

To: Planning & Zoning Commission From: Jeremy DeCarli, Planning & Zoning Official RE: July 5, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting – Staff Notes Date: June 29, 2023

The following are staff notes and comments as they relate to agenda items. Additional information and documents are available on the website. The status of applications is subject to change between the date of this memo and the date of the meeting.

## 1. Call to Order and Seating of Alternates

**3.** Communications, Liaison Reports, and Public Comments (Use the "Raise Your Hand" feature to speak)

Key Capture Energy, LLC has formally submitted to the CT Siting Council for the battery storage project at 44 Skinner St.

## 5. Public Hearings:

A. PZC-23-011: Edgewater Hill, 10 Edgewater Circle, Text Amendment regarding water requirement in MUDD zone per Sec. 6.4.D.3.d.3, Map 10A/ Block 85/ Lot 5B

A revised proposed draft has been provided by the applicant and is within the packet. As discussed at the June 7 meeting, the new draft includes language capping the number of units that could have an individual private well within a MUDD at 14. As a reminder, this application is for a text amendment to the zone. Although Edgewater is currently the only MUDD development, others could be developed in the future.

B. PZC-23-012: Michael Bakaj, 37 South Main Street, a 22-lot (33 units) HOD subdivision in existing HOD Zone, Map 20 Block 51/ Lot 27

The subdivision has been reviewed by the Director of Public Works, the Town's consulting Engineer, Chatham Health District and me. All reviews have been provided to the applicants Engineer and are included in your packet. We have not yet received updated plans or any other items that have been requested. There are several items outstanding, including, but not limited to the draft affordability plan and a cost estimate of road construction for bond estimating.

We have not received a copy of mailing receipts proving that abutters were notified of the hearing opening on July 5, nor is there a sign posted on the property. Office Staff did file the appropriate legal notice for the hearing.

As proof of notification is not available and we are missing documents and revised plans, I recommend opening the hearing as required (within 65 days of accepting the application), and continuing the hearing to the August 2 meeting to give the applicant enough time to fulfill the requirements of the application.

C. PZC-23-013: M&J Bus, Inc., 9 Young Street, Special Permit to allow school bus storage per Sec. 5.3.C.6, Map 20/ Block 33/ Lot 7A

The application contemplates the storage of school buses and vans to transport children attending East Hampton Schools, along with the installation of an office trailer on the property formerly used as a gravel pit. M&J has purchased the property and plans to operate the bus yard out of this location, rather than the non-conforming bus yard on North Main Street which has been in operation since at least the 1950's.

The parcel is zoned Industrial which allows for "contractor storage/service/office" and fronts on a State Highway (Route 196). The applicant is proposing to use the existing access to and from Route 196 without any changes in configuration. The access drive is approximately 380 feet south of the traffic light at the Route 16 intersection, which would allow approximately 8 full size school buses to queue if needed.

The applicant is not proposing any additional impervious coverage on the site. Drainage is handled by two existing drainage ponds currently on the property. All improvements and parking are located outside the 100 foot upland review area of surrounding wetlands and are not subject to the Wetland Regulations.

If after the Public Hearing the Commission there are no further requests for information, the application can be approved as presented as all requirements have been met and the use meets the zoning requirements.

## D. Text Amendment Regarding Required Setbacks on Non-Conforming Lots in the R-1 Zone: Section 8.2 of the East Hampton Zoning Regulations

ZBA reviewed the changes and had no concerns regarding the proposal. The minutes from their meeting are in your packet. The Conservation Lake Commission was asked to review the proposal and provided no feedback.