

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MINUTES - SEPTEMBER 23, 1991

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

Alan Schweikert called the meeting to order at 5:17 P.M.

KELLY'S KITCHEN -

Mr. Schweikert discussed a letter from Richard McCarron regarding the Kelly's Kitchen and asked that all receive copies of same and then asked Attorney McCarron to explain the letter.

Attorney McCarron explained the proposal and requested that the referral not be considered a DRI. He briefly discussed what might happen in the future and noted that whatever was proposed would have to return to the MVC as a DRI anyway.

Mr. Sullivan asked if he had seen the Edgartown Planning Board letter. Attorney McCarron indicated not yet.

Attorney McCarron agreed with all in letter but felt that it had no relevance to the referral being a DRI or not.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the problem of what may happen in the future and how that related to the proposal.

Attorney McCarron further discussed the issue.

Mr. Schweikert discussed the concern that the area would be used as a parking lot by default. Attorney McCarron noted that the A & P already rented a portion of the lot for employee parking.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the Planning Board concern for carrying out the Dodson report and have structures to the front of the lots. He expressed concern over default parking.

Attorney McCarron discussed the parking situation presently on the site.

Mr. Colaneri questioned what would be accomplished or what would the impact be to the applicant if it were determined that it were a DRI. A discussion of this matter followed.

Attorney McCarron discussed what had been submitted to the Commission.

Mr. Donaroma noted that the Commission had already voted to hold a public hearing. A discussion of what was needed for the hearing followed.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the past history of the A & P and the difficulty in contacting them. A discussion of this issue followed.

Ms. Greene indicated that the future plans of the area were needed. A discussion of the various steps necessary followed.

Mr. Schweikert asked what was needed for the hearing. Mr. Jason asked about easements. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of the multi-use parking area currently being used followed.

Mr. Sullivan further discussed the Dodson plan as related to

the future use of the site. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Jason questioned what may happen to the site. Attorney McCarron indicated that it would be graded to level and left dirt.

A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Clifford asked for a plan indicating where the rental space for parking was located or had been located. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of the previous Kelly 's Kitchen DRI followed.

#### TISBURY WHARF -

Mr. Schweikert called for discussion. Glenn Provost, Ralph Packer and Donald DeSourcy discussed the proposal.

Mr. Provost explained the past activity on the site and the current status of same. He further discussed the plan shown and the reason for the two supplemental plans. He discussed some of the confusion that may be present regarding the proposal. He indicated that there were no plans to use the site at this time and no plans to bring in any fill to change the grade. He explained the plan that showed the grades and the septic system plans.

Mr. Best discussed the Conservation Commission meeting with respect to filling and grading - above grade - . He further discussed the fact that some of the dredge spoils may be used.

Mr. Provost agreed that these issues had been discussed but none were part of the application. A discussion of the confusion of grades and fill followed. Mr. Provost discussed the potential use of the area for dredge spoils.

Mr. Sullivan questioned the plan with elevations shown. A discussion of the replacement of this plan with a new, clearer plan followed.

Ms. Greene raised a question of the piers and the application thereof.

Mr. Best indicated that the piers were under a separate application.

A discussion of the pier maintenance application and the present application followed.

Mr. Best raised a question of the addition of a dingy float. A discussion of this matter followed.

Ms. Greene questioned what the ground up material would be like.

Mr. Packer explained that the asphalt would go to Goodell to become "rays" on-site.

A discussion of the volume of concrete being spread across the site followed. There would be about 200 cubic yards of volume.

Mr. Donaroma questioned why not fill now rather than later. A discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Packer discussed the removal process and the problem of dust control. A discussion of what the area would look like in the final end followed.

Mr. Packer discussed the problems of the harbor with respect to needs for dredging and the permit process problems. A

discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Packer discussed the possibility of using crushed stone to eliminate dust problems. Mr. Sullivan discussed the burying on the concrete.

Mr. Colaneri raised a question regarding any pedestrian usage being considered for the area. A discussion of this issue followed. None were proposed.

Ms. Greene asked about any long range plan. Mr. Packer discussed his ideas for the area. He discussed the removal of the oil tanks and the possible usage for marine services. He discussed the use of the showers for those boats that moor in the harbor. He discussed the future possibility of using the pier for pleasure boats. He also discussed the possibility of joint work with the shipyard. He then discussed the septic system being required. He then discussed possible boat storage usage.

Mr. Best discussed the building plan and the number of bathrooms.

Mr. Packer explained the number of bathrooms on the site. A discussion of this issue followed. A discussion of the number of bathrooms to be available followed.

Ms. Greene discussed the issue of the installation of the septic system. Mr. DeSourcy explained what was happening with respect to the septic design. Ms. Greene questioned what would happen to the demolition materials. Mr. Packer explained where the various items of demolition would go or how they would be disposed of.

Mr. Best further discussed the septic system being proposed. A discussion of the location and size thereof followed. Mr. Packer discussed the system being proposed to be located on site and how it was to be disguised.

A discussion of the future use of the site followed.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the recommendation needed to be presented to the full Commission and then offered the recommendation that the change was not significant enough to warrant a public hearing.

