

**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.

June 22, 2018

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

RE: Edgewater  
City of Beacon  
Tax Map Nos. 5954-25-566983, 574979,  
581985, & 5955-19-590022

Dear Mr. Gunn:

Our office has reviewed the following documents as presented to the City's consultants at the June 12<sup>th</sup>, Planning Board meeting:

- Sheet 1 of 15, entitled "Site Plan", last revised June 11, 2018, as prepared by Hudson Land Design, TEC Land Surveying, Landscape Restorations, and Aryeh Siegel, Architect.
- Sheet 1 of 1, entitled "Steep Slopes Analysis Map, dated June 8, 2018, as prepared by Hudson Land Design, TEC Land Surveying, Landscape Restorations, and Aryeh Siegel, Architect.
- Letter from Cuddy & Feder, dated June 12, 2018, regarding SEQR & LWRP Consistency Review, along with eleven (11) supplements to support the consistency review.

Our office has also received CAD files from the applicant's consultants on June 20, 2018, so that our office could verify the slope analysis information provided by the applicant. Per the documents submitted, the applicant has reduced the total number of units to be constructed at the site from 307 to 246, a 65 unit reduction, to address comments received from the City Council as well as the reduction in buildable area due to the deduction of steep slopes.

Based upon our review of the submitted plans and documents, we offer the following comments:

General Comments:

1. With the electronic point data provided in the CAD files, our office was able to create an existing surface of the site that could be analyzed to determine the areas on site containing steep slopes of 25% or greater. Once the location of steep slopes was determined, we then looked at each area to determine which of the areas contained 10,000 square feet or more as per the City's recently adopted code. Based upon our analysis of the site, we calculated a total area of 110,533

square feet that would need to be deducted prior to determining the net buildable area for the site. Although slightly higher than the value calculated by the applicant's consultants, the net results still yield a loss of 65 units from the originally planned 307 units, for a unit count of 242. It should be noted that the unit count of 242 is prior to the addition of the 10 allowable units per the City's Affordable Work Force Housing Law, bringing the total allowable units to a new total of 252.

2. We would recommend that a plan be prepared and presented to the Planning Board showing the proposed project laid atop of the steep slope analysis plan, so it is clear as to where the steep slopes on site will be disturbed by the proposed project. We would further recommend that this plan show the original limits of disturbance along with the newly proposed limits of disturbance based upon changes made to the plan to avoid steep slopes where possible, and the net area for the previous and newly proposed disturbance limits be noted on the plan.
3. As there is a reduction in the amount of disturbance to the site and possibly impervious area based upon revisions to the plan, the previously submitted Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will need to be updated for the project.
4. The site plan as presented shows a total of 238 parking stalls to be constructed and a total of 64 spaces to be land banked, for a total of 302 spaces. As parking is proposed under buildings 2 and 3, a note should be added to the plans stating the number of available parking spaces proposed under each of these buildings, to clarify the actual number of parking spaces to be constructed.
5. A sidewalk should be shown along the lower driveway to the south of buildings 3 and 4, to allow for a continuous pedestrian friendly route from the east side of buildings 1, 2 and 3 to the top of the Branch Street entry.
6. Note No. 5 states that the Applicant is proposing only directional signage around the property. This note should be modified to include traffic control signs, as stop signs are also noted on the site plan.

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 Clark, Planner  
Jennifer Gray, Esq.  
Tim Dexter, Building Inspector