

**LANC & TULLY**  
**ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING, P.C.**

---

John J. O'Rourke, P.E., Principal  
David E. Higgins, P.E., Principal  
John Queenan, P.E., Principal

Rodney C. Knowlton, L.S., Principal  
Jerry A. Woods, L.S., Principal

John D. Russo, P.E., Principal  
John Lane, P.E., L.S.  
Arthur R. Tully, P.E.

May 9, 2019

Mr. John Gunn  
Beacon Planning Board Chair  
City of Beacon  
1 Municipal Plaza  
Beacon, NY 12508

RE: 23-28 Creek Drive  
City of Beacon  
Site Plan Application

Dear Mr. Gunn:

My office has received the following in regard to the above application:

- Project correspondence dated April 30, 2019, as prepared by Aryeh Siegel, Architect.
- Project correspondence dated April 30, 2019, as prepared by Hudson Land Design.
- Project correspondence dated April 30, 2019, as prepared by Maser Consulting.
- Full Environmental Assessment Form last revised April 30, 2019.
- Slope Analysis Plan & FEMA Flood Calculation Plan, as prepared by Hudson Land Design.
- Plan entitled "Lot Line Realignment", with the last revised March 26, 2019, as prepared by Aryeh Siegel.
- Plan Set entitled "Site Plan Application – 23-28 Creek Drive," last revised April 30, 2019 consisting of 12 sheets as prepared by Aryeh Siegel, Architect, Hudson Land Design, TEC Land Surveying, P.C., and Landscape Restorations.

Based on our review of the above materials, we would like to offer the following comments:

General Comments:

1. The applicant will need to seek a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the proposed site parking, as they note they will be deficient by 20 parking spaces for the project. The applicant should provide to the Board a status update as to where this stands in the process. The applicant has also noted 3 other variances that will be required for the project (building height, number of stories and apartment area) and should also inform the Board as to their status.

2. The applicant should also confirm that no setback variances will be required for the proposed garage/workshop building as it is located 1.5 feet of the property line.
3. As previously noted, the Infiltration and Inflow Report was found to be acceptable. The findings of the study determined that no illicit connections were found tied to the City's sanitary system that would allow for the inflow of stormwater.
4. Our office has calculated usable area of the site based upon deductions for steep slopes, wetlands, floodway, etc. Based upon our calculations the net buildable area of the parcel is 1.474 acres which would equate to an allowance of 16 units on the site (1.474 acres x 11 units per acre). This confirms the calculations provided by Hudson Land Design in their April submission to the Board.
5. The plan set should be revised to include the most recent improvements recommended by your traffic consultants response letter dated April 30, 2019, such as the cross-walk between projects, additional traffic signage, etc. *The Applicant's consultant notes that these will be incorporated in the next plan submission.*
6. The applicant's consultant has noted that a formal subdivision plat will be provided in the future. The plat shall show all utility and access easements required for the project. Based upon the lot line realignment plan provided, an access easement will be required from the neighboring parcel to allow for access to the project parcel. The plat shall also include parcel owner information. *The Applicant's consultants note that the project surveyor is currently preparing a formal subdivision plat that will be provided with a future submission.*
7. We still recommend that a separate "Signage" plan be provided as part of the plan set. Although the project consultants note that these signs are being added to Sheet 1 of the plan set, it appears that labeling for some signs is missing or cut-off.
8. The Applicant's consultants note that they have met with the Trail Committee and that minor revisions are necessary to the trail and will be provided on a future submission. The Applicant should keep the Board apprised of these meetings and revisions requested by the Committee.
9. This project includes disturbances to the Fishkill Creek floodplain with a mitigation area near the public park area. The project consultant has submitted to the Army Corp. of Engineers for these disturbances. All responses from the Army Corp. shall be submitted to the Planning Board.

Sheet 1 of 12:

1. It appears that a portion of the proposed Greenway Trail is to be constructed off the project parcel in the lower easterly corner of the site. The plan should note who owns this parcel, and if an easement has been secured to allow for the construction of the trail in this location.
2. The north arrow on both plan views on this sheet should be shifted so that it is fully visible.

Sheet 2 of 12:

1. The "Existing Conditions Plan" should show the location of the receiving sewer manhole across the Fishkill Creek from the project site, so that proposed utility easement for the sewer can be properly located.
2. The proposed construction details shown on this sheet should be relocated to the appropriate sheets where the work is proposed or moved to the detail sheets. This would include all lighting details, planting details, etc. as currently shown on this plan.

Sheet 7 of 12:

1. The plan now depicts a cast in place retaining wall to be located along the northerly portion of the parcel. Construction details for this proposed wall shall be provided on the plans. It should be further evaluated as to whether easements will be required to allow for the construction of the wall including excavation, wall footings and the installation of the curtain drain behind the wall. It is recommended that a larger view of this area should be provided on the plans. *The applicant's consultant has noted that the owner has reached out to the MTA to see if a grading easement can be secured. Any correspondence with the MTA should be provided to the Planning Board.*
2. Although the proposed sewer manhole SMH-12 has been shifted to provide clearance between the structure and the retaining wall, we would recommend that SMH-12 be extended further to the north-east and that a new line be installed between proposed SMH-12 and Ex. MH-11, as the proposed retaining wall will be within 2-feet of the existing sewer line. This will be problematic in the future if this existing line needs to be repaired as it is 7-feet deep and any excavation of this line will undermine the proposed retaining wall.
3. The proposed water line to service the project is connecting to the existing water line in Creek Drive, then running south-west, then south-east to the project entrance, then turning 90 degrees and running south-west into the site. Although water main was previously proposed to head down Creek Drive on the adjacent parcel due to a building being previously proposed along the property line, it is now recommended that the water line extension be run directly through the neighboring parking lot directly into the project site to avoid this irregular run since the previously proposed building will no longer be constructed.

Sheet 10 of 12:

1. Although a hand-rail detail has been provided for the handrail proposed along the top of the retaining wall located at the building, as previously noted, the hand-rail and guards shall comply with the International Building Code as adopted by NYS. It is recommended that the project consultant discuss this matter further with the City's building department at this time.

Preliminary Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:

1. Infiltration tests will need to be conducted at locations of the 2 proposed infiltration systems. Our office should be notified prior to testing so we may witness the tests. *Consultant notes that once weather improves, testing will be scheduled.*
2. The general design of the SWPPP appears acceptable, sizing information for the hydrodynamic separators should be provided now. *Consultant notes will be provided in a future submission.*
3. The project scope on page 2 should be updated to match the current proposed project. *Consultant notes will be provided in future submission.*

This completes our review at this time. Further comments may be forthcoming based upon future submissions. A written response letter addressing each of the above comments should be provided with the next submission. If you have any questions, or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Very truly,

LANC & TULLY, P.C.



John Russo, P.E.

cc: John Clarke, Planner  
Jennifer Gray, Esq.  
David Buckley, Building Inspector