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.

March 4, 2020

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

RE:

16 West Main Street/Beacon Commons

City of Beacon

Tax Map No. 5954-25-616969

Dear Mr. Gunn:

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

- Response correspondence from JMC dated February 25, 2020.
- Plan set titled "Site Plan Drawings Beacon Commons", with the latest revision date of February 24, 2020 consisting of Sheets C-100, C-200, C-600 and L-100 sheets, as prepared by JMC.
- Long Environmental Assessment Form dated 02/25/2020 as prepared by JMC.
- Inflow and Infiltration Study Memorandum dated 02/24/2020 as prepared by JMC.
- Public School Children Analysis Letter dated 02/24/2020 as prepared by JMC.

We would like to note that some of our previous comments may be repeated below since we could not verify that they have been properly addressed due to the limited plan submission. We would recommend that a full plan set submission be provided for the next submission. Based upon our review of the above referenced documents and plans, we offer the following comments:

General Comments:

- 1. An Inflow & Infiltration study of the existing site has been conducted and it should be noted that the site currently has no illegal cross-connections between the existing site and the City's sanitary sewer system. Although no illegal connections were observed, it is unclear as to why the wash sink in the rear of the building is connected to the storm drainage system. The sink should be disconnected from the drainage system and connected to the sanitary sewer system.
- 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. The applicant's consultant has noted that they have

- coordinating with the Planning Board's Traffic Consultant and expect the traffic impact study to be completed within the next month.
- 3. If soil testing has been conducted on the site for the proposed building, was rock encountered? If so, at what depth and will blasting be required? The applicant's consultant has stated soil testing will occur at a later date and a geotechnical report shall be included with a future submission.
- 4. As discussed at the December 10, 2019 Planning Board meeting, the application should be referred to the Fire Chief with regard to emergency access. The applicant has stated that since it appears the building has been conceptually approved, they will provide the fire truck turning plans to the Fire Department.
- A Performance Bond will need to be posted for all public improvements proposed as part
 of the project. As the project progresses, the applicant's engineer should prepare an
 itemized cost estimate for all public improvements and submit to the City Engineer's
 office for review.
- 6. On the cover page, it is unclear as to where Note No. 6 would come into play on this project. If the note is not necessary, it should be removed. Cover page has not been included in this submission.

Site Plan

- 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. The applicant states that additional information will be provided in a future submission, and it is likely that the sewer will exit the building at the corner of West Main and Bank Street.
- 2. As previously mentioned, Detail #10, "Utility Trench Detail", shall have a minimum of 95% compaction, not 92%. *Detail sheet has not been included in this submission.*
- 3. The proposed storm pipe crossing West Main Street crosses multiple existing utilities. Utility profiles should be included in the plan set to show all crossings and show that no conflicts will occur with existing utilities. Stationing shall also be included on these profiles and on the utility plan set to allow for coordination between the plan and profile. Applicant's consultant notes that this will be provided in future submission.
- 4. On Sheet C-100 (Sheet 4 of 24) the proposed stop sign, and no turn right sign, are shown on the wrong side of the road. They should either be installed next to the proposed stop bar or on both sides of the road. The applicant's consultant notes that if the signs were located on the right side near the wall, they would be damaged by a vehicle or plow since it is not behind a curb for protection. We believe that the signs could be located on the proper side of the drive from the rear parking area, as a small curbed corner island could be provided at the intersection since cars leaving the rear parking area are unable to make a right turn out of the site towards Bank Street.

- 5. The size and material of the existing watermain shall be included on the plans. *The applicant states that this will be provided in a future submission.* Based upon the City's water mapping, the line in West Main Street is a 6" cast iron pipe.
- 6. It is unclear where the existing 18" CMP drainage pipe that crosses Bank Street, just up from West Main Street, is coming from. The plan should clearly show where this drainage line starts. The applicant states that they have contacted the DPW for record plans of this area. I have informed the applicant's consultant that there are no record plans for this area and that they will have to conduct further field investigations.
- 7. The detail titled "Stormwater Treatment Landscaped Area" states that the existing native soil will be aerated and used as biofilter soil. What if the native soil is unsuitable to be used as biofilter material? The applicant's consultant has noted that if poor soils are encountered then they will be replaced with new soils meeting the specifications of rain garden/bioretention soil media as described in the NYS Stormwater Management Design manual. The plans should clearly note this along with providing the specifications for the replacement soils.

Erosion and Sediment Control Plan: Sheet not included in submission

- 1. Plan shall be cleaned up so that labels do not overlap and are brought in front of the site plan design.
- 2. The South East Corner of the plan does not have the Limit of Disturbance matching up with what is proposed to be disturbed. This shall be fixed accordingly.
- 3. The limit of disturbance leader is pointing to the proposed wall. This shall be fixed accordingly.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) - Not included in submission

- 1. MS4 SWPPP acceptance form shall be included as an appendix to the document. *Applicant states forms will be included when the project advances towards approval.*
- 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. Applicant states soil testing will be coordinated with City Engineer at a later date.

This completes our review at this time. Further comments may be forth coming 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