



300 Westage Business Center, Suite 380
Fishkill, New York 12524
T 845 896 2229
F 845 896 3672
cuddyfeder.com

Jennifer L. Van Tuyl
jvantuyl@cuddyfeder.com

February 27, 2018

Hon. John Gunn, Chairman
And Member of the Planning Board
City of Beacon
1 Municipal Plaza
Beacon, New York 12508

Re: River Ridge – Submission cover letter and response to comments from John Clarke and Lanc & Tully

Dear Chairman Gunn and Members of the Planning Board:

At the February 14, 2018 Planning Board meeting, the Board closed the public hearing and authorized its attorney to prepare a draft Certificate of Appropriateness and Resolutions of Site Plan and Subdivision approval for the Board's consideration.

Enclosed is our submission for the March 15, 2018 meeting. This includes:

1. 3 copies of the SWPPP
2. 5 copies of plans (sheets 1 and 3 prepared by Aryeh Siegel and sheets 7-15 prepared by Hudson Land Design)
3. CD with copy of submission documents

We hereby respond to the consultant comments as follows:

LANC & TULLY COMMENT LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 4, 2018:

General Comments:

1. **Comment:** The appropriate HOA documentation shall be submitted so that it can be reviewed by the Planning Board Attorney. The Applicant agrees to the review by the Planning Board Attorney, and requests that this be a condition of subdivision approval.

Response: Comment noted. We request that this be a condition of subdivision



February 27, 2018

Page 2

approval.

2. **Comment:** Although a preliminary retaining wall report was submitted from Civil Design Professionals for the retaining walls proposed at the site, a detailed calculations report with wall plans should be submitted for review. The report and plans shall be signed and sealed by a NYS licensed engineer. The preliminary report also states, "The project geotechnical engineer shall confirm global stability based on the proposed wall design and the actual parameters of the onsite soil." Soil testing should be conducted so that soil data and global stability of the wall can be included in the design report. We would further recommend that the report clearly define acceptable "structural fill" and "select granular" backfill material that can be used. It may be helpful to classify this material using a NYSDOT Item number designation for clarity. The calculation report shall also take into account the stormwater infiltration system located in close proximity to the retaining walls.

Response: Agreed. The Applicant requests that submission of these materials be made a condition of site plan and subdivision approval.

3. **Comment:** The Engineer's Water & Sewer Report should be updated to reflect the actual fire flows that can be achieved from the existing hydrants adjacent to the project, along with calculations for the fire flows anticipated from the hydrants proposed as part of the project.

Response: The report has been revised based on the information available at this time, and considering the requested change of bringing 8" watermain into the site beyond the hydrant tees.

4. **Comment:** The Engineer's Water & Sewer Report states that the water line running along the front of the project will be a 6" line to a point past the hydrant located at the entrance, and then reduced to a 4" line. We would recommend that the water line running from Ferry Street and across the front of the project to the hydrant at the entrance be installed as an 8" line to achieve higher fire flows at the proposed hydrants.

Response: This recommendation has been incorporated into the plans and the report.

5. **Comment:** The Engineer's Water & Sewer Report states the installation of a 6" fire flow meter, then an 8" double check valve installed after the meter. The size of the meter and double check valve should be coordinated with one another.

Response: Both the meter and the double check are now shown at 8".

C&F: 3679067.1



February 27, 2018

Page 3

6. **Comment:** Developer will need approval from NYSDOT for proposed work within the NYSDOT right-of-way, and Dutchess County Department of Health approval. All correspondences to and from the agencies shall be submitted to the Planning Board.

Response: We intend to submit to both agencies concurrent with this Planning Board submittal. Copies will be forwarded to the Planning Board.

7. **Comment:** We would recommend that the entrance sidewalk to service the staircase from Wolcott to Ferry Street be shifted to the south, so that Unit 1 does not have to share the access with the general public.

Response: The terminal section, per conversation with NYSDOT personnel onsite, was not to be changed. Therefore, the sidewalk as previously configured remains. It is only slightly different than the other proposed sidewalks to the units which connect to the public sidewalk along Route 9D.

Preliminary Subdivision Plat: (repeated, although not submitted this submission)

1. **Comment:** An easement will be required across the common HOA parcel allowing for ingress and egress to each of the 18 proposed residential lots. The applicant notes that this should be a condition of Final Approval.

Response: Agreed. We request that this be a condition of final approval.

2. **Comment:** Additional easements may be necessary for the running of utilities between the HOA parcel and the individual parcels being created. The applicant notes that this should be a condition of Final Approval.

Response: Upon finalizing utility comments from the Planning Board's consultants and the Health Department, the plat and its easements will be updated. We request that this be a condition of final approval.

Sheet 1 of 14:

1. **Comment:** Although it appears a Symbol Legend was added to the plan, the legend is missing the symbols. The legend should be revised to include the symbols for the items listed in the legend.

Response: The symbol legend has been corrected.

2. **Comment:** The concrete stair detail should include details for the hand rails that would

C&F: 3679067.1



February 27, 2018

Page 4

be installed with the stairs.

Response: This detail is now included on Sheet 1 of the plans.

3. **Comment:** A north arrow should be provided on the plan. This comment is applicable to all plans having a plan view.

Response: North arrows have been added to the plans.

4. **Comment:** The roads should be labeled on the plan.

Response: Roads are labeled on the plans.

Sheet 3 of 14:

1. **Comment:** The "Retaining Wall" detail on the bottom of the plan should be enlarged and darkened for clarity.

Response: The retaining wall detail has been clarified.

2. **Comment:** Consideration should be given to lightening the existing topography so that the proposed plantings are visible. We would further recommend that the proposed plantings, and their respective callouts, are darkened.

Response: The drawing has been clarified.

3. **Comment:** It appears that the planting of several of the proposed trees along the front of the project may be in conflict with the existing guide rail located on the south side of the project.

Response: The locations of proposed trees have been adjusted to avoid conflict with the existing guardrail, and the Landscape Plan has been corrected.

Sheet 7 of 14:

1. **Comment:** The soil data collected from the on-site deep tests and percolation tests performed at the site should be provided on the plan.

Response: Soil test results have been added to the Grading Plan.

2. **Comment:** It is recommended that spot elevations be provided along the top and bottom

C&F: 3679067.1



February 27, 2018

Page 5

of the curb lines to clearly define curb grades.

Response: Several spot elevations have been added to the Grading Plan.

3. **Comment:** The roads should be labeled on the plan.

Response: The road names have been added to the Grading Plan.

4. **Comment:** Grading for the stairs to the Ferry Street cul-de-sac should be shown on the plan.

Response: The stairs are generally above grade and require no grading. Where the stairs are above grade, an outside wall will extend to the stair's foundation. Where the outside grade is above the level of the steps (refer mainly to the initial portion of the staircase near Ferry Street), an outside wall will extend up to retain existing grades.

5. **Comment:** The Post Construction Notes on this sheet should be revised to state that record drawings of the project including all utilities will be provided to the Building Inspector after construction is complete.

Response: The post construction notes have been modified.

Sheet 8 of 14:

1. **Comment:** We have concerns of the possible impacts of the stormwater infiltration system on the retaining wall system given their proximity to one another. The bottom of the retaining wall in this location has an elevation of 104.0, whereas the bottom of the stone for the stormwater infiltration system has an elevation of 110.0. Given the elevation difference between the two, and only a separation distance of 15 feet, we have concerns of increased hydrostatic pressures being built up behind the wall, leading to a future wall failure. We are also concerned with the possibility of the infiltrated stormwater draining towards the wall underdrains and being directly discharged towards Hammond Plaza, therefore not infiltrating into the ground as design. One possibility to avoid these possible scenarios from occurring would be to relocate the infiltration system to a location below the proposed retaining walls.

