



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

August 6, 2019

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Eric Schantz 
Senior Planner

RE: Below the Bridge Industrial Park – Site Plan/Special Permit
SCTM#300-145-3-9.4, 11.1, 12.1, 21.1, 22.1 & 145-5-4.1, 14.1

Last Review Date: February 6, 2019

Items and Date Received:

06/04/19 Applicant submission; Cover letter; Ten (10) copies of revised plans for Lots 1, 3, and 4. Specification sheet C-1 through C-6 dated May 23, 2019 and Sheet L-1 dated May 26, 2019. 06/05/19 Public Comments – R. Pine 07/17/19 Fire Marshal Comments

Background Information: Site plan application has been made to develop four (4) individual lots. Three (3) of the lots are to contain a series of individual stalls to be rented to contractors for storage. No buildings are proposed on these lots and the only structures will be a series of 4' tall stockade fences to separate the "pens". Lot 2 is proposed to be improved with a 7,317 sq. ft. warehouse building for a wholesale building supplies distributor along with parking, landscaping, lighting and related accessory structures.

The subject parcels are all zoned CI: Commercial Industrial and are situated off of Springs – Fireplace Road in East Hampton. They range in size from 42,216 sq. ft. to 42,312 sq. ft. All are 100% cleared of naturally – occurring vegetation. All are within the South Fork Special Groundwater Protection Area.

The property originally consisted of seven (7) individual parcels. A lot line modification which reconfigured and combined these lots to create four (4) lots conforming to the minimum lot size requirement of the CI: Commercial Industrial Zoning District (40,000 sq. f.t) was approved by the Planning Board on October 28, 2015.

Pursuant to SEQRA and Chapter 128 of the Town Code, the proposed project is an unlisted action. The Planning Board has declared lead agency status and has adopted a negative declaration.

Issues for Discussion:

Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA)

The ZBA held a public hearing on April 16, 2019 and by resolution dated June 18, 2019 denied the requested variances for maximum allowable total lot coverage for Lots 1, 3 & 4. The applicants have accordingly amended the plans to meet the maximum allowable total lot coverage (75%) in the CI: Commercial Industrial Zoning District.

Landscaping

A revised landscaping plan has been submitted. This plan illustrates areas of eastern red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*), northern bayberry (*Myrica pennsylvanicica*), Inkberry (*Ilex glabra*) and grasses (*Panicum virgatum* & *Schizachyrium scoparium*). Although the Planning Department does not object to any of these species, the areas of the site which are still native, naturally-occurring deciduous woodlands are recommended to remain un-cleared. The Board had already previously stated that a similar plan was acceptable but it is recommended that the Board reconsider and preserve as much of the natural woodlands as possible. The areas of remaining woodlands (i.e. the edge of existing clearing) should be illustrated. It is also recommended that a notation indicating that project-limiting fencing will be required at the time of construction be added to the site plan.

On-Site Circulation

Prior to the ZBA's denial of the total lot coverage variances, Lot 1 was proposed to have 11 individual pens, Lot 3 was proposed to have 16 individual pens and Lot 4 was proposed to have 12 individual pens. Under the revised submission, Lot 1 would have 11 individual pens (no change), Lot 3 would have 16 individual pens (no change), and Lot 4 would have 12 individual pens (no change).

The Planning Department, as it has stated in nearly every one of its previous memorandums feels that the proposal to have this number of pens (39 in total) across three lots, where the proposed circulation pattern is to have contractors park in the access lane, turn on their work vehicles, pull these vehicles into the access lane, pull their passenger vehicles into the individual pen and then drive off and repeat these steps at the end of the work day is impractical and presents the potential for serious on-site circulation issues.

It is again recommended that at the very least, that one on-site passenger vehicle parking space per pen be required.

The Board is reminded that this is not a specifically defined use in the Town Code and therefore has been deemed to fall into the category of "other non-nuisance industry". Additionally, the subject application is the first of this type to be applied for in the Town.

It is again recommended that the Board discuss the possible precedent that could be established by requiring roughly 0.5 on-site parking spaces per individual pen.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it appears that the application is otherwise complete pending possible changes to the parking and on-site circulation and the landscaping plan as required by the Board.

ES

Should the landscaping plan be amended to preserve existing areas of deciduous woodlands?

Additional comments: _____

Should the parking and on-site circulation be amended?

Additional comments: _____

Is the application complete and ready to be scheduled for a public hearing?

Additional comments: _____

Additional Board Comments:

