

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

Date: January 4, 2019

Re: **23-28 Creek Drive Site Plan Application**

I have reviewed the December 26, 2018 Site Plan application packet, including a cover letter from Cuddy + Feder, Full EAF Part 1 and Narrative, Site Plan Application, Architect Project Narrative, response letters to previous consultant comments from Aryeh Siegel and Hudson Land Design, Traffic Impact Report by Maser Consulting, among other exhibits, and a 12-sheet Site Plan Application set with the last revision date of December 25, 2018.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to construct a mixed-use development on the former DPW site with a total of nine apartments and 13,771 square feet of co-working commercial space. The project is in the Fishkill Creek Development (FCD) district and includes a lot line realignment with the adjacent parcel. A Greenway Trail segment and ½-acre+ public park are also proposed as part of the project.

An application in the FCD district requires Concept Plan approval from the City Council and then Site Plan approval from the Planning Board. The Council has requested that the Planning Board undertake the SEQRA review and provide recommendations to the Council on the Concept Plan. The Board should also provide comments to the ZBA on the requested variances.

Comments and Recommendations

1. The EAF should acknowledge that the proposed commercial use will involve the disposal of some solid waste in question D.2.r.
2. 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 flood displacement issues should be addressed by the Project Engineer, as well as any floodplain impacts on the Greenway Trail.
3. 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 FCD proposals. Although nine units should not exceed the permitted development potential, the applicant should provide the mapping and area calculations for the listed environmental features so the City Engineer can confirm the allowable unit count. This would likely affect the Maximum Residential Development Potential in the Zoning Table and Land Use Compliance table.
4. In the Zoning Table on Sheet 1 the Proposed Open Space appears inaccurate.
5. The trail does not quite meet the minimum 25-foot buffer width requirement at the northern section of the patio retaining wall. The wall should be adjusted to meet the minimum distance.

6. The 20-foot Greenway Trail easement, which under Section 223-41.13 I(10)(b) is “for the enjoyment of the public,” overlaps the fenced-off Tenant Green Area.
7. The Planning Board and applicant should consider the design and surface treatment of the emergency access drive to act as an attractive pedestrian linkage up to Main Street.
8. The required four ADA-compliant spaces are included on the site, but only two are for the building uses. This may not be sufficient.
9. Sheet 2 should show any existing trees over six inches in diameter and note any of these trees that will be removed.
10. All the species listed in the Plant Schedule on Sheet 4 should be shown on the plan, the trees should include caliper dimensions, and the central note referring to Sheet 2 should be removed.
11. A variety of tree plantings should be included within the Public Park area at the southern end of the site and along the creek and Greenway Trail.
12. Additional landscape screening should be provided between the parking areas north and south of the building and the Greenway Trail.
13. Section 223-26 C(3) requires at least one three-inch diameter tree for every 10 spaces in a parking lot. One additional tree should be located in the upper lot.
14. Sheet 6 shows two renderings of the proposal from different viewing points. For Site Plan approval the Planning Board will need elevations for the three buildings with materials listed.
15. There are two different trash enclosure details on sheets 2 and 10.
16. A detail should be provided for the six-foot shadowbox fence around the Tenant Green Area.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to email me.

John Clarke, Beacon Planning Consultant

c: Dave Buckley, Deputy 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