

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

Date: May 2, 2018

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

I have reviewed the revised EAF Part 1, response letters from Aryeh Siegel and Hudson Land Design, Preliminary Subdivision Plat, and 5-sheet Special Permit Application, all dated April 24, 2018, and an undated Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) Consistency Statement.

### **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. The Subdivision Plat should identify major trees over 8 inches diameter and include species.
2. 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 applicant will request an area variance once the SEQR determination has been completed. The Board should issue a recommendation to the ZBA.
3. The front setback for the new building is 21.7 feet, less than the required 30 feet, but appropriate given the setbacks of the existing adjacent buildings. The Board should approve this reduced front setback without a variance, consistent with Section 223-13 K.
4. Since this parcel is in the Historic District and Landmark Overlay Zone and within the 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's LWRP justification addresses the most applicable Policy 23 on historic districts, maintaining that the proposed building enhances the historic district by filling a gap in the street wall and screening the rear parking lot. Once the initial plan issues have been addressed, the design could also be referred to the Architectural Review Subcommittee for compatibility with the adjacent historic buildings.
5. Although only one ADA space is required by law, the Board may want to request two ADA spaces for the two buildings, especially given the overflow street parking on Tompkins Avenue.
6. The Board could consider a new sidewalk along the Tompkins Avenue side of Lot 1, given that the existing office building has no accessible entrance from the front sidewalk.
7. The applicant should explain why the proposed sign for the new building on Lot 2 is located on Lot 1 behind the existing sign.

Page 2, 1181 North Avenue, May 2, 2018 memo

8. The L2 lighting fixtures are not included in the lighting details. The existing floodlights on the existing building and garage are not dark sky compliant or compatible with the historic structures and should be removed.
9. The property survey should be stamped and signed before approvals.
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