

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 May 8, 2000 Meeting Olde Stone Building

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

Staff present: David Wessling, William Wilcox

Others present: Mathew Poole, Stuart Johnson, Stephen Faost

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

Corcoran Building (DRI #518)

Ms. Brown summarized the results of the public hearing held on May 4th.

Ms. Sibley stated several "concerns". She described the Airport Manager's assessment of the Business Park's regulations, lack of their enforcement and the importance of site landscaping. She also conveyed a request from the Airport Commissioners to the MVC as to site plan review.

Ms. Sibley pointed out (referring to locus plans and site plans) the inadequate state of landscaping on lots abutting the subject lot.

Ms. Sibley, Ms. Brown and Mr. Colaneri then began to suggest the types of screening vegetation, shade trees and foundation planting. Ms. Sibley insisted on indigenous plant material.

Mr. Colaneri indicated the location and number of shade trees. (See annotated site plan.) Ms. Sibley, again, insisted on indigenous trees in the lot's buffer zones. She also explained the need for vegetation that "will survive in the state of neglect, indigenous species".

The Members agreed to accept the Applicant's offers concerning affordable housing, hours of operation and manner of exterior lighting.

Mr. Donaroma arrived and the matter of landscaping was discussed. Ms. Brown summarized the matter of enforcement and regulations for Mr. Donaroma. There was more talk about the Airport Manager and the need to enforce regulations.

Mr. Colaneri returned the conversation to the Applicant's offers. He began by discussing the Applicant's offer to store PVC products/materials and to fence the storage area.

Mr. Donaroma commented on the site landscaping. He suggested 3-4" caliper evergreens and listed several species of shade trees (London Plane and Linden) also 3-4" caliper. He also suggested shad "tree form", 2-3" caliper. He noted that Austrian Pine, cedars and Pitch Pine would be suitable. There was more discussion about the Business Park regulations as to landscaping. The issue of screening the chain link fence surrounding the outdoor storage area was discussed.

Mr. Colaneri made a motion to recommend approval of the project with conditions as discussed above. The motion was approved unanimously.

Herring Creek Farm Trust (DRI #500)

Referencing a staff document (a staff review with recommendations), Mr. Donaroma noted that neither the Edgartown Board of Health nor the Conservation Commission had submitted (recent) written comments as to the subdivision proposal. Mr. Donaroma then invited Mathew Poole, the Town's Health Agent, to address the meeting.

Before Mr. Poole addressed the meeting, Mr. Wilcox summarized the essential planning issues concerning the RUCK system. He presented information about a similar system in Lunenburg. Mr. Wilcox stated that neither he nor Mr. Poole were qualified to review the RUCK system's engineering design.

Ms. Sibley asked Mr. Wilcox if he was capable of assessing the consequences of a failed denitrification system. Mr. Wilcox said the her question was related to nitrogen loading, a subject that he was qualified to discuss. Mr. Wilcox added that the Commission could dictate the effluent quality without dictating the technology.

In response to Mr. Colaneri's question, Mr. Wilcox described the RUCK system's engineering details. He then answered questions about denitrification.

Mr. Colaneri asked Mr. Poole if the RUCK system met the DEP/Edgartown Board of Health standards. He replied that the RUCK system is not a Title V system, that he did not understand the design, and that it probably would not be approved by the Board of Health.

Ms. Brown asked Mr. Wilcox about the role of an outside advisor as to the RUCK system's engineering details. He recounted the search for an engineer and the preparation of a "scope of services". Mr. Wilcox noted that the RUCK system's detrifcation concept is an acceptable solution. [At this point in the meeting, the audio tape failed.] He added that the RUCK system is relatively new and that Commission may need to define performance standards.

He also discussed the issue of regulatory jurisdiction. Because the system consists of 2 phases, DEP may not have review authority. Ms. Sibley stated that the system

should be "conditioned" as a single entity in order to ensure its review by DEP.

The discussion returned to the issue of "functionality". Mr. Wilcox and Mr. Poole agreed that outside assistance should be provided in order to complete their review of the RUCK system. Mr. Colaneri urged the Chairman to keep the record open so that an engineer's evaluation could be submitted.

Ms. Sibley argued against the proposition that the Board of Health should be responsible for the engineering review. "The Commission must satisfy itself", she said. More information was needed in order to know that "it [the RUCK system] won't be a disaster".

Mr. Donaroma after listening to advice from Mr. Poole and Ms. Brown directed the staff to retain the services of a consulting engineer. Mr. Johnson agreed to keep the record open for such purpose.

Ms. Sibley discussed the need to keep the "Central Field" a unified rather than a "fragmented open space". Her comments led to a discussion of the draft covenants.

The Members present discussed the staff's recommendations.

The Members agreed to discuss landscape guidelines and scenic preservation at the LUPC's May 22nd meeting. At that time, the Applicant's photomontages will be reviewed.

Meeting adjourned at 7:03 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling