

**PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON**

AGENDA FOR MEETING OF:

July 10, 2019

Board of Review:

Robert Gold & Kathy Green – Springs, Map 16, Block 17, UR Parcel 68A, SP 4-1, Lots 1-5, 40

Planning Board:

REGULAR MEETING

SUBDIVISIONS:

SUBWAIVER:

SITE PLAN:

OTHER:

Adoption of Minutes: May 22, 2019; June 5, 2019

URBAN RENEWAL:

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

OLD FILED MAPS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON
WORK SESSION:
July 10, 2019**

SUBDIVISION REVIEW:

SUBWAIVER REVIEW:

SITE PLAN REVIEW:

Duryea's II Site Plan/Special Permit

Cortese/Pahwul/Montauk

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

ZONE CHANGES:

OTHER:

URBAN RENEWAL:

OLD FILED MAPS:



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

July 5, 2019

To: Planning Board

From: JoAnne Pahwul, AICP
Assistant Planning Director

Re: Duryea's Site Plan/Special Permit
SCTM#300-16-1- 8.9

Last Review Date: March 6, 2019

Items Received:

- Letter dated March 22, 2019 from Michael G. Walsh;
- Copy of Planning Department evaluation dated February 26, 2019 with edits by the applicant's representatives;
- Exhibit A - Reduced scale 8 ½" x 11" Sanitary system plans prepared by S.L. Mareseca;
- Exhibit B - Copy of determination from Chief Building Inspector Fred Sellers, dated April 30, 1997;
- Exhibit C – Suffolk County tax maps of the subject parcel from 1980 and 1993 and chain of title;
- Exhibit D – 1980 tax map with zoning district lines from 1991 and 1993;
- Exhibit E – 6 NYCRR 617.5 SEQRA Regulations – Type II;
- Exhibit F – Reduced scale 8 ½" x 11" survey by Walbridge Surveyors, P.C. dated November 30, 2017;
- Exhibit G – Aerial photographs alleged to depict preexisting parking;
- Exhibit H – Letter dated May 25, 1998 from Chairman of the Tuthill Road Association to the Building Inspector;
- Exhibit I – Reduced scale 8 ½" x 11" Floor Plan and Seating plan undated and not signed or sealed by a licensed professional;
- Exhibit J – Archaeology report prepared by Tracker dated March 2019;
- Exhibit K – Memorandum from Chief Fire Marshal dated April 3, 2015 regarding maximum occupancy;
- Exhibit L - Letter dated March 21, 2019 from Environmental Consulting, Inc.;

- Exhibit M – Photoshop illustration of the proposed retaining wall.

Background Information:

The 2.67 acre lot is located in Montauk with frontage on both Tuthill Pond and Fort Pond Bay and contains tidal and freshwater wetlands. The site is zoned Waterfront/B Residence/Harbor Protection Overlay District, Water Protection Overlay District and is located in the Peconic Bay Critical Environmental Area and a Scenic Area of Statewide Significance. Tuthill Road represents a private road that traverses the lot.

The site was the subject of a recent stipulation of settlement involving a facility that had approval as a wholesale/retail seafood shop, with accessory food service counters and an accessory patio deck for outdoor consumption of food sold at the fish market, that had been operating as a restaurant. The stipulation required that the applicant obtain site plan/special permit approval for the restaurant use and the proposed I/A sanitary system and recognizes those improvements depicted in Exhibit E as being preexisting. The stipulation of settlement and its terms have since been stayed by the court.

The subject site plan application was submitted requesting approval for a change of use to a restaurant and for the installation of an Innovative and Alternative Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (I/A OWTS). The Planning Department has noted that approval of additional parking is also required.

The Planning Board discussed the application at its March 6, 2019 work session, but did not reach a consensus on the outstanding issues as there was uncertainty as to what issues were under the Board's purview to address given the stipulation of settlement. Further legal input was sought with regard to this matter.

The applicant submitted additional information on March 22, 2019. A stay on the stipulation of settlement was issued on April 10, 2019.

The March 22nd submission only included two copies of documents, whereas 10 copies are the minimum required for an official submission. The Planning Department has reviewed the information submitted and offers comments under the following Issues for Discussion section.

It is noted that the applicant requests that the Planning Board adopt the applicant's edited version of the evaluation form. This does not reflect the Planning Board's policies or procedures. The standard practice is for the Planning Department to prepare an evaluation that the Planning Board discusses and determines what aspects of the project require additional information. The applicant then submits new information that addresses issues and comments raised by the Planning Department and Planning Board. This information is then reviewed by the Planning Department and Planning Board to determine whether the issues raised have been adequately addressed. It has never been the Board's policy or procedure to adopt a Planning Department evaluation or memorandum as edited by the applicant.

Issues for Discussion:

The Planning Department supports the information provided in the Department's evaluation of the site plan/special permit dated February 26, 2019 and disagrees with the information in the applicant's edits, as more specifically discussed below:

Zoning District

The Town's official zoning map and GIS system depict the parcel as being zoned Waterfront & B Residence/Harbor Protection District Overlay. The Planning Department disagrees with the applicant's position that the B-Residence zoning does not apply.

Lot Area

The lot area pursuant to the Town Code is 2.76 acres, as indicated on the site plan prepared by George Walbridge and dated revised February 21, 2019.

§255-1-20 (Definitions)

LOT AREA

The total horizontal area contained within and enclosed by the outer boundary lines of any lot; provided, however, that, for any purpose for which it must be calculated under the provisions of this chapter, "lot area" shall not include the following:

- A. That portion of a lot which is underwater land.
- B. That portion of a lot which lies in, on or under any street, right-of-way, common driveway easement or access easement.
- C. That portion of a lot which is burdened by a private easement prohibiting the erection of buildings.
- D. That portion of a lot which lies seaward of the bluff line or primary dune crest, except in those areas designated in § 255-4-40C where lot area shall exclude that portion of the lot that is seaward from the base of bluff.
- E. That portion of a lot which is beach, wetland or watercourse, as defined herein. Except for the exclusion of underwater land, the above limitations on calculated lot area shall not be applied in determining the applicable bluff setback for any lot.

Coverage

Existing and proposed building and total coverage calculations need to be provided. Coverage calculations on the site plan prepared by George Walbridge Surveyors and dated revised February 21, 2019 are not based on lot area as determined by the Town Code and should be corrected. Additionally, building and total coverage should be calculated separately for the Waterfront and A Residence portions of the lot. Existing coverage should reflect those parking areas recognized as preexisting in the stipulation and proposed coverage any additional areas where parking is proposed, whether improved or unimproved.

Special Permit Use

A restaurant is a special permit use, not a permitted use, in a Waterfront zoning district and is subject to the special permit standards for a restaurant. See attached §255-11-10 (Use Table). The application submitted by the applicant on February 22, 2019 indicated that a special permit was being applied for.

§255-5-50 (Special Permit Standards)

RESTAURANT

(1) determining whether to issue a special permit for this use, the ultimate customer capacity of the restaurant shall be calculated in order to determine potential sewage waste, kitchen waste and parking needs and shall include any potential expansion of outdoor eating patios or decks.

(2) A plan demonstrating how the disposal of sewage and kitchen wastes will be handled shall be provided. Particular attention shall be given where the proposed site is near wetlands or surface waters or is located in the Water Recharge Overlay District.

The applicant needs to demonstrate compliance with the special permit standards for a restaurant. The proposal is also subject to the special permit standards for a Waterfront District and will need to demonstrate compliance with these standards.

§255-5-45 (General standards in particular districts)

D. Waterfront District All special permit uses in the Waterfront District (WF), other than ferry terminals, are deemed not to be water-related uses, and therefore every such use:

(1) Must not adversely affect any existing waterfront use which is so water-related or any potential water-related uses to be made of the lot or of nearby waterfront which are indicated in the Town Comprehensive Plan;

(2) Must be ancillary to a principal water-related use in that the special permit use would economically support the principal water-related use and would enhance the ability of the general public to gain visual or physical access to the waterfront

(3) Must not usurp any land surface area needed by the principal water-related use and must, together with all uses on the lot, be able to demonstrate an integrated and adequate circulation and parking plan; and

(4). Must have a maritime character or theme.

A restaurant is a special permit use in a Waterfront zoning district and therefore not deemed to be water-related. The proposed restaurant appears to be the primary use on the property. It is not clear from the site plan, how and where the commercial fishing and

fish processing aspects of the existing uses on the site business will continue to operate on the site. A narrative should be submitted that explains how these businesses will continue and how the project addresses the special permit standards for a use in a Waterfront District that is not water related.

Parking

The stipulation of settlement and the Certificate of Occupancy recognize the parking depicted on Exhibit E of the stipulation. The proposal for a change of use to a restaurant increases the parking requirement pursuant to §255-11-45 of the Town Code (Parking Requirements). The site plan submitted by the applicant, prepared by Walbridge Surveyors, P.C and dated revised February 21, 2019, depicts additional parking that was not depicted on the survey associated with the stipulation and the C.O. and has not been determined to be pre-existing. These parking spaces require site plan review. Although, the applicant submitted site plan applications in 1991 and 1996 requesting approval for this additional parking, these applications were never completed or approved.

The applicant has inserted parking calculations in their edited version of the Planning Department memorandum. The Planning Department notes that not all of the existing uses are included in these parking calculations. The C.O. includes a private dining deck that is not reflected in the parking calculations provided. Additionally, the site plan prepared by Walbridge Surveyors dated February 21, 2019 depicts 11 boat slips and §255-11-45 requires 1.25 parking spaces per boat slip that are not accounted for in the parking calculations.

Pursuant to §255-11-45 of the Town Code, parking calculations are based on uses and in some instances the gross square footage of these uses. Floor plans prepared by a licensed professional that are signed and sealed should depict the various uses and indicate the square footage of each that correspond to the parking calculations. The parking calculations should be revised to include the relevant square footage of the existing and proposed uses and the uses listed should reflect the C.O. dated February 19, 2019 or a narrative provided that reflects the changes to those uses.

Additionally, the parking calculations need to be indicated on the site plan.

The additional parking spaces depicted on the site plan prepared by Walbridge Surveyors dated February 21, 2019 are not associated with a water dependent use and are not exempt from wetland setback requirements pursuant to §255-4-43 of the Town Code. These spaces do not meet zoning with regard to a minimum 100' wetland setback requirement and cannot be approved unless a variance from this wetland setback requirement and a Natural Resources Special Permit are obtained from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Outdoor Seating

The proposed 90 outdoor seats exceed 30% of the proposed 24 indoor seats and can only be approved by the Planning Board if the compliance with any increases in site parking requirements and approval of the wastewater disposal system are demonstrated.

§255-11-88 OUTDOOR DINING AT RESTAURANTS

(3) Outdoor dining may also be considered in a site plan review pursuant to § 255-6-30B, and in such case outdoor dining need not be limited by 30% of the approved indoor seating but is limited by the property owner's compliance with any increases in site parking requirements or a requirement of approval of the wastewater disposal system by the Suffolk County Department of Health Services. When approval for outdoor dining is permitted pursuant to site plan review, reduction of indoor dining is not necessarily required, but a seating plan for both indoor and outdoor seating must be filed with the Planning Board.

Exemption from Site Plan Review of I/A

The applicant cites the following provision of the Town Code as exempting the proposed I/A upgrades from site plan review.

§ 210-3-3 Exception for repair or replacement.

Notwithstanding anything in the preceding section nor any provision to the contrary in Chapter **255**, Zoning, of the Town Code, a building permit obtained solely for the purpose of repairing or upgrading to a low-nitrogen sanitary system an existing sanitary system which complies in all respects with the current standards and requirements of the Suffolk County Sanitary Code and meets all current setbacks for such systems in the Town Code, or is being placed such that the location of the sanitary system will be consistent with the location of the current sanitary system in relation to setbacks, may be issued without Town site plan review, special permit review or other local review and approval which might be a prerequisite to issuance of other similar building permits on the particular property in question, provided that all other conditions for issuance of the requested building permit, including approval by the Suffolk County Department of Health Services, have been met by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Building Inspector. This section shall not apply to proposed expansions of existing on-site sanitary systems nor to any other new work whatsoever.

The Planning Department notes that it has not yet been demonstrated that the applicant can comply with Suffolk County Department of Health density standards for the uses on the site. Additionally, the proposed septic system will accommodate an increase in sanitary flow on the site and represents an expansion of the system. Therefore, it appears that the installation of the I/A sanitary system will require site plan approval.

The Planning Department also notes that not only is site plan approval required, but a use variance would be necessary to place a sanitary system associated with a commercial use in a residential zoning district.

Sanitary Plans

In the site plan evaluation dated February 26, 2019, the Planning Department requested submission of a plan with sanitary density flows. Sanitary calculations appear to be listed on SAN-1 prepared by S.L. Maresca submitted in a reduced scale drawing in Exhibit A of the March 22, 2019. The reduced scale renders much of the writing, including the sanitary density calculations, undiscernible.

The Planning Department has reviewed a full scale copy of this plan that was filed with the Building Department and found that the table listing the sanitary waste density flow does not match the project that is before the Planning Board. The density flow calculation table lists 5 marina slips, where 11 are depicted on the site plan, and 16 indoor restaurant seats, where the seating plan submitted indicates that 16 indoor bar and 24 indoor restaurant seats are proposed.

Ten copies of a full scale SAN-1 plan should be submitted to the official file. The applicant should also submit floor plans depicting the various uses and square footage of those uses with a density flow table that corresponds to this information and with the plans and site plan application before the Planning Board.

Patent Areas

Exhibit F is a reduced scale map and it cannot be determined from this submission which areas are purported to be covered by a patent. The applicant should submit a full scale map depicting the patent areas and a copy of the patent to the file for review.



Light fixture with exposed bulb does not conform to the Town Code.

Lighting

The applicant indicates that no change to lighting is proposed. However, a site visit indicated that not all of the lighting on the site complies with the Town Code. The Town Board adopted a local law on July 3, 2014 that provides that all noncompliant, nonresidential lighting shall be replaced with compliant lighting within three years from the adoption of the law. The applicant is obligated by this law to update the lighting on

the site with Code compliant lighting and a comprehensive lighting plan should be submitted for the site.

Architectural Review Board

Pursuant to §255-7-30 of the Town Code, the Architectural Review Board has jurisdiction over all building and structures, including signs, which require site plan approval except for coastal structures, parking lots, driveways, tennis courts and swimming pools, pool patios and pool decks. ARB jurisdiction includes walls that require building permits. As more information is received about the project, it will be determined whether there are elements of the project that require ARB review.

Handicapped Accessibility

By memorandum dated March 1, 2019, the Town Engineer advised that the handicap parking spaces need to have detailed grading to show the assessable route from the parking spaces to the building, and that these spaces need to have striping, the appropriate slope, and signage indicated in order to ensure ADA compatibility.

Review of Exhibits

The Planning Department offers the following comments on the exhibits submitted.

Exhibit A

SAN-1, SAN-2, and SAN-3, septic plans, prepared by S.L. Maresca dated last revised May 8, 2018 and submitted to the Suffolk county Department of Health Services represent Exhibit A.

These plans have been reduced in size and pertinent information is indiscernible. Ten copies of these plans at full scale should be submitted to the file.

Exhibit B

Exhibit B consists of a memorandum from Fred Sellers, Town Building Inspector, dated April 30, 1997. This memorandum made a determination as to the various uses in areas of the buildings on the site that corresponded to an attached sketch. One of the uses listed was a restaurant use in Area G, including dining area, prep area, kitchen, steam room, restrooms and display area.

The Planning Department notes that the Zoning Board of Appeals reversed this Building Inspector determination with respect to the finding that the subject property lawfully contains a “restaurant use” in a decision filed on October 5, 1997.

The 1991 site plan application submitted to the Planning Board offered the following description of the proposed project.

“Applicant and his family have operated this waterfront wholesale and retail lobster and seafood operation for over sixty years. The retail sale of prepared lobsters and seafood items has long been a significant portion of this business. This application has been prompted by the East Hampton Town Building

Inspector's request for site plan approval for the placement of 12 plastic patio tables (4 to 5 seats per table) on a pre-existing deck for the convenience seating of patrons while they wait for their seafood to be packaged and/or prepared and/or to sit at (picnic style) while consuming their purchases. There will be no table service, no sale of alcoholic beverages or other restaurant type activities."

Exhibit C

Exhibit C consists of a chain of title and copies of pages from 1980 and 1983 tax map books that depict the parcel. The 1980 tax map book depicts the commercially zoned and residentially zoned portions of the site as one lot. The 1983 tax map book depicts the residentially zoned portion of the parcel as a separate parcel.

The applicant's claim that the zone split was the result of a scrivener's error appears incorrect, as the existing zoning line was lawfully created Local Law No. 23 of 1992. The residential portion of the property is situated in the B Residence District.

