



April 08, 2026

**Contract #:** 2104

**Project:** Wayne Avenue

**Location:** 156-160 Wayne Avenue

**Architect:** [pgaitojr@pfga.net](mailto:pgaitojr@pfga.net)

**Responses to The Village Planner: March 17, 2026**

**Questions & Answers**

[info@pfga.net](mailto:info@pfga.net)

[www.pfga.net](http://www.pfga.net)

**Partners**

Peter F. Gaito  
AIA, NCARB, LEED AP

Peter F. Gaito Jr.  
AIA, NCARB

**Associates**

Nick Tucci  
PE, LEED AP

J.B. Macutay Jr.  
P.E., S.E.

**Construction Managers**

James Barry  
CM, LEED AP

Paul Wojnowski, CM

**General Comments:**

**2. The Project Data table on the Cover Sheet indicates the occupancy classification as Group R-2, however, the project title and Zoning District row in the table indicates Townhouses. Please clarify if this will be a Group R-2 under the NYS Building Code or Townhouses under the Residential Code of NYS. If the classification is Townhouse under the Residential Code of NYS, then there are no accessibility requirements.**

*i. “Applicant intends to use the 2025 NYSBC and R-2 classification, however, this will be finally determined during the building permit process to the satisfaction of the Village of Suffern CEO”. This comment remains applicable until such time that a final determination is made.*

*Team Response: Comment noted.*

**3. Emergency vehicle access, fire hydrant locations and fire sprinkler connections (if provided) and are subject to the approval of the Fire Marshal and the Building Code Official.**

*i. “Noted. Plans and submissions were referred to the Fire Marshal COE and comments was obtained and incorporated in the plan set during previous submissions.” Please provide all correspondence with the fire Marshal.*

*Team Response: All comments from the Fire Chief were sent directly to the Town Planning Board Secretary and then provided to the Applicant. Enclosed are the email chains the Applicant was forwarded.*

**Civil Site Plan Comments:**

**B. Sheet 2 – Site Plan (C02):**

**2. Confirm if the proposed setback line provided along the southwest property line, along Stewart Circle, is considered a Front Yard or a Side Yard setback; please review and revise as necessary.**

*i. “The setbacks are designed pursuant to an email received from Adam Gordon Assistant Building Inspector/fire inspector dated March 19, 2025. Which says “pursuant to 266- 15H of our code, this proposal has two front yards, one rear yard and only one side yard”. Please provide all correspondence with the fire Marshal.*

*Team Response: All comments from the Building Inspector and Fire Chief were sent directly to the Town Planning Board Secretary and then provided to the Applicant. Enclosed are the email chains and Memos the Applicant was forwarded.*

**3. Proposed light pole locations should be shown on the Site Plan, sheet C02, for coordination and to ensure there is no conflict with a proposed light pole location and any proposed site features.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, light poles are shown as requested.*

**10. Provide the dimensional width of the proposed concrete sidewalks. Ensure that there is sufficient width of sidewalk behind the proposed ADA signs and EV charging equipment as per Section 403.5 of the 2017 ICC A117.1.**

**i. This comment has been partially addressed. The current proposed locations for the EV chargers result in the cable be pulled across the sidewalk. This poses a tripping hazard. Consider revising the locations in such a manner that does not require pulling the cable across the sidewalk.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, EV charging station has been moved.*

**11. Clearly identify all proposed accessible curbs ramps on the Site Plan.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, drop curb locations are depicted as “DC” on the enclosed site plan.*

**12. Rotate the proposed accessible pavement markings provided within the accessible parking stalls.**

*i. The accessible pavement markings should be revised to depict the current Dynamic Accessibility Symbol.”*

*Team Response: Comment noted, symbol revised on the enclosed site plan.*

**14. The legend identifies proposed decks and proposed steps, but these items are not provided on the Site Plan, please revise and revise as necessary. These items, if proposed, should be shown on the Site Plan.**

**i. The grading plan shows spot elevations just outside the entrance that are more than 6” lower than the proposed finished floor elevation. This grading suggests that stairs will be required as some units. The plan should be revised for consistency.**

*Team Response: No step is required. The spot grade shown is to depict a positive pitch away from the building towards the parking lot.*

**18. The use of grasspave2 for the proposed dead-end fire apparatus access road turnaround provided on the north side of the site to be approved by local Fire Code Official.**

***i. “The full plan package was reviewed by the fire marshal, and his comments were incorporated in the plans during previous submittals.” Please provide this correspondence for review.***

*Team Response: All comments from the Fire Chief were sent directly to the Town Planning Board Secretary and then forwarded to the Applicant. Enclosed are the email chains the Applicant was forwarded.*

**19. Clearly identify all proposed work and the extent of the proposed curbing within the right-of-way (R.O.W.).**

**i. As per comment #4 of NYSDOT comment letter by Mary Jo Russo, PE dated July 8, 2011, the full width of the road will need to be resurfaced if trenchless installation is not possible. This comment should be addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, work within state right-of-way has been depicted.*

**23. As per § 228-22. D.4 the planning board may require motorcycle/bicycle parking.**

***i. “Noted, the site layout was confirmed as the preferred layout.” Please clarify this response. Confirmed by who?***

*Team Response: The Planning Board confirmed this orally at one of its previous meetings.*

**24. Provide pedestrian access to the proposed refuse enclosures.**

***i. “Noted, the site layout was confirmed as the preferred layout.” Please clarify this response. Confirmed by who?***

*Team Response: See response in # 23i.*

**25. Demonstrate access to the proposed refuse enclosures on a truck turning plan.**

***i. “How is the proposed refuse enclosure intended to be accessed with the current orientation, review and revise as necessary.”***

***1. “Refuse collection will utilize residential wheeled carts.” Confirm with planning board that residential wheeled carts are acceptable. We recommend angling the refuse enclosures to provide for easier pickup access.***

*Team Response: The Applicant understands that the Planning Board is amenable to the existing Site Plan as proposed, which includes wheeled carts. Further, the containers typically are rolled out by the waste disposal company, and angling the containers is not necessary for pickup access.*

**C. Sheet 3 – Grading Plan (C03):**

**1. Legend identifies steps, but none are shown on the plans. Further detail is required to demonstrate how these buildings are to be accessed. Please clarify the accessibility requirements.**

***i. This comment has not been addressed. Spot elevations that are more than 6” lower than the finished floor elevation that are shown on the plans.***

*Team Response: There are not steps into the buildings, the spot grades are lower than the finished floor to show positive pitch away from the proposed buildings.*

**3. Detailed plans and calculations should be provided for all proposed retaining walls provided on the Site Plan. 1. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, all retaining walls will be designed and endorsed by a New York State Licensed Professional Engineer during the Building Permit application process and submitted to the Building Department for review and approval as part of the Building Permit application.*

***iii. The “BW” bottom wall elevation appears to be inaccurate for the proposed retaining wall on the northern corner of the most northern building, please review and revise as necessary.***

*Team Response: Comment noted top and bottom of wall elevations have been corrected in the enclosed site plan.*

**1. The maximum wall height is indicated as 15.4’ on Sheet C-02 yet the spot elevations show the top and bottom of wall at the same elevation. Even if separate plans are to be provided, the scope should be properly shown on this plan. Revise the grading to accurately show the proposed wall heights.**

*Team Response: Comment noted see response above in #3iii.*

***iv. Vehicle protection for the retaining walls should be provided.***

**1. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted heavy-duty rubber wall mounted guards are being proposed for Vehicle protection.*

**4. Architectural plans and elevations should be revised to be consistent with the proposed site grading and stepping provided on C03 of the Site Plan.**

**i. As per previous comments, this has not been addressed. Either steps should be added, or the grading should be revised.**

*Team Response: Architectural plans and elevations have been revised to be consistent with the proposed site grading shown on Sheet C03 of the Site Plan. Please note, there are no steps to access the individual townhouses.*

**5. Provide detailed grading for the proposed accessible parking, all curb ramps and along the accessible paths to ensure full compliance with ADA standards and regulations.**

**i. This comment has not been addressed. Furthermore, there are slopes in excess of 4% being proposed within the accessible stalls. The grading should be revised such that slopes do not exceed 2% in any direction.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, handicapped parking and associated access slopes have been corrected in the enclosed site plan, as requested.*

