

# THE MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

BOX 1447 • OAK BLUFFS  
MASSACHUSETTS 02557

(508) 693-3453

FAX (508) 693-7894

MINUTES OF AUGUST 20, 1992

## MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION MEETING

The Martha's Vineyard Commission held a Regular Meeting on Thursday, August 20, 1992, in the Commission Offices, Olde Stone Building, New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs, MA.

There being a quorum present, Jennie Greene, Chairman of the Commission, called the meeting to order at 8:09 p.m.

Ms. Greene introduced Jim Tiejje of Patriot Party Boats who asked to make a presentation to the Commission regarding a proposed ferry service between Falmouth and Edgartown.

Mr. Tiejje distributed copies of a letter and the proposed schedule for service. He explained that the idea was a result of the transportation symposium that the Commission had sponsored in 1990. He noted that he was already providing service to the Island. (newspaper delivery) He noted he had already visited with the Edgartown Park Committee and the Board of Selectmen and so far had received a favorable response.

Mr. Tiejje noted also that he had met with the Steamship Authority to discuss their licensing process. He further explained that process. Mr. Tiejje explained that he had met with the Falmouth Selectmen and had received overwhelming support.

Mr. Tiejje then went on to explain what Patriot Party Boats were all about, how long they had been in business and what services were provided.

Mr. Tiejje then explained how he envisioned the service would work, the number of daily trips and the length of the season proposed. He felt that those people who were going to Edgartown would use the service.

He did not feel it would conflict with existing services to the Island. He then noted that he would be going to the Steamship Authority in September for a determination of whether an RFP would be issued or not.

Mrs. Marinelli questioned why the proposal was before the Commission. It was explained that it was an information presentation. Mrs. Marinelli commented on the Falmouth reaction. Mr. Clifford discussed his interpretation of the current parking issues in Falmouth. Mrs. Marinelli then questioned whether there would be tour busses meeting the boat in Edgartown. Mr. Tiejje explained how he envisioned the system working. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Early questioned whether there would be a need for additional shore facilities on the Vineyard. Mr. Tiejje felt that only a boarding

step would be needed. He noted the boat would be about 100-140-person capacity. He further discussed the usage of Memorial Wharf.

Mr. Jason questioned the depth the proposed boat would draw. Mr. Tiejje felt about six feet. He explained what the boat would look like.

Ms. Greene questioned what provisions for ticketing in Edgartown would have to be made. Mr. Tiejje hoped to have all round trip tickets and he would have a person on the dock to issue boarding passes and tickets may be sold on the boat.

Mr. Donaroma questioned whether there would be parking in Edgartown. Mr. Tiejje indicated no, only walk-on passengers and the cost of the round trip would be about \$15.00.

Mr. Donaroma questioned the possible carrying of freight. Mr. Tiejje indicated no, he would not.

Mr. Schweikert questioned how the SSA felt. Mr. Tiejje did not have a clear picture. He noted that the Falmouth rep would be favorable. Mr. Schweikert questioned what further process was needed. Mr. Tiejje indicated completion of lease arrangements and the like as well as responding to the SSA RFP and being the successful bidder. He then explained the formal process necessary to bid for the license. Mr. Schweikert questioned whether he anticipated returning to the MVC as a DRI. Mr. Tiejje didn't think so. A discussion of qualification under the checklist followed.

Mrs. Marinelli further discussed the possible prematurity of the visit. A discussion of this issue followed.

Mr. Early indicated that he felt such presentations were very beneficial. He further asked if the Parks Department had given any indication favorably or not. Mr. Tiejje felt that both they and the Selectmen had received the idea favorably and further discussed the issue.

Mr. Early questioned what fees would be put toward town expenses. Mr. Tiejje indicated a reasonable dockage fee and possibly a percent of the revenue.

Ms. Greene noted it sounded like a reasonable proposal but would possibly be referred as a DRI. A discussion of which item the proposal would fall under followed. It appeared to be 16b. A discussion of what would happen if there was no referral followed. A discussion of how a referral would be made followed.

Ms. Greene thanked Mr. Tiejje for the presentation and wished him well.

Ms. Greene then indicated that she would take ITEM 7 out of sequence.

ITEM #7 - Old Business  
Cronig's Market - modification of DRI

Stephen Bernier asked that the Commission be brought up to speed on where the proposal stood and why it was back on the agenda.

Ms. Greene explained how the project had returned and what the proposed change entailed and why. She noted that the issue before the Commission was whether the change would need a full DRI review or not, including public hearing. A discussion of this process followed.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the various LUPC meetings that had been held on the proposal.

Mr. Bernier explained the reasons for the proposed changes and the various design alternatives to eliminate the potential problems. He discussed the various design options available to lessen the impact visually.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the various LUPC meetings that had been held on the proposal.

Mr. Bernier explained the reasons for the proposed changes and the various design alternatives to eliminate the potential problems. He discussed the various design options available to lessen the impact visually.

Mr. Sullivan noted he still felt the ridge was being loaded or overloaded. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Early questioned the plane of the facade and what was to be housed in the newly created area.

Ms. Greene explained the proposed usage of the second floor area. Mr. Bernier further explained the use of the second floor - office space, conference and lunch room for employees and space for the bookkeeper.

Mrs. Marinelli questioned the term 'tin roof'. A discussion of clarifying the term to mean a metal roof and not corrugated tin followed.

Mrs. Marinelli questioned whether there would ever be any further use later. Br. Bernier discussed what could be done in the future but never retail or office due to limited parking availability. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Sullivan questioned the square footage of the area proposed. Mr. Bernier felt about 3,400 sq. ft.

Mr. Hall questioned whether a set back of the roof would help. Mr. Bernier discussed the aesthetics of such a move and whether there would be any structural problems. A discussion of this issue followed.

Mr. Early questioned whether there would be any natural light in the atrium area. Mr. Bernier didn't believe it was possible but there would probably be a window from the office that opens to the store below. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Hall discussed the possible use of a false front on the building ala Tisbury Marketplace. A general discussion of this issue followed.

Mr. Best further discussed the issue of the facade look and the problems created in design and look. He didn't feel the Commission should do a design makeover but that a proper design solution should be presented.

Mr. Early felt the Commission was only attempting to understand the proposal and recognize the structure for what it was - a supermarket.

Mr. Jason discussed the feeling of the LUPC in working with the landscaping to mask the mass of the structure.

Mr. Schweikert discussed what had transpired during the LUPC meetings to address the issues of massive structures.

Mr. Sullivan raised issue with deciduous trees only masking during part of the year. He felt that there needed to be some benefit from a professional designer and felt that public impact would be warranted. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the gabled look of the structure and the need to maintain same architectural character to the site.

Sanford Evans discussed the proposed landscaping which was intended to help screen the structure. He explained how the pictures he used had been developed. He discussed the various reasons for the locations of the trees that would be put on the site. He discussed the slope of the land and how the building would appear smaller.

Mr. Evans then discussed the arrangement of trees, the types and sizes and the feel of the area. He noted that there would be red oaks, norway maples and the like. He explained the sizes - 2 to 3" cal.- 15 to 17 feet, the roof being about 23 feet. He then discussed the existing trees on the site.

Mr. Early questioned what would protect the trees from harm; would there be raised curbs. Mr. Evans indicated what protection would be afforded the trees.

Mr. Evans further discussed the landscaping at the end of the building.

Mrs. Marinelli indicated a problem not having public input to discuss the changes. A discussion of this issue followed.

Mr. Early questioned any potential problem with roots and asphalt parking. Mr. Evans indicated where the shallow rooted trees would be and where those with top roots would be located.

Mr. Early then asked how the roof drainage would be affected.

Mr. Bernier indicated the location of the gutters and the fact that the same amount of water would be entering the proposed system.

Mr. Hall asked about the location of HVAC units. Mr. Bernier indicated that they would be located to the rear of the building - none on roof.

Mr. Early questioned what would happen if a tree died. Mr. Evans indicated it would be replaced. A discussion of this issue followed. Mr. Donaroma discussed what issues remained to be completed by the

LUPC and the Applicant.

Mr. Early moved that the Commission consider the change insubstantial and did not warrant a full DRI review but that the Applicant continue discussion with the LUPC on all final detail. Seconded by Mr. Donaroma.

