

Hudson Todd LLC

4 Cross Street, Beacon, NY 12508 | 646-284-3118 | jDonovan@HudsonTodd.com

14-Nov-2019

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

Re: 2 Cross Street (Hudson Todd) – Response to comments from John Clarke, and Lanc & Tully

Dear Chairman Gunn and Members of the Planning Board:

This letter is submitted to respond to the comments submitted to the Planning Board on November 8, 2019 from Lanc & Tully, and September 6, 2019 from John Clarke:

LANC & TULLY COMMENT MEMO DATED NOVEMBER 8, 2019:

General Comments:

1. Comment: The applicant's consultant has conducted an Inflow & Infiltration study of the existing site and buildings. Based upon the study it was found that the roof leader drains to the sanitary sewer along with a sump pump in the basement. Elimination of these interconnections will remove 2,076 gallons of stormwater from the sanitary system during a 1-year storm event, up to 6,963 gallons of stormwater during a 100-year storm event. We would recommend that these interconnections be removed sooner than later

Response: Comment acknowledged. The interconnections will be removed as soon as practicable. Options are being investigated.

2. Comment: The plan sheets should be number in sequential order such a 1 of X, with "X" representing the number of plans in the set, similar to what is shown on the Hudson Land Design plans found within the plan set.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Plan sheets are and will continue to be numbered in sequential order and the full list of plan sheets are itemized on the cover sheet. We expect the number of sheets in the building design set (architectural and building engineering) to steadily increase as the project evolves.

3. Comment: The Location Map on Sheet A1 should also note the parking lot areas on the opposite side of Cross Street as part of the project site.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Note will be added.

4. Comment: The Site Plan information provided on Sheet A2 is a duplication of the engineer's plans, which is confusing the application. The duplicated information should be removed and/or the titles changed.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Titles will be changed.

5. Comment: The Existing Conditions Survey on Sheet A2 should include a note referencing the survey from which the boundary information was acquired.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Surveyor reference will be included.

6. The “Offsite Parking Plan” on Sheet 2 of 6 from Hudson Land Design should be revised to include the following:

- a. Comment: Clearly show the existing pavement limits.

Response: Comment acknowledged. On both Offsite Parking Plan and Existing Conditions Plan existing pavement limits are currently shown and where not shown they generally follow the building and fence lines. Lines representing the approximate edge of pavement along the Main Street entrance will be added to the plans.

- b. Comment: Sight distance for all entrances/exits from the proposed parking areas.

Response: We are proposing to reuse and improve the existing entrances on West Church Street and Cross Street, while the existing Main Street entrance will not be changed. Parking details may be adjusted after the November City Council Workshop and sight distances will be calculated and provided in a subsequent Planning Board submission.

- c. Comment: How drainage will be handled on the site.

Response: Design for stormwater conveyance and an analysis comparing runoff between pre-development and post-development conditions will be provided in the future as the project progresses.

- d. Comment: Any proposed grading to be conducted on the site.

Response: Grading will be provided in the future as the project progresses.

- e. Comment: Any cross-easements that exist and/or are proposed.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Easements are being drafted and will be included in a subsequent submission.

- f. Comment: More detailed information on the existing parking for 152 Main Street, such as current parking space layout, etc.

Response: The 1983 site plan for 152 Main Street property required 23 parking spaces. The plans will be revised to show that adequate space for the required spaces will remain in the parking area.

7. Comment: The parking proposed on the north-east side of Cross Street is shown to occur over 4 separate parcels. We would recommend that these parcels be consolidated to a single parcel.

Response: Three parcels have been merged (see response to comment 9). The fourth parcel is under separate ownership and will not be merged.

8. Comment: With regards to the parking on the north-east side of Cross Street, what legal instrument will be used to ensure that these parcels cannot be sold in the future, thereby impacting the proposed parking for this site?

Response: Permanent easements, legally recorded, will secure all offsite parking.

9. Comment: We would recommend that the 3 parcels on the building site be consolidated to a single parcel.

Response: Comment acknowledged. The three tax parcels known as 4 Cross Street, 2 Cross Street, and 172 Main Street were merged into a single parcel in August 2019 (and may not be reflected in City records or on the County website until 2020). In addition, the Attorney for the Planning Board has requested that the applicant file an application for subdivision approval and the survey required has been requested and filing shall occur on its receipt.

10. With regards to the “Grading and Utility” plan on Sheet 2 of 6 prepared by Hudson Land Design we offer the following:

- a. Comment: Are the existing utilities (water, sewer, etc.) that serve the existing buildings to remain or be removed?

Response: The water and sewer serving the existing buildings at 4 Cross Street and 172 Main Street will be abandoned and replaced with a single building connection on Cross Street. Additional details will be included in a subsequent submission.

- b. Comment: We would recommend that the roof leader drain line proposed to run across Cross Street from the west side of the building be re-directed to the basins on the same side of the street as the building.

Response: Comment acknowledged. The proposed stormwater pipe in the rear of the building also connects to a proposed catch basin that drains the low point behind the building. The closest connection point, also resulting in the least disturbance, is across Cross Street as shown on the plans.

- c. Comment: The plan notes that no curbing is to be provided at the end of the on-site parking lot to allow for access to 174-178 Main Street. The applicant should explain this further.

Response: No curbing is proposed in this area to allow continued access to the 174-178 Main Street parking area located in the rear of the buildings. Access to this parking area is provided across 4 Cross St, per existing easement. The callout on the plan will be revised to clarify.

- d. Comment: The two parking spaces located on the neighboring parcel at the end of the parking lot should be clearly shown on the plan.

Response: Two parking spaces behind 174 Main Street are dedicated by existing easement to the development parcel. The easement does not fix the precise location of these spaces.

11. Comment: The Grading and Utility plan on Sheet 2 of 6 prepared by Hudson Land Design The EAF notes a usage of 3,000 gallons of water per day. We would ask that a breakdown for this water usage be provided.

Response: Water usage calculations for proposed project have been estimated to be approximately 1,852 gallons/day, as shown in the calculation attached to the 29Oct2019 EAF. A

corrected breakdown of the water usage was submitted as an appendix to the 29Oct2019 Environmental Assessment Form.

12. Comment: A survey should also be provided for each of the parcels located on the east side of Cross Street where the walkway and parking are proposed.

Response: Three historic parcels now exist as a single parcel, as noted in response to comment 9, above. A survey of the consolidated parcel is being prepared and will be submitted at a later date.

13. Comment: As previously noted, we would recommend that a pre and post drainage analysis be prepared for the project to show if more or less stormwater runoff is proposed to be generated by the proposed project, based upon various storm events.

Response: A plan to provide conveyance of the stormwater from the site has been provide on the grading and utility plan. The details of the drainage analysis will be refined as the project layout plan is finalized with the Planning Board. We request guidance from the City Engineer's office on the parameters of the requested analysis, so that we can provide appropriate information in future submittals.

14. Comment: A site lighting plans shall be provided for the project. The applicant notes that a lighting plan will be provided in a future submission.

Response: A lighting plan will be provided in a future submission.

15. Comment: The plan shall all proposed signage, include signage for the ADA parking. The applicant notes that as the plans are advanced, additional signage information will be provided.

Response: Signage for the ADA parking spaces behind the Two Cross Street building is shown on Sheet 2 and details of the signs/spaces are shown on Sheet 4.

Comments and Recommendations

1. Comment: The applicant has made a persuasive argument that the proposal is compatible in many ways with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, but it is inconsistent with several key zoning requirements. Office and multifamily are not currently permitted in the PB district and the PB building height is limited to 2½ stories. The applicant could request that the City Council rezone the northern PB portion of the site into the CMS district, now that the three parcels have been combined into one property with a frontage on Main Street. This would eliminate these zoning conflicts.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Requested rezoning to be on agenda for City Council Workshop Monday November 25, 2019.

2. Under existing zoning, the approval process for the proposal involves multiple actions, including:

- Designation by the City Council of the 4 Cross Street into the HDLO;
- Special permit from the City Council to allow office and multifamily uses on the PB/HDLO site;
- ZBA area variance for 3 stories in the PB district, where 2½ stories are permitted;
- ZBA area variance to avoid 15-foot setbacks for the 4th story in the CMS district;
- Special permit from the City Council for the proposed 4th floor; and
- Site plan and certificate of appropriateness approval from the Planning Board.

Comment: Given these options, the applicant might consider another presentation at a City Council workshop to see if a rezoning or special permit approach is likely to be supported. The addition of affordable housing and a public plaza space are cited in Section 223-41.18 E(7) as positive factors for consideration during the special permit review process.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Potential for support for rezoning and/or special permits is on agenda for City Council Workshop Monday November 25, 2019.

3. Comment: If the 4 Cross Street building was included in the HDLO district, I could not likely recommend changing the 2-story structure with a gable roof into a 3-story attached building with a flat roof. Similarly, adding two floors to the historically significant 172 Main Street, without at least a setback, would be difficult to justify. The applicant should consider architectural modifications consistent with the design criteria in the Historic Preservation chapter, most specifically in Section 134-7 B(2).

Response: Comment acknowledged. Adaptive reuse of historic buildings (both unique and monumental landmarks as well as smaller vernacular structures) often requires exterior modifications and additions to address evolving needs and uses. We believe a conversion of this two and a half story brick building to a three story structure is both necessary and appropriate to address current needs. We look forward to continued architectural design continuing with input from the Council, Planning Board, and Architectural Review Board.

4. Comment: The applicant should be prepared to explain how the existing floor heights in 172 Main Street can be reconciled with the 4-story proposal.

Response: Comment acknowledged. The elevation of the 172 Main St second floor will be changed to match the elevation of the new structure. Details will be included in subsequent submissions.

5. Comment: If the 4th floor includes the 15-foot setback from Main and Cross streets, around 2,000 square feet of top-floor office space would be eliminated from the proposal. The first floor of 4 Cross Street could be used for replacement office space. The new building could also be extended toward the rear parking spaces behind 4 Cross Street, reclaiming most or all of the office space lost to the setback. The setback area would offer attractive green terraces overlooking Main Street for the residents and employees.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Project feasibility requires front-to-back retail (service access at the rear) on ground floor and flexible open office space on upper floors. Functional proportions for flexible office space on a double loaded corridor (communicating between stairway and elevator) are not feasible on this property if a 15' setback is introduced on the 4th floor, ground level office space has limited market appeal to tenants in an urban setting. Terraces, while appealing to some office tenants, would render the project functionally unfeasible.

6. Based on the senior units and square footage, with deductions for utility and circulation space, the applicant has calculated the required parking at 36 total spaces. This based on the CMS district standards, but will need to factor in the different PB parking standards in 223-26 F. The applicant has requested a lower parking count under the provisions in 223-41.18 G(3).

Response: Comment acknowledged. Per Comment 1 above we are requesting City Council returning 4 Cross St. to a business zone (CMS). Revised calculations will be prepared if and as necessary once we have clarity on Council's intent.

7. a) The Off-Site Parking Plan on Sheet GU-1 should show the proposed parking spaces behind 174 Main Street and

Response: As per Lanc and Tully comment 10(d) above.

- b) all the spaces at the 152 Main Street parcel to see how the spaces will be integrated into the existing site.

Response: Will be included in a future submittal.

- c) Also, under Section 223-41.18 G(3)(b), the contractually obligated off-site parking must be within the CMS or PB districts, not the R1-5 district.

Response: Subject of discussion at the November City Council Workshop and further response will be provided in a subsequent Planning Board submission.

8. Future submittals will need a full landscaping plan, lighting plan with fixture specifications, trash disposal methods, and elevations with materials and colors noted.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Full details will be included as the review progresses.

With thanks,

Joseph Donovan