

August 28, 2018

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



RE: Penelope Hedges Subdivision  
31 Mountain Lane  
Tax Map: 6054-02-535593

Dear Mr. Gunn:

We have reviewed the comment letter from Lanc & Tully Engineering and Surveying, P.C. dated August 8, 2018 for the above project. Below are our responses to those comments, for ease of review the comments are included followed by our responses.

Lanc & Tully Engineering and Surveying, P.C. comment letter dated August 8, 2018:

- 1. The information presented in regards to the driveway sight distances (both for intersection and stopping) do not appear to be in conformance with City Code Section It appears that the actual distances presented, the required minimum distances referenced, and the method of distance measurement do not appear to be correctly or properly depicted. The City Code is based on the latest version of NYSDOT Standards and the project engineer is required to provide a certification on the plan set that the driveway design is done in accordance with Section 192-9(B) of the City Code.*

**Response:** The driveway has been revised to comply with the City Code 192-9(B) and is now properly shown on the plan set. Specifically, the minimum stopping sight distance (SSD) looking left out of the driveway has been extended to 200' which is the minimum SSD for a 30 MPH speed limit according to AASHTO 2011 as referred to in the City Code.

- 2. In regard to water pressure, it is stated in the Badey & Watson letter that the water pressure in the street is 31 psi. However, it is not clear where this pressure was measured. With a proposed house first floor elevation of 373.8 (which is 30' ± higher than the road) and a proposed 175' long, 3/4" water service line, we have concerns with the engineer's statement that a booster pump "may be" required. It appears more likely that a booster pump will be required and the engineer should provide calculations regarding expected flows and pressures which would occur in the event that a two (2) story home were constructed. Additionally, the water service detail continues to be shown incorrectly.*

**Response:** Calculations regarding expected flows and pressures which are intended to occur have been provided with this letter. These calculations show that a booster pump will be required. The applicant is aware of this, as they presently have a booster pump in the existing home at 31 Mountain Lane.

**Additionally, the water service detail has been revised to comply with City code.**

3. *With the proposal requiring the removal of 40 trees, the Planning Board should discuss whether or not any new landscaping should be considered.*

**Response: Comment noted.**

4. *There is a double line shown on the plans which encompasses the proposed house and garage on Lot 2. This line should be labeled. Grading, if proposed should also be shown on the northern corner of this building.*

**Response: The double line shown which encompasses the proposed house and garage on lot 2 is the roof and footing drains. They have been labeled on the plan set and the line type has been revised for clarity. The foundation will act as a retaining wall, the grade will match existing grade when complete.**

5. *As we previously commented, this project will require the preparation of a SWPPP in accordance with GP-0-15-002. The SWPPP should include all the items listed in Part III of the General Permit. The City of Beacon, as an MS4, will need to review and approve this SWPPP along with the NOI prior to submission to the NYSDEC.*

**Response: An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been developed for the plan set and the erosion and sediment control practices have been removed from the Integrated Plot Plan. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan along with the relevant details and notes within the plan set constitute the required SWPPP for the project.**

6. *The proposed dry wells appear to have less than 4 feet of separation from the existing water service for existing dwelling. Also, this water service location is approximate, which may result in the existing service being closer, if not within the dry well footprint the dry wells and/or existing water service should be relocated or the existing water service location should be confirmed through a site investigation to provide at least 10 feet of separation.*

**Response: The existing water service line has been marked by the city water department and field located by Badey & Watson, P.C., although not survey located. It appears that there is 10 feet of separation between the exiting water service line to the proposed dry wells. Additionally, a note has been made on the plan stating that the water line must maintain a 10' horizontal distance from the seepage pits or be relocated.**

7. *The proposed dry wells must be protected from silt and sediment during construction at the site. The plans should show how they will be protected and when they will be constructed during the construction sequence.*

**Response: The plans have been revised to show orange construction fence to be installed around the dry well area to protect it from compaction by heavy equipment during construction. We have also shown orange construction fence around the proposed septic areas to similarly protect them from inadvertent compaction. The construction sequence has been updated to reflect that the drywells should be installed at the end of construction just prior to final stabilization of the site.**

8. *The plans appear to show the proposed privately-owned inlet catch basins connected to the dry wells uphill of the low points in the swales along the proposed driveway. How will the low points on either side of the driveway drain? The catch basin inlets should be located at the swale and driveway low points. An enlarged driveway profile should be provided for at least the first 100 feet of the driveway to clearly show where the low points are located. These catch basins should also be located outside the City right-of-way.*

**Response: The common driveway from the proposed privately-owned inlet catch basins will transition from a crowned driveway to a super elevated cross section to allow this low lost 200 feet to sheet flow to the existing drainage system in Mountain Road. The terrain does not allow for the catch basins to be relocated to the lowest point in the driveway and discharge to the proposed drywells.**

### **Conclusion**

We trust that you will find this letter and the revised plans responsive to your concerns and look forward to the conclusion of the Public Hearing for on September 11.

Thank you for your continued attention to this application.

Yours truly,

**BADEY & WATSON,**

*Surveying & Engineering, P.C.*



by

Glennon J. Watson, L.S.

845.265.9217 x14

[gwatson@badey-watson.com](mailto:gwatson@badey-watson.com)

GJW/msm

cc: U:\83-9177B\WO\_23883\JG31JL18BP\_SubmitsRevisedPlans.docx

enc: five (5) sets of the five (5) sheet Subdivision Plan Set last dated August 28, 2018.