Land Use Planning Committee
Summary of June 21,1999 Meeting
Olde Stone Building

Members present: John Best, Christina Brown, Marcia Cini, Michael Colaneri, Michael Donaroma, Anne Gallagher, Jane Greene, Tristan Israel, Lenny Jason, Megan Ottens-Sargent, Linda Sibley, Richard Toole, Robert Zeltzer

Staff present: Christine Flynn, William Veno, David Wessling, William Wilcox

Others present: See attached list

Meeting opened at 5:37 P.M. by Christina Brown

Vineyard Golf Club (DRI #484)

Ms. Brown continued the previous LUPC evaluation of the proposed project. She read into the record Section 15(c) of the Commission's enabling legislation. She then asked for comments.

Mr. Colaneri stated that the proposal would “favorably affect persons and property...” Ms. Sibley agreed by saying, “it's probably nicer to live next to a golf course than to more houses”.

The vote was called; 7 Members voted “yes” to the question, will the proposed development favorably affect other persons and property...? One Member voted “no”.

Ms. Brown read Section 15(d) into the record and asked for comments.

Mr. Colaneri replied, "...depending on the conditions, it [the proposal] should favorably affect the supply of low income housing..." The Members debated how to frame the topic - an "as presented proposal" or "as conditioned proposal".

The Members reviewed the Applicant’s proposal as to the provision of “40 beds” for seasonal workers and senior staff housing. Mr. Jason asked what was the affordable housing requirement associated with the approved subdivision.

Ms. Sibley argued that “as presented [the proposal] negatively impacts” the supply of
affordable housing. She then went on to discuss the link between seasonal employment and housing.

Ms. Greene suggested that the project would have a favorable long-term impact on the supply of needed housing.

The vote was called: 2 Members voted “yes” to the question, (will the proposal, as presented favorably affect the supply of needed low and moderate income housing for island residents?), and 7 Members voted “no”.

Ms. Brown read Section 15(e) into the record and asked for comments.

Mr. Colaneri stated that the proposal would have a favorable impact on the provision of municipal services. Mr. Zeltzer inquired about the project’s real estate tax effect. Mr. Israel inquired about the project’s water usage and “septic impact”. Mr. Wilcox and Ms. Brown responded.

The Members discussed the Applicant’s offer to pay “in lieu of” taxes before voting on the question. Eight Members voted “yes” (i.e., the proposal will favorably affect the provision of municipal services...) and 2 Members abstained.

Ms. Brown read Section 15(f) into the record. After a brief discussion, the Members agreed that the Section is “not applicable”.

Ms. Brown read Section 15(g) into the record.

Ms. Greene stated the proposal is consistent with the Town’s Open Space Plan. The Members discussed the development’s proposal concerning “public access” Mr. Zeltzer and Mr. Jason talked about gating Dr. Fisher Road; Ms. Sibley argued about the distinction between “open space” and “natural open space”; Ms. Otten-Sargent reviewed the proposed conservation restriction; others commented on the golf course layout; the golf course’s impact on Middle Line Path; and the protection of the frost bottom.

When the vote was called, 4 Members voted “yes” (i.e., the proposal will aid the ability of the Town to achieve the objectives of its Master Plan) and 7 Members voted “no”.

Ms. Brown read Section 15(h) into the record and, again, invited comments.

Ms. Otten-Sargent began by inquiring about the Applicant’s proposed conservation restriction. In that the conservation restriction is linked to several issues (viz., public access, recreation and protection of natural resources), she believed the matter is relevant to Section 15(h). She then presented her views of the existing conservation restrictions and those proposed.

Mr. Colaneri disagreed with Ms. Otten-Sargent’s viewpoint. Other Members disputed her assessment as to the current use of the property for recreation and public access.

Ms. Sibley likened the proposal to a “controlled park system” which, in her opinion, would be inconsistent with the Commission’s Regional Island Plan. She added that the
project would provide very little year-round employment which is contrary to the Plan's intent. Mr. Zeltzer disagreed with Ms. Sibley's remarks.

A vote was called. Eight Members voted "yes", the proposal "will contravene land development objectives and policies...". Three Members voted "no".

Mr. Colaneri and Mr. Jason noted that contravened objectives and policies were not referenced during the discussion of Section 15(h).

Ms. Brown left the meeting and Mr. Donaroma chaired the remainder of the meeting.

The Members discussed the project's probable benefits and detriments. After the Members debated procedures, Mr. Colaneri made a motion to recommend approval of the project with conditions. Mr. Jason seconded the motion.

Mr. Colaneri discussed his motion, referencing the staff document (dated 6/17/99) containing draft conditions of approval.

Mr. Israel suggested 2 conditions: reconfiguration of the golf course and elimination of proposed dwelling units. Elimination of the "village" and practice area, in his opinion, would lead to a better plan.

Ms. Sibley agreed with Mr. Israel. She was concerned with the proximity of golf holes to the frost bottom,"fragmentation" of the landscape, meaningful conservation restrictions, and the golf club's "membership structure". But, she summarized her objections by saying, "I wouldn't be comfortable writing those as conditions. So, I'll end up voting no. You could write those as conditions and I'd still vote no..."

Ms. Gallagher "had problems with the driving range".

Ms. Ottens-Sargent suggested eliminating the holes from the land to the west of the frost bottom.

Mr. Colaneri, Mr. Zeltzer and Mr. Jason reminded the Members of the alternative - a 148 lot subdivision.

The Members discussed a buffer zone around the frost bottom and other matters.

Mr. Donaroma polled the Members: 7 members voted to recommend approval of the project, 5 Members opposed the motion.

Concerning possible conditions:

- Mr. Colaneri suggested the need for a buffer zone surrounding the frost bottom.
- Mr. Donaroma suggested that the public's rights vested in the property's existing conservation restriction be maintained (i.e., not lessened).
- Mr. Donaroma suggested protecting the public's use and enjoyment of Middle Line Path.
- Ms. Sibley suggested eliminating all "holes on the west side of the frost bottom".
- Ms. Sibley suggested a 300' wide frost bottom buffer. Others suggested a 50'
buffer.
Ms. Sibley suggested redesigning the golf course so that Dr. Fisher Road will not be gated.
Mr. Zeltzer asked for a clarification of "organic" as in organic golf course or organic pesticides. He also wanted to know the human toxicity of organic materials that were proposed to be applied.

Pier 44/Island Transport (DRI #499)

Mr. Donaroma and staff informed the Members of a recent referral of the pier made by the Tisbury Board of Selectmen. The matter requires the Commission's "concurrence" and will be considered at its July 8, 1999 meeting.

Mr. Israel commented on the Executive Director's written opinion. Specifically, Mr. Israel disagreed with Mr. Clifford's assessment (that the bathrooms do not have regional significance).

Mr. Fornes, representing Island Transport, spoke.

Note: Mr. Jason was not present.

Tisbury Wharf (DRI #474)

Mr. Donaroma reviewed the project's referral by the Tisbury Conservation Commission. That referral, he explained, does not require the Commission's concurrence.

The Applicant was not present. A LUPC/full Commission meeting will be scheduled in July.

Mr. Israel summarized the project's history. He decried the Applicant's reluctance to complete the regulatory process.

Note: Mr. Jason was not present.

Meeting adjourned at 7:13 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling