The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
People. Purpose. Place.
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs
NY 12866
p: 518-587-8100
f: 518-587-0180
www.thelagroup.com

June 19, 2018

Mr. Tim Wales, PE
City Engineer
City of Saratoga Springs
474 Broadway Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
timothy.wales@saratoga-springs.org

RE: 153 South Broadway Redevelopment, PB# 18.031
City of Saratoga Springs, Saratoga County, New York

Dear Mr. Wales:

The LA Group is in receipt of comments from Chazen Companies, dated June 18, 2018. The following are responses to the comments. Revised plans, Engineers Report, and SWPPP will be submitted at a later date.

General:

Comment 1: The City's project number of 18.031 should be added to all site plan application documents.

Response 1: **The City's project number will be added to all site plan application documents.**

Comment 2: There are many discrepancies between the Project Narrative, Full EAF, Water Sewer Engineering Report and Site Plans, i.e. the site plans indicated a 150-seat restaurant vs the 48-seats used in the Narrative, Engineers Report and FEAF; 15,850 sf commercial/retail/office space vs 27,000 sf; 273 parking spaces provided vs 244; etc. Please review all documents listed and revise for consistency.

Response 2: **All documents will be reviewed for consistency to include 150 seats for the restaurant, 15,850 sf of Commercial Office, and 244 Parking spaces. All these uses are within the allowed uses and sizes within the Special Use permit and are smaller than the approved EAF considered.**

Comment 3: Since the project will consume/generate more than 2,500 gpd of water/wastewater, NYSDEC must review and approve the plans for the service connections/extensions. Please provide a letter from NYSDEC approving the service connections/extensions for this project.

Response 3: **The LA Group will discuss the project with the NYSDEC regarding approvals.**

Comment 4: Based on a review of aerial photos, it appears that Mavis Tire is utilizing this property for parking.

a. Is there an easement or agreement in place allowing them to do this? If so, please explain how this will be accommodated or terminated.

b. Also, please provide documentation indicating how the Mavis site will meet the parking required by the City code with the elimination of these spaces.

c. The upper parking structure ramp is proposed to be constructed approximately 12'

from the Mavis Tire building with the asphalt pavement to remain. Is this intended to remain a driveway to the rear of Mavis's building? If so, there is a door way that opens onto this drive – bollards should be provided to protect the door from being hit when opened. Also, it is questionable if the retaining wall for the ramp can be constructed while protecting the pavement – please revise the site plans accordingly.

Response 4: **The owner of the adjacent lot noted is the same owner as the project site. This project will be leased from the owner as are the other businesses on the adjacent parcels. The lease line will be depicted on the revised plans showing the extent this project will be using and which land will be left for the owner to use for adjacent properties and businesses. Any development outside our lease line is outside the project boundaries and scope. The owner of the parcels has been involved with the design discussions and has submitted an owner authorization letter which allows this applicant to seek the land use approvals needed to develop the lease parcel in this way.**

Comment 5: Based on a review of aerial photos, the neighboring building at the intersection of Union Street and Adelphia Street has a driveway and parking area that is located on the project site that are to be removed.

a. Is there an easement or agreement in place allowing them to do this? If so, please explain how this will be accommodated or terminated.

b. This building has 2 overhead doors facing the project site with only 20' of the asphalt to remain on-site. 20' in not adequate room to accommodate vehicles entering/exiting the overhead doors. Please revise site plans to provide the required room to utilize these doors.

c. Also, please provide documentation indicating how parking on this site meets that required by the City code with the elimination of these spaces.

Response 5: **See response 4 above.**

Water Sewer Engineering Report:

Comment 6: The project lies upstream from the Saratoga County Sewer District Pump Station at Highrock Avenue and Warren Street, but the report is silent on the pump station and forcemain's ability to service the project. Please revise the report to discuss this and provide a letter from Saratoga County indicating that they can accommodate the projected flows from the development.

Response 6: **The LA Group has contacted the Saratoga County Sewer District and the County has indicated that the Pump Station at Highrock and Warren Street has sufficient capacity. LA Group will work with the County to provide a letter stating the pump station and forcemain have adequate capacity to service the project.**

Comment 7: The sewer and water use needs to be updated to reflect 150-seat restaurant vs the 48-seats as well as the 15,850-sf commercial/retail/office space vs the 27,000-sf evaluated. Please revise the report accordingly.

Response 7: **The Engineering Report will be revised to reflect 150 seat restaurant and 15,850 sf commercial office.**

New Water Service Connection Agreement & Application Form:

Comment 8: Please update the annual water use to reflect the revisions to the Water Sewer Engineering Report.

Response 8: **Annual water use will be updated to reflect Engineers Report.**

Survey:

Comment 9: The survey does not show the location of water mains, gas mains, water/gas/sanitary services to the existing diner as referenced in the various documents supporting the application. Please revise accordingly and provide a signed/sealed survey.

Response 9: **The survey will be updated to provide this information.**

Site Plans:

Comment 10: Please update the sheet Index on the cover sheet to reflect all drawings in the package – L3.1 and L5.3 were not listed.

Response 10: **The cover sheet will be updated.**

Comment 11: Please indicate the size and material of existing utilities which the project will tie into on the utility plans.

Response 11: **The survey will be updated to provide this information.**

Comment 12: Please indicate the material, size, invert and slope of the building sewer proposed to tie into the sewer within Canfield Street. Also, same information needs to be provided on the grease trap serving the restaurant. Given the length of the building, will more than one building sewer be needed?

Response 12: **Two sewer connections are proposed along Canfield Street to service the project. Additional utility information will be added to the plans.**

Comment 13: The plans do not indicate the locations of proposed transformer(s), switchgear, etc. Given the size and tenant makeup, will more than one transformer be required? Please indicate the proposed location(s) along with appropriate screening that will be installed.

Response 13: **Coordination with National Grid has begun, and transformer locations and screening will be added to the site plans when available.**

Comment 14: The plans do not indicate the location of proposed gas service(s). Will there be one main service or will each tenant space be metered individually. Please indicate the location(s) for the gas meter(s) and if gang meters will be utilized please indicate appropriate screening.

Response 14: **Gas meter locations will be added to the plans and will be shown attached to the building under the parking deck. The service location will be completed by the architect and National Grid during coordination.**

Comment 15: The architectural plans indicate central trash rooms with overhead doors accessing loading areas – will exterior dumpsters be utilized? If so, please indicate the location on the site plans along with appropriate screening.

Response 15: **No exterior dumpsters will be utilized for this project.**

Comment 16: The parking shown on the site plans and architectural plans are not consistent.

a. The Architectural Plans indicate 214 parking spaces within the parking structure whereas the Site Plans indicate 219 spaces. The applicant also counts 25 on-street parking spaces that brings their total to 239 or 244 spaces depending on which drawings are correct. Please clarify and revise the plans and supporting application documents for consistency.

b. Additional dimensions are needed for the parking spaces within the parking structure – please update either the architectural plans or the site plans.

Response 16: **a. The parking spaces depicted in the site plan drawings are to be used to determine the number of parking spaces for the garage.**
b. Additional dimensions will be provided on the site drawings.

Comment 17: Regarding the 25 on-street parking spaces shown along Union Street, Canfield Street and So. Broadway: Will these spaces be public or restricted? Please indicate any required signage if the parking will be restricted.

Response 17: **The proposed parking spaces will be for public use. The plans proposed to have the three spaces along South Broadway marked for loading during designated morning hours similar to the loading areas on Broadway.**

Comment 18: Pavement will be sawcut and removed to accommodate proposed utility connections however the sawcut lines and limit of asphalt removal are not shown consistently on the sheets. Please revise accordingly.

Response 18: **Sawcut lines will be revised to accommodate utility installations.**

Comment 19: The site lighting plan does not indicate the illumination levels along the southern property line where the ramps into the parking structure are proposed.

Response 19: **Comment noted. Additional lighting information will be added to the plans.**

Comment 20: It is unclear from the site plans if the asphalt pavement between the Mavis Tire Center building and the proposed ramp from So. Broadway is to remain, be replaced or removed. It appears as if the proposed ramp is located within 13' of the Mavis Tire Building. Please dimension the plans accordingly and revise the Site Preparation Plan and other plans to clearly convey the intent.

Response 20: **Asphalt pavement in this area is to remain. Pavement disturbed in this area during construction will be replaced.**

Comment 21: The garbage truck and restaurant delivery vehicle maneuvering plan comments are as follows:

a. The plans indicate vehicles will back into the loading area off Union Street. The maneuvering plan provided shows vehicles turning right out of the site and entering oncoming traffic to clear the curb cut – please modify the curb cut to avoid this. Also, please provide maneuvering for a left turn out of the loading area.

b. The plan indicates that vehicles entering the parking structure ramp from So. Broadway will drive in and out of the ramp but will need to do multi point turns to exit the loading area off the ramp. It appears as if the curb cut needs to be widened at the loading area to avoid trucks jumping the curbs. Also, please provide maneuvering plan for a left turn out of the loading area.

c. The maneuvering plan provided only shows vehicles turning left into and left out of the ramp off So. Broadway without problems. Please provide maneuvering plan for a right turn in and right turn out. If this movement shows vehicles entering oncoming traffic to clear the curb cut – please modify the curb cut to avoid this.

Response 21: **a and c. The commercial driveway drop curb entry is a standard city detail which has been accepted and required throughout the city to be used for this type of site entry. b. The flush curb at the loading area will be widened to minimize the tracking of the tires over full height curbing.**

Comment 22: If work is proposed on the neighboring property, a temporary construction easement will be necessary. Please provide documentation that the neighbor will grant the easement.

Response 22: **Easements for construction are not needed because the owner remains the same and the Lease Line denotes the project site. The owner has also been in support of the project as presented.**

Comment 23: Please provide additional spot elevations and elevations at the top and bottom of wall elevations along the parking structure ramps.

Response 23: **Additional spot elevations will be added to these areas.**

Comment 24: There appears to be a trench drain proposed within the ramp leading from Union Street, however no information is shown on the grading, drainage and utility plan. Please provide.

Response 24: **Trench drain callouts will be added to the grading, drainage and utility plan.**

Comment 25: There also is no rim or invert information for the lower level parking structure storm sewer system – please provide.

Response 25: **This information will be added to the grading, drainage and utility plan.**

Comment 26: Comments on the underground infiltration chambers proposed along Union Street are as follows:

a. Detailed spot elevations over the SWM system should be provided – the stone dust walk appears to have a 4.2% cross scope where it crosses the chambers near diversion structure. Also, the rim elevation of DMH-2 appears to be 1 foot too low given the contours.

b. The falling head permeability tests results and deep test pit data completed by Dente Engineering supporting the design of the system needs to be added to the site plans.

c. There are inconsistencies between the elevation information presented on the utility plan and the details for the diversion structure, chambers and outlet control structure. Please confirm all information is consistent between the plans and the HydroCAD model.

d. Please confirm that diversion structure can be fabricated with the 12" and 15" inlet pipes at the same elevation and angle – it appears that they are too close. Also, please confirm that the 24" outlet pipe to the isolator will fit in relation to the concrete weir.

e. It is unclear how the two rows of chambers closest to Union Street receive water since the manifold piping is not shown connecting to them or the outlet control structure. Please clarify and if necessary modify the HydroCAD model accordingly for consistency.

Response 26: **A. The elevation of the outlet control structure will be revised.**
B. The geotechnical information will be added to the site plans.
C. The plans will be revised to ensure consistency.
D. The proposed pipe angles are greater than the minimum 'k' factors listed in the NPCA manhole sizing guidance for a 6.0' diameter manhole.
E. The manifold is not required for each row, water travels through the stone voids below the chambers.

Comment 27: Regarding the storm water planter in the main entry plaza:

a. Details for the system must be provided showing the relationship of the retaining wall footings, footing drains, etc.

b. Additional spot elevations need to be provided within the limits of the storm water planter on Sheet L-3.1.

c. Detail 2/L-5.2 shows a 4" perforated wall drain that will be essentially at the same elevation as the yard drains. Please confirm and revise details and SWM system design accordingly.

d. The elevation of the 6" outlet pipe from the storm water planter appears as if will be at the same elevation as the wall footing. Please confirm and revise details accordingly.

e. The location, size and number of scuppers that will penetrate the upper retaining wall needs to be identified. It appears from the grading that the majority of storm water will drain along the plaza toward Canfield and So. Broadway, not into the storm water planter. Please revise accordingly.

f. The lower plaza storm water drains into a plant bed without first being treated. Please advise how this new impervious area is treated, and document within the SWPPP.

Response 27: **Comments noted, the planter details and elevations will be reviewed and revised as necessary.**

Comment 28: A 12" storm sewer is proposed running parallel to the west side of the parking structure that is located beneath a swale and discharges into CB-5. This pipe collects runoff from the upper parking structure deck but does not show the inverts of these connections. Please revise plan to show this information. It is recommended that a cleanout should be provided at the end of the pipe so that it can be cleaned in the future. Please provide details for this as well.

Response 28: **Upper deck storm pipe connections will be added to the grading, drainage and utility plan.**

Comment 29: There appears to be inconsistency between the architectural plans and the site plans regarding finished floor elevations at doorways, particularly the entry corridor off Canfield Street (Architectural Plans indicate 312.62 and site plans indicate 313.00). Please verify and label all entry elevations.

Response 29: **The building finished floor elevations will be 313.00.**

SWPPP:

Comment 30: The overall pre- and post-development watershed boundaries are inconsistent. The post-development watershed is less than pre- development watershed which results in a reduction in the runoff for site. Please revise the SWPPP and HydroCAD model accordingly.

Response 30: **The HydroCAD will be revised to ensure consistency.**

Comment 31: The upper parking structure and the majority of the roof from the Canfield Street wing discharges to the infiltration system, however the lower level parking structure, entry ramp and the roof of the So. Broadway wing do not. Also, there are two roof drains from the So. Broadway wing that discharge directly into the So. Broadway storm sewer system without treatment.

a. Please revise the SWPPP to describe which of the methodologies outlined in Chapter 9 of the SWMDM is being applied to this development.

b. Please revise the SWPPP to clearly indicate the areas being treated, those that are not being treated and how this satisfies the requirements of a redevelopment project.

c. Also, please revise the SWPPP to include backup for the areas presented in the

Stormwater Practice Sizing worksheet.

Response 31: **The WQv for the site is calculated in accordance with Chapter 9 of the SWMDM (redevelopment projects) which requires 25% treatment of existing impervious areas that are to be disturbed and 100% of any new impervious area. The total required WQv for the site is provided by the infiltration chambers. WQv calculations can be found in Attachment E of the Stormwater Management Report.**

Comment 32: Requirements for temporary and permanent seeding, as stated in the project SWPPP, need to be added to the erosion control plan on Sheet L-1.0.

Response 32: **This information will be added to the erosion and sediment control plan.**

Comment 33: The project is located within an area indicated as containing listed, threatened, or endangered species or a critical habitat. The applicant has noted in the SWPPP that they are seeking a determination from DEC on this matter. That determination must be forwarded to the City when received and included in the SWPPP, and the applicant must take any actions that may be required to address permit eligibility under Part I.F.4 of the SPDES General Permit GP-0-15-002.

Response 33: **A letter was received from NY Fish and Wildlife regarding the listed, threatened or endangered species or critical habitat. This letter will be provided to the City and added to the SWPPP.**

Comment 34: The Stormwater Management Practice Maintenance Log was missing from Appendix E of the copy of the SWPPP received by our office. Please add.

Response 34: **Maintenance logs for the infiltration chambers will be added to the SWPPP.**

Comment 35: The site area listed in the NOI is not consistent with that listed in the EAF or on the site plans. Please revise and update the stormwater management design as appropriate.

Response 35: **The total site area listed on the EAF is correct (3.06 Acres). The NOI will be updated for consistency.**

Sincerely,

Brett C. Strom, PE
Civil Engineer
bstrom@thelagroup.com