



City of Beacon Parking and Traffic Safety Committee

City Hall
1 Municipal Plaza, Beacon, NY 12508

Minutes

April 30, 2020 at 9 am

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee (PTSC) will be meeting via conference call.

Attendees: Fire Chief Gary VanVoorhis, Lieutenant Sands Frost, Jill Reynolds (Planning Board Representative), Collin Milone (Secretary). Not in attendance, Matt Dubetsky (Chair), Michael Manzi (Superintendent of Streets)

➤ **Old Business**

1. Cliff St. and Beacon St.
2. E. Main St. / Spring St. / Washington Ave.
3. Blackburn Ave. and Fishkill Ave.
4. Howland Ave. Truck Traffic
5. Matteawan Rd. Crosswalk
6. Sargent Ave. Sidewalk
7. Churchill St. Parking Lot to Main St.

➤ **New Business**

1. Proposed Zoning Changes
2. Exeter Circle
3. Roundtree Court amended parking proposal

➤ **Old Business**

1. Cliff St. and Beacon St.

Please see this note from a resident:

Today was the second morning in a row (and the umpteenth time over the past few years, with ever increasing frequency) that I have had to lay on my horn as a car sailed through the intersection at Cliff St. and Beacon St. We have many kids walking to South Ave. school along Cliff St., and this intersection is becoming increasingly dangerous the more and more people move to this neighborhood.

*The intersection is askew, and I realize it's sometimes hard to gauge whether a car opposite you has actually stopped, and it's hard to see around the corner, but people **MUST** slow down there.*

I recommend larger, brighter signage reminding drivers that is in fact a four-way stop. Currently, people just seem to have no idea, and they just zip on through.

Can you please turn your attention to this dangerous situation? I'm concerned that it will only be getting worse, as density increases in the area.

Thank you so much, and please let me know what else I can do!

Committee Recommendation: The PD will monitor, CM will update the resident, and this item will be placed on the March 26 agenda.

March update: PD has monitored; however, traffic has slowed greatly due to COVID-19. He would like to review again at a later date when traffic has returned to status quo to get a more accurate gauge of the area. He thinks it is marked very well. The "All Way" sign on the stop signs is faded and perhaps they should be replaced. MM will look to see what he has in stock, if he doesn't have any, he will order some new ones.

April Update: SF said that PD will monitor when things return back to normal.

2. E. Main St. / Spring St. / Washington Ave.

Please see the note below from Councilmember Dan Aymar-Blair

Two constituents asked me to look into the intersection of East Main and Spring and Washington, the corner with Barb's Butchery. Pulling out of Spring St in a car, you have no view of traffic coming from around the bend. (I have experienced this myself.) They also said its' very dangerous crossing for the same reason that cars come whipping around that bend.

Now Amber and Jodi said this topic was brought up already and may have already gone to the traffic and safety committee. So hopefully something's in the works for this intersection. I just wanted to add my two cents because I think this is an important one for the city to deal with.

Councilmember McCredo referred this to the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee on behalf of the JV Forrester Lego League on December 9, 2019. The Committee reviewed the comments at the next meeting on January 23rd. Please see an excerpt from that meeting below.

East Main St. and Spring St.

Please see the letter below:

The JV Forrester Lego League has a proposal for a four way stop sign at the intersection of East Main St., Spring St., and Washington Ave., near BarB's Butchery. Some cars speed on Washington Ave.. It has no current stop sign and it is quite difficult to see around.

Thank you very much for looking into this matter.

Committee Recommendation: The committee recommended that the PD monitor the area over the course of the next month. This item will be revisited at the February 27th meeting of the PTSC. CM informed Councilmember McCredo.

February Update: The PTSC has referred this to Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development for review and comment. It will be placed on the March 26th agenda.

Please see the comments below from Dutchess County Planning and Development Junior Planner, Dylan Tuttle.

We reviewed the sight lines, available traffic volumes, and crash history for this site. Sight lines from Spring St are clearly an issue, and we agree that a four-way stop is likely the best solution. A few notes:

- While the intersection's crash history, volumes, and speeds do not meet the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices' (MUTCD) guidance for a 4-way stop, one of the considerations under "other criteria that may be considered" is "locations where a road user, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able to negotiate the intersection unless conflicting traffic is also required to stop." See [section 2B.07](#). The MUTCD requires an engineering study before making such a change.
- There were 12 reported crashes at this location over the last 5 years (2015-2019). One was directly related to sight lines. Two involved pedestrians. While speeding was not specifically identified as the cause of any crashes, it was likely a factor in a few. These are just reported crashes, and do not take into account close calls or unreported incidents.
- Stop signs on E Main St/Washington Ave would make it easier and safer for vehicles on Spring St to enter the intersection, and would slow traffic in general around the curve. Stop signs could also, however, lead to an increase in rear-end crashes. Compliance with the new signs would be essential to avoiding the bad crashes that can occur when road users (including pedestrians and bicyclists) expect a driver to stop and they do not. Sight distance approaching the signs is one key to this. The sight distance approaching the potential stop sign around the curve on E Main St appears adequate, but that should be verified in an engineering study.

- When new stop signs are installed, all stop signs should be given the “All Way” plaque (MUTCD plaque R1-3P), and the new signs should be given “New” plaques (W16-15P) for the first several months. The City way also want to temporarily install advance warning signs (W3-1) for the new stop signs.
- We currently only have traffic volumes for Washington Ave (about [2,000 cars per day](#)). I have added E Main St and Spring St to our count schedule for this summer.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Best,

Dylan

March Update: SF will try to find the accident reports at the intersection over the last five years. CM will reach out to Dutchess County for the actual dates of the accidents. Jill said there is increased pedestrian traffic from hikers crossing East Main from Spring Street up to the mountain.

April Update: CM will ask attorneys if engineering study is legally required. JR is in favor of a four-way stop. PTSC will review at May meeting.

3. Blackburn Ave. and Fishkill Ave.

The City Administrator requested the PTSC review the possible addition of a stop sign at this intersection.

Committee Recommendation: The PTSC recommended not adding a stop sign due to the potential for increased congestion. They will consider a crosswalk sign westbound at their March 26 meeting.

March Update: MM will put up a crosswalk sign coming into town. There are three others already up which will be upgraded to the proper coded signs. MM has the signs; they will go up when he has proper staffing to allow.

April Update: Just waiting for update from MM. JR brought up an eradic driver on Robert Cahill Rd., SF recommended calling PD when occurs.

4. Howland Avenue Truck Traffic

Councilmember Dan Aymar-Blair has inquired about potential solutions to truck traffic on Howland Avenue. Please see his message below along with comments from Police Chief Kevin Junjulas.

Last year, I heard from several families on Howland Ave about several problems with their street, most of which we'll have to get to later. A common complaint however was the amount of truck traffic on Howland. It seems truck drivers have discovered this secret passageway to 52 and 84 by way of Howland and Depuyster. I have observed this myself waiting at my kids' bus stop. The trucks are loud when they hit those sunken drainage pits and they go around that turn by the JW center awfully fast.

So, I assume my questions would need to go the traffic and safety committee? They are:

- If truck traffic is permitted, can we ban trucks from what should be a neighborhood street?*
- If truck traffic is not permitted, can we get some signs that say no trucks, probably by the mountain parking lot and then another spot at the other end near Glenham perhaps?*

Comments on Howland Ave. Truck Traffic by Police Chief Kevin Junjulas:

Trucks with a total gross weight of over 10,000 lbs. are not permitted on Howland Ave. unless making a local delivery or pick up. I have advised patrols to monitor the area in question as staffing and workload allow. I agree that better signage in the area will help alleviate the problem as it has been our experience that most drivers just follow GPS and are not aware of the designated truck routes. I will forward a request to the traffic safety committee to look into placing signage along this corridor.

On a side note, some of the code is contradictory, specifically where it says that truck traffic is prohibited on Wolcott Ave. but allowed on Rt. 9D, these roads are obviously one in the same. This needs to be corrected and I will also bring this to the attention of the traffic safety committee.

Committee Recommendation: CM will work with attorneys and Council to prepare a proposed local law clarifying the language and allowing Wolcott Avenue to serve as a truck route. MM and SF will determine sign placement locations.

March Update: MM and SF identified areas where signs should be added. MM ordered the signs; the signs should arrive by the next meeting in April.

April Update: PD will monitor; MM will update PTSC at next meeting.

5. Matteawan Rd. Crosswalk

A resident requested the PTSC review the possible addition of a crosswalk on Matteawan Rd. in front of Meadow Ridge One because of the pedestrian traffic generated by school children.

February Update: The PTSC did not have time to review this item; it will be placed on the March 26th agenda.

March Update: SF said PD will monitor around 7 am to count the number of students who live in Meadow Ridge One when school reopens.

April Update: SF will work with PD and School District to learn how many students live in Meadow Ridge One.

6. Sargent Ave. Sidewalk

A resident requested the addition of a crosswalk on the southeast side of Sargent Ave. from Wolcott Ave. to Education Dr. to accommodate the pedestrian traffic generated from children, particularly during soccer matches.

February Update: The PTSC did not have time to review this item; it will be placed on the March 26th agenda.

March Update: The road is not wide enough for two-way traffic and a sidewalk. There is a grassy area along the stone wall for pedestrians to walk on which is off of the roadway. Sargent Avenue is 15 miles per hour. There are a lot of telephone poles on the east side that would hinder the ability to put a sidewalk there. MM will measure for the price of a sidewalk on the east side of Sargent Avenue. GV suggested writing a letter to the school board to put a parking lot on the entrance roadway to Sargent Avenue School off of Wolcott Avenue.

April Update: PTSC will leave this item on agenda until full committee can comment. SF will ask the crossing guard at Wolcott Avenue and Sargeant Avenue how many students cross each day. GV suggested making a recommendation to the soccer club to park on one side of the access road off of Wolcott and making a trail to the soccer fields. CM will draft a letter for PTSC to review at next meeting with PTSC recommendations to the School District.

7. Churchill St. Parking Lot to Main St.

A resident requested the PTSC review this area for potential pedestrian improvements. The RSA contains several recommendations for this area.

The PTSC did not have time to review this item; it will be placed on the March 26th agenda.

March Update: PTSC recommended allowing the Main Street Access Committee to review. PTSC will review again in April.

April Update: PTSC will not review, and will allow MSA to review and comment. PTSC requests updates every 30 days from MSA.

New Business

1. Proposed Zoning Changes

See attached Memorandum from City Planner, John Clarke.

April: CM will draft letter to Mayor and Council recommending the proposed changes.

2. Exeter Circle

Please see the note below from a resident.

Yesterday upon returning home as I entered Exeter Circle there were cars parked belonging to hikers leaving exactly 8'4" space between them. None of the residents of Exeter Circle needed an ambulance or fire truck. If we had, I think they would have needed 11' There is no good reason for allowing hikers

to park on our street. Most of us have children and built or bought these homes on Exeter Circle for the advantages of living on a cul de sac. Our kids can no longer ride their bikes, scooters etc. around the circle. We cannot go out and play catch with our kids. There is a constant parade of cars turning around the circle. This all seems very unfair for us. The solution appears simple. Parking for residents only. Move the "**no parking from here to corner**" south 50 meters and allow only resident parking from that point on. I hope you will give this serious consideration and take appropriate action before one of our kids gets run over or we need an emergency vehicle that cannot get through.

April: PD has been sending a car to Exeter Circle 4 times daily and ticketing illegally parked vehicles. C.M will update complainant. PTSC will revisit after Scenic Hudson parking lot reopens at Mount Beacon trailhead.

3. Roundtree Court Amended Parking Proposal

From Michael Manzi, Superintendent of Streets:

I do not see a problem with making area across the street from originally proposed **no parking** as long as the committee is ok as well. It would be an area 80 feet between units 15 and 17 and it would be NO PARKING BETWEEN SIGNS.

April: PTSC recommend making the amendment CM will write letter to Mayor and Council.

4. Add to May agenda: PTSC policies regarding review process; length of reviews, re-reviewing items, scope of review.

To: Traffic Safety Committee
From: John Clarke, City Planner
Date: April 6, 2020
Re: Proposed Zoning Changes

The City Council is considering a package of draft Zoning Code changes, including revised Use and Dimensional Tables and other associated amendments to make the Code internally consistent with the new tables and other existing sections. Section 223-13 on visibility at intersections is inconsistent with the more often-cited standards in Subdivision of Land, Section 195-25, shown below. Given that many blocks in the City measure only 200 – 300 feet between intersections and individual lots are often only 40 – 50 feet wide, having a 100-foot visibility triangle seems excessive. The proposed amendment makes the Zoning Code comparable to the standards in the Subdivision of Land chapter.

The City Council suggested that I circulate these draft changes to the Traffic Safety Committee for any comments.

Zoning Chapter 223: Article III, General Regulations

§223-13 Yards, building projections, heights, and accessory structures [deleted and new text in red]

I. Visibility at intersections. On a corner lot in any residence district, no fence wall, hedge or other structure or planting more than ~~three~~ 3.5 feet in height shall be erected, placed or maintained within the triangular area formed by ~~the intersecting street center lines and a straight line joining said street center lines at~~ points which are ~~100~~ 25 feet distant from ~~the point of intersection, measured along said street center lines~~ intersecting lines of the curb or edge of pavement. The height of ~~three~~ 3.5 feet shall be measured above the road surface at the ~~center line~~ edge of the road having the lesser elevation. This subsection shall not apply to existing trees, provided that no branches are closer than six feet to the ground and they are not obstructing street views from the corner.

Subdivision of Land Chapter 195: Article V, General Requirements for Subdivision Design

§195-25 Reservations and easements

E. Sight easements. Sight easements shall be provided across all street or private road corners, outside the street or private road right-of-way, within the triangular area formed by the nearest edges of street or private road pavement and a straight line between two points each 25 feet back from the theoretical intersection of the edges of such pavement prolonged. The easements shall provide that the holder of fee title to the abutting streets or private roads shall have the right to enter the easement area for the purpose of clearing, pruning or regrading so as to maintain a clear line of sight in either direction across such triangular area between an observer's eye 3.5 feet above the pavement surface on one street or private road and an object one foot above the pavement surface on the other. The initial establishment of clear sight lines within the sight easement area shall be the responsibility of the subdivider.