Exhibit D

Exhibit D purports to interpolate the zoning lines in 1980 and 1993 showing the change in the B Residence and Waterfront zoning lines. The Town changed this zoning line by Local Law No 23 in 1992. The current zoning of the portion of the property containing the Duryea residence and the area where the I/A sanitary system for the commercial uses on the property is proposed to be constructed was rezoned to B Residence in 1993. Commercial uses are prohibited in a residential zoning district.

Exhibit E

Exhibit E consists of a copy of 6 NYCRR 617.5 SEQRA regulations that list actions that are classified as Type II and therefore do not require review under SEQRA. The Type II list includes the construction or expansion of a primary or accessory, nonresidential structure or facility involving less than 4,000 square feet of gross floor area and not involving a change in zoning or a use variance and consistent with local land use controls.

The area of the sanitary system, additional parking areas, interior and exterior dining areas appear to exceed 4,000 square feet. Additionally, placing a sanitary system and parking for commercial use in a residential zoning district would require a use variance or a zone change and is not consistent with local land use controls.

In a memorandum dated February 26, 2019, the Planning Department recommended that the current project be classified as an Unlisted action.

Exhibit F

Exhibit F consists of a survey prepared by Walbridge Surveyors and dated November 30, 2017 that is noted as being prepared for a Certificate of Occupancy. This survey is consistent with Exhibit E of the now-stayed stipulation of settlement that recognized the preexisting structures on the site.

The Planning Department notes that the parking depicted on this plan does not reflect the more extensive parking depicted on the site plan prepared by Walbridge Surveyors dated February 21, 2019 that is before the Planning Board for approval.

Exhibit G

Aerial photographs from 1902, 1978, 1984, 1996, 1999, 2001, 2004, 2007, 2013, 2016, and 2018 described as depicting “pre-existing, nonconforming parking” on the Duryea site comprise Exhibit G. Exhibit E of the stipulation of settlement depicts the parking that is recognized by the Town as preexisting, nonconforming.

Site plan approval from the Planning Board has been required since 1975 and to be preexisting, the parking would need to predate that time. The Planning Board reviewed site plan applications submitted in 1991 and 1996 that depicted proposals for additional parking that was not pursued by the applicant and not approved. The Planning Department has been unable to locate any records indicating that approvals were obtained for this parking since that date. The 2018 aerial shows that parking improvements have been made that require site plan approval.

Exhibit H

Exhibit H consists of a letter dated May 25, 1998 prepared by Joe Peel, Chairman of the Tuthill Road Association to Doug Massa, Town Building Inspector. It is indicated in the letter that the Town should issue violations as the applicant is illegally operating a restaurant and that parking is occurring along the shoreline of Tuthill Pond. The applicant has highlighted a sentence in this letter that describes parking along the shoreline of Tuthill Pond as existing.

The applicant submitted site plan applications to the Planning Board that included plans for expanding parking along the shoreline of Tuthill Pond in 1991 and 1996. These applications were not followed through on by the applicant and never deemed complete or approved. The only parking recognized by the Town as legally preexisting is that depicted in Exhibit E of the (now stayed) stipulation of settlement. Any additional parking occurring along the shoreline of Tuthill Pond in 1998 does not have the appropriate approvals.

Exhibit I

A seating plan of the interior of the building and the attached deck comprises Exhibit I. The plan does not indicate a scale or the preparer. A scalable plan, with a title, and stamped and sealed by a licensed professional needs to be submitted for review. This plan should include seating calculations and the dimensions and square footage of the seating areas. A comparable seating plan for the private dining deck should also be provided.

A special permit standard for a restaurant requires that the maximum rated capacity be determined for the proposal. This calculation will be based on the plans described above. It is noted that the Fire Marshal’s previous calculation of rated capacity was not based on the current proposal.

Exhibit J

A Phase I Archaeological Investigation prepared by Alfred G. Cammisa and dated March 2019 was submitted. This report concluded that the site had a higher than average potential for recovery of prehistoric resources. A Phase II investigation dug twenty-one test holes in the area where the I/A sanitary system is proposed to be located. One prehistoric artifact, a quartz flake, was encountered and additional radial shovel tests were conducted at closer intervals around this artifact.

