

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 20, 2000 Meeting Olde Stone Building

Members present: Christina Brown, Michael Colaneri, Michael Donaroma, Jane Greene
Richard Toole

Staff present: David Wessling

Others present: See attached list

Meeting opened at 5:35 P.M. by Michael Donaroma

Corcoran Building (DRI #518)

After a brief introduction and outline of the LUPC's purpose, Mr. Donaroma invited David Corcoran, the Applicant, to begin his presentation.

Referring to a general location plan, a site plan and building elevations, Mr. Corcoran explained the nature of his proposal. He stated that the proposed building would be an "expanded version" of his company's business in Vineyard Haven. His company's present location is disadvantaged by traffic congestion on Beach Road and by limited outdoor storage.

He indicated the locations of storage areas, contractor "pick-up" areas and a "showroom selection area". His presentation included a description of the business (90% sales to contractors), deliveries, and the flow of materials within the building.

The size of the storage area, in part, is determined by ferry schedules and the shipping priority for freight. Logistics and inventory requirements will be particularly important in the future. His presentation concluded with a description of the outdoor storage areas and employment needs.

Mr. Colaneri spoke. He repeated the Chairman's welcome and then asked questions about outdoor storage, security, fencing (location and type), hours of operation, lighting and landscaping, and the affordable housing contribution.

Mr. Corcoran asked "what's the issue with lighting?" Mr. Colaneri explained that the Commission prefers motion sensor lighting for after regular business hours.

Mr. Donaroma encouraged the Applicant "to soften the look of the area" by planting shade trees. A landscaping plan is to be submitted.

The Members present favored the Applicant's plan for the exterior of the proposed building.

Mr. Corcoran indicated that he has offered a \$5,700 contribution to the affordable housing fund. Ms. Brown asked questions about housing for employees.

Mr. Toole asked questions about retail sales. Mr. Donaroma and Ms. Brown added that the Edgartown Building Inspector and Planning Board have considered the implications of retail sales at the Applicant's premises. They stated that such retail sales comply with the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Colaneri argued in favor of the proposal because traffic congestion at 5 Corners would lessen.

Before concluding, the members agreed that the "Staff" will determine the application's completeness and then schedule a public hearing date.

Martha's Vineyard Refuse District and Resource Recovery District (391/391-M)

Mr. Donaroma, referring to a letter submitted to the Commission, reviewed the project's conditions of approval. Several conditions required the Applicant to return to the LUPC.

Mr. Colaneri asked several questions. He wanted to know "whether we have received the appropriate documents to address the issues to be raised by our decision".

Mr. Noonan was invited to the table. Mr. Colaneri posed several questions from the conditions of approval for Mr. Noonan to answer. Ms. Greene, Mr. Donaroma and Ms. Brown suggested to Mr. Colaneri that his interpretation of the conditions was incorrect.

Mr. Colaneri, nonetheless, continued. Mr. Noonan described the status of bird surveys.

Mr. Noonan, then stated that a site visit had occurred several years ago. The Members discussed that site visit and pending site visits. Mr. Colaneri wanted to know who attended the site visit and when did it take place. Ms. Greene asked the "Staff" to research the matter.

Mr. Colaneri told the Members present about the phone calls that he had received about the project.

Ms. Brown asked about the preliminary landscaping plan that was approved.

Mr. Donaroma attempted to blunt Mr. Colaneri's anger by instructing the "Staff" to research the referenced site visit and to find the landscaping plan. He urged Mr. Noonan to be aware of the importance of screening the building.

Mr. Colaneri continued to complain about the site visit. Mr. Donaroma said to Mr. Colaneri that "there's no big conspiracy..." There was more discussion about the non-

site visit.

Mr. Donaroma wanted to know if the Commission can require the Applicant to return to the LUPC in order to discuss - prior to construction of the storage building - site landscaping and the location of the gate.

Mr. Noonan informed the Members that the gate was constructed in the location required by the conditions of approval.

Mr. Noonan agreed to return to the LUPC on March 28, 2000 for further discussion.

Finally, the Members and Mr. Noonan discussed the location of the local drop-off.

Sears Building (DRI #506)

At the outset, Mr. Donaroma stated to James Fuller, the Applicant's representative, that the purpose of the meeting is prepare recommendations.

Mr. Colaneri made a motion to recommend approval of the proposal with conditions. Ms. Brown seconded the proposal.

Ms. Brown read the West Tisbury Selectmen's letter and the Planning Board's letter in order to highlight the major planning issues. The Members, then, discussed the Town's Special Permit requirements.

Mr. Colaneri listed several conditions:

- Reduce the size of the building to a footprint of 3,500 sq.ft.

- Limit the building's height to 24 ft.

- Relocate the parking area and prohibit vehicular traffic from circling the building, except for emergency buildings.

- Provide additional trees in order to screen the building.

- Limit incoming deliveries to no more than 2 trips per week.

- Require an affordable housing fund contribution.

- Maintain existing walking paths.

During the discussion of the motion:

- Mr. Colaneri related "the information that he received from my Board of Selectmen and others" about the size of the building. He stated that display area need not be as large as proposed.

- Mr. Donaroma and Mr. Toole agreed with "down-sizing" the building.

- Mr. Colaneri talked about lowering the building's height in order create a

building with a "standard peak" and "decrease the visual impact".

Mr. Fuller explained the reasons for the building's height.

Mr. Colaneri stated that the proposed flow of traffic on the lot was a "nuisance to neighbors". "No traffic behind the building", he said, would be responsive to the neighbors' complaints.

Ms. Brown noted that the building's reduced size may reduce the sales revenues needed for the venture to succeed and thus "nix the project". She also stated that the 3,500 sq.ft. size is arbitrary.

The Members asked the "Staff" to present examples of 3,500 sq.ft. buildings.

Ms. Brown asked, "is it the size of the business or the size of the building" that's the problem?

Mr. Donaroma recommended "3 good-sized shade trees" at the northwest corner of the proposed building. Mr. Colaneri lobbied for a fence along the abutting residential property line.

Mr. Donaroma called the vote. The Members present voted unanimously to recommend approval with the conditions as listed above.

Notes: Ms. Greene did not participate in the discussion or vote.

After the discussion, Mr. Fuller reminded the Members that the neighbors favored neither a fence nor a path.

Edgartown National Bank (DRI #508)

Mr. Donaroma asked the Members to be prepared for a reconsideration of the vote that resulted in the rejection of the proposed branch bank in Tisbury.

He had questions about the "legalities" and the procedures concerning a motion for reconsideration.

Ms. Brown also spoke about the technicalities of reconsideration versus the appearance of unfairness (citing the Waller Farm DRI).

Meeting adjourned at 6:53 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling