

**ARYEH SIEGEL**  
ARCHITECT

---

Jay Sheers - Planning Board Chairman  
City of Beacon  
One Municipal Plaza  
Beacon, NY 12508

**Re: Edgewater – 22 Edgewater Place, Beacon, New York**  
*Site Plan Application – Responses to Comments*

October 31, 2017

Dear Chairman Sheers and Members of the Planning Board,

Below please find our responses to the comments included in John Clarke Planning and Design's Memorandum dated October 6, 2017, and Lanc & Tully's October 5, 2017 Memorandum regarding the Edgewater project. Please note that the Applicant's engineering consultant, Hudson Land Design (HLD), has prepared a separate response to comments letter that addresses specific engineering comments from Lanc & Tully's October 5, 2017 Memorandum. A copy of that letter is enclosed herein.

Additionally, we respectfully submit a copy of the letter dated October 25, 2017 prepared by Cleary Consulting, which responds to the comments from the October Public Hearing regarding the Beacon City School District.

As indicated above, our responses to comments are as follows:

**John Clarke Planning and Design Comment Responses:**

1. The first 2 proposed spaces in the northeast corner near Bank Street have been relocated per the requirements in 223-26 C(1), as shown on the Site Plan
2. The unit mix and bedroom count have been coordinated
3. Comment acknowledged. All documentation has been submitted for the Board's SEQR determination, including a new response letter dated October 25, 2017 from Pat Cleary.
4. Three (3) variances are being requested for the project. In response to Member Jill Reynold's comment at the August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017 Planning Board Public Hearing regarding project density, please note that the Applicant is not seeking variances to increase the permitted total number of units to be developed, which is 307. The Bulk Zoning Table on the Site Plan demonstrates that 307 units are permitted as-of-right, which is calculated using the total site area of the Premises. The variances are intended to minimize the building footprints, and maximize green areas. It is

respectfully submitted that this is a more ecological approach to the development of the site.

- a. As indicated in the Applicant's submission to the Zoning Board of Appeals, which has jurisdiction to consider the relief sought for the requested area variances, the maximum number of stories is proposed to be 5 instead of 4 ½ for 3 out of the 7 buildings. This allows the building footprints to be consolidated and the landscape and open space to be maximized.
  - b. The maximum number of units per building is proposed to be between 48 and 59 units in Buildings 1, 2, 3, and 6. The Applicant is seeking an area variance for the maximum number of units, normally 36 per building, to allow the building footprints to be consolidated and the landscape space to be maximized. As indicated above, the Applicant is not requesting to build more units than the 307 units that are permitted as-of-right considering the total lot area.
  - c. The separation between buildings is proposed to be 25 feet on average, and the separation between Buildings 3 and 4 at the corner is 12 feet.
5. Comment acknowledged. The LWRP consistency statement is complete.
  6. A crosswalk has been added to the Site Plan across Bank Street at Tompkins Avenue.
  7. The building dimensions have been coordinated between the site plan and floor plans.
  8. Comment acknowledged. Please refer to the letter dated October 25, 2017 prepared by Cleary Consulting, which responds to the comments from the October Public Hearing regarding the Beacon City School District.

**Lanc & Tully Comment Responses:**

**Sheet 1 of 15 – Site Plan**

1. The Existing Woodlands to Remain hatching has been corrected to include areas to be graded and restored.
2. The existing stone wall is clearly shown on the site plan.

**Sheet 2 of 15 – Existing Conditions & Demolition**

1. The existing water main location is shown on Bank Street.
2. The existing 20 foot easement is to benefit lands N/F of Bobbit to the Southwest for ingress and egress. The plans went into reproduction prior to gathering knowledge in reference to the purpose of the easement. Therefore, notes referencing the purpose of the easement will be

added to the plans for the next submission.

**Sheet 3 of 15 – Landscape Plan**

1. The curb and existing water main location is shown on Bank Street.

**Sheet 4 of 15 – Lighting Plan**

1. The site plans include construction details and anchoring for the light poles.

Please note that the following impacts were discussed at the September Planning Board Hearing, per a transcript of that section of the hearing. This represents a portion of all of the impacts to be discussed due to time constraints:

1. Impact on Land – consensus is that impacts on land do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
2. Geologic Features - consensus is that impacts on geologic features do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
3. Surface Water and Ground Water - consensus is that impacts on Surface Water and Ground Water do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
4. Flooding - consensus is that impacts on Flooding do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
5. Air - consensus is that impacts on Air do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
6. Plant and Animals - consensus is that impacts on Plant and Animals do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
7. Agricultural Resources - consensus is that impacts on Agricultural Resources do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
8. Aesthetic Resources - consensus is that impacts on Aesthetic Resources do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
9. Historic and Archeological Resources – A Report on Archeological Resources has been provided with this submission for further discussion

10. Open Space - consensus is that impacts on Open Space do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
11. Transportation - consensus is that impacts on Transportation do not rise to the level of substantial negative impact.
12. Community Character – discussion regarding Community Character will continue.

For the reasons set forth above, as well as in prior submissions and appearances, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicant's comprehensive application package complies with all the applicable requirements to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"). Based on the particular facts and circumstances of the case, it is respectfully submitted that the record shows that a hard look has been taken and that the Proposed Action will not have a "significant" adverse impact on the environment.<sup>1</sup> The Applicant submits that a Negative Declaration is justified in this case, based upon these principles. At this point, we respectfully submit that the Board make its Determination of Significance, and that the Board continue with the Site Plan and Subdivision review of the application.

Thank you. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Aryeh Siegel". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Aryeh Siegel  
*Aryeh Siegel, Architect*