

To: Mayor Casale and the Beacon City Council

Date: January 11, 2019

Re: **110 Howland Avenue Communications Tower, Special Permit Application**

I have reviewed the November 23, 2018 Special Permit Application from Verizon Wireless, including a Short EAF Part 1, and a January 9, 2019 Visual Analysis with photo-simulations of the proposed tower from three identified locations.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to construct a 52-foot wooden utility pole with communications antennas and associated ground-based equipment on 102 square feet of leased space. The private 4.359-acre parcel is in the R-40 residential zoning district.

Comments and Recommendations

1. The Special Permit Application and Site Plan identify the parcel as in the R1-20 zoning district, but it is actually in the R1-40 district.
2. Short EAF question 3.a states the site acreage is 6 acres, but the Dutchess County Parcel Access lists the lot size as 4.359 acres. The form should also attach DEC's EAF Mapper to confirm some of the answers.
3. Sections 223-24.5 D(1)(a) and D(3) of the Zoning Code include as locational priorities that new facilities should be attached to a City-owned or existing structure, wherever possible. The application's Site Selection Analysis contains no specific information on consideration of alternative sites. Only two are listed as possibilities, both on the proposed property. For example, there is a City of Beacon water tower only 800 feet to the south that could have been investigated. The application should include a more detailed explanation of alternative properties (see also Section 223-24.5 R(4)).
4. If this property is determined to be the only or best viable option, why is the tower not located farther back on the site, closer to the tree line where it could be better screened from the immediate neighbors? It is instead placed directly next to a residential building and parking lot in full view of the houses just to the south, one of which is listed as The Swann Inn of Beacon, a tourist-oriented bed and breakfast originally built in the 1860s.
5. The visible area identified in the Key Map of the Visual Analysis should include 53-60 Chiusano Drive. One of the photographs at the end of the application packet clearly shows that the tower site will be visible from this adjacent house to the south.
6. The Site Plan in the application should propose landscaping and/or screening to minimize the visual impacts from surrounding properties, consistent with Section 223-24.5 G.

7. The Site Plan should show the setback distances from the tower to the residential building on the site and to the surrounding property lines, meeting the setback requirements in 223-24.5 E.

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

John Clarke, Beacon Planning Consultant

c: Anthony J. Ruggiero, City Administrator
 David Buckley, Building Inspector
 Nicholas M. Ward-Willis, Esq., City Attorney
 John Russo, P.E., City Engineer
 Scott P. Olson, Esq., Project Representative