

THE MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

BOX 1447 • OAK BLUFFS
MASSACHUSETTS 02557
(508) 693-3453
FAX (508) 693-7894

Land Use Planning Committee Summary of March 8, 1999 Meeting Olde Stone Building Oak Bluffs, MA

Members Present: John Best, Christina Brown, Michael Colaneri, Jane Greene, Lenny Jason
and Richard Toole

Staff Present: David Wessling

Audience: James Beckman, Alan Dorfman and Ralph Packer

Meeting opened by Christina Brown, Chairman, at 5:35 P.M.

Airport Laundromat DRI #433

Alan Dorfman began his presentation by describing the redesigned laundry proposal. He also distributed a document, Analysis of Expansion Proposal, which outlines the scope and reasons for the current changes. Referencing building and site plans and building elevation drawings, he stated that:

- the new building's height will be 20' rather than 23'1",
- the clerestory will not be constructed,
- the new building will be setback 26' behind the existing laudromat and approximately 25' towards the airport runway, and
- wall heights will be reduced to 8'.

Mr. Colaneri asked questions to clarify the changes to the building's dimensions and relocation.

Response: Mr. Dorfman reemphasized the facts of his opening statement and added that relocating the proposed building will increase the area by 676 sq.ft. 468 sq.ft. of the added area will be used for retailing. He noted that the overall length of the building will increase to 222' (rather than 200' in the previous proposal) and that the height to the building may be reduced to 18'

Mr. Jason asked questions concerning ventilation.

Response: Mr. Dorfman explained that fans will be used to ventilate the building.

Mr. Colaneri asked the Applicant several questions about the redesigned parking area, surfacing materials and access.

Response: Mr. Dorfman explained the flow of traffic within the site and stated that R.A.P. will be used to surface the access drive and parking area. The plan indicated 33 customer parking spaces and 10 employee parking spaces.

Ms. Brown, Mr. Colaneri, Mr. Jason and Ms. Greene asked Mr. Dorfman questions concerning landscaping, signage, building materials and color of the proposed structure.

Response: The Applicant replied that:

the landscaping improvements, as shown on a plan displayed, consist of trees and shrubs similar to those to be planted on the adjacent airport grounds - pines, oaks and junipers (Ms. Greene suggested that the plantings not be arranged to create a "picket fence" like appearance. Mr. Colaneri emphasized that the landscape screening should be sufficiently tall and dense in order to be effective); and the building will be metal clad and of a color to be approved by the LUPC (Mr. Jason and Mr. Colaneri informed the Applicant of the role of the Airport Commission and its guidelines - wood shingles are preferred); signage will be in keeping with the character of the area (Mr. Colaneri and Mr. Jason reminded the Applicant of the West Tisbury's sign by-law and the Airport Commission's policies).

After further discussion, the members agreed that the revised plans for the proposal were responsive to previous comments and suggestions. Mr. Dorfman informed the members that he would prepare new plans which will incorporate the members' comments.

Before closing the discussion, Mr. Colaneri, Mr. Jason and Ms. Greene asked questions concerning the Applicant's compliance with the Commission's affordable housing policy.

Response: The Applicant agreed to recalculate the amount of the monetary contribution because of the larger building area.

Note: Continuation of public hearing (scheduled) April 15th contingent on receipt of revised project plans.

Vineyard Service Center DRI #489

Ms. Brown began the discussion by asking the staff to summarize the correspondence received. 48 letters were received. The number of responses and the reasons, pro and con, are as follows:

<u>Against the project</u>		<u>For the project</u>	
Traffic congestion	32	Improve Five Corners traffic	16
Not needed	20	Needed	6
Wellhead risk	15	Environmental safety	6
Threat to other gas stations	7	Good location	3
Incompatible land use	5	Good use of property	3
Master plan inconsistency	3		
	1		

Committee members also discussed the Regional Housing Authority's letter.

Mr. Colaneri asked the staff about the Applicant's traffic study.

