

To: Jay Sheers, Chair, and the City of Beacon Planning Board

Date: April 7, 2017

Re: **The Hose Company LLC, 162 Main Street Site Plan**

I have reviewed the March 28, 2017 response letter from Jeff Wilkinson, R.A., an Infiltration and Inflow Investigation from Hudson Land Design, dated March 24, 2017, an 8-sheet Site Plan package, all dated March 28, 2017, and a signed survey of the property from February 10, 2016.

### **Proposal**

The applicant proposes to replace a circa 1950s one-story addition with a 1,565 square foot two-story addition, including a workshop and offices. The site is in the Central Business zoning district, Historic District and Landmark Overlay Zone, and the Lower Main Street National Register Historic District.

### **Comments and Recommendations**

1. The four dedicated spaces do not meet the minimum 9-foot width standards in Section 223-26 C(2)(a), although they could provide the minimum width with a minor curb change and restriping of the adjacent three spaces in the municipal lot. The Building Inspector should make a recommendation for the required parking based on the building's pre-1964 use.
2. The architect's response letter states that the existing trees on the adjacent municipal lot are to remain, but the S-1 Site Plan shows one tree is to be removed. The tree should be retained, but if it needs to be removed because of construction, a replacement tree should be provided on the plans. The plans should also show where the existing junipers will be relocated. All construction activities on municipal property will need to be coordinated with city officials.
3. If known, the plans should show where the existing utility pole is to be relocated.
4. On the S-1 schedule, the required side yard abutting a residential district is 20 feet, not 25 feet. On the A-4 elevation the note about a new sidewalk connected to the parking lot should be coordinated with the Site Plan or removed. On the A-5 elevation the exhaust outlet is mislabeled.
5. Is the existing sign on the east side of the building to be relocated?
6. This proposal in the Historic Overlay Zone will need a separate Certificate of Appropriateness approval under Chapter 134, Historic Preservation. The revised architectural design seems entirely compatible with the original building.

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

John Clarke, Beacon Planning Consultant

c: Tim Dexter, Building Inspector  
Jennifer L. Gray, Esq., City Attorney  
Arthur R. Tully, P.E., City Engineer  
John Russo, P.E., City Engineer  
Jeff Wilkinson, R.A., Project Architect