



TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON

300 Pantigo Place – Suite 105
East Hampton, New York 11937-2684

Planning Department
Marguerite Wolffsohn
Director

Telephone (631) 324-2178
Fax (631) 324-1476

May 18, 2009

To: Planning Board

From: Maureen Ryan
Planning Aide

Re: Fenchel-Menzer – Site Plan/Special Permit
SCTM # 300-147-4-35

Last Review Date: November 6, 2008

Items and Date Received: Survey/Site Plan by David Saskas, dated revised April 15, 2009; Building Plans (5 pages) by Hollenbeck & Smith, dated revised April 14, 2009; Lighting Plan by Hollenbeck & Smith, dated revised March 6, 2009; Manufacturer Specification Sheet for proposed light fixture; Landscape Plan by Land Planning Services, dated revised March 6, 2009. All above received on April 21, 2009.

Background Information:

The applicants, Fenchel & Menzer, are proposing to demolish the existing one story dwelling and replace it with a service commercial building on this 0.3 acre (13,231 s.f. including the abandonment of Amagansett Drive West) Commercial Industrial (“CI”) zoned parcel located on the east side of Springs Fireplace Road in the Special Groundwater Protection District.



At the May 7, 2008 review, the Board found the size (1,800 s.f.) and location of the proposed building acceptable, recommended that the 9 space parking be located on the eastern portion of the lot, that the two large maple trees in front be depicted on the landscaping plan as being preserved, and asked the applicant for a narrative on how the two-story service commercial building will operate.

At the June 4, 2008 review, the Board found the parking lot design, the 7' buffer, the dumpster location and the Arborvitae acceptable.

At the September 24, 2008 review, the Board agreed to re-establish lead agency status and found the layout of the nine parking space lot with the 7' buffer acceptable; the building plans were acceptable; requested pictures and spec sheets of the full cut-off light fixtures; lighting plan was found acceptable but a notation regarding the fixture operation to be on motion sensors should be added; the landscape plan was acceptable, although the word "lawn" should be added, along with a notation regarding the four-sided dumpster fence; the Board agreed to send a letter to the ZBA supporting the 25' variance. The applicant stated the Department of Public Works will require a sidewalk. The Town Engineer asked that a correction be made to the plans regarding Groundwater Protection Policy, i.e., the amount of sealant needs to be noted; the site plan needs to be corrected to depict the 20' (blacktop) access driveway width, and the words "Van Accessible Sign" needs to be added to the site plan.

At the November 5, 2008 review, although the site plan application was still incomplete pending submission of the information requested at the previous review, enough information had been submitted for the Board to agree to a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

At the February 3, 2009 hearing, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted the 25' front yard set-back variance to the applicant.

Issues for Discussion:

Site Plan revisions.

The map by David Saskas, dated revised April 15, 2009, has been revised to indicate a proposed 6' tall stockade fence to be placed around the dumpster, the location of the up-right sign noting the van accessible handicapped parking space, the 20' wide access as a paved driveway, the existing curb-cut on Springs-Fireplace Road is to be removed and a concrete sidewalk installed as per SCDPW.

The map indicates the water service line will enter the building through a RPZ valve that is located in the basement. According to the building plans, the building is built on a slab and does not have a basement or crawl space. The applicant should clarify the location of the RPZ valve.

Building Plans.

The ground floor (30' x 60') on the building plans by Hollenbeck & Smith, dated revised April 14, 2009, has been revised to depict the floor pitch and the quantity of sealant required to seal the floor in accordance with the Board's Groundwater Protection Policy. The building has two (836 s.f.) bays, each with a lavatory, a pedestrian door and an overhead door (10' x 10') facing the parking area. Each bay also contains a second pedestrian door on either side of the building.

The second floor (580 s.f.) contains two (290 s.f.) service commercial units, each with a door to the staircase, and each is heated with a Modine ceiling-hung, gas-fired heater, to be used as required.

Lighting Plan.

The lighting plan by Hollenbeck & Smith, dated revised March 6, 2009, has been revised to note that all (eight) Sea Gull fixtures are to use motion sensors. The applicant submitted the manufacturer's spec sheet containing a picture of the Sea Gull outdoor tubed (cylindrical) wall fixture (Model 8338-10) indicating that the fixture meets dark sky requirements.

Landscaping Plan.

The landscaping plan by Land Planning Services, dated revised March 6, 2009, has been revised, as the Board requested at the last review, to re-locate four (5'-6') arborvitae "Emerald green" (*Thuja occidentalis*) from the rear of the dumpster to the stockade fence on the northerly property line. The plan also has been revised, as requested by the Board, to depict the proposed lawn abutting up to the access driveway.

Outdoor Storage.

The applicant has not proposed an outdoor storage area. The Planning Department recommends that a notation be placed on the site plan stating no outdoor storage is permitted.

Architectural Review Board.

The applicant should submit comments from the ARB to the Planning Board.

Fire Department.

The Board received a letter from the East Hampton Fire Department, dated September 29, 2006, stating the site is adjacent to public water and will not require additional fire fighting devices.

In conclusion, this application is incomplete pending the issues raised above.

MR

Planning Board Consensus

Does the Board feel the RPZ valve location should be clarified?

Additional comments: _____

Does the Board agree the notation “no outdoor storage is permitted” should be placed on the map?

Additional comments: _____

Does the Board agree the applicant should submit ARB comments?

Additional comments: _____

Additional Board Comments:
