

To: John Gunn, Chair, and the City of Beacon Planning Board

Date: May 9, 2018

Re: **184 Main Street Site Plan**

I have reviewed the March 21, 2019 Site plan Application, March 7, 2019 Full EAF Parts 1 and 2, and a 2-sheet Site Plan set dated March 27, 2019.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to replace an existing 1-story restaurant with a new 2-story building containing two restaurants. The parcel is in the Central Main Street (CMS) district and the Historic District and Landmark Overlay (HDLO) Zone.

Comments and Recommendations

1. The following questions should be revised on the Full EAF:
 - B.b and e should be answered yes and the columns filled out. A County Planning Department referral is required because the parcel is within 500 feet of a County building;
 - B.i.ii should be answered yes. The City has an adopted LWRP;
 - C.1 should be answered no;
 - C.2.a should be answered yes, then no;
 - C.3.a should include that the parcel is in the Historic District and Landmark Overlay Zone;
 - D.1.g should be answered yes and the subsequent questions filled out;
 - D.2.c and d should be answered yes and the subsequent questions filled out;
 - D.2.l should include expected construction hours;
 - The DEC Environmental Mapper sheet should be included to confirm some of the answers.
2. Adding a second floor is consistent with the minimum 2-story requirement for the CMS district in 223-41.18 E(6), but the existing building is a contributing structure in the Lower Main Street National Register Historic District. It is also in the HDLO and subject to the Certificate of Appropriateness approval process in Chapter 134, Historic Preservation.
3. The building design should be referred to the Architectural Review Subcommittee. The applicant will need to justify the building design in relation to the criteria in 134-7 and the CMS design standards in 223-41.18 J. Based on these standards, the existing storefront and cornice would likely need to be retained and new elements should be compatible to the original brick, window types, and roof cornice with no projection beyond the existing front of the building.
4. The proposed 10-foot rear setback will need an area variance since the parcel is 100 feet deep.
5. A 10 percent landscaped area is required under 223-41.18 E(12), but the Planning Board may waive it for lots 5,000 square feet or less.

6. Parking space requirements in the CMS district are regulated by 223-41.18 G(2-5), not 223-26 F, so a parking variance may not be required. The Planning Board may waive on-site parking under G(4).
7. The second-floor piers and rear addition would extend out into the alley 2.6 feet to the full width of the parcel. Do vehicles ever use the existing alley and does the owner have an alley easement for construction purposes or trash removal? If the alley is for pedestrian use only, the front curb ramp could be removed and an extra street tree and on-street parking space could be provided.
8. Under 223-13 G, the side and rear yard fencing can only be 6 feet high. A fencing detail should be provided.
9. The parcel identification on Sheet A1 should be 811956

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me.

John Clarke, Beacon Planning Consultant

c: Dave Buckley, Building Inspector
Jennifer L. Gray, Esq., City Attorney
Arthur R. Tully, P.E., City Engineer
John Russo, P.E., City Engineer
Joe Buglino, R.A., Project Architect