Ms. Greene restated the motion and called for discussion.

Mr. Hall asked about the new net square footage. The office space would be 600 sq. ft. and about 3,400 sq. ft. of dry storage. Mr. Hall felt uncomfortable with no hearing and no input from the public and indicated disagreement with motion.

Mr. Donaroma favored the motion and explained his reasons including a better landscaping plan. He further discussed his reasoning since the structure was and still is a grocery store.

A discussion of what the issue before the Commission was followed.

Mr. Bernier requested permission to explain the square footage issue and was granted thus. He explained that he had to have the proper storage space to be able to compete.

Ms. Greene discussed how the Commission had always calculated usable space.

Mr. Clifford indicated that there was no staff review since it was all handled at LUPC

Ms. Greene restated the motion and called the roll. On a vote of 5-4 the motion passed.

The Commission took a brief recess so that all could meet Jan's daughter.

ITEM #3 - Approval of Minutes August 6, 1992

Mr. Hall moved approval with one change. - duly seconded.

Mr. Hall noted that page 5, ITEM 5, should indicate that he had removed himself from the proceedings. On a voice vote, the minutes were approved with the correction.

ITEM #4 - Chairman's Report

Ms. Greene noted that Mr. Hall was going to Boston and would take nomination papers for those who wished to have them delivered.

A discussion of the staff tee shirts followed.

LUPC -

Mr. Schweikert noted that the report had already been given

PED - no report

EDTF - no report

AG T.F. - Ms. Greene noted that there would be a meeting at the Extension Service on August 26 to discuss feasibility of a slaughterhouse on the Island.

Legislative Liaison - no report

ITEM #5 - Possible Discussion - Written Decision - Marianne DRI  
Ms. Greene moved to ITEM #6.

ITEM #6 - Possible Vote - Written Decision - Marianne DRI  
Mr. Early felt that the wording of the condition regarding reserve parking spaces was awkward and did not make sense. The number six should have been included.

Ms. Greene felt that there was a condition missing and that was the one relating to the use of the garage by any business other than Marianne. Mr. Clifford noted that it had been omitted in the draft inadvertently and would be included in the final version.

Mr. Sullivan moved approval as amended, duly seconded.  
On a roll call vote, the amended written decision was approved.

ITEM #8 - New Business -  
Mr. Clifford asked the MVC representatives for their help in working with the Mass. Highway Department to get funds to design the bike paths so that they can be constructed. He explained the problem and how much was needed to get the designs done. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mrs. Marinelli raised a question regarding a letter written by MVC staff pertaining to a proposed transfer station in Oak Bluffs and asked if the MVC had ever voted on this matter or when it had been discussed. Mr. Clifford explained where the letter came from and the fact that the term 'Commission' is a generic term which means the representatives or the staff or both. He went on to explain the purpose of the response to a MEPA request and that the response was solely an environmental issue and not a political one. A discussion of this issue followed.

Mr. Schweikert raised a question regarding grant funds and whether the Commission ever suggested certain parties to do work. Mr. Clifford indicated no and went on further to explain a specific situation regarding the Oak Bluffs bulkhead grant. Mrs. Marinelli indicated that town counsel had been asked to once again verify the legality of a previous decision. Mr. Jason asked about a recent grant received by the MVC. Mr. Wilcox explained the purpose of the grant; regional aquifer protection, regional agreements in event of emergencies. He noted that the communities involved would be Oak Bluffs, Edgartown, Tisbury and West Tisbury plus the County.

ITEM #9 - Correspondence - there was none.

A brief discussion of when Herring Creek may return to the MVC followed.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:14 P.M.

ATTEST

Jane A. Greene                      9/17/92  
Jane A. Greene, Chairman              Date

Thomas Sullivan                      9/17/92  
Thomas Sullivan,                      Date  
Clerk/Treasurer

Attendance

Present: Best, Donaroma, Early, Greene, Hall, Jason, Schweikert, Sibley, Sullivan, Marinelli, Chapin

Absent: Briggs, Bryant, Colaneri, Alley, Vanderhoop, Lee, Allen, Bolling, Gallagher, Benoit, Clarke