Response: Staff informed the Committee that the Applicant engaged a traffic engineering consultant who prepared a preliminary review of the proposal's potential impacts. A final report, referenced in the consultant's letter had not been received. Mr. Sherman, the Applicant's agent, commented

on the consultant's report. In reply, Mr. Colaneri felt the traffic study that was prepared for the Applicant's withdrawn application should have been included as part of the subject DRI application.

Mr. Colaneri, then, moved to recommend denial of the proposal on technical grounds because the application is incomplete (in that a complete traffic study had not been submitted). Motion seconded for discussion by Mr. Best. Mr. Toole argued that the results of a traffic study were unlikely persuade Commissioners who were not receptive to the proposal and that no "better alternative land uses (in terms of potential traffic impacts) were feasible. Upon further discussion, the motion was withdrawn.

Mr. Colaneri offered another motion, again seconded by Mr. Best: LUPC recommends that the proposal be denied. During the discussion of the motion, Mr. Colaneri cited the following reasons for denying the project:

- lack of a traffic study,
- potential impacts on High Point Lane due to insufficient turning radius and number of left turns,
- adverse effects on planned expansion of the Tisbury Shuttle and additional traffic to the enlarged parking area, and
- the risk of polluting the groundwater which is a source of Tisbury's drinking water.

All the members spoke during the discussion period. They debated the extent of traffic congestion, impacts of the project on groundwater, alternative uses that would produce less adverse impacts.

Ms. Brown called the vote: Mr. Colaneri voted for the motion, Mr. Toole opposed the motion, Mr. Best and Ms. Brown abstained. Mr. Jason and Ms. Greene were not present.

Tar Kiln Subdivision DRI #470

The members reviewed the recommendations that were made at the previous meeting (March 1st). After discussion of the recommendations the members directed the staff to prepare detailed recommendations. The revised recommendations are as follows:

1. That the subdivision shall consist of 29 lots as follows -
 - 2 "open space" lots,
 - 7 building lots to be designated as "affordable housing" in order to satisfy the Commission's affordable housing policy and
 - 20 building lots for market rate housing.
2. That the transfer of the designated "affordable housing" lots shall occur prior to the transfer of the market rate housing lots.
3. That the "affordable housing" lots shall be sited so as form a "scattered" pattern.
4. That the maximum number of bedrooms in each house to be built shall be 3.
5. That, prior to their transfer, the existing foundations, septic systems and public

water utilities which will serve the affordable housing” lots shall comply with state and local codes and regulations.

6. That each septic system shall be capable of at least 50% nitrogen reduction.
7. That the Applicant's offers concerning protective covenants, conservation easements and restrictions (contained in a document date January 19, 1999) shall be accepted. Its key provisions include:

The grant of a perpetual right and easement by the Applicant to the Town of Edgartown a perpetual right and easement to pass and repass by foot, horseback and non-motorized bicycles in and over that section of the Dr. Fisher Road (a/k/a Willays Plain Path) shown on the site plan as it abuts Lots 27-32 and the common areas.

The Applicant, as Grantor, further covenants that it will not clear the area within 25 feet of the sideline of Dr. Fisher Road nor erect any structures therein. This “green belt” area shall be along the rear property lines of lots 27-31 and a portion of lot 32 as shown on the site plan and along the rear property line of the common areas.

The grant of a perpetual right and easement in and over Tarkiln Path and the northerly boundaries of Lots 1-5 as shown on the site plan for travel by foot, horseback, an non-motorized bicycles, and for the realignment of Tarkiln Path for the construction of walkways and bike paths.

The Applicant, as Grantor, grants walkway easements affecting Lots 32,33, and 43, 10 feet in width, for pedestrian, horseback, or non-motorized bicycle travel.

Tisbury Wharf DRI #479

Ms. Brown and staff summarized the background facts of the project. At issue is the Applicant's contention that the proposal should not have been referred to the Commission by the Tisbury Planning Board.

Ralph Packer, the Applicant, and James Beckman, the Applicant's agent, participated in the Committee members' discussion. The Applicant informed the Committee how the nature of the actual proposal differs from the proposal that had been referred by the Planning Board.

Mr. Best suggested that a representative of the Planning Board should be invited to a continued meeting. The members so agreed.

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling