



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

September 11, 2009

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Eric Schantz
Planner

RE: Pulver Gas Tank Replacement Site Plan
SCTM# 300-27-4-2.1
Application # A0520060156

Last Review Date: July 8, 2009

Items and Date Received: 08/21/09 Applicant submission; cover letter; 10 sets of plans (S-1A - Site Plan, dated revised 08/12/09; E-1 - Electrical, dated revised 08/12/09; E-2 - Electrical Lighting Isolux, dated revised 08/12/09; E-3 - Electrical Lighting Foot Candle Points, dated revised 08/12/09).

Background Information: The application is for Site Plan approval for the replacement of 4 propane storage tanks totaling 62,000 Gal. capacity with 2 propane gas tanks totaling 60,000 Gal. capacity as well as the removal of a trailer from the site. The parcel is located on Second House (Industrial) Rd. in Montauk along Fort Pond, is zoned Commercial/Industrial and is 109,760 Sq. Ft. The use is classified in the town code as fuel storage and is a special permit use in the CI zoning district.

Issues for Discussion:

Filling station

The filling station has not been illustrated on the site plan as requested by the Fire Marshal. The applicants should refer to the Fire Marshal's memos (dated March 3, 2009, May 7, 2009, June 26, 2009 & August 26, 2009) or speak directly with the Chief Fire Marshal and the plans should be revised accordingly for the next submission.

Lighting

The last submission included a comprehensive lighting plan which consisted of:

- Three (3) 150 Watt HPS fixtures mounted at 20' in height not controlled by motion sensors and,
- Three (3) 250 Watt HPS fixtures mounted at 20' in height and controlled by motion sensors

The Board did not find this plan acceptable and stated that the applicants should meet with the Planning Department in order to formulate an acceptable lighting plan. A meeting was held and although we favored the lighting plan recommended in the previous memo, a general agreement was made regarding a new plan with slightly more lighting. It was the understanding of the Planning Department that the plan would be amended to consist of:

- Entrance Gate: One 150 (or lower) Watt HPS fixture mounted at 16' in height (or lower) to remain on at all times.
- Front of Tank: One 150 Watt HPS fixture mounted at 16' in height to remain on at all times
- Side of Tank/BBQ Filling Station: One 150 Watt HPS (or lower) fixture mounted at 16' in height and controlled by a motion sensor.

The goals of this plan being to reduce the light levels over that which was previously proposed, and to within Planning Board Guideline limits, while providing constant light at both the front of the tank and the entrance gate for security and safety purposes and also to provide motion-sensor activated light on the side of the tanks in case of attempted vandalism. The plan the applicants have submitted is generally the same as that which was discussed earlier, however, with two major exceptions.

First, two (2) 150 Watt HPS fixtures instead of one such fixture have been proposed in the area to the side of the tank in the vicinity of the BBQ tank filling station as well as in the area to the front of the two proposed 30,000 Gal tanks. This is unnecessarily excessive lighting in both spots. Both lights near the BBQ filling station are to be controlled by motion sensors pointed at the perimeter fence and one of the two lights at the front of the tanks is to be motion sensor controlled. The applicants may wish to discuss with the Board the feasibility of having one (1) motion-sensor activated light on each side of the proposed tanks, as doing so would most likely not exceed any footcandle thresholds listed in the Board's Guidelines, and would provide security lighting which would not remain constantly lit. However, having two lights in this one spot represents functionless and excessive lighting.

Second, and most importantly, it was our understanding that where there were to be two lights mounted to one pole, that these fixtures would both be of the same type as the originally proposed full-cut off post light. In actuality, the currently proposed Type B fixture is a non-cut off, non-shielded flood light. These flood lights were actually added at the time of the last submission but were missed by the Planning Department in part due

to the many other more obvious problems with the plan (e.g. mounting height, number of fixtures, wattage, etc.). We apologize for not specifically addressing this aspect of the plan at the last review. Regardless, lights of this type should never be approved by the Board. Additionally, (as an afterthought) it is noted that HPS often takes a minute or so to “heat up” and may not be the best choice for security lighting which is to be controlled by a motion sensor and designed to turn on upon intrusion of the site by a possible vandal.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the application is incomplete pending the resolution of the aforementioned issues and the submission of the required items.

ES

Planning Board Consensus

Should the lighting plan be revised? If so, how?

Additional comments: _____

Should the filling station be illustrated as proposed by the Chief Fire Marshal?

Additional comments: _____

Additional Board Comments:

