

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 July 31, 2000 Meeting Olde Stone Building

Members present: Christina Brown, Marcia Cini, Tristan Israel
Staff present: Andrew Grant, David Wessling,

Others present: See attached list

Meeting opened at 5:35 P.M. by Christina Brown

Black Dog Bakery Cafe (DRI #522)

Ms. Brown greeted the Applicant and, as is her custom, outlined the purposes and procedures of the Land Use Planning Committee. She also apologized for the Members poor attendance.

Doug Hoehn then began his presentation. He recounted the project's history, the roles of various Town of Tisbury officials, and LUPC directives. In the end, he emphasized the Applicant's intent which is merely to legalize the placement of the historic railroad car and to refurbish it. Once again, he noted that the Black Dog, at a later time, will incorporate the railroad car into the restaurant. Such plans are long term and are not part of the present application.

His presentation included a revised site plan and a landscaping plan. In describing the site plan, he showed how the railroad car's placement affected the parking layout. Previously, the Tisbury Planning Board through its site plan review allowed 48 parking spaces. Since the railroad car occupies several parking spaces, a revised layout became necessary.

In order to "beautify" the portion of the lot adjacent to the railroad car, the Applicant submitted a landscaping plan. The plan which Mr. Hoehn described is the first phase of a long-term landscaping program.

Mr. Hoehn summarized Andrew Grant's comments concerning "handicapped" parking.

Mr. Hoehn said the proposal submitted to the LUPC had been reviewed by the Tisbury

Planning Board. He went on to say that the Planning Board "informally approved" the site plan.

He also spoke about a meeting with the Tisbury Zoning Board of Appeal in order to gain approval for an "outdoor display" (as the railroad car is described by the Tisbury Building Official). Mr. Hoehn reported that the Board opened the public hearing but did not take any official action.

Ms. Brown asked questions about landscaping details, decorative fencing and exterior lighting. She and Mr. Israel suggested that elevation drawings of the improvements should be presented at the public hearing. Ms. Cini asked that the type of lighting fixtures should be specified at the public hearing.

George Brush, also representing the Applicant, outlined an "affordable housing" offer. The offer, in the form of a pledge, is payment of \$7,500 in 3 annual installments of \$2,500. The money will be used to fund a summer employee housing program. Mr. Brush said the pledge is consistent with the Commission's policy.

In summary, Mr. Hoehn said that the application was complete and asked that a public hearing be scheduled.

Ms. Cini asked about the restoration schedule of the railroad car. Mr. Brush said that the owner has not defined a specific completion deadline. Ms. Brown also commented on the completion schedule. Mr. Israel expressed his frustration as to the project's delays. Nonetheless, Ms. Brown requested a restoration timetable.

Mr. Israel also complained about traffic flows within the lot and travel to and from the Black Dog properties on both sides of State Road. Ms. Brown asked the Applicant discuss both matters at the public hearing.

Mr. Israel requested a discussion of the "larger plan" at the public hearing as did Ms. Brown. He also wanted assurances that the railroad car will be "secure".

Before closing the session, Ms. Brown inquired about the State Road corridor study. She suggested that the scope of the study should be included in Mr. Hoehn's public hearing presentation.

Ratner Pier (DRI #520)

Ms. Brown began by welcoming the audience and Glenn Provost who represents the