November 12, 2025

Mayor Steven Vescio
Village of Briarcliff Manor Board of Trustees
1111 Pleasantville Road
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510

Re: Renaissance at Briarcliff – 235 Elm Road
Parcel ID 98.19-2-11
Village of Briarcliff Manor, Westchester County, New York
Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Preliminary Review

Dear Mayor Vescio and Members of the Board of Trustees:

This office is in receipt of the Preliminary PUD submission materials for the above-referenced project, as supplied by the Applicant and its consultants, which included the following materials:

- Cover letter prepared by David Steinmetz of Zarin & Steinmetz, dated October 14, 2025;
- Zoning Petition prepared by David Steinmetz of Zarin & Steinmetz, dated October 14, 2025;
- Preliminary Site Plan Set prepared by JMC Planning, Engineering, Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying (JMC), dated October 14, 2025;
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared by JMC, dated October 10, 2025;
- Mobility Summary and Trip Generation Analysis Letter prepared by JMC, dated October 14, 2025;
- Architectural Elevations prepared by Sullivan Architecture dated October 14, 2025;
- Affidavit of Ownership
- Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF), Part 1, prepared by JMC, dated October 14, 2025;
- Analysis of Potential Impacts to Municipal Services, prepared by JMC, dated October 14, 2025; and
- Site Layout Rendering, prepared by JMC, dated October 14, 2025

At the request of the Village, this office has conducted a review of the proposed Civil & Traffic Engineering and Architecture of the proposed project. As any final planned unit development plans shall be in substantial conformance with the preliminary planned unit development plans, this office has reviewed the submitted material with the intent of identifying big picture items that could impact the layout and design of the final PUD.

Below, please find a summary of the Civil & Traffic Engineering review comments. Architectural review comments are provided under separate cover:

Site Development Plans:

1. The bulk table contains 1 set of bulk requirements for the PUD. Separate requirements for the single-family houses and townhomes should be considered, such as maintaining a maximum 30' building height for the single-family homes while permitting the townhomes a maximum height of 45'.

2. The proposed yard setbacks don't appear to reflect the Layout Plan. Revise as needed.

3. In the bulk table parking summary, differentiate proposed parking spaces provided between on-street and off-street spaces so the number of guest spaces can be more readily evaluated.

4. Include tree removal areas on the Demolition Plan.

5. Show the limit of disturbance on the Demolition Plan.

6. Show existing utilities to be abandoned and/or removed on the Demolition Plan and provide associated callouts as needed.

7. Unfreeze items called out for removal on the Demolition Plan that aren't shown (eg. light poles).

8. The two project driveways on Elm Road are existing curb cuts from the previous campus use. While they are existing driveways, LaBella recommends a sight distance analysis at the east driveway where Elm Road curves to the north to confirm if there are concerns about sight distance for drivers entering and exiting the proposed development, and to provide recommendations if needed. The analysis should include photos documenting the sight lines and any obstructions that require mitigation.

9. What is the design vehicle for the internal roadways of the townhouse development area? Does it satisfy the dimensions of the local fire department's vehicles?

10. An AutoTurn analysis should be provided to demonstrate truck turning movements at the driveways on Elm Road and within the site.

11. The Fire Code Official should review the dead end roads exceeding 150-feet in length that do not provide for emergency apparatus turnaround areas meeting the requirements of Appendix D of NYS Fire Code to determine if they are sufficient.

12. There are a number of locations where the proposed on-site concrete sidewalks and trails are proposed at excessive slopes, some approaching 15%. These are primarily at locations adjacent to units with walk-out basements. The specific alignment of the proposed sidewalk/trail network should be reconsidered and should be located in locations permitting more reasonable and safe slopes.

13. The plans demonstrate that a Village Steep Slopes Permit is required.

14. Show areas of steep slopes meeting the criteria of Village Code Section 220-15(D). Show steep slope areas between 15-25% and areas >25% as separate, distinct areas.

15. A wetland reference note should be added to the plans referencing the source of the wetland flagging shown on the plans.

16. Submit a Parcel Jurisdictional Determination request to NYSDEC for the on-site wetlands.

17. The plans demonstrate that a Village Wetlands Permit is required for proposed trails, a proposed retaining wall and proposed grading within the Village 100-foot wetland buffer area.

18. Provide a wetland/watercourse delineation report with the information required per Village Code Section 218-8(C)5.

19. A wetland mitigation plan shall be provided once and if the Village Board has determined the proposed buffer disturbances are necessary and unavoidable, in accordance with Village Code Section 218-10.

20. Identify which streets and utilities will be public or private.

21. Add additional drainage pipes to the Utility Plan to reflect the subcatchments and routing shown on the Post-Development Watershed Map in the SWPPP. For example, the area between the single-family homes and the westernmost townhomes is shown as being conveyed to Elm Road.

22. Parking for guests and visitors appears limited at the amenities building and throughout the site. Further evaluation will be conducted following submission of the traffic impact study which shall include an analysis of on-site parking.

23. Erosion & sediment control plans shall be provided.

24. Provide a cut-fill analysis estimating the amount of gross earthwork and net cut/fill required for the project.

Full Environmental Assessment Form:

1. B. Government Approvals – add Steep Slope Permit and Wetland Disturbance Permit to the required Village Board approvals.

2. B. Government Approvals – is a monument sign/signs proposed at the site entrances off Elm Road? If yes, add to the Government Approvals section.

3. B. Government Approvals – add the HOA Offering Plan to the list of State Approvals.

4. D.2.c – Add the single-family homes to the water usage/demand calculation.

5. D.2.c.iii – change answer from "No" to "Yes" and answer ensuing questions.

6. D.2.d – Add the single-family homes to the liquid waste generation per day estimate.

7. D.2.d.iii – change answer from "No" to "Yes" and answer ensuing questions.

8. D.2.e.iii – revise section to include surface water and adjacent property discharges.

9. E2h. Surface water features – The answer to i should be switched to "Yes" as a portion of the project site does contain wetlands or other waterbodies.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP):

1. Preliminary soil testing shall be conducted to ensure the infiltration chambers are feasible. Deep tests should be conducted to identify any urban fill and ensure adequate separation to bedrock and seasonal high groundwater. Falling head permeability testing should be conducted to confirm infiltration rates match or exceed the minimum.

2. The infiltration practice is proposed partially in the footprint of the existing Dow Hall foundation. Does Dow Hall have a basement in this location? If so, engineered fill will likely

be required for the infiltration chambers, which should be addressed in the SWPPP.

3. Provide additional soils information (eg. depth to bedrock) related to the existing soil survey / web soil survey in the report narrative.

4. A Design Point appears to be missing. EDA 2A is currently discharging to Design Point 2 but it appears it should discharge at the end of the existing 24" RCP.

5. There appears to be several isolated locations where there is underground drainage pipe not connected to any downstream conveyance (including but not limited to north and east of the Dining Hall and south and east of Howard Johnson Hall). Does the existing site contain any dry wells or other stormwater management areas facilitating infiltration or detention? If yes, these should be incorporated. If not, where do these pipes connect to? Provide the missing information so subcatchment areas tributary to design points can be verified.

6. Clarify the required and provided WQv in Appendix C and/or provide in the narrative. Step 2 currently states the required WQv is 109,950 cf while the Summary Table states WQv reduced/provided is 23,454 cf. The Initial WQv calculation, including a breakdown of redevelopment areas vs. new development areas, should be provided.

7. The Step 2 table states the project is "Redevelopment with no increase in impervious area." However, the project appears to result in an increase in impervious cover. Revise as needed.

8. Show the proposed drainage pipes on the Post-Development Watershed.

9. The soil type table soils listed don't appear to match the soils present on-site.

10. The limit of soil groups line in the Legend doesn't match the limit on the map. The soils limit line and associated labels on the map are light and difficult to read/follow and should be darkened for legibility.

<u>Municipal Services Impact Letter:</u>

1. The sewer generation/water demand calculations (and other sections describing the proposed development) don't include the 5 single-family homes. These units should be incorporated into the letter.

2. Update the references to the "BFJ Planning Study" to reference the specific study with full title and date.

3. The concluding sentence within the "Police Department / Fire Department / EMS Budget Summary" section appears to contain an unintended double negative.

4. Include an analysis of the impact of the proposal on existing transportation systems, per the PUD Zoning Text.

<u>Mobility Summary and Trip Generation Analysis:</u>

1. JMC has prepared a Mobility Summary and Trip Generation Analysis Review for the proposed Renaissance Briarcliff Manor project. Their October 14, 2025, document presents a summary of trip generation estimates for the proposed 110 single family townhouses and

5 detached single-family homes in comparison to trip generation estimates for the prior uses on the site associated with Pace University. The conclusion of the traffic assessment is based on the difference in trip generation estimates, which would result in a net decrease in trips. However, the site has been vacant since 2016. Therefore, LaBella recommends that the traffic assessment for the proposed project consider only the addition of new trips generated by the proposed residential uses.

2. LaBella recommends a traffic study that includes, at a minimum, an analysis of traffic operations at the intersections of (1) Elm Road and Tuttle Road, (2) Elm Road and S. State Road, and (3) Elm Road and Long Hill Road for the weekday morning, weekday evening, and Saturday midday peak hours. LaBella suggests that JMC install an automatic traffic recorder (ATR) to collect volume, speed, and classification data along Elm Road to validate the manual turning movement counts and to confirm the prevailing speed, which is used to inform the sight distance analysis.

3. LaBella recommends applying a background traffic growth rate and consider traffic associated with nearby planned development projects. LaBella recommends that JMC prepare a table summarizing the location, type of project, square footage/density of the project, total trip generation, and source of traffic data associated with each planned development project so a validation can be performed.

4. The site plan indicates that there will be 110 townhouse units and 5 single-family units. In the October 14, 2025, document, JMC cited the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition, to determine the number of trips generated by the proposed residential units using the appropriate land use designations. LaBella recommends that JMC consider the fitted curve trip generation estimates for the Weekday AM peak hour for land use 210 rather than the trip generation based on average rates. LaBella concurs with the remainder of the trip generation estimates provided.

5. JMC should provide figures that show the arrival and departure distributions for the development. The distributions represent possible traffic patterns of future residents. JMC should explain the rationale for the trip distribution and assignment of future site-generated traffic.

6. JMC should provide a level of service (LOS) analysis incorporating the trip generation volumes based on the trip generation and trip distribution/assignment.

7. JMC should provide a summary of the proposed parking supply in comparison to the Village of Briarcliff Manor's requirements.

8. JMC should provide an overview of crashes reported on Elm Road and on S. State Road and Long Hill Road in the vicinity of the proposed project over a three-year period. The period start date and end date should be specified. Crash summary tables for study intersections and segment should be provided to present intersection type, severity, and contributing factors.

9. The October 14, 2025, document indicates in the second paragraph that the existing site includes 9 buildings that will be demolished. The other documents associated with this project indicate that there are 10 existing buildings. JMC should update the letter accordingly.

If you should have any questions related to the review memo comments made herein, feel free to reach out to me directly at (845) 454-3980.

Sincerely,

Kyle Ahearn, PE
Senior Civil Engineer

Cc: Kevin Leddy, PE, Village Engineer