

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

Date: May 5, 2017

Re: **226 Main Street, Special Use Permit**

I have reviewed an April 25, 2017 Special Use Permit Application and Site Plan Specification Form, an April 25, 2017 Full EAF Part 1, a Boundary Survey, dated April 18, 2017, an April 25, 2017 Infiltration and Inflow Investigation letter from Hudson Land Design, and a 4-sheet Special Use Permit and Site Plan set, dated April 25, 2017.

### **Proposal**

The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing one-story structure and construct a four-story mixed-use building, creating eight apartments and ground-floor storefronts. The building is in the Central Main Street zoning district.

### **Comments and Recommendations**

1. There is no provision in the CMS district that requires a Special Use Permit for this project. Sheet 1 should be retitled and EAF question B.b should be changed to Site Plan approval. The EAF Question D.2.r should be answered yes. The EAF Mapper Summary Report should be attached to the EAF.
2. This proposed building supports the overall intent of the CMS district by replacing an auto-oriented business and front yard parking with a multi-story, mixed-use, storefront building type that will enhance the pedestrian experience along Main Street. However, it does not meet several standards of the CMS district:
  - The minimum rear yard setback in the CMS district is 25 feet. The proposed rear setback of 10 feet will require an area variance based on the limited depth of the existing lot.
  - A minimum of 10 percent of the lot is required to be landscaped under Section 223-41.17 D(12). The rear area should include plantings to meet this standard.
  - The proposal has no off-street parking, although elimination of existing curb cuts could create at least three new on-street spaces. The required parking may be modified by the Planning Board if there is sufficient public parking available within 800 feet of the site to meet the foreseeable needs of the uses. The applicant may also request a ZBA variance.
3. The plans should show the location of the adjacent residential building to the rear for site context. It is not clear on the plans where the fence and gate are located.
4. The Sheet 1 Zoning Summary should state that this parcel is not in the Historic Overlay District.
5. One existing street tree is located in front of the property along Main Street. Additional street trees should be added along both streets as part of this project, consistent with Section 223-41.17 G(2) and similar to the spacing of trees across Main Street.

6. Also according to Section 223-41.17 G(2), a pedestrian clearway at least eight feet wide should be provided along the sidewalk from the street tree plantings to the building face. This may require the building be set back two feet from the adjacent storefront. Doors should be designed to not open into the clearway.
7. The Board may also require bicycle racks and should require a brick transition zone in the former driveway to match existing sidewalk conditions.
8. Once the Board has agreed on the overall size of the building, the architecture should be reviewed by the Architectural Review Subcommittee to meet the Design Standards in Section 223-41.17 K. The plans will need elevations with materials and colors noted for all four sides of the proposed 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  
Aryeh Siegel, Project Architect