

THE MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

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

Land Use Planning Committee Summary of November 22, 1999 Meeting Olde Stone Building

Members present: Christina Brown, Marcia Cini, Michael Colaneri, Michael Donaroma,
Richard Toole, Linda Sibley

Staff present: David Wessling

Others present: Ralph Packer and Leo DeSoucy

Meeting opened at 5:38 P.M. by Christina Brown

SBS (DRI #191-M)

Ms. Brown welcomed the Applicant and his agent. She then reviewed the site's DRI history, explained the need for a concurrence vote and summarized the LUPC process.

Referencing building and site plans, Mr. DeSoucy briefly described the proposal's scope: two "gable end" additions - 24' x 30' retail spaces, with a full basement - consistent with the building's architectural style. Though shown on the plans, cupolas will not be constructed.

In reply to Mr. Colaneri's questions, Mr. Packer described the building layout, and the various uses by the tenant, the Black Dog. Mr. Colaneri persisted with questions concerning retailing and parking,

Mrs. Sibley and Mr. Colaneri asked questions about the size of the additions. She contended that the porch area should be counted, thus causing the project to cross the DRI review threshold. Ms. Brown pointed out that the definition of floor area excludes porch areas.

Mrs. Sibley questioned the referral: is it a modification of an existing DRI or a new DRI? Along with Mr. Toole, she opined that the proposal should not be considered a modified DRI.

Mr. Colaneri moved: "...recommendation not to concur with the referral".

During the discussion of the motion:

Mrs. Sibley questioned the safety and suitability of the 20'+ wide driveway between the greenhouse and the building's porch.

Mrs. Sibley questioned the use of an unbuilt structure at the rear of the property and its consistency with the previous DRI decision.

Mrs. Sibley questioned the use of the site for bus parking.

Mrs. Sibley argued against the motion, citing lack of information about the proposed additions, the uses of the property and the area's general traffic conditions. The Members present discussed, at length, uses of the property vis-a-vis the Commission's process and procedures.

Ms. Sibley and Mr. Colaneri argued about the uses of the building. She contended that any change of use requires the Commission's review. Mr. Colaneri stated that only use having regional impacts (see referral checklist) require MVC review.

Mrs. Sibley returned to the question of the addition's size (i.e., area).

The vote was taken: Mr. Colaneri voted for the motion; Mr. Toole and Mrs. Sibley voted against the motion; Ms. Brown abstained; and Mr. Donaroma did not vote.

A motion to recommend referral was made and seconded. It was approved - two Members voted in favor of the motion and one Member opposed it.

Land Use Planning Committee Process

The Member began their discussion with a review of Commission rules and regulations as to LUPC.

Ms. Brown stressed that LUPC is "advisory in nature". She also sought agreement from the Members present that LUPC does not review project plans after a final MVC decision is rendered.

Mrs. Sibley recalled the reasoning for requiring detailed landscaping plans.

Mr. Colaneri asked why the subject was placed on the meeting agenda.

Mr. Donaroma stressed a flexible approach to plan review. He cited examples in support of his position. Mrs. Sibley agreed with Mr. Donaroma's examples.

Mr. Colaneri urged the Members to expedite the review of projects. The process, he said, should not be "cumbersome". Mr. Colaneri decried that the lack of participation/ interest by the majority of Commissioners. Mr Toole agreed, adding that Members not attending LUPC meetings often prolong the public public hearing.

Mr. Donaroma encouraged the Members to "move the application forward, not to drag the process".

Mrs. Sibley became defensive in response to Mr. Colaneri's remarks. Ms. Brown suggested a stronger role for LUPC at the public hearing.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the role of LUPC as a forum for "making a good project better, if possible". Working with the Applicant to make a better project is an important aspect of LUPC.

Mrs. Sibley discussed limiting the number of LUPC meetings per project. Ms. Brown disagreed with the notion of repetitive meetings. She worried that such meetings may convey an "endorsement of a proposal".

Mr. Colaneri stated that LUPC's role is to ascertain "completeness" of an application.

Mr. Donaroma suggested that, at each LUPC meeting, the Chairman should emphasize the advisory role of LUPC.

Mrs. Sibley discussed "complete" applications as opposed to applications with "adequate" information. Her comments led to a wide-ranging discussion about preparing an Applicant for a public hearing - the "best shot" theory.

Mrs. Sibley recommended more communication between LUPC and Town Boards. She asked Staff to make phone calls and send written notices.

Ms. Brown thanked the Members for their views and adjourned the meeting at 7:05 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling