

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

Date: April 5, 2018

Re: **1181 North Avenue Subdivision and Special Permit**

I have reviewed the March 27, 2018 Full EAF Part 1, March 27, 2018 response letters from Aryeh Siegel and Hudson Land Design, December 11, 1984 NYS DOT easement deed, March 27, 2018 Preliminary Subdivision Plat, and a 5-sheet Special Permit Application, dated March 27, 2018.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to subdivide a 0.74-acre parcel with one existing office building into two lots for the construction of a new office building. The parcel is in the R1-7.5 district and the Historic District and Landmark Overlay Zone, which allows office uses by Special Permit from the City Council.

Comments and Recommendations

1. For the Full EAF, Question B should be changed to indicate that the City Council will need to approve the Special Permit application. Question C.2.a should be answered yes, but the second box can be marked no. The applicant should follow-up with the State Historic Preservation Office regarding potential impacts on historic or archeological resources.
2. The Subdivision Plat should identify major trees over 8 inches diameter and include species.
3. The proposed building is located on a front section of Lot 2 that does not meet the minimum 75-foot lot width standard in Section 223-12 H. The Board may modify the lot requirements in accordance with Section 223-12 J, but that section appears to be intended for residential subdivisions and to protect the natural and scenic qualities of open lands. The applicant could also apply for an area variance, or the new building could be placed in the wider rear portion of the proposed lot, perhaps designed similar to a carriage house behind the historic building.
4. The parcel size numbers in the Schedule of Regulations Table and Sheet 1 Site Plan do not match the Existing Conditions Survey on Sheet 2. The property survey should be stamped and signed before approvals.
5. Since this parcel is in the Historic District and Landmark Overlay Zone and within the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) boundary, the Board will have to adopt a Certificate of Appropriateness consistent with Chapter 134, Historic Preservation, and a LWRP consistency statement. The applicant should prepare a LWRP justification. Once the initial plan issues have been addressed, the design should also be referred to the Architectural Review Subcommittee.
6. The Board may want to request two ADA spaces for the two buildings, given the overflow street parking on Tompkins Avenue.

7. The Board could consider a new sidewalk along the Tompkins Avenue side of Lot 1.
8. The new plantings along Tompkins Avenue in the Landscape Plan feature five small trees that only grow to 15-30 feet high. Since there are no overhead wires on this side of the street, I suggest 3-4 taller and regularly spaced street trees that will in time provide a canopy framing the street. The new trees flanking the parking lot should be at least 3-inch diameter, according to Section 223-26.
9. The plan should include sign details, noting if the existing sign is to be removed. Given the proposed lighting fixtures, the existing floodlights on the building and garage should be removed.
10. Professional offices with up to 10 employees are allowed in the Historic District and Landmark Overlay Zone by Special Permit from the City Council, although the standards seem targeted toward conversions of existing historic structures rather than separate new construction. Once the Board is in generally satisfied with the Site Plan, it should issue recommendations to the Council on the Special Permit.

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