

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES - SEPTEMBER 16, 1991

ATTENDANCE: Schweikert, Jason, Greene, Colaneri, Sullivan, Donaroma, Best, Hall

Alan Schweikert called the meeting to order at 5:24 P.M.

There was a brief discussion of the proposed amendment to return the cross-town referral back into the legislation.

A discussion of whether the Commission was an adjudicatory board or not followed.

WEISNER DRI -

Doug Hoehn showed the proposed subdivision of a nine-acre lot which was part of a previous DRI in 1977. He asked whether there could be a determination of whether this division was or was not significant enough for a new DRI. Ms. Green asked for some background. Mr. Hoehn explained the proposal and how it came about. The issue of whether there could be further subdivision of the area followed.

A discussion of the past subdivision and the decision thereof followed.

A discussion of what was being sought followed. It was noted that there were no conditions placed on the 1977 subdivision.

A discussion of what was on the site with respect to wetlands, burial sites, etc. followed.

Ms. Greene did not feel that it was a DRI. Several others felt the same. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Colaneri questioned whether there were any further restrictions on the site. None were known.

Mr. Schweikert asked the feelings of those present - most did not feel it was significant enough of a change to warrant a hearing. He then noted that the LUPC would recommend non significance.

TISBURY WHARF -

Mr. Clifford explained the request of R. Packer as to whether the proposed demolition was a DRI or not.

Mr. Best explained where the proposed activity was to occur.

Mr. Best explained why it had been referred to the Commission.

He discussed the proposal with respect to potential filling. He explained the differences in the plans and questioned what was actually going on.

A discussion of what had been checked on the Checklist followed. A discussion of which wall was to be the wall remaining after demolition.

A discussion of what was contained in the application followed.

It was suggested that Glenn Provost be invited to the next LUPC meeting to explain the application. Mr. Best further discussed the possible changes of use in the area and explained what was in the area now. A discussion of what was checked on the Checklist followed. A discussion of the issue of grading followed. Mr. Best explained what had been discussed with the Conservation Commission and the applicant. He discussed the application with respect to a raised septic system and what had happened before the Planning Board. A discussion of how to interpret the Checklist followed. It was finally decided that the Committee would ask Mr. Packer and Glenn Provost to come to the next meeting. A discussion of the size of the septic system being proposed and the validity of the permit therefor followed. Ms. Greene questioned whether there was any indication of long-term uses being proposed for the site. A discussion of this matter followed.

KELLY'S KITCHEN, A & P -

Mr. Clifford explained the request of Richard McCarron to have a determination made as to whether it was a DRI or not. A discussion of whether the previous DRI had been withdrawn or denied followed. Mr. Schweikert discussed the issue of significance. Mr. Colaneri read the letter and discussed the various parts thereof. A discussion of the use of the rear area as parking followed. A discussion of what might happen should the building be removed. Mr. Donaroma discussed the general feeling of the Planning Board with respect to demolition. A discussion of what was being sought followed. Mr. Hall discussed his feeling on what could be reviewed depending on how it is determined to relate to other aspects of the development proposal. Mr. Donaroma discussed the feeling of the Planning Board again and expressed their concern regarding demolition of the structure. Mr. Schweikert suggested having Mr. McCarron come before the Committee to explain the proposal. Mr. Best raised a question regarding the present usage of the site. Mr. Jason discussed a method of dealing with the request. A discussion of how long parking had occurred behind the Kelly's Kitchen area. A general discussion of the issue followed. Mr. Schweikert raised a question regarding procedures on this issue. A discussion of what was included in the term 'development' followed.

Mr. Clifford explained the proposed wording for the return of the cross-town referral to the legislation. All agreed to have this matter discussed at the next Commission meeting.

Mr. Best raised a question regarding the proposal of E. Boch to fence in his property. He discussed the information being submitted to the Conservation Commission. He asked Mr. Clifford his feelings. Mr. Clifford explained his feelings and felt that it was not a DRI since it was not a structure and there was no regional impact from a fence.

A discussion of the order of conditions before the Conservation Commission followed. A discussion of the impact of the fence followed.

Mr. Best Further explained the feeling of the Conservation Commission. All present seemed to agree that there was no DRI.

HOUSING POLICY -

A discussion of what was contained in the draft followed.

Mr. Clifford noted that it was nothing more than the present housing policy reorganized.

Mr. Hall discussed a study regarding affordable housing and the relationship to needed infrastructure and other matters.

A discussion of the 10% figure followed. Mr. Jason noted that it was related to the comprehensive permit legislation.

Mr. Best asked for a clarification of the draft. Mr. Clifford explained the housing policy, its background and other related issues.

Mr. Best felt there was confusion over the interpretation of the policy.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the various aspects of housing policies in the towns - particularly West Tisbury and Chilmark.

A discussion of the policy followed.

A discussion of the need to have a clear policy that all could follow followed.

Ms. Greene asked for a slight change to the policy to indicate that the Regional Housing Authority lot could be given with the equivalent amount of cash at the discretion of the Commission.

Mr. Jason disagreed and explained why.

Mr. Best discussed the options available to the Housing Authority to raise cash.

Mr. Sullivan raised a question regarding the phrase dealing with making adjustments to the policy. Mr. Jason discussed how this all came about.

A discussion of the need for that flexibility.

Mr. Sullivan discussed the issue of high priced subdivisions vs lesser priced subdivisions. Mr. Jason explained how the Commission had dealt in the past with developments that fit the low or moderate end of the scale and gave an example. If someone is meeting the need then no further requirements are

sought from that person. A further discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of how the 20% amount was arrived at followed. Mr. Sullivan further discussed the adjustment factor. A discussion of the actual meaning of the policy.

Mr. Hall asked what the studies were that lead to the housing policy. Mr. Jason discussed the relationship between the comprehensive permit statute and the housing policy. Mr. Clifford noted that the review and development of the policy and studies were done by the MVC legal council in reviewing all relevant statutes and regulations in the State.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the issue of the 20% and the relationship of the money to lots or land. A discussion of the relationship between the MVC policy and the various actions that may be taken by the Regional Housing Authority followed.

Mr. Clifford discussed the numbers contained in the policy and the problems of making too many radical changes and losing the legality.

Mr. Best discussed the purpose of the policy and the need not to try and use it to get the mitigation of other issues. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Jason then asked to have the housing policy address the commercial developments.

Mr. Sullivan discussed the need to make it clear to all parties and really make it clear.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the issue of incremental development. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Best discussed the problem of having lots on-site or off-site. Mr. Colaneri discussed the practice in West Tisbury regarding on or off-site lots. Mr. Jason explained the practice in Chilmark.

A discussion of whether the lots given were exempted from any and/or all covenants and growth control measures followed.

Mr. Jason wished to discuss the relationship to commercial developments.

Mr. Sullivan further discussed the issue of low-middle income developments. A discussion of who paid a fair proportional share followed.

A discussion of the purpose of the housing value followed.

Mr. Jason felt that perhaps the elimination of off-site would make the policy better. A discussion of this matter followed. It was agreed that if an applicant wanted to provide off-site lots then that applicant would be expected to offer more than the 10%.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the possibility of giving only money. A discussion of requiring appraisals followed.

Mr. Jason discussed how the process may work.

A discussion of the size of youth lots in the various towns followed.

A discussion of the use of the term "buildable" followed.

Mr. Hall discussed the need to add the term "number" to the

policy.

Mr. Jason wanted to see the Housing Policy consistent with the Regional Policy Plan.

The hour being late, the Committee agreed to further discuss the issue of the relationship of housing to commercial developments.