**6. Detailed grading should be provided along the pedestrian paths and at all building entrances.**

***i. "FG" is provided with a 1-ft elevation difference at the same building corner, please review and provide details on how this is to be achieved.***

***1. These comments have not been addressed.***

*Team Response: Comment noted, grading and slopes provided in the enclosed site plan, as requested.*

#### **D. Sheet 4 – Utility Plan (C04):**

**1. Provide dimensions showing adequate horizontal separation between the proposed stormwater collection/infiltration system, proposed onsite water main, and proposed onsite sanitary sewer.**

**i. This comment has not been addressed. Dimensions should be provided showing minimum separation distance to building foundations and other on-site utilities.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, dimensions provided in the enclosed site plan, as requested.*

**2. Clearly identify all proposed crossings on the Utility Plan.**

*i. Provide details of each crossing demonstrating full compliance with minimum vertical separations required by the local authority having jurisdiction.*

*1. This comment has not been addressed. Please provide all crossing information on the utility plan.*

*Team Response: Comment noted, crossings provided on profiles in the enclosed site plan, as requested.*

**3. No electrical service is currently proposed for the development, please clarify and provide details on how the proposed development will be powered.**

**i. Electrical service and transformer locations are now shown on the plan. Please add dimensions to the plans showing adequate horizontal separation from other onsite utilities. In addition, verify that setbacks, as required by the local utility authority and NFPA 850, are being met in relation to the location of transformers and their proximity to adjacent structures and pedestrian facilities.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, the electric and other utilities are diagrammatically shown and meet all requirements of the individual utility provider, Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc. As is typical, Orange & Rockland Utilities will prepare their owner plans for the project.*

*4. ii. The Village of Suffern DPW letter also states that the developer is proposing an upgrade to the existing water main within the right-of-way, confirming if this work still being proposed.*

**1. Please provide details of the proposed water improvements within the right-of-way.**

*i. Applicant is in contact with the Village DPW and will work to the satisfaction of the department. Applicant hasn't been asked currently for any upgrades on the existing water main." This comment remains applicable until such a time that a final determination has been made.*

*Team Response: Comment noted, the Village Department of Public Works has provided a "willingness to Service" letter.*

**5. Please clarify if the proposed water main will be public or private. R309.1 of the Residential Code of NYS 2025 requires an automatic sprinkler system to be installed in townhouse units having a height of less than 3 stories and connected to a public water main.**

*i. “Project is designed to have automated sprinklers and water main is designed to be public. However final determination to be made by the Village DPW as per their preference town the main.” This comment remains applicable until such a time that a final determination has been made.*

*Team Response: Comment noted.*

**6. Provide soil borings and infiltration testing for the proposed subsurface infiltration basin. i. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, soil testing was previously provided.*

**13. There is an existing drainage structure along Wayne Avenue next to the utility pole on the northeast corner of the site that is now proposed to be behind the back of curb, please review the existing drainage withing the right-of-way to ensure this change will not affect the existing drainage flow pattern within the right-of-way. Provide a copy of the NYSDOT Highway Work Permit Plans for all improvements within the ROW.**

*i. “Applicant is in contact with the NYSDOT, will design to their satisfaction and provide a copy of the permit and plans to the planning board “. This comment remains applicable. All correspondence with the NYSDOT should be provided for review. This comment remains applicable. All correspondence with the NYSDOT should be provided for review.*

*Team Response: Comment noted, NYSDOT correspondence enclosed herewith. Note that an updated Traffic Report responding to comments herein as well as in the NYSDOT’s latest January 2026 email is being submitted to the NYSDOT simultaneously.*

**14. As per comment letter from the Village of Suffern DPW dated July 8, 2011, if trenchless installation of utilities is not possible, the full width of the road will need to be resurfaced.**

**i. This comment remains applicable.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, however no Village roads will be affected by proposed project.*

**16. Clearly show and identify all proposed roof drainage, roof leaders, and down spout locations to be coordinated with the architectural plans.**

**i. This comment has only partially been addressed and remains applicable.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, roof drainage information is provided on the enclosed site plan, as requested.*

**19. Show the proposed drainage- drainage crossing on the southeast side of the site in the proposed profile on C05.**

*i. Review the proposed drainage – drainage crossing, the inverts appear to be conflicting. 1. This comment has only partially been addressed and remains applicable.*

*Team Response: Comment noted, no conflict between inverts is present.*

**21. Provide details of the proposed sanitary / drainage crossing on the southern corner of the property.**

**i. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, see enclosed site plan.*

**22. The pipe between CB #24 & CB#23 appears too close to both the building foundation and sanitary manhole. Ensure there is a minimum of 5” separation.**

*Team Response: Comment noted and the pipe is depicted further than 5”.*

**23. The pipe connections into the existing in Stewart Circle should be revised. The existing structure will not be able to accommodate two new connections. The design should be revised to take constructability into account.**

*Team Response: Comment noted there is only one connection onto Stewart Circle.*

#### **E. Sheet 5 – Road Profile (C05)**

**1. No comments at this time.**

*Team Response: Comment noted.*

#### **F. Sheet 6/7 – Storm Drain Profile (C06/C07):**

**1. SD1 Profile.**

*i. Show the sanitary crossing on the profile.*

*Team Response: Comment noted. Sheet C07 show the storm drainage line. There are no sanitary sewer crossings of the storm drainage line.*

**2. SD2 Profile**

*i. A minimum of 18” vertical separation is required at storm/sanitary crossings.*

*Team Response: Comment noted, this requirement is more typical for sanitary and water crossings. However 18” separation has been provided as shown in the enclosed site plan.*

### **3. SD3 Profile**

*i. While the profile shows the storm crossing, there is concern as to the constructability of the crossing due to its close proximity to the adjacent drainage structure. An alternate routing should be considered.*

*Team Response: Comment noted.*

### **4. SD4 Profile**

*i. While the profile shows the storm crossing, there is concern as to the constructability of the crossing due to its close proximity to the adjacent drainage structure. An alternate routing should be considered.*

*Team Response: Comment noted.*

### **5. SD5 Profile**

*i. While the profile shows the storm crossing, there is concern as to the constructability of the crossing due to its close proximity to the adjacent drainage structure. An alternate routing should be considered.*

*Team Response: Comment noted.*

### **6. SD6 Profile. i. No comments at this time**

*Team Response: Comment noted.*

### **7. SD7 Profile**

*i. The applicant should consider raising the inverts within the catch basins to reduce the total depth of the structures.*

*Team Response: Comment noted, to maintain requested 18" separation of sanitary and storm sewers some drainage structures had to made deeper.*

### **G. Sheet 8 – Sewer Profile (C08):**

**1. All utility crossings should be identified in the profiles.**

**i. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, addressed in the enclosed plan set, as requested.*

### **5. Sewer 1 Profile**

*i. A minimum of 18" vertical separation is required at storm/sanitary crossings.*

*Team Response: Comment noted, see response #2i.*

## **6. Sewer 2 Profile**

*i. A minimum of 18” vertical separation is required at storm/sanitary crossings.*

*Team Response: Comment noted, see response #2i & 6i.*

## **H. Sheet X – Landscape Plan (C07):**

**1. Landscape comments from May 18, 2011, planning board meeting have not been incorporated into the plans.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, please provide the 2011 comments to be incorporated as the Applicant has not received any formal Board Comments on landscaping.*

**2. As per comment letter from the Village of Suffern DPW dated July 8, 2011, all shrubs planted in the state right of way or within the sight triangle of the driveway shall have a mature height no greater than 2 feet in height.**

*Team Response: Comment noted and confirmed that the shrubs planted within the ROW and sight triangle will be less than 2' in height.*

**3. Species on the Plant schedule are shown at mature height revise as follows:**

**1. Deciduous trees specify as 3.5”-4” caliper, 20 feet on center.**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**2. Evergreen trees specify at 9’-10’ height. English Holly is slow growing and difficult to source at this size. Substitute Pinus strobus (White Pine) Picea abies (Norway Spruce) or Juniperus virginiana (American Redcedar).**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**3. Shamrock Inkberry has a mature height of 3’-4’. Specify at #5 Container size.**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**4. Gold Coast Juniper specify at #5 Container size.**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**4. The foundation planting bed is very narrow and Green Gem Boxwood is susceptible to Volutella blight requiring good air flow. Substitution of groundcovers such as Liriope (Lilyturf) or Pachysandra is recommended.**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**5. Install evergreen buffer plantings along northern residential property line (see item 2. Above) at 8' on center in 2 staggered rows.**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**6. Include staking for Tree Planting details for deciduous and evergreen trees.**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**7. Include 1.5"-2" mulch with Perennial Planting details.**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**8. Grass monoculture of Kentucky Blue Grass is not recommended. Submit a specification of Bluegrass and Perennial Ryegrass.**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**9. Landscape planting notes: Item 20.5. ISA (International Society of Arborists) recommends tree staking in high wind areas, poor soil conditions, and/or protection from lawn mowers. Tree staking is advised.**

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**10. Ensure the proposed tree locations do not conflict with any underground utilities/ infrastructure.**

***i. Please provide a full landscaping plan. The plan provided is cut off in the middle. Please also add to the sheet legend on the cover sheet.***

*Team Response: Comment noted. Revised Landscape Plan/Plant schedule will be provided at a later date.*

**I. Sheet 9 – Erosion Control Plan (C07):**

**1. Label the total disturbance area on the Erosion Control Plan.**

***i. While the total area of disturbance is now indicated on the plans, the limit does not take into account all construction activity and work within the ROW. The plan should be revised to include ALL disturbance.***

*Team Response: Comment noted, disturbance revised in enclosed site plan.*

**2. The limit of disturbance as currently depicted on the Erosion Control Plan does not seem to consider the regrading required for the proposed retaining walls or swales, review and revise to include all areas / limit of regrading.**

*i. The area of disturbance should also include any proposed disturbance within the ROW. 1. These comments have not been addressed. See response above.*

*Team Response: Comment noted, see response #1.*

**3. Provide dust control notes. i. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, note added to enclosed site plan, as requested.*

**J. Sheet 10 – Truck Turnaround (C10):**

**1. A separate viewport for the garbage truck should be provided.**

*Team Response: Garbage trucks typically do not have turn into this type of garbage enclosure, rather the wheeled dumpsters are rolled out of the enclosure.*

**K. Sheet 11 – Construction Details (C11):**

**1. Provide the location of the proposed concrete drop curb on the Site Plan, sheet C02; a detail was provided but the location was not shown on the plan.**

*i. If no concrete drop curb is provided on the site plan, please remove the detail from the set. 1. This comment has not been addressed.*

*Team Response: Comment addressed as Civil Site Plan Comments: B. Sheet 2 – Site Plan (C02) #11. Drop curbs locations depicted on Sheet C02.*

**2. Revise the Handicapped Parking Detail provided to depict the current dynamic accessible pavement marking. In addition, revise the detail to include the “No Parking Anytime” signage required at the accessible access aisle. 1. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, symbol revised in enclosed site plan.*

**L. Sheet 12 – Details (C12):**

**1. Provide a detail of the required “No Parking Anytime” signage required at the accessible access aisle within the parking area.**

**1. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, detail provided in enclosed site plan.*

**2. Provide an accessible curb ramp detail to match the proposed accessible curb ramps provided on the site plan.**

**1. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, detail provided in enclosed site plan.*

**3. Revise the Accessible Parking Signage to include the Van Accessible Parking sign. 1. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, detail provided in enclosed site plan.*

**4. Provide details of the proposed refuse enclosures provided on the site plan. 1. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, detail provided in enclosed site plan.*

**M. Sheet 13 – Details (C13): 1. No comments at this time.**

*Team Response: Comment noted.*

**N. Sheet 14 – Existing Plan (C14):**

**1. A tree schedule is provided, but the existing trees are not labeled; number the trees on the site plan to match the tree schedule provided along with a note in the schedule whether the tree is to remain or be removed. i. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, tree schedule provided in enclosed site plan.*

**2. Show the proposed limit of disturbance and call out the total area to be disturbed. The area of disturbance should include any disturbance within the ROW and any disturbance as a result of regrading.**

**i. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment addressed previously.*

**Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Comments:**

**A. The eNOI should be prepared and provided for review, including all attachments and signature pages required. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, an eNOI has been prepared and is included in the enclosed SWPPP.*

**B. B. Section 6 of the SWPPP should indicate that if deficiencies are observed during inspections by the trained contractor or qualified inspector, the contractor must begin implementing corrective actions within one business day and complete the corrective actions within five business days if the corrective action does not require engineering design. If the corrective action requires engineering design, the contractor must begin the engineering design process within five business days and complete the corrective action within a reasonable timeframe but no later than within 60 calendar days. See Part IV.B.1 and Part IV.C.5 of the General Permit. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, a narrative has been added at the end of Section 6 of the SWPPP.*

**C. C. In accordance with Part III.A.2 of the General Permit, the SWPPP must demonstrate consideration in narrative format of the future physical risks due to climate change. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, a narrative has been added at the end of Section 6 of the SWPPP.*

**D. D. The SWPPP should include a schedule that identifies the timing of initial placement or implementation of each erosion and sediment control practice and the minimum timeframes that each practice should remain in place or be implemented (Part III.B.1). a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, a table has been added showing the approximate start time for implementing each practice - See section 7 of the SWPPP.*

***Comment E***

**E. E. The SWPPP or Erosion Control Details should specify maintenance requirements for each erosion control practice proposed. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, maintenance requirements for all proposed erosion and sediment control practices have been added to Section 8.4 of the SWPPP.*

**F. F. In accordance with the General Permit's eligibility requirements, the SWPPP should demonstrate in narrative format that there are no expected impacts to historic properties or to species that are endangered or threatened. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, a narrative has been added to Section 1 of the SWPPP.*

**G. G. Modelling and mapping should identify the ultimate outfall of each drainage area. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: A label has been added to the enclosed drainage plan indicating the ultimate outfalls, and these have been included in HydroCAD with the same descriptions. See appendices N (HydroCAD Model) and R (Pre and Post Plans).*

**H. H. Existing and proposed mapping should provide contour labels for existing and proposed contours. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, contours have been added to both maps. See appendix R of the SWPPP.*

**I. I. Provide a legend for pre and post development maps. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, Legend has been added to both maps. See appendix R of the SWPPP.*

**J. J. The SWPPP (page 9) indicates a range for ksat values, and the modeling utilized an infiltration rate of 1.5 in/hr. Please clarify and explain how the design infiltration was determined. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, the SWPPP was updated to use the on-site percolation test results as the basis for the design infiltration rate. See appendix P of the SWPPP.*

**K. K. Indicate depth to groundwater and separation to ground water on the plans. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, the separation between the systems and the groundwater has been added to the Underground Detention Cross Section plan enclosed herewith.*

**L. L. There are concerns of insufficient cover over the system. Please provide elevations to demonstrate that both systems have sufficient cover. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, elevations and detailed views of the covers for both systems are provided in the Underground Detention Cross Section plan enclosed herewith.*

**M. M. The NRCS Web Soil Survey Map Shows a small pocket of 'A' soil bordering a much larger area of 'D' soil. Applicant to ensure that proposed infiltration practices are located on 'A' soils. Applicant to provide soil borings and infiltration test to confirm both suitable soil for infiltration and the infiltration rate. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, percolation test has been provided. See appendix P of the SWPPP.*

**N. N. The existing conditions plan identifies Existing Area #2 as fully wooded. Aerial imagery and the survey show non-wooded areas. The area calculations should be revised to reflect current site conditions. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, Existing Area #2 has been reviewed, and the plans and area calculations accurately reflect current site conditions based on the survey and available aerial imagery. See EXISTING DRAINAGE PLAN in appendix R of the SWPPP.*

**O. O. Provide separate models/reports for both pre & post. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, separate models have been provided. See appendix N of the SWPPP.*

**P. P. Proposed areas 1+2 are modeling as part of the same drainage area in preexisting conditions. The analysis should be consistent throughout. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, The Hydrologic model and drainage area mapping have been updated to ensure consistency between existing and proposed conditions. See appendices N and R of the SWPPP.*

**Q. Q. Table 3a indicates a 1-year post dev flow of 0 cfs. While the area is heavily wooded there should still be some flow attributed to the area. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, Table 3a has been updated correctly. See section 5 of the SWPPP.*

**R. Provide a cross section of the proposed swale. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment no longer applicable. Pipes have been proposed instead of swales on both sides of the lot.*

**R. S. The swale along the northern edge is directing runoff into the road, while the swale to the south is directing runoff into the public collection system. The northern swale should likewise be directed directly into the collection system as opposed to into the roadway. a. This comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment no longer applicable. Pipes have been proposed instead of swales on both sides of the lot.*

**Traffic Impact Comments:**

**A. The overall study methodology generally follows standard traffic engineering practices.**

*Team Response: Comment noted.*

**B. The development of traffic volumes from existing conditions through the 2028 No-Build conditions appears to be arithmetically correct; however, errors were identified in the 2028 No-Build AM Peak Hour traffic volume figure for the intersection of Wayne Avenue and Orchard Street.**

*Team Response: Figures revised and included in the revised Traffic study being submitted simultaneously herewith.*

**C. Based on our review of the study area roadways and intersections, it appears that a significant portion of traffic generated by the proposed development would travel to and from the intersections of Wayne Avenue at Chestnut Street and Wayne Avenue at Orange Avenue. These intersections were not included in the analysis. Please provide justification for their exclusion from the Traffic Impact Study.**

*Team Response: We conducted a new traffic count at the Wayne Avenue/Washington Street and Wayne Avenue/Stewart Circle and revised the trip distribution in the revised Traffic Study being submitted simultaneously herewith. We did not count the Wayne Avenue/Orange Avenue intersection because the trips assigned would not impact the operation of the traffic signal.*

**D. Review of the trip distribution indicates that the applicant's engineer assumed an even split of site-generated traffic traveling northbound and southbound on Wayne Avenue. This assumption is inconsistent with the observed traffic volumes at the study intersections, which indicate a greater proportion of traffic traveling to and from the south along Wayne Avenue. As such, the trip distribution used in the study does not reflect existing travel patterns and should be revised to represent more realistic conditions.**

*Team Response: See answer to C.*

**E. To accurately quantify traffic impacts associated with the proposed development, the Traffic Impact Study should be updated to incorporate a revised trip distribution and include analysis of the intersections at Wayne Avenue and Chestnut Street and Wayne Avenue and Orange Avenue. a. These comments have not been addressed. The applicant has stated that "DOT has confirmed that there are no issues with the Traffic Report. The Site engineers will reach out to Shahid to go over any minor site plan issues and permitting as requested." All correspondence should be provided for review.**

*Team Response: See answer to C.*

### **DPW Memorandum 02-17-26**

**A. Soil Stockpile Detail – Sheet C08 – Distance from toe of stockpile to placement of silt fence must be ten feet (10' 0") minimum. a. This comment has been partially addressed. The plan view should also be updated to show 10' minimum.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, addressed in enclosed Site Plan, as requested.*

**D. Provide manufacturer's specifications, catalog cuts, and maintenance requirements for all Stormwater Management Practices. a. The comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted and addressed in enclosed Site Plan, as requested.*

**E. Required Stormwater Management Maintenance Agreement between Property Owner and the Village of Suffern.**

*a. “In accordance with an email from the Planning Board Attorney, the Stormwater Management Maintenance Agreement will be a condition of Site Plan Approval that the Applicant will satisfy utilizing the Town’s form to be provided by the Planning Board Attorney after Site Plan Approval.” This comment remains applicable until such a time that a final agreement is provided.*

*Team Response: Comment noted. Again, the Applicant has confirmed with the Planning Board attorney that this Agreement will be a condition contained in the Site Plan Approval.*

**DPW Memorandum 03-16-26**

**A. Limits of disturbed area need to be broadened to include all areas disturbed as a result of construction activities, associated utilities, stormwater conveyance and grade modifications. a. The comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment addressed previously in response.*

**B. All ADA ramps shall include ADA detectable pad in yellow. a. The comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment addressed and the addition on a “yellow” detectable warning tile has been called out on the enclosed Site Plan.*

**C. Stormwater conveyance system and all associated stormwater management practices shall be identified on a separate drawing entitled “Stormwater Management Plan” (Remove from “Utility Plan”). a. The comment has not been addressed.**

*Team Response: Comment noted, plans added.*

**Planning Board Meeting Notes - 01-21-26**

**A. Public Comments:**

**a. Traffic and Parking**

*i. There are concerns from the residents that the proposed that project traffic will worsen existing congestion and cause parking to spill into Wayne Ave. The applicant responded that the project would have minimal impacts, but the Board noted that existing conditions must be addressed. 1. All comments related to the Traffic study must be addressed to satisfy these concerns.*

*Team Response: As set forth in the enclosed Zarin & Steinmetz LLP letter, the Applicant is not responsible for mitigating existing conditions.*

## **b. Flooding and Stormwater**

***i. Multiple residents expressed concern about flooding on the site and surrounding properties, especially runoff from Nordkop Mountain (which is in Harriman State Park). Questions raised about where the stormwater will go and whether the system can handle major storm events. The applicant stated that the SWPPP provides 100% containment for the 100-year flood, and the system includes infiltration chambers, swales, and percolation into the soil. 1. The applicant has failed to demonstrate 100% containment of the 100-year storm. Under the current design, the upland flow and some landscaped areas are currently being diverted into the public system. In addition, with the introduction of new curbs along the front of the property, the existing inlets in the ROW will now be behind a curb. Furthermore, the front yard of the site is presently functioning as a drainage depression. These new curbs will result in the impoundment of additional water within the ROW and exacerbate the existing flooding. Additionally, available soil mapping shows that only a small portion of the site contains soil suitable for infiltration. The applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed infiltration practice is located within this suitable area, nor have they conducted infiltration testing to confirm that infiltration is feasible at all. It must be demonstrated that the proposed drainage system can accommodate the additional upland flow while accounting for a potentially reduced infiltration footprint***

*Team Response: As set forth in the enclosed Zarin & Steinmetz LLP letter, the Applicant is not responsible for mitigating existing off-Site conditions. The drainage system proposed as part of the Project will contain the 100-year storm event for the proposed Project. Further, infiltration testing was performed in December 2025 and is included as an appendix to the enclosed SWPPP.*

## **c. Pedestrian Safety**

**i. There is concern about the lack of sidewalks across Route 202, and the safety implications for families and children. 1. This comment has been partially addressed and should be coordinated with the NYSDOT.**

*Team Response: The Applicant will discuss with the NYSDOT the feasibility of a future crosswalk.*

## **d. Density and Site Layout**

**i. Some residents felt that the project is too much housing for the size of the lot. 1. The project complies with allowable density as per the zoning code. A calculation to this effect should be added to the plans.**

*Team Response: See Sheet C01 of the Site Plan Set which confirms that the Applicant meets all dimensional requirements of the Zoning Code.*

## **B. Planning Board Comments:**

### **a. Additional Engineering Submissions**

#### ***i. Updating the stormwater analysis that demonstrates 100% containment of the 100-year flood.***

*Team Response: The project completely contains the proposed 100-year storm for the proposed development see SWPPP and HydroCAD analysis.*

#### ***ii. Clarification of how runoff from Nordkop Mountain (which is in Harriman State Park) is being managed.***

*Team Response: Runoff from Nordkop Mountain flows along the pre-established path/system. We refer you to the letter prepared by Zarin & Steinmetz LLP submitted herewith confirming that the Applicant need not manage existing off-site conditions.*

#### ***iii. Confirmation that the system contains the difference between existing and proposed impervious surface runoff. 1. These comments have not been addressed. Please see response above.***

*Team Response: See enclosed SWPPP and HydroCAD analysis.*

### **b. Addressing Existing Conditions**

#### ***i. The Planning Board emphasized that existing drainage and flooding issues should be considered in the design.***

*Team Response: As per the SWPPP and the HydroCAD analysis the project will not contribute to current purported flooding. The analysis enclosed herewith demonstrates that the project and associated site will more than adequately handle the 100-year storm event for the proposed construction. It additionally shows that we might even be able to handle the off-site runoff to the 25-year storm event and make it slightly better. The biggest issue causing the existing flooding is the existing undersized storm drainage system handling off-site runoff in Wayne Avenue (New York State Route 202)runoff, which the Applicant will not be tying into.*

#### ***ii. The applicant must demonstrate that the project will not worsen existing conditions on or off site. 1. These comments have not been addressed. Please see response above.***

*Team Response: Refer to response to comment b(i) above.*