

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE - MINUTES

November 19, 1990

Attendance: T. Sullivan; L. Sibley; A. Schweikert; J. Green

C. Clifford called the meeting to order at 4:45 p.m. and asked J. Schilling on the staff to explain the situation with Farm Pond in Oak Bluffs.

Farm Pond

Mr. Schilling discussed the project with aspect to the work to be done by the DPW and the culvert that would be put in during the work. There would be a cost savings if work done at the same time.

A request from J. Devillas for a waiver was effectively turned down.

No opposition on Island to project.

Oak Bluffs asking for support and to ask question as to whether project must be handled as a DRI.

A discussion of this matter followed. An explanation of what was requested by EOEA followed.

K. Barnicle of IEP and K. DeBettencourt of O.B. Board of Health discussed their perspective of the situation.

A discussion of the status of the pond followed.

A discussion of the proposed solution to the problem followed.

A discussion of the pond level and the consequences of not correcting the problem followed.

K. DeBettencourt discussed the alternatives that had been proposed and eliminated and then the change of mind on behalf of certain state officials.

A discussion of the existing facilities followed.

Oak Bluffs is still attempting to get a waiver of the need for a full EIS.

A discussion of whether the Commission needed to reconsider its position with respect to the project.

A discussion of whether this item should have been considered a DRI followed.

Mr. Schweikert suggested that the LUPC recommend again that the project not be considered a DRI.

He also asked if a letter could be sent to J. Devillas to discuss the matter with him.

A discussion of the timing of the proposal and its construction timeframe followed.

It was suggested that the decision of the Commission should stand and that the Commission staff would do what it can in support of the project.

K. DeBettencourt asked for a letter of support if possible.

Peter Simon - Bowling Alley-preliminary

Ron Rappaport discussed the proposal and what was needed to make the project a reality.

He discussed the various permits needed from the town.

He felt that the applicant needed a read from the Commission as to whether the project would be a DRI or not. He discussed the history of the building and the previous DRI.

A discussion of Island Tire request followed.

Attorney Rappaport felt that the proposal was not a DRI. since he felt that it was a lesser use than previously.

A discussion of whether building permits were needed or not followed.

A discussion of the original Woodchips DRI followed.

A discussion of the issue of a change of use followed.

A discussion of the limits of "once a DRI, always a DRI" followed.

Attorney Rappaport gave his interpretation of same and his reasonings why the proposal should not be a DRI - i.e. no permits required.

A discussion of the need for permits followed.

A discussion of the need for this type of facility followed.

A discussion of any traffic impact followed.

A discussion of the actual configuration of the facility followed.

A discussion of the DRI process followed. A discussion of whether any items could be waived. An explanation of the process followed. A further discussion of the need for permits for electrical, plumbing and other items followed.

The applicant was requested to return on November 9 and hopefully questions would be answered at that time.

Mr. Clifford read a letter from Thimble Farm requesting that the LUPC determine whether a proposed phasing of the approved greenhouse project would be considered insignificant.

A question of why even make such a request was answered that the owners of Thimble Farm wanted to be sure that all parties had agreed to permit phasing. They wanted to do things right.

A discussion of the L.P. gas usage followed. It was noted that the approved proposal would eventually be built but the L.P. gas was less expensive to use in the smaller phase.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that he felt the Town preferred L.P. gas anyway.

The Committee did not feel it necessary to send to the Commission due to its insignificance.

A discussion of the December meeting followed.

A discussion of the need to treat all applicants along State Road equally. The traffic issue was always to be an issue in that area.

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