Response: As discussed at the Planning Board meeting, there are several measures that are being contemplated, but will not be finalized until final wall design is complete. These measures include the incorporation of a clay key on the downhill side of the infiltration basin area, and also collection of underdrains

C&F: 3679067.1



February 27, 2018

Page 6

behind the walls that will discharge to the catch basin system located downhill of the walls. Final design may also incorporate a stone chimney drain. Notes have been added to discuss these options, and a preliminary clay key has been shown

2. **Comment:** The lowest sewerable elevation (LSE) for each unit should be checked based upon a 2% grade from the sewer main to each respective unit. Although the response states "The LSE is the basement or garage floor elevation", if the LSE is set to the garage floor elevation, the sanitary sewer service lines would have insufficient coverage, or actually be above the grade given the downward slope in grade to a drain outside units 1 thru 7.

Response: The LSE has been updated to match the raw inverts as previously shown. In addition, sewer lateral profiles have been provided for review.

3. **Comment:** Stationing should be provided along the utilities to correspond with the stationing provided on the various profiles.

Response: A master stationing plan has been provided on the Water Profile and Stationing Plan (sheet 11 of 15).

4. **Comment:** We would recommend that the water line proposed along the front of the project as 6" ductile iron pipe be changed to an 8" ductile iron pipe to improve possible fire flows at the hydrants to be located on site.

Response: The water line is shown as 8" CL52 DIP.

5. **Comment:** The meter pit drain line it currently direct towards the proposed stairwell leading to Ferry Street. The drain line should be re-directed, so that water is not drained onto the stairs.

Response: The drain has been extended toward the curbline.

6. **Comment:** The valve proposed on the main line prior to the entrance should be shifted to after the hydrant tee for the hydrant located at the entrance. A valve should also be added on the hydrant line leading into the site after the tee off of the main line.

Response: The valve configuration as recommended has been provided.

7. **Comment:** As the water system is a private system, a note should be added to the plans stating that the water service connection, meter pit, and water lines running through the site are the responsibility of River Ridge Town Houses.

C&F: 3679067.1



February 27, 2018

Page 7

Response: A note has been added to the Utility Plan.

8. **Comment:** A drainage manhole should be provided on the inlet row of the stormwater infiltration system to allow for cleaning as required in the long-term maintenance schedule.

Response: We contacted Cultec regarding maintenance. Their response has been included within the SWPPP. The water quality inlet proposed meets their recommended standards for maintenance.

Sheet 10 of 14:

1. **Comment:** Each profile shall be labeled with a title and location.

Response: Profile titles have been added.

2. **Comment:** The profiles shall be updated to include all water and sewer line crossings.

Response: We believe that all existing and proposed crossings have been shown on the profiles.

3. **Comment:** The profiles shall be updated to include the proposed retaining walls and proposed stairs to the Ferry Street cul-de-sac.

Response: The retaining walls and the stairs are shown in the profile views.

Sheet 11 of 14:

1. **Comment:** Each profile shall be labeled with a title and location.

Response: Profile titles have been added.

2. **Comment:** Although valves and fittings are called out at the bottom of the profiles, they should also be shown on the profiles.

Response: Valves have been shown on the profiles.

3. **Comment:** We would recommend that a sleeve be provided for the water line in where it crosses under the retaining walls, so that in the event of a leak or break in this area, the retaining wall does not fail.

C&F: 3679067.1



February 27, 2018

Page 8

Response: A water main encasement has been added.

4. **Comment:** A profile should be added to the water line running to the hydrant on the interior of the site from the entrance.

Response: A profile of the stub to the interior hydrant has been provided.

5. **Comment:** Profiles should be updated to include water crossings, sewer crossings, and the proposed stairs to the Ferry Street cul-de-sac.

Response: We believe that all existing and proposed crossings have been shown on the profiles. The stairs to Ferry Street have also been added.

Sheet 12 of 14:

1. **Comment:** Note No. 2 under the gravity wall detail shall be revised to further state that the final engineering calculations and details shall also be submitted to the Beacon Building Department and the City Engineer for review.

Response: The note has been added.

Sheet 13 of 14:

1. **Comment:** The stormwater inspection and long-term maintenance notes provided on Sheet 7 should also be provided on this Sheet, adjacent to the underground detention system detail.

Response: In order to avoid potential future conflicting notes/revisions, a note has been added to the detail referring to the notes on the Grading Plan.

2. **Comment:** Inspection port details for the underground detention system should be provided.

