LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES - January 7, 1991

Attendance: T. Sullivan, A. Schweikert, J. Greene, J. Best, M. Donaroma, B. Hall, L. Jason

Allan Schweikert called the meeting to order at 5:16 P.M.

Mr. Schweikert called upon R.M. Packer to make a presentation. Ralph Packer introduced George Wey who explained Phase II of the project. He explained the various components of each part of the phase. He discussed usage by the oil barges and tankers as well as the usage of the existing marine railway. He discussed the new design and it's here the dredge materials might go - they are proposed to be placed behind the new bulkhead. Mr. Wey used a number of models to illustrate the vessel usage of the present set-up as well as the proposed set-up.

A discussion of this matter followed.
A discussion of the measurements of the proposed bulkhead followed.
A discussion of the sizes of the barges and tankers using the facility followed.
A discussion of the sizes of the barges and tankers using the facility followed.
A discussion of the length of the present facilities vs. the proposed facilities followed.
A discussion of oil spill mitigation measures followed.

Mr. Packer indicated that such measures were already on-site.
A discussion of the relationship of the proposal to the harbor management plan followed.
A discussion of where the various channels in the harbor were located followed.
A discussion of the location of the proposed dredging followed.
A discussion of the possibility of dumping the dredge materials at the state beach followed.
A discussion of oil spill prevention measures followed.

Mr. Schweikert asked if there were any final comments. Mr. Packer made a number of comments related to the need for the proposal. Mr. Schilling noted that the proposal could be deemed complete even though the comments from CZM and MEPA had not yet arrived.
A discussion of this matter followed.
A discussion of any update data on winds and currents in the harbor followed.

There being no further comments, Mr. Schweikert thanked the applicant for the presentation and closed the discussion at 5:45 P.M.
It was noted that there had been no comments received from Tisbury's Planning Board or any other boards.

Mr. Schweikert called upon Joe Whitemore to discuss his proposal. Mr. Whitemore discussed the proposal as to location and what was being proposed. He questioned why he was before the Committee and was uncertain as to the depth of discussion desired. He discussed the number of rooms, the parking and the possible exterior changes to the three buildings and the linkages between the three structures. Mr. Whitemore discussed the various correspondence that he had submitted.
Mr. Schweikert raised a question of which items had been checked on the Administrative Checklist.
Mr. Simmons discussed each of the items checked.
A discussion of the historical significance of the structures followed.
A discussion of what constituted "commercial" and what was "residential" followed.
Mr. Whitemore read a letter from town counsel to the Tisbury Board of Appeals regarding his interpretation of the Tisbury Zoning Ordinance.
A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Simmons discussed those items that had been submitted in the application. He discussed items that he felt needed additional submittals or clarification.
A discussion of the DRI process and whether, in fact, this item was a DRI or not followed.

Mr. Best raised a number of questions regarding what the Commission could review and needed to review. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of the parking proposed for the project followed. A discussion of the relationship between numbers of guests and number of vehicles followed.

A discussion of water quality issues as related to this proposal followed. A discussion of the proposed septic system update followed.

Mr. Sullivan questioned the location of the definitions in the state building code. Mr. Hall indicated that it was in Chap. 140 of the statutes.

Mr. Hall discussed the issue of definition of lodging, inn, hotel and similar uses. A further discussion of whether the proposal was a DRI or not followed.

Mr. Best suggested that the Committee should review the copy of town counsel's letter. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of the number of rooms and potential numbers of vehicles followed. A discussion of what the surface of the parking lot would be followed - gravel was the indication.

Mr. Whitemore discussed the traffic information that he had received from the Commission. Mr. Simmons discussed the ITE figures for traffic generation. A Discussion of this matter followed.
Mr. Jason questioned the handicapped accessibility. Mr. Whitemore discussed the location of the handicapped rooms and explained the floor plans.

Mr. Schweikert indicated that since it was getting late, the Committee should consider continuing this matter to the following Monday.
It was agreed to continue this matter until Monday, January 14.

A discussion of fire alarm systems and sprinkler systems followed.

Mr. Sullivan questioned how the issue of definitions in conflict could be resolved. A brief discussion of this matter followed.

There being no further discussion on the Whitemore DRI, Mr. Schweikert continued the session to the following Monday.

Mr. Clifford noted that the materials handed out were the proposed changes to the Standards and Criteria. He explained that they needed to be reviewed within the next few months, changes approved by the Commission and the item sent to the Secretary of Environmental Affairs for confirmation.

Mr. Jason discussed a matter related to a proposal in Chilmark in which an applicant wanted to change the configuration of some of the units in an existing inn. A discussion of the matter followed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:53 P.M.