

THE MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

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

Land Use Planning Committee Summary of October 18, 1999 Meeting Olde Stone Building

Members present: Christina Brown, Marcia Cini, Michael Colaneri, Michael Donaroma,
Tristan Israel, Jane Greene, Richard Toole,
Staff present: Andrew Grant, Jo-Ann Taylor

Others present: See attached list

Meeting opened at 5:32 P.M. by Christina Brown

Vineyard Service Center (DRI #489-1)

Martin Tomasian, representing the Applicant, outlined the scope of the project. He stated that the proposal is consistent with Tisbury's general planning objectives and the Town's development ordinances. He also noted that the project site is not within any District of Critical Planning Concern.

He then reviewed the key planning and development issues: access and circulation, groundwater, drainage, and aesthetics.

Steven Wehner, the Applicant, described the project's components: a gas and repair station that will offer vehicle inspection services. He emphasized the importance of landscaping enhancements. Mr. Tomasian explained further the nature of the inspection services and equipment.

Peter Maclean, referencing photographs and drawings, described the proposed visual changes. He stated that the current "overall look" of the site and existing structures would not be significantly changed. He then discussed the fuelling area canopy (its dimensions, location and landscape screening) before discussing the floor plans of the buildings. (See plans in file.)

Mr. Wehner answered Mr. Colaneri's questions about the layout of the repair shop.

Mr. Maclean continued his presentation by describing the proposed exterior renovations. Mr. Donaroma asked questions about exterior building material and colors.

Mr. Colaneri asked questions about the number of fuel pumps. Mr. Donaroma, again, asked questions about the type and color of the canopy's materials. Ms. Brown asked questions about site lighting.

Mr. Israel asked questions about the canopy's height and its ability to accommodate trucks.

Davide LaRue, a landscape designer, highlighted the key details of the proposed landscaping plan. Referencing a landscaping plan, he described the landscaped entrance, "lawn" area, and types of trees to be planted. To the extent possible, existing vegetation will remain.

Mr. Tomasian returned to earlier comments concerning the number of employees. He emphasized that no more than 8 employees would be on-site per day although as many as 30 workers would be on the weekly payroll. Mr. Wehner in response to questions from Ms. Brown and Mr. Colaneri said that the hours of operation would be from 6 A.M. to midnight.

William Skully, a traffic engineer, began a lengthy discussion of the site access and circulation plan. His presentation included a summary of State Road's characteristics and travel trends, land use patterns, driveways near the proposed gas station, and accident frequencies. His comments and analyses were based on an extensive data collection program conducted during the past Summer.

Mr. Skully stated that the data supporting his comments are contained in a 2 volume study. (See project file.)

He then highlighted the findings of his report: a forecast of 106 weekday peak hour trips and 85 weekend peak hour trips that the proposed use of the site would generate. He then explained the so-called "pass by" effect in conjunction with his analysis of "new traffic" to/from the proposed service center.

Ms. Brown and Mr. Colaneri asked questions about expected traffic volumes and planning assumptions. Mr. Colaneri suggested that turning movement conflicts and not "new" traffic should be at the core of the public presentation.

Mr. Skully continued his review by comparing the proposal's impact with alternative land uses. A retail store, he said, would generate twice the amount of traffic in the peak hour relative to the proposed uses.

Mr. Israel questioned the estimated "retail" traffic assumptions.

Mr. Skully then summarized the results of the level of service (LOS) analysis. He stated that the project would have a "minimal effect" on State Road's traffic flow. State Road, he said, has sufficient capacity to accommodate the expected hourly increase of 18-20 vehicles.

In closing, Mr. Skully reviewed a series of recommendations that would mitigate possible adverse impacts. (The list of recommendations is included in the traffic report on file.)

Mr. Israel questioned the conclusion of Mr. Skully's LOS analysis. Mr. Skully stated that while the traffic model may have predicted a low level of service, his observations indicated that State Road is operating at an acceptable level of service.

Mr. Skully continued his summary of recommendations.

The Members discussed the flow of internal traffic. Mr. Donaroma suggested that the internal flow of traffic would be more important than a discussion of State Road conditions. Ms. Brown requested more information as to the surrounding land uses and properties.

Mr. Israel asked questions about the new inspection procedures. Mr. Colaneri asked questions about parking and staging/storage areas, operating hours and employee parking. Mr. Donaroma reminded the Applicant that the "Cranberry Highway" effect would not be acceptable. Ms. Cini asked questions about the Applicant's affordable housing offer.

Mr. Colaneri noted that the application is not yet complete. Additional information from the Town's Fire and Police Chiefs is needed.

Note: Ms. Greene was not present during the meeting

Tar Kiln (DRI #470M)

Jo-Ann Taylor briefed the Members as to the Applicant's request for a "modification" of a previously approved Development of Regional Impact (DRI) proposal. That proposal was the redivision of a subdivision. Ms. Taylor reviewed the Commission's procedures as to requests for modification. A recommendation from LUPC to the "full" Commission would be the result of the present meeting.

The Applicant, Fred Walters, described the nature of the proposed modification. Referencing a site plan, he indicated 2 options:

1. To reduce the number of lots to 24 lots from 27 lots (19 market-rate and 5 "youth" lots from 20 market-rate and 7 "youth" lots) or
2. (Second option not discussed.)

Mr. Colaneri and Ms. Greene objected to the first option because proportionately more "youth" lots (i.e., affordable housing) would be foregone.

Mr. Colaneri suggested that the LUPC not make a recommendation. He favored the Applicant presenting his proposal to the "full" Commission.

The other Members present (Ms. Brown, Ms. Greene, and Mr. Toole) agreed with Mr. Colaneri.

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling