

To: Mayor Casale and the Beacon City Council
Date: November 21, 2018
Re: 23-28 Creek Drive Concept Plan Application

I have reviewed the October 23, 2018 Concept Plan application packet, including a cover letter from Cuddy + Feder, Full EAF Part 1 and Narrative, Architect Project Narrative, four site aerials and maps, and sheets 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 of an 11-sheet Site Plan Application set.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to construct a mixed-use development on the former DPW site with a total of 9 apartments and 13,771 square feet of co-working commercial space. The project is in the Fishkill Creek Development district and includes a lot line realignment with the adjacent parcel. A Greenway Trail segment and publicly accessible park space are also proposed as part of the project.

Comments and Recommendations

The submission covers most of the basics required for Concept Plan review by the City Council. However, there are some changes and additional pieces of information that should be provided:

1. The EAF narrative should include a traffic analysis to justify the no substantial increase in traffic answer to question D.2.j. Also, the applicant should provide an explanation as to why the proposed commercial use will involve the disposal of no solid waste in question D.2.r.
2. The proposed lot line realignment should be clearly shown on the plans.
3. Since the proposed building encroaches into the 100-year floodplain, the EAF narrative should describe how the proposal complies with Chapter 123, Flood Damage Prevention. Floor heights and any flood displacement issues will need to be addressed by the Project Engineer, as well as any floodplain impacts on the Greenway Trail.
4. The City adopted lot area deductions in Section 223-41.14B for surface water, regulated floodway and wetlands, and pre-development very steep slopes involving proposals on more than three acres in the FCD. Although 9 units should not exceed the permitted development potential, the applicant should provide the mapping on Sheet 2 and area calculations for the listed environmental features to confirm the allowable unit count. This would likely affect the Maximum Residential Development Potential in the Zoning Table.
5. The Zoning Table on Sheet 1 should include the Minimum Open Space and change the Existing Site Area to 2.807 acres and 3.246 acres with the lot line realignment.
6. The lot frontage, building setbacks, and minimum trail buffer widths should be shown on the Site Plan. The trail does not appear to meet the minimum 25-foot setback requirement.

7. According to 223-41.13 I(10)(b), each FCD project should show a dry-land right-of-way or easement for the enjoyment of the public not less than 20 feet in width traversing the entire length of the site, wherever possible.
8. The Zoning Summary and Land Use Compliance Table on Sheet 1 list 12,911 square feet of commercial space and 33% of building area, while the cover letter and narratives state 13,771 square feet and 40%. The commercial size on Sheet 3 should also be corrected.
9. Sheet 1 lists three requested area variances, but the cover letter and EAF narrative refer to four variances. The southern lot frontage along the Wolcott Avenue right-of-way would seem to satisfy the site frontage requirement. The applicant may want to confirm this with the Building Inspector.
10. Sheet 6 shows two renderings of the proposal from different viewing points. Under 223-41.13 F(1)(i), the Council may request additional photo-simulations.
11. The Sheet 7 building square footage and parking numbers should match Sheet 1.
12. The proposal provides the required parking spaces, but the Council or Planning Board may want to consider some land-banked parking for the spaces closest to the Greenway Trail.
13. The Council and applicant should consider the design and treatment of the emergency access drive to act as a direct pedestrian linkage up to Main Street.

These should be considered initial planning comments, which may be supplemented by a review from the City Engineer. It should be noted that the Concept Plan process need not involve specific architectural, landscaping, lighting, and engineering details, such as final grading for the southern section of the Greenway Trail. If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to email me.

John Clarke, Beacon Planning Consultant

c: Tim Dexter, Building Inspector
Nicholas M. Ward-Willis, Esq., City Attorney
Arthur R. Tully, P.E., City Engineer
John Russo, P.E., City Engineer
Aryeh Siegel, Project Architect