

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF June 3, 1991

Present: A. Schweikert; B. Hall, Jr.; J. Best; R. Lee; L. Sibley; T. Sullivan; J. Greene; M. Donaroma; L. Jason

Mr. Scwheikert opened the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

FISHER DRI

Ed Cuetara representing the applicant discussed the revised plan. He noted that the proposal was 1,000 feet less than before. He discussed the 11 parking spaces and the loading area, the trash compactor, the rest rooms and other features. He discussed the pavement treatment of brick. He discussed the building design. He also discussed the visual impact and the possibility of plantings growing up the side of the building. He discussed meetings with abutters to discuss their concerns. He noted that the shops were to be very fancy shops which would augment the A & P traffic. He noted that the materials for the building would be clapboard. He discussed the lighting and other features. A discussion of the changes and the reasons therefore followed.

Ms. Sibley questioned which elevation on the plans was the correct one. Mr. Cuetara noted what would be seen from Upper Main Street. A discussion of which elevation was the one followed. A further discussion of possible visual impact followed.

Mr. Cuetara discussed the set-back and the septic system, four stores, handicapped bathrooms, other features.

A discussion of the use of the rest rooms by the public followed.

Mr. Cuetara noted that they were intended for employee use only but would be handicapped accessible. Ms. Greene asked if the rest rooms would be serviced by a sidewalk. Mr. Cuetara discussed the paving and how one would reach the rest rooms. A discussion of their location and possible movement followed.

Mr. Donaroma questioned whether there was any consideration of the extension of the service road easement followed. Mr. Cuetara indicated no.

Mr. Cuetara discussed the possible pedestrian connection to the A & P.

A discussion of how the proposal might fit into the BII master plan followed. A further discussion of the parking issue followed.

Ms. Greene expressed a concern for the use of the bank parking lot since it was used summers by employees. Mr. Cuetara was unaware of any problem. A discussion followed.

Mr. Donaroma discussed possible arrangements with the bank for parking. Mr. Cuetara indicated no interest on the part of the bank. A discussion of this matter followed.

BOCH DRI

Mr. Schweikert then discussed the issue of the Boch DRI. Mr. Barbini explained why he had asked to meet with the LUPC again. He discussed the recommendations of the LUPC and hoped for further discussion to resolve any differences.

Mr. Lee left the room.

Gino Montessi discussed what the intent of the proposal was. He noted that the building would be used to sell small inflatable boats, the remaining buildings would be removed and boat storage which was badly needed would occur in the winter. He discussed the benefits of boat storage for the boat yards. He noted the final use would be for summer parking which also was needed. He discussed the past history of attempts to gain parking for the town. He discussed the requirements for employee parking in the zoning ordinance and the lack of same along Beach Road. He noted that employee parking was to be a major part of the proposal. He also discussed uses of the Steamship Authority. (SSA)

Mr. Schweikert questioned whether there would be work done on stored boats. Mr. Montessi indicated no. He further discussed boat storage issues.

Mr. Schweikert asked about the feelings of the Planning Board and whether there was any concern for traffic issues. Mr. Montessi indicated an endorsement of the proposal. Mr. Barbini discussed the traffic study and the MVC staff conclusions.

Ms. Sibley asked for the rough season of boat storage. Mr. Montessi felt that the end of October to May 1 was the season. He further discussed the fact that the lot should be vacant by May 15. He discussed the possibility of using the front of the lot for SSA parking in off-season.

Mr. Hall questioned the number of employee parking spaces in area.

Mr. Montessi felt around 15. A discussion of the numbers of employee parking spaces followed. Mr. Montessi discussed the renting of spaces in the Beach Road area.

Mr. Schweikert questioned the total number of spaces in the lot. Mr. Barbini indicated 80. A discussion of rental of employee

parking followed.

Ms. Sibley questioned whether there were other employees who would use the service. Mr. Montessi felt that all would. A discussion of who would pay for the spaces for employees followed. A discussion of other Island parking issues followed. A discussion of the use of such a lot by SSA patrons followed.

A discussion of the rental fee structure followed.

Ms. Sibley questioned how things would operate if the majority of the spaces were seasonal. Mr. Montessi felt that there may be a requirement for certain numbers of daily parking.

A discussion of the economics of the proposal followed. Mr. Montessi noted that the owner would be willing to sign papers indicating that there would never be an auto dealership on-site. A discussion of the problem of access/egress followed.

Ms. Sibley discussed the problems of day-long parkers throughout Tisbury.

A discussion of employee parking followed.

Mr. Best discussed the issue of controlling use of lot as well as the environmental concerns.

Mr. Montessi discussed the relation of this lot to its neighbors. Mr. Barbini discussed environmental issues related to the proposal.

Ms. Sibley questioned a possible maintenance program for the pervious surface. Mr. Montessi felt such was reasonable. Mr. Barbini felt it was viable if the timeframe was realistic. A discussion of this matter followed. A discussion of the composition of pervious surfaces followed.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the issue of parking lot on waterfront as well as the aesthetic appeal of same and ways to make it more acceptable. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of addressing long term problems with short term solutions.

Ms. Sibley questioned the possibility of a period of usage before having to return for review. A discussion of Mr. Montessi's negative response followed. Mr. Best discussed the issue of a parking lot and the need thereof. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Hall questioned the elevation difference from the low spot to the highest. Mr. Barbini felt about 4 feet. A discussion of screening followed.

A discussion of use of right turn only followed. Mr. Schweikert noted a need to see what staff had said. Ms. Greene suggested LUPC continue with same recommendation to the Commission. She felt nothing was being accomplished.

Ms. Sibley discussed how to determine what the public wanted. She discussed need to work toward transit or getting people out of cars.

Mr. Montessi discussed issue of required parking and marine usage. He then thanked those present for listening.

Mr. Hall discussed reduction of spaces and types of uses by rental, plus a timeframe to determine impact.

Mr. Schweikert questioned when the 60 days were up. He further discussed restriction to employee parking. Mr. Clifford noted the 60 days were up on June 17.

Mr. Clifford noted that the map on the wall was in response to a request from the Tisbury Traffic Committee and that they were on the way to the printer.

CAPE COD COMPANY

Mr. Schilling read a letter from the Chilmark Planning Board asking for one youth lot and the Menemsha Beach lot. He further discussed possible conditions.

A discussion of the Squibnocket Pond Advisory Committee activity followed. Ms. Greene questioned who would enforce the cutting rules. Mr. Schilling indicated that the SPAC would be the ones. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Sullivan questioned the possible number of houses. Mr. Racicot indicated 36 lots maybe. Since the new Squibnocket regulations he could only guess about 25. A discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Racicot discussed the Chilmark maximum build-out formula.

Mr. Schilling noted that some of the items on the possible condition list had been covered. He felt that a three-year pump-out time frame was necessary. A discussion of monitoring wells followed. Mr. Racicot discussed his feelings regarding the recommendations.

Ms. Sibley discussed the issue of access over an unstable area. A discussion of the erosion issue followed. A discussion of a State designation of a barrier beach followed. A discussion of public safety followed.

A discussion of whether there were any comments from the fire chiefs followed. Mr. Schilling discussed the chief's comments.

Mr. Sullivan questioned the feelings of the applicant regarding archeological issue. Mr. Racicot noted that there would be wording in the subdivision covenant. A discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Schilling read proposed wording from the applicant. Mr. Lee related various conversations with Forrest Coch regarding this matter and expressed the Tribal concern for the area. A discussion of this matter followed.

Ms. Greene raised the issue of housing. Mr. Schilling re-read the letter from the Planning Board.

Mr. Jason noted that the MVC policy was 10%.

Ms. Greene felt that there should be a donation to the Elderly Housing project for sidewalks and sprinklers. A discussion of this matter followed. A discussion of a monetary donation followed.

A discussion of the issue of affordable housing need followed. A discussion of the availability of year-round housing followed.

A discussion of the relationships of Squibnocket Beach and the applicant followed.

Mr. Racicot discussed the MVC affordable housing policy and asked for a wording clarification.

Ms. Greene discussed a financial donation over a period of years for the Housing Authority in lieu of a second lot.

Mr. Donaroma asked to table the issue to give the applicant a chance to review the options. Mr. Racicot asked that it not go to the full Commission yet.

Mr. Jason noted that he needed to go to a Housing Authority meeting and suggested that if the Boch DRI were to be approved, he wished to see it staggered to insure no traffic problem and that there should be employee parking for the site. A discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Sullivan felt that everyone should read Mr. Simmons' report again.

Ms. Greene expressed a concern regarding the parking and discussed her feelings regarding the relationship to 5 Corners. Mr. Donaroma discussed his feelings regarding the traffic issue. Mr. Schweikert discussed his feeling regarding a shoppers' lot but did like the idea of employee parking. He felt employee parking plus long term parking made sense. Ms. Sibley expressed her feelings regarding employee usage. She felt a reduced size was better. Ms. Greene discussed the issue of employer paid parking.

Mr. Sullivan discussed employee parking along Beach Road. Mr. Donaroma discussed how he deals with the issue at his business. Mr. Hall discussed the need for employee parking in the downtown

area. A discussion of the past attempts to gain parking areas in Tisbury followed. A discussion of how to deal with this issue followed. A discussion of screening followed.

A discussion of procedures followed.

Ms. Greene discussed the issue of marine uses vs other uses in the area. She felt that the LUPC should be hard and hold to its recommendation. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Hall discussed possible compromises. He discussed possible numbers and the means of mitigating certain visual aspects. Mr. Schweikert expressed his feelings regarding non-shopper parking within a certain timeframe. He further discussed the needs of the area.

Ms. Sibley asked if it were possible to set timeframes on particular DRIs. Mr. Clifford felt that the Commission could and cited past practices.

A discussion of a timeframe per year, reduced numbers and other items followed.

Mr. Donaroma discussed what he felt was being asked of the applicant.

He discussed what constituted direct marine usage.

Mr. Hall discussed a possible roll for the local planning board.

Mr. Schweikert discussed further the possible review of the proposal at a later date.

Mr. Donaroma further discussed what was needed from the applicant.

A discussion of working with the applicant and what would be asked of him followed.

A significantly scaled down project with fewer spaces; a timeframe from Memorial Day to Labor Day; screening, landscape, lighting, elevations, view scopes; parking mixture - employee oriented, long term; three-year period for review; oil mitigation; engineering review of structures to see if they are usable by others.

Mr. Sullivan felt the LUPC was doing the work of the applicant and was against doing such.

Ms. Sibley felt the LUPC was telling applicant what was wanted or that the proposal would not pass.

Mr. Schweikert summed up what would be suggested to the full Commission.

Mr. Lee discussed the possible re-use of the buildings which were to be removed.

HUGH TAYLOR DRI

Mr. Lee discussed the issue with respect to this proposal. He questioned the proposed numbers of seats in the restaurant and

the water usage.

A discussion of how the numbers of seats was calculated as well as how to calculate the total usage of the septic system followed.

Mr. Lee expressed concern regarding multiple seatings, numbers of patrons and the total amount of usage. He questioned whether it should be downsized. A discussion of the calculations of Title V followed. A discussion of what the actual volume was followed.

Ms. Sibley discussed the issue of the Gay Head DCPC area in relation to the proposal. A discussion of what the LUPC was reviewing followed.

Mr. Lee discussed the past history of this proposal. He discussed the size of the proposal and some of the feeling in the town. He felt that the proposal potentially could be approved with various conditions such as downsizing the restaurant and very close scrutinizing of the septic system. A discussion of how to proceed followed.

Ms. Sibley suggested a site visit. Mr. Donaroma discussed his visit to the site. He discussed the natural screening of the site and how the LUPC could deal with the proposal. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Lee suggested possible approval with conditions. A discussion of abutters location followed. He felt that more accurate math on the septic was necessary. Mr. Clifford read a further letter of clarification of this issue. Mr. Hall discussed the issue of turn-over. A discussion of limited seatings and limiting hours followed.

A discussion of when the 60 days was up followed. Ms. Sibley discussed the past decision of the Board of Appeals.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

