

THE MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

P. O. BOX 1447, OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS 02557 • PHONE (508) 693-3453 • FAX (508) 693-7894

1974 25 1999

Together we achieve the extraordinary

Land Use Planning Committee Summary of March 6, 2000 Meeting Olde Stone Building

Members present: Christina Brown, Michael Donaroma, Linda Sibley,
Staff present: David Wessling

Others present: See attached list

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

Edgartown National Bank (DRI #508)

Mr. Donaroma began the discussion by asking if additional information had been received. Mr. Wessling stated that the Applicant had submitted a "21-E" report as well as data related to lighting, signage and paving materials.

Mr. Donaroma then discussed the Tisbury Planning Board's contention that the proposed use will be more "intense" than the present car wash. He suggested, as a conditional of approval, that the building's size be decreased. He noted that the meeting room could be smaller than proposed.

Ms. Sibley agreed with Mr. Donaroma. She also spoke about the role of the Tisbury Zoning Board of Appeals in that that Board has the responsibility to interpret that meaning of "non-conformity". [Note: The existing use, a car wash, is pre-existing non-conforming use.] She then went on to say that the intent of the Zoning Bylaw is "for the area, in the long-run, to revert to a residential [district]." While she stated that the proposed building will be more pleasing in appearance than the car wash, the Bank's investment in the property could lead to further commercial development.

Mr. Donaroma disagreed with her argument. He again said that "downsizing" the proposed building should be an essential condition of approval. Ms. Brown made a distinction between the size of the building and the intensity of the proposed use.

Ms. Sibley suggested 2 conditions: reducing the size of the building and the hours of the bank's operations. Ms. Sibley and Mr. Donaroma did not envision the need for a 24-hour bank.

Somewhat rhetorically, Ms. Sibley argued for the retention of the car wash.

Mr. Donaroma made a motion to recommend approval of the project with several conditions - "down-size" the building, limit hours of operations, eliminate the concrete paving materials and add shade trees.

The Members discussed Mr. Donaroma's conditions. Ms. Sibley requested motion sensor activated lighting. She also desired to limit the ATM lighting. There was further discussion about paving materials and lighting levels.

Ms Brown summarized the conditions: "down-size" building area, limit intensity of use and hours of operations, reduced intensity of exterior lighting, control lighting with motion sensors, minimize ATM lighting, provide additional shade trees.

Ms. Sibley seconded the motion. Ms. Brown called the vote. Mr. Donaroma and Ms. Sibley voted to recommend approval of the project with the conditions described above. Ms. Brown did not vote.

Afterwards, Mr. Donaroma requested Mr. Wessling to provide a comparison of building sizes (car wash versus proposed bank).

Folino Building (DRI #514)

Prior to the opening of the meeting, Mr. Folino informed to the Committee of a change of the tenant mix. His proposal, presented at the public hearing, limited the tenants to contractors.

Mr. Dinelli and Mr. Folino reviewed the additional information submitted during the public comment period: correspondence from the Edgartown Fire Chief, and a revised site plan. (See documents on file.)

Ms. Brown asked Mr. Wessling to report on an analysis of lot coverage as requested at the public hearing. (See report on file.) He stated that the Applicant's building covers 23% of the site. Other buildings in the Business Park, typically, cover 12-29% of their lots.

Ms. Sibley commented on the need for additional landscaping and plantings in the buffer area. Ms. Brown reminded the Members that landscaping at the Business Park is not a regional issue.

Mr. Donaroma made a motion to recommend approval of the proposal "as presented".

After a discussion of potential tenants and uses of the building, Ms. Sibley seconded the motion. All the Members presented voted in favor of the motion.

Roth Rogers Subdivision (DRI #516)

Ms. Brown recapped the various review stages of the Applicant's proposal. She then read into the record a letter from the Applicant which described the latest changes concerning the subdivision covenants. (Letter is on file.) The changes are responses to comments made by Commissioners at the public hearing.

Ms. Sibley asked for clarification of the covenants dealing with signs. Other matters discussed dealt with the density of the subdivision, nitrogen loading, protection of the frost bottom and the protective value and location of the proposed buffer area.

Mr. Donaroma summarized his viewpoint: the Applicant has been responsive to LUPC suggestions and has incorporated them into the final plan.

The discussion returned to protection of the frost bottom, its areal extent and the quality of the habitat. Ms. Sibley referred to the frost bottom as "severely compromised". The Members agreed that the proposed road would not adversely affect the frost bottom.

The Members also discussed covenants dealing with the rights of property owners to use Coffin's Field Road. Ms. Brown recounted the history to the Coffin's Field subdivision. Ms. Sibley asked Glenn Provost, the Applicant's representative, questions concerning the history of the road "rights".

Mr. Donaroma made a motion to recommend approval of the subdivision. The motion was seconded and voted in the affirmative. The The Members continued to discuss the nature if the buffer areas before adjourning.

Meeting adjourned at 7:08 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling