)

14. All proposed and existing utilities should be shown on the plans. This should include labeling or identifiers for waterman, sewer, catch basin and manholes, as well as size, material, slopes (where applicable), and inverts of the utilities.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Grading, Drainage and Utilities Plan.

15. Survey information should be provided beyond the boundary of this development in order to review how the proposed grading will blend with existing offsite grading and roads, and to better define the location of existing utilities and proposed utility connection locations.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised drawings. Existing utility information is shown, including rim elevations and inverts. Existing topography along Paul St. is shown and proposed grades tie into existing contours along the property line.

16. The plans should clearly address how drainage being directed to Paul street will be handled.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Grading, Drainage and Utilities Plan.

17. Note 14 on L1.00 references two existing catch basins rim and grates being reset. On drawing L2.00 it is not clear how these existing catch basins connect into a storm sewer system. Please clarify.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Site Preparation Plan. Existing storm structures are being removed.

18. The site plans will need to demonstrate that emergency vehicles can properly navigate the proposed drive aisles in order to access the building.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Layout Plan. Fire truck turning template has been provided.

19. The utility labels provided (such as for the proposed catch basins) are incomplete and do not provide the corresponding numbers to reference with the details on L4.00.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised drawings. Corrections have been made.

20. All existing and proposed easements should be shown.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised drawings. Existing easements are shown on the Site Preparation Plan and proposed access easement limits are shown on the grading, layout and planting plans.

21. An engineer's report will need to be provided demonstrate that there is sufficient pressure and flow to meet the demands for the proposed on-site hydrants and any building sprinkler system.

RESPONSE: Engineer's report is forthcoming and will be shared with the Village upon completion.

22. Coordination will be required with the Onondaga County Water Authority (OCWA) with regards to meter/RPZ location and any other of their approval requirements related to the water system.

RESPONSE: Engineer's report is forthcoming and will be shared with the Village upon completion.

23. The Village fire inspector should confirm that proposed locations of the fire hydrants provide adequate building coverage.

RESPONSE: Fire Department has approved the current layout.

24. Provide and label ADA detectable warning fields at all appropriate locations.

RESPONSE: Refer to note 17 on revised Layout Plan.

25. Show rip rap aprons at all applicable locations, including flared end section, mitered drain outlet and bio-retention emergency spillway.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised drawings. Rip rap is proposed at all pipe ends.

26. Per note 6, a spot elevation should be shown for the utility pad.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Grading, Drainage and Utilities Plan.

27. The storm piping and inlet on the west side of the service parking lot is not labeled or connected to the rest of the storm system. Please clarify.

RESPONSE: Correction has been made. Refer to revised Grading, Drainage and Utilities Plan.

28. Light pole locations should be shown on the plan.

RESPONSE: Light pole locations have been added. Refer to revised drawings.

29. Current land banked parking on north side shows a conflict with the proposed stormwater pond. Please revise.

RESPONSE: Stormwater facility has been shifted to avoid land-banked parking spaces. Refer to revised drawings.

30. The proposed sewer is planned to pass through the northern stormwater pond. A manhole should be proposed as the sewer changes direction. Please review and revise.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Grading, Drainage and Utilities Plan. Sanitary manhole has been added.

31. Based on the proposed bio-retention facility plantings, have considerations been made about possible clogging of the mitered drain outlet? Is there a significant advantage of using this over a flared end section?

RESPONSE: Mitered drain outlet reference has been removed. Rip rap is proposed at all pipe ends.

32. Details and dimensions will need to be provided for any of the proposed fencing/screening or retaining walls.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised drawings. Details and dimensions are provided.

33. The proposed land banked parking, sidewalks and walking paths should be clearly labeled on this plan and on the Layout and Planting Plan.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised drawings. Land-banked parking, sidewalks and access easement are labeled or referenced through key notes on each plan.

34. The plans should note the typical parking stall dimensions.

RESPONSE: Refer to parking data chart on drawing L3.00. Parking stall dimensions are noted.

35. If a variance is received for land banked parking, the information and date of this variance approval should be added to the plans.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised parking data chart. ZBA meeting will be held on 2/7/22.

D. Layout and Planting Plan (L3.00)

36. The land banked parking shows trees proposed within its boundary. Please revise.

RESPONSE: Proposed trees have been removed from the land banked parking area. Refer to Planting Plan.

37. A more in-depth planting schedule should be added. This should include at a minimum, the size, type, and quantity of all plantings as well as any applicable installation or maintenance notes.

RESPONSE: Refer to Planting Plan. A planting schedule and plant installation details are provided.

38. Spacing between proposed utilities and proposed plantings should be considered in order to avoid future maintenance issues.

RESPONSE: Agreed. Refer to Planting Plan.

39. The site lighting and landscaping plans need to be coordinated as there are currently conflicts between these two layouts, including trees and light poles located in the same location.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised drawings, conflicts have been resolved.

40. The following Layout Construction Notes are note referenced on the drawings. Note 4, 6B, 7, 8, 13.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Layout Plan.

41. Provide and label the proposed snow storage locations on the plans.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Layout Plan. Snow storage locations have been added.

E. Details (L4.00)

42. A detail should be provided for the proposed connection into the Village sanitary sewer system.

RESPONSE: Refer to sanitary lateral detail #24 on drawing L5.00.

43. The plans should call out the size of the proposed dry well. All details for the dry well should show consistent information to what is called out on the site plans.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Grading, Drainage and Utilities Plan. Drywell size and depth has been added.

44. The bio-retention detail refers to 'Wetland Plants per Landscape Architects Planting Plan.' Please provide this additional plan or a planting schedule.

RESPONSE: Refer to drawing L4.00, Planting Plan.

F. Photometric Plan (L5.00)

45. The proposed background site plan for the photometric plan should be consistent with the current proposed site plan.

RESPONSE: Refer to revised Photometric Plan.

G. SWPPP Report

46. Please provide an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan in the SWPPP and drawing set.

RZE RESPONSE: Drawing L-1.10 has been added to the drawing set.

47. The Existing and Proposed drainage maps should reflect the most recent plan set.

RZE RESPONSE: Proposed site maps have been updated to reflect the most recent site plan.

48. There is references to grass filter strips, rooftop drainage disconnection, and a pea gravel diagram on the east side of the parking lot. Please add and label these features on the plans.

RZE RESPONSE: Figure 12 has been added to the SWPPP to show the green infrastructure practices.

49. Please provide the calculations referenced in Section 7.0 – Proposed Stormwater Drainage Facilities.

RZE RESPONSE: Due to the reduction in impervious surfaces no calculations were provided. Minimum pipe sizes (12") are anticipated to contain sufficient capacity to handle the minimal flows generated to each pipes.

50. Some sections of the SWPPP Report reflect a previous concept where 23 stand alone buildings are shown. Please show the accurate proposed plans in all sections of the report.

RZE RESPONSE: Our office was able to find one reference to the previous concept within the SWPPP under the archaeological study completed in 2014. This reference is within a document evaluating the existing site conditions and should not have any bearing on the proposed development. If your office is aware of other locations that the previous concept is mentioned in the SWPPP, please provide the exact location so that we can edit the document.

51. The routing diagram in Appendix D needs to show the pond on the north side of the parking lot and the bio-retention facility on the northeast side of the parking lot.

RZE RESPONSE: According to the NYS Stormwater manual a 25% reduction to impervious surfaces requires no water quality or quantity to be provided. Therefore, the areas that are not required but will, in practice, serve as an infiltration basin and a bioretention facility have not been routed. The area serving as a bioretention facility will function as phosphorus treatment due to the site being located within in a TMDL. Calculations for verification of Water Quality Volume are presented within Appendix G of the SWPPP and a minimum Bioretention volume is presented on Drawing L2.00.

52. The proposed ponds do not show any calculations for stormwater runoff for the 1-year through 100-year storms. Please provide for both ponds.

RZE RESPONSE: No ponds are proposed as outlined in the Stormwater Design Manual. According to the NYS Stormwater manual a 25% reduction to impervious surfaces requires no water quality or quantity to be provided. Our proposed site plan proposes a reduction exceeding that amount as noted in the SWPPP page 4. Therefore, two areas that will serve as additional stormwater management but are not required are the infiltration basin and the bioretention facility. Since they are not required it is unnecessary to route them and no calculations have been provided.

53. Provide a summary table that shows the pre-development and post development runoff outflow for the 1-year through 100-year storms.

RZE RESPONSE: Appendices C and D provide pre and post development peak runoff numbers as required by the stormwater design manual. According to the NYS Stormwater manual a 25% reduction to impervious surfaces requires no water quality or quantity treatment measures to be provided. Therefore, no routing tables or calculations have been provided.

54. Please provide the signed MS4 SWPPP Acceptance Form.

RZE RESPONSE: Municipality typically signs this form after approval, prior to NOI submission. Please advise.

55. There are steep slopes downstream of the discharge from the bio-retention facility. Please review and add SMP's as necessary.

RZE RESPONSE: A rip-rap spillway has been provided at the bioretention facility to prevent erosion control. Due to more than a 25% reduction of the impervious surfaces in the proposed site no other measures are proposed to prevent the sheet flow over the slope at the discharge point.

Very truly yours,

Keplinger Freeman Associates

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott J. Freeman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.