

THE MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

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

MINUTES OF APRIL 25, 1991

MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION MEETING

The Martha's Vineyard Commission held a public hearing on Thursday, April 25, 1991 at 7:30 p.m. at the Tisbury Elementary School, Spring Street, Tisbury, MA regarding the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI):

Applicant: MVY Realty Trust
c/o Schofield Bros., Inc.
P.O. Box 339
Vineyard Haven, MA 02568

Location: State Road
Vineyard Haven, MA

Proposal: Construction of a commercial building qualifying as a DRI since the proposal is for the construction of commercial structure greater than 1,000 square feet and the land in question was the subject of a previous DRI.

Alan Schweikert, Chairman of the Land Use Planning Committee, (LUPC), read the Public Hearing Notice, opened the hearing for testimony at 7:40 p.m. and introduced the applicant to make his presentation.

Michael Putziger introduced those present and indicated that there would be some comments and answers to questions from the previous hearing.

Doug Hoehn discussed the questions and responded to them. He indicated that the size of the proposal in 1987 was for a total of 55,750 square feet; the second proposal was for a total of 50,600 square feet and the present proposal was for 25,600 square feet of supermarket. He discussed the existing building location and the proposed location of the supermarket. He also discussed the various components of the drainage system. He discussed the proximity to abutters. He discussed past town meeting actions regarding proposals for the same site.

Alan Haven, architect, discussed the proposal as compared to the previous submittals. He discussed the locations of various components of the proposal, including electrical, emergency back-up generator, etc.

Mr. Jason raised a question regarding the loading dock; Mr. Haven discussed the location and design. A discussion of this matter

followed.

Ms. Sibley raised a question regarding the size compared to previous submittals; Mr. Haven discussed this issue.

Mr. Colaneri raised a question regarding the space available for commercial vehicular traffic; Mr. Haven discussed this issue. A discussion of this matter followed.

Ms. Greene raised a concern regarding handicapped access and various issues; Mr. Haven discussed these matters.

Mr. Early raised a concern regarding a comparison between the height of existing structure and the proposed structure; Mr. Haven discussed this matter.

William Roache, V.H.B. traffic engineer, presented the completed traffic study and the findings therein. He discussed the scope of the study and the analysis of the data generated by the investigation. He discussed existing traffic conditions, counts and problem areas. He discussed the counts, their locations and the times of day/week/month each was taken. He discussed hourly variations for peak summer week days as well as weekends. He discussed various technical aspects of the counts. He discussed the adjustments made to the counts; the numbers to be assigned to the use intended; population distribution and other aspects of the study. He further discussed the components of the analysis and impacts. He also discussed the mitigation measures possible. He discussed the methods of determining the impacts of proposals and then went further to indicate the mitigation measures being proposed to lessen or alleviate those impacts. He discussed traffic flow in and around the project, the bike path layout and areas of road widening. He discussed control of flow through intersection by police during peak hours in summer.

Mr. Roache then offered to respond to any questions.

Mr. Schweikert called upon Tom Simmons of the staff to discuss the traffic issues.

Mr. Simmons discussed the various problem areas of the study using a series of overhead projections of certain pages of the study. He discussed off-season peaks of unsignalized intersections and comparisons to in-season peaks as taken from the study. He indicated that the study had not followed the scope as accepted by the applicant. A letter of August 6, 1990 was discussed. He discussed the scope and the use of on-island traffic counts. He discussed the change to ITE counts and the disclaimer of those rates. He then used ITE rates to indicate differences between those rates and actual counts for a similar traffic report for Cronig's Market. He then compared the studies and the methodologies used in each.

Mr. Simmons further discussed the scope of the study and the adequacy of the study as completed. He then discussed the apparent means used by the applicant to develop certain numbers in report. He cited an example of inconsistencies in the report using numbers for Lambert's

Cove Road as developed by the applicant. He discussed the location of the access drive as the existing Holmes Hole Road intersection. He discussed the need for the study to be forwarded to EOTC, MEPA and that DPW had received a copy.

Bill Wilcox, MVC staff discussed various water quality issues related to the proposal. He discussed the concerns, the test wells and the monitoring program discussed earlier. He discussed groundwater flow and the existence of a perched water table on-site. He discussed the need for clear threshold parameters and mitigation measures established.

Mr. Sullivan raised a question of types of mitigation measures; Mr. Wilcox discussed possible measures.

Mr. Best raised the issue of wastewater flow; Mr. Wilcox discussed the matter and its similarity to domestic waste flow.

Mr. Lee questioned the location within the zone of contribution and the amount of wastewater allowed; Mr. Wilcox explained how to calculate the acreage needed and the discharges allowed. A discussion of the perched water table followed.

Ms. Greene raised the question of run-off and site drainage and the adequacy of the remaining vegetation; Mr. Wilcox discussed these issues as well as the locations of catch basins and grass areas for run-off retention.

Ms. Sibley raised a question of whether there would be further sessions on traffic. A discussion of this matter followed. Ms. Sibley raised questions regarding sampling times and duration; Mr. Roache discussed this matter with respect to dates and locations. A discussion of the items depicted on the various charts used followed. A discussion of stacking on State Road followed.

Mr. Hebert questioned the use of ITE numbers; Mr. Roache discussed the reasoning and the methodology used to determine the numbers for the proposal. A discussion of the Cronig counts followed. Mr. Hebert further raised a question regarding the conflict between automobile-bikes-pedestrians; Mr. Roache discussed this matter and how the problem may be addressed.

Mr. Combra discussed the issue of residents leaving Holmes Hole Road. Mr. Roache discussed the need to create a single entrance which could be used by both the residents along Holmes Hole Road and development. He discussed the need to resolve the issue of the curb cut for the town-owned strip of land adjacent to Holmes Hole Road. Mr. Combra further questioned the issuance of permits by the state; Mr. Roache indicated that none had been applied for yet.

Ms. Greene raised the issue of widening State Road and the willingness of the State to permit this to occur; Mr. Roache indicated that there had been no response from DPW since no formal application had as yet been submitted.

Mr. Sullivan discussed the discrepancies between assumptions made about the types of uses at Cronig's and MVY; Mr. Roache discussed the matter of what each had been considered for the purposes of traffic generation.

Ms. Sibley raised a question regarding vehicle trips during the summer; Mr. Roache discussed how such numbers were generated and whether adjustments made were sufficient to give true values. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Combra indicated that the usage of percentages was very misleading. He felt that you could get them to mean anything.

Mr. Roache discussed the submission of additional data to the Commission for further review. He discussed various aspects of the report. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Schweikert called for town boards comments.

Craig Saunders, West Tisbury Planning Board, 4 out of 5 members opposed. Scale too large; issue of economic impact and impact on travel route up-island.

Jack Borden, Vineyard Haven, raised issue that was unrelated to the public hearing. The Chair and Mr. Borden discussed the matter briefly.

Mr. Schweikert called for proponents.

Tom Wallace, discussed the benefit of the proposal and that no changes had been made in the zoning. He felt that it was an issue of services to the island. He discussed the differences between previous submittals, the need for competition and the need to judge each fairly.

Mr. Schweikert called for opponents.

Brendan O'Neill, Vineyard Conservation Society, introduced the following expert witnesses: Ralph Gakenheimer, Craig Saunders and Daniel Greenbaum. He discussed potential uses for the site and the need to protect the environment and economic values of the island.

Mr. Gakenheimer, West Tisbury summer resident, discussed his credentials and the paper that had been distributed. He discussed the proposal from the standpoint of economic impact. He discussed in detail competition, cost factors, needs and pricing. He discussed the information presented in the impact report and questioned a number of statements contained therein.

Craig Saunders, West Tisbury, discussed issues related to hydrology and geology and the relationship of the proposal to the Lake Tashmoo watershed. He discussed the location of the Spring Street well and the zone of contribution. He discussed possible problems with contaminants and the well, the perched water table and other aspects of groundwater flow.

Daniel Greenbaum, M.I.T., discussed the issue of traffic impact. He reviewed the study presented and discussed the information contained therein. He discussed the problems of the proposal as he had determined. He discussed trip generation, road capacities and the usage of ITE data. He further discussed access to the site and the effects upon traffic movement. He discussed how to analyze the data presented.

Brendan O'Neill, VCS, discussed the need to consider old Holmes Hole Road status and future usage. He discussed past considerations of the area. He felt plan should not be accepted due to many factors already raised.

Edith Eber, League of Women Voters, spoke in opposition and read a statement from the League addressing run-off and air pollution.

Robert Staigert (unknown), discussed amount of data and time necessary to digest all factors; discussed users and past town votes, and need for the project.

Pamela Cook, West Tisbury, discussed light pollution and the glare from large areas of lighting. She further discussed the economic benefits or lack thereof and the possibility of more waste pollution.

Jeremy Goodale, Tisbury, discussed abutters and easements that are currently in existence regarding access.

Katherine Logue, West Tisbury, urges careful review and effect that could occur in downtown area. She discussed ability of tourists to walk to market on Water Street and the loss of this could hurt entire island. She discussed problems of ambulance calls and traffic problems.

Mr. Schweikert called for other testimony; there was none. He then asked if the applicant had any additional comments he wished to make.

Michael Putziger, MVY Trustee, asked that the hearing be continued to permit traffic engineer to talk and work with MVC staff on remaining issues.

Ms. Bryant questioned whether the applicant would respond to economic questions raised. Mr. Putziger indicated that they would probably do so.

There being no further testimony, Mr. Schweikert continued the hearing to a later date which was tentatively set as May 23.

Jenny Greene opened the Regular Meeting at 10:47 p.m.

She reminded all that the meeting time would be at 7:30 p.m. for all subsequent meetings.