Response: A detail of the inspection port has been provided.

Sheet 14 of 14:

1. **Comment:** We would recommend that the Meter Pit detail be enlarged for clarity.

Response: The meter pit detail has been enlarged.

C&F: 3679067.1



February 27, 2018

Page 9

SWPPP Comments:

1. **Comment:** Water quality/runoff reduction volume was only calculated for the area tributary to underground infiltration area in the parking area (watershed 30). Water quality/runoff reduction volume calculations should account for all disturbed areas of the project.

Response: A sitewide evaluation of the water quality volume has also been included in the SWPPP.

2. **Comment:** Sizing for the hydrodynamic separator should be provided in the SWPPP.

Response: Contech has provided a calculation sheet which is now included in the Appendix of the SWPPP.

3. **Comment:** The depth of stone surrounding the Cultec units appears to 8' in the stormwater modeling although the detail on the plans shows less. The stone depth and elevations should be clarified.

Response: The stone depth callout on the detail has been revised to match the model.

4. **Comment:** Channel protection volume requirements and control should be discussed in the SWPPP.

Response: CPv is discussed in the SWPPP. Refer to Section 6.8.3.1 which notes that the entire CPv is infiltrated through the practice.

5. **Comment:** The report shows peak flow rate increases at several stormwater discharge point for several design storms. Increases in peak flow rates at any discharge point are not acceptable. The drainage design should be revised to control flows to this design point. This may be accomplished by capturing additional area surrounding the project and directing it to the underground stormwater system.

Response: Please refer to the updated SWPPP.



February 27, 2018

Page 10

JOHN CLARKE COMMENT LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2018:

Comments and Recommendations

1. **Comment:** Since this property is in the Historic District and Landmark Overlay Zone, the Board will need to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness with any final approvals.

Response: Comment noted.

2. **Comment:** The building elevations were revised and then evaluated by the Architectural Review Subcommittee at its January 11, 2018 meeting. The Subcommittee agreed on a variegated brick color pattern, suggested that the cross-gables be lowered on the buildings flanking the entrance drive, and accepted the more asymmetrical roof types, materials, and building forms as proposed along Wolcott Avenue.

Response: Agreed. These comments have been incorporated in the plans and construction drawings.

3. **Comment:** After comments by a number of neighbors, the applicant is now proposing to eliminate the lower pocket park, the rear path along the cemetery, and the retaining wall stairs. The Board should decide whether the application should at least retain stairs down the wall to allow residents access to the lower part of the property with views of the cemetery. By not connecting a path down the slopes, any potential attractive nuisance for the area could be avoided.

Response: This issue was resolved at the February 14, 2018 Planning Board meeting. The stairs and the path have been eliminated from the plans.

4. **Comment:** I recommend a crosswalk at Rombout Avenue, which will be used by pedestrians crossing Wolcott Avenue and heading to the new stairs at Ferry Street towards the Train Station. The crosswalk should be shown on the northern side of the intersection to provide better sight distance to the south, with a note on the plans that it is subject to DOT approval.

Response: It is our opinion that a crosswalk on either side of Rombout Avenue has limited sight distance. The crosswalk has been shown on the plans and relocated north of Rombout Avenue, as requested. As noted on the plans, both the permission to place the crosswalk and the location of any permitted crosswalk are within the sole jurisdiction of NYSDOT review and approval.

C&F: 3679067.1



February 27, 2018

Page 11

5. **Comment:** The Landscape Plan should show the planting codes and arrows in a darker ink so that it can be easily read. At the Architectural Subcommittee meeting members also asked that the street trees along Wolcott Avenue be at least 3½ inches diameter to help establish an attractive frontage as soon as construction is complete.

Response: The plans now show the trees along Wolcott Avenue at a minimum 3½ inch diameter. The ink for the planting codes and arrows has been darkened.

We look forward to meeting with the Board on March 14, 2018, as the Board considers the Certificate of Appropriateness and Resolutions of Site Plan and Subdivision approval.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jm', is written over a faint, larger blue signature that is partially visible in the background.

Jennifer L. Van Tuyl

Enclosures