

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

Date: December 6, 2019

Re: **23-28 Creek Drive, Site Plan Application and Lot Line Alteration**

I have reviewed October 29, 2019 response letters from Aryeh Seigel and Hudson Land Design, November 18, 2019 City Council Concept Plan Resolution, September 16, 2019 Army Corps of Engineers letter, correspondence with MTA regarding a grading easement, October 28, 2019 Lot Line Alteration sheet, and sheets 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10 of a 12-sheet Site Plan Application set with the latest revision date of October 29, 2019.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to construct a mixed-use development on the former DPW site with a total of eight apartments and 20,000 square feet of commercial space. The project is in the Fishkill Creek Development (FCD) district and includes a lot line realignment with the adjacent parcel. A Greenway Trail segment and public park are also proposed as part of the project.

Comments and Recommendations

1. The proposal has received a SEQR Negative Declaration from the Planning Board, variances from the ZBA for parking, building height, and unit sizes, and Concept Plan approval from the City Council. The proposal is now back before the Planning Board for final site plan approval, including specific architectural, landscaping, lighting, and engineering details. The missing sheets should be included in subsequent submittals.
2. For the Sheet 4 Landscape Plan:
 - The Plant Schedule should be revised to show only the plants that are proposed on this site and include the number of each tree and shrub species proposed.
 - Three proposed trees and the very few shrubs shown are not labeled on the plan.
 - The tree planting sizes average 5-7 feet tall, too small for a site and building this large.
 - Section 223-26 C(3) requires at least one tree with a minimum 3-inch caliper for each 10 spaces in a parking area.
 - I recommend additional trees along both sides of the Greenway Trail in the vicinity of the proposed building and to screen the lower parking lot, as represented on the Sheet 6 Renderings.
 - There also should be shrubs and lower plantings throughout the site, for example, to screen and soften the patio wall.
 - The lighting fixture labels are not clear, especially along the west side of the building.

3. For the Sheet 6 Renderings:

- The proposal should be referred to the Architectural Review Subcommittee to assess the building design and consistency with the architectural standards in Section 223-41.13 I.
- The green roof, fixed terrace plantings, and any rooftop accessory equipment should be described on the plans.
- The rooftop access structures should be minimized. Previous plans only showed two such structures.
- The Sheet 1 garage entrance is shown as an off-center 23.7 feet wide, but the Sheet 6 North Elevation shows an 11-foot centered opening.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to email 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
Aryeh Siegel, Project Architect
Michael Bodendorf, P.E, Project Engineer
Tina Andress, V.P. Weber Projects