Mr. Schweikert asked for comments. Mr. Jason discussed the issue of filling and noted that there was to be no filling. A discussion of this issue followed. Mr. Donaroma did not feel that the removal of the wall, the crushing of same and the spreading of the material over the lot was a significant change. Mr. Sullivan did not feel that the 200 cubic yards of broken concrete would substantially alter the grade. He felt the net effect would be minimal.

A discussion of the square footage of the lot followed - it was roughly an acre and a half.

Mr. Jason did not feel that it met the checklist requirements. A discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Best discussed the feeling of the Conservation Commission and read the checklist and the part which the application may have fallen under.

Mr. Best then expressed all the parts of the various applications which he felt when combined would constitute a DRI.

Mr. Jason reviewed the issue before the Committee. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of what was actually in the referral application followed. Mr. Clifford noted that only the demolition was now under consideration.

Mr. Clifford felt that the only item before the Commission was the issue of the demolition and that it did not fit any category of the checklist.

Ms. Greene felt that with no filling or grade increase that it did not meet the checklist at this time.

Mr. Sullivan expressed concern for the so-called loose ends but felt that the present application did not fit the checklist.

Mr. Best noted that he felt opposite.

Mr. Schweikert indicated that the consensus was not a DRI as shown on plans and as presented; he noted there was one who disagreed.

Mr. Clifford asked if the Committee wished to take the following Monday off since the Herring Creek DRI had been postponed.

A discussion of the issue of what was needed to be referred to the MVC to make the Tisbury Wharf a DRI followed. Mr. Best discussed the various aspects of the proposals that have occurred in the area.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the change as being relatively safer for the Harbor and the benefit thereof.

A discussion of the piece-meal approach to the situation followed.

## HOUSING POLICY

Mr. Jason discussed the commercial aspect of the housing policy. Mr. Sullivan discussed the issue regarding having all lots on-site. A discussion of this issue followed.

Mr. Jason further discussed the issue of commercial participation in the housing program. He suggested that if any units were lost to a commercial venture then they must be replaced in-kind. Mr. Sullivan discussed the issue of on-site or off-site, commensurate value and other problems. A discussion of various aspects of the commercial/housing issue followed.

Mr. Colaneri discussed how to deal with commercial ventures and sought to determine a fair figure if it were to be cash.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the replacement of units lost to commercial ventures. A discussion of this issue followed.

A discussion of encouraging apartments over commercial ventures followed.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the comparison between subdivisions and commercial ventures and whether these were exactments or mitigation. A discussion of offering units as benefits followed.

Mr. Best discussed the accommodation of low/moderate income units within various developments.

Mr. Schweikert discussed the various matters covered - if a unit is lost then it is replaced. He then encouraged apartments over commercial units.

Mr. Schweikert discussed how to handle those applications which do not cause the loss of housing units.

Mr. Best discussed the issue of housing and its impact on the need. A discussion of the relevancy of the housing issue with respect to housing followed.

Mr. Donaroma raised a question of the potential impact on commercial proposals if housing became a major issue.

Ms. Greene asked for some suggestions for a scale related to something; square footage, etc.

A discussion of any other areas that used a ratio of housing to commercial followed.

A discussion of the use or misuse of the term mitigation followed. Mr. Clifford discussed the requirements of Chapter 831, Sections 14 and 15.

Mr. Colaneri further discussed the relationship of commercial ventures to the housing policy and further discussed how to relate the two. He raised a question of how to address this issue.

Mr. Schweikert discussed where the discussion had so far gone and what was left.

A discussion of employees having housing units provided by employers, i.e. summer employees. Mr. Donaroma discussed this issue from the standpoint of an employer. He further discussed the possible benefits to the community and the balance that may be created between housing detriment and community benefit.

Ms. Greene asked how soon could information be made available regarding how other jurisdictions deal with this matter. Mr. Clifford indicated that by the next time the LUPC met, the data should be available.

Mr. Sullivan discussed the issue of on-site vs. off-site.

A discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Schweikert questioned what would be replaced when something is lost. All agreed that it would be a unit for a unit - if a two-bedroom unit were to be demolished then a two-bedroom unit must be provided elsewhere. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Best discussed the issue of providing housing since there was a loss. Mr. Jason further discussed this issue. Mr. Schweikert attempted to explain the confusion. Mr. Best further discussed the matter of rentals and how to accomplish the end desired.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the issue of monies for the housing authority and the easiest way to obtain these funds.

Ms. Greene discussed how to deal with persons who want to provide off-site units. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of the cost of rental housing followed. A discussion of the benefits of commercial expansions followed. A discussion of the need to determine a fair dollar amount to be sought followed.

Mr. Schweikert discussed the suggestion of the three options - replace lost units in kind on site; cash to Housing Authority;

units on-site above commercial.

A discussion of how to determine a fair dollar figure followed.

A discussion of the problems of basing the issue on rental figures followed.

A discussion of the problems of on-site apartments followed. Mr. Clifford agreed to provide some figures relative to the conversation and to find out what other jurisdictions did.

There being no further business the Committee adjourned.