Exhibit K

Exhibit K consists of a letter from David Browne, Chief Fire Marshal dated April 3, 2015 that advised that the existing exterior deck has a maximum occupancy of 129 as per measurements from previously submitted plans. Measurements from a site plan submitted on December 2, 2014 resulted in the exterior deck having a calculation of a maximum occupancy of 192 and the proposed restaurant's interior having a maximum occupancy of 151. The Fire Marshal continues to state that these occupancy numbers are solely based on square footage and have no correlation to what is permitted under the Town Code (zoning) or other restrictions.

The Fire Marshal has advised the Planning Department that the latter occupancy ratings were based on a site plan application submitted in February 2015 that proposed to eliminate the current building and construct a 6,350 sq. ft. restaurant with 4,300 sq. ft. of decking and not the current structures. As pointed out by the Fire Marshal, rated capacity does not correlate to what is permitted under zoning requirements for parking or (SCDHS) the Town Code. Floor plans as described above should be submitted to the file so that the Fire Marshal can make a determination regarding rated capacity for the current proposal.

Exhibit L

Exhibit L consists of a letter dated March 21, 2019 from Bruce Anderson of Suffolk Environmental Consulting, consultant for the applicant, stating that the site plan depicts the installation of an I/a OWTS low-nitrogen sanitary system at the site and the boundary of the wetlands delineated on October 28, 2014 has not changed.

It is the practice and policy of the Town that Town staff, not private consultants, flag and verify the boundary of wetlands. By letter dated December 18, 2014, the Town notified the applicant's representative Inter-Science Research Associates, that the natural features, including wetland boundaries, mean high water, edge of beach and bluff crest had been verified as depicted on the George Walbridge Surveyors survey dated revised October 29, 2014. The letter further advises the applicant that the boundaries are valid for a period of three years from the date of the letter, or until December 18, 2017. Therefore, the applicant is required to obtain an updated flagging and verification of these natural features.

Exhibit M

Photo shopped photographs illustrating the proposed retaining walls in front of the residence where the septic will be installed are contained in Exhibit M. The illustration depicts vegetation that softens the appearance of these walls.

Detailed, scalable plans of the proposed retaining walls including elevations drawings that show height, material, and color should be submitted to the file. A landscaping plan that indicates the common and Latin names, height at planting, number of plants, and spacing proposed as to screen the walls should be submitted.

Conclusion

The Planning Board should review the evaluation form prepared by the Planning Department dated February 26, 2019 and reach a consensus on the questions contained in that memorandum and those contained below. The project does not meet zoning as proposed and the Planning Board will not be able to deem the application complete until and unless the applicant first obtains a wetland setback variance for the proposed parking and a use variance to locate the sanitary system associated with the commercial use in a residentially zoned area from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The alternative to obtaining a use variance would be to obtain a zone change from the Town Board.

Planning Board Consensus:

The Planning Board should advise the applicant whether a revised site plan that provides the zoning district lines and coverage calculations in accordance with the Town Code should be submitted.

Additional comments: _____

The Planning Board should determine whether the applicant should demonstrate compliance with the special permit standards in §255-5-50 of the Town Code for a restaurant, including the submission of full scale, scalable, dimensioned floor plans prepared, signed and stamped by a licensed professional that indicate the square footage of the relevant areas, including the private dining deck, and with seating calculations.

Additional comments: _____

The Board should determine whether the applicant should demonstrate compliance with the special permit standards in §255-5-50 for a non-water related use in a Waterfront zoning district.

Additional comments: _____

The Board should advise the applicant as to whether information demonstrating compliance with §255-11-88 regarding outdoor dining should be provided.

Additional comments: _____

The Planning Board should advise the applicant as to whether 10 copies of a full scale plan of SAN-1 with sanitary density calculations that reflect existing uses and proposed uses that correspond to the application before the Board should be submitted and that the proposed density calculations should correspond to floor plans that depict the various uses and the square footage of those uses.

Additional comments: _____

The Board should advise the applicant whether a full scale map depicting the patent areas and a copy of the patent for the underwater lands should be submitted to the file for review

Additional comments: _____

The Planning Board should advise the applicant whether a lighting plan for the site should be submitted that brings the site into compliance with the Town Code.

Additional comments: _____

The Board should advise the applicant whether the Town Engineer's memorandum dated March 1, 2019 regarding ADA compatibility should be addressed.

Additional comments: _____

Additional Board Comments:
