

November 26, 2019

**I. John Clarke Planning and Design Comment Memo, dated November 8, 2019**

Comment No. 1

*A project narrative would be useful for the environmental review process to explain how the project complies with the Comprehensive Plan and the purposes and standards of the Linkage district, to address the on-site parking count, and to justify the requested parking modification. The Board may also ask for a public school impact analysis and a transportation study, assessing train use, walkability, biking, and cumulative traffic impacts on nearby streets and intersections.*

Response No. 1

A project narrative has been submitted. Additional items will be submitted if requested by the Planning Board, and as appropriate.

Comment No. 2

*The proposal is located in the area covered by the City's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP), requiring a Consistency Determination. The applicant should provide an LWRP consistency justification for the project.*

Response No. 2

An LWRP Consistency Report has been submitted.

Comment No. 3

*The plans should include a detailed aerial photo or show all the buildings on the adjacent lots to help assess potential impacts on neighboring properties.*

Response No. 3

An aerial photo has been submitted.

Comment No. 4

*The applicant should explain Parcel 3 shown on the survey, as well as the 15-foot drainage easement and how the northern portion of the proposed building might affect that easement.*

Response No. 4

Parcel 3 appears to be from an old public right-of-way when West Main Street may have stopped and there was a cul-de-sac in front of the site. The project will involve the dedication of the small piece of parcel 3 that extends into the public sidewalk and roadway, Parcels 1, 2 and 3 should be merged into one lot. The previously submitted Site Plans showed the modification of the City drainage easement in order to conveyed upstream off-site drainage through the site.

Comment No. 5

*For the Sheet C-000 Table of Land Use, the Lot Area should be 1.3 acres, since Parcel 2 is not involved in the project. The landscaping coverage also needs to meet the minimum 15 percent.*

Response No. 5

Involving Parcel 2 as shown in Drawing C-100 "Alternative Site Plan" with a proposed parking area results in the pervious coverage of the site to be approximately 17%.

Comment No. 6

*Bike racks and/or a bicycle storage room should be provided.*

Response No. 6

Bicycle storage has been provided in the building for 20 bikes. We will review the feasibility of additional bicycle parking on the site.

Comment No. 7

*For the Sheet L-100 Landscaping Plan:*

- Can any existing trees along Bank Street be incorporated into the plan?
- Street trees should be added along Bank Street in front of the building.
- The parking lot shade trees must be minimum 3-inch caliper (see 223-26 C(3)).

Response No. 7

The landscaping plan shall be revised and resubmitted under separate cover, to include Parcel 2.

Comment No. 8

*For the Sheet C-600 Lighting Plan:*

- The Site Light drawing shows the mounting height of the parking lot fixtures as the distance from the top of the base to the bottom of the lamp. The 20-foot maximum height should be measured from the ground level to the top of the light-emitting portion of the fixture.

- The perimeter light poles, especially along the north entrance drive, spillover light onto the adjacent parcels.
- The lighting levels in the parking area are too high. They should instead average around 1 footcandle.
- Some lighting should be provided for the driveway underpass and building entrances.
- Notes on the plan should describe the fixture types and color temperatures and confirm that the lights will be full cut-off fixtures and shielded so that there will be no direct glare or light spillover onto adjacent properties.

Response No. 8

The lighting plan shall be revised and resubmitted under separate cover, to include Parcel 2.

Comment No. 9

*Sheet C-906 shows chain link fencing for the top of retaining walls. Chain link fencing is not permitted in the Linkage district (see 223-41.21 K(10)).*

Response No. 9

The fence specification will be revised to eliminate chain link fencing and replace it with another fence type such as black aluminum decorative fencing.

Comment No. 10

- The elevations show 3 stories on the uphill sections along West Main and Bank streets, but the floor plans show 4 stories throughout the building.
- The elevations will need materials, major dimensions, floor-to-floor heights, and building heights noted.
- The proposal should be referred to the Architectural Review Subcommittee to assess the building design and consistency with the architectural standards in 223-41.21 K.
- The main building entrance may need more architectural emphasis.
- The underpass building entrance has outward swinging doors onto a 5-foot sidewalk. The sidewalk should be wider and/or the door recessed to avoid stepping into a vehicle lane.

Response No. 10

This is a 4 story building. Portions of the uphill section of the building are below the line of the sidewalk on the street side. However, these spaces are either common space and not apartments,

or windows are provided in other areas.

Elevations will be provided with detailed notes on materials, dimensions, and building heights in future submissions

Comment Acknowledged. We understand that the project will be referred to the Architectural Review Board Subcommittee

The main entrance of the building will be modified to provide more emphasis

The lobby door design has been revised to eliminate door swings interfering with the sidewalk clearance. The submitted floor plans reflect this change

## **2. Lanc & Tully Comment Letter, dated November 8, 2019**

### **General Comments**

#### Comment No. 1

*The applicant's consultant should conduct an Inflow & Infiltration study of the existing site and provide certification to the City of Beacon that the site currently has no illegal cross connections between the existing site and the City's sanitary sewer system. Possible cross-connections that should be looked at would be roof-leaders, sump pumps, existing site drains, etc. If any cross-connections are found, a report should be submitted as to the findings, the volume of I&I being introduced into the sanitary sewer collection system, and the proposed remediation for the cross-connection(s) found. The plans should also clearly show the proposed remediation as outlined in the report.*

#### Response No. 1

JMC has begun an investigation of potential inflow and infiltration cross connections such as roof drains, sump pumps, site drains and plumbing fixtures. The above items were reviewed by running water and adding fluorescent dye and checking downstream structures. A summary memo will be prepared documenting the findings and submitted to the Planning Board at a later date.

#### Comment No. 2

*As the project entails the development of 62 residential units, we would recommend that a traffic study be conducted to determine if there will be any impacts on the intersections adjacent to or near the proposed project, as well any impacts to the existing traffic lights along Route 9D. We would recommend that the City of Beacon retain the services of a traffic engineer to review the project and work with the applicant to determine the intersections that should be studied. This may also impact the answer to question "j" under section D.2 of the EAF.*

#### Response No. 2

JMC will prepare the traffic scope for the Planning Board and the Planning Board Traffic Consultant to review. The traffic study will be completed once the scope is finalized.

Comment No. 3

*The applicant is seeking a parking waiver from the Planning Board, as the project is required to have 62 parking spaces, but the applicant is only proposing 49 onsite parking spaces. The applicant should provide additional information to the Planning Board detailing why only 49 parking spaces are needed for the project.*

Response No. 3

During discussions at the previous Planning Board meeting, it was recommended by the Board and its consultants to investigate the use of the rear parcel. Since then we have reviewed the rear parcel with the City Planning Consultant and City Building Inspector and it appears that the parcel can be used for parking. Therefore Drawing C-100 "Alternative Site Plan" has been provided to show the parking needed to meet the City code.

Comment No. 4

*A sewer study should be conducted of the existing sewer infrastructure to ensure that the system will be able to handle the additional flows proposed to be generated by the project. This would include analyzing the infrastructure from the project site to the lower west main pump station, the pump station, pump station forcemain, and the north interceptor sewer line to the sewer plant.*

Response No. 4

JMC will work with the City to investigate the existing infrastructure. Any plans and reports that can be provided would be appreciated.

Comment No. 5

*If soil testing has been conducted on the site for the proposed buildings, was rock encountered? If so, at what depth and will blasting be required?*

Response No. 5

Soil testing has been conducted on the site and the geotechnical report will be provided shortly.

Comment No. 6

*The sheets of the plan set should be numbered in a sequential order so that the total number of sheets in the set are known. Sheet numbering should appear as 1 of 25 through 25 of 25, where the final number may change based upon the number of sheets in the final set.*

Response No. 6

We will update the list of sheets when they are submitted.

### **Site Plan**

#### Comment No. 1

*Water and Sewer service lines are only shown connecting to the building on the eastern side of the property. How is the water conveyed from the easterly building to the westerly building and sewer conveyed from the westerly building to the easterly building? This should be clarified on the plans.*

#### Response No. 1

The utility connections for the building have not been designed by the project architect and/or project plumbing engineer. The site plans will be revised accordingly as that design is provided.

#### Comment No. 2

*Sight distances to the left and right shall be provided on the plan for the proposed entrances onto West Main Street and Bank Street.*

#### Response No. 2

Acknowledged and they shall be provided in upcoming submissions.

#### Comment No. 3

*Encroachments are shown to the north on the site for a fence, retaining wall and 3 structures. The applicant should shall explain to the Planning Board as to how these encroachments will be rectified.*

#### Response No. 3

JMC and the existing site property owner met with the adjacent property owners to discuss the existing encroachments onto the property as well as to discuss any needed temporary construction easements and/or permanent easements the project would need. At this time, the adjacent neighbors are cooperating and the Alternative Site Plan submitted as part of this subomission was reviewed with the adjacent neighbors. The plan will be further advanced based on feedback from the Planning Board and the City consultants.

#### Comment No. 4

*Sheet C-100 shows a two 15-foot by 15-foot snow storage areas on the site, which appear to be deficient for storage given the overall paved area for the parking lot. Additional storage area should be provided on site, or the applicant shall explain as to how they will ensure snow will be removed from the site in a timely fashion.*

#### Response No. 4

Additional snow storage areas can be provided in a few other areas and will be shown on the updated site plans once feedback is provided on the Alternative Site Plan. The applicant is also investigating snow removal services that would dispose of snow off-site.

Comment No. 5

*Proposed contour lines do not connect to existing contours and should be fixed accordingly.*

Response No. 5

It is unclear where the contours are not connected. Any disconnections would be addressed when a new grading plan is provided.

Comment No. 6

*All ADA Accessible ramps shall be called out on the plans.*

Response No. 6

As modifications are made to the proposed parking lot and submitted under separate cover, the accessible ramps will be labeled.

Comment No. 7

*ADA Parking spaces shall be located closest to main building entrance. Main entrance shall be called out on plans.*

Response No. 7

The plans shall be revised to shift any accessible parking spaces as close as possible to the building entrances and the building entrances shall be labeled.

Comment No. 8

*It is shown that the sidewalk located in front of the ADA parking spaces is 4' wide. Does this leave sufficient room for wheelchair access if a car is overhanging the sidewalk? It is recommended that the sidewalk be increased in width to ensure sufficient room for a wheelchair to have unobstructed access along the sidewalk.*

Response No. 8

Concrete bumper blocks have been proposed to deter vehicles from overhanging onto the sidewalk. However, the proposed sidewalk can be widened.

Comment No. 9

*The crossing of stormwater piping for the stormtech unit system is unnecessary. If the isolator row was flipped to the other end, the crossing of pipes could potentially be eliminated.*

Response No. 9

We will re-review the drainage design however it appears that the pipe alignment needs to be as proposed in order to capture and convey runoff from CI-4-3 into the system.

Comment No. 10

*Calculations and construction details for the type of wall proposed shall be provided.*

Response No. 10

Retaining wall design drawings and details shall be provided under separate cover and subsequent submissions.

Comment No. 11

*A number of the retaining walls appear in close proximity of the property lines. Will any construction easements from neighboring parcels be required for the construction of these walls?*

Response No. 11

There will be temporary construction easements required to install the proposed retaining walls. We have communicated this with the adjacent property owners who appear to be cooperative.

Comment No. 12

*The plan shows proposed lighting atop of the retaining walls in several locations. How is the lighting being installed atop of these walls? Construction details shall be provided showing this installation.*

Response No. 12

Specific details shall be provided for the proposed lights on top of retaining walls under separate cover.

Comment No. 13

*A significant amount of lighting is being spilled from the site on to the neighboring parcel to the north of the site. Lighting shall be adjusted and shielded to reduce the amount of lighting being conveyed on to the neighboring parcels.*

Response No. 13

The lighting plan shall be reduced in scale in order to reduce some of the light levels from encroaching on to the neighboring residential property to the north. An updated lighting plan will be provided under separate cover.

\*



Comment No. 14

*Detail #10, "Utility Trench Detail", shall have a minimum of 95% compaction, not 92%.*

Response No. 14

The detail shall be revised as requested.

Comment No. 15

*Detail #18 "Manhole (Type B)", note 2 states, "The covers shall have vent holes". The manhole covers should not have vent holes on the sanitary sewer structures.*

Response No. 15

The detail shall be revised as requested.

Comment No. 16

*Drainage Inlet details on Sheet C-901 should be revised to include a weep hole in the bottom so that water does not sit in the structure and create a breeding ground for mosquitoes, or the sumps eliminated.*

Response No. 16

The detail shall be revised as requested.

**Erosion and Sediment Control Plan:**

Comment No. 1

*Silt fencing should be shown on the plans parallel to the contour lines.*

Response No. 1

Silt fence shall be installed parallel to the slopes and contours in accordance with the silt fence detail. Any silt fence lines shown on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan shall be adjusted accordingly.

Comment No. 2

*Plan shall be cleaned up so that labels do not overlap.*

Response No. 2

The plan will be made more clear by eliminating some less pertinent labeling.

**Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)**

Comment No. 1

*MS4 SWPPP acceptance form shall be included as an appendix to the document.*

Response No. 1

The MS4 SWPPP Acceptance Form shall be completed and provided as part of the report.

Comment No. 2

*Since infiltration is being considered for the subsurface chamber system and rain garden, soil testing will need to be conducted for these proposed systems, and will need to be witnessed by the City Engineer's office. Using assumed saturated hydraulic conductivity data from the USDA Web Soil Survey is not sufficient.*

Response No. 2

Soil testing will be performed on the site in accordance with NYSDEC regulations. Our office will notify the City to witness the testing if desired.

Comment No. 3

*A hydrodynamic separator is included in the SWPPP but, is not shown on the plans and is not included on any of the detail sheets. If a hydrodynamic separator is to be used, it shall be shown on the plans and a detail shall be provided on the plans.*

Response No. 3

The proposed hydrodynamic separator is shown at the main driveway entrance off West Main Street. It is labeled as WQS-3-1 on the left side of the driveway. A detail will be provided for the water quality structure.

Comment No. 4

*Sizing for the hydrodynamic separator shall be provided in the SWPPP.*

Response No. 4

There are sizing calculations based on the water quality storm requirements within Appendix B of the SWPPP.

p:\2018\18119\admin\comment-response ltr 11-26-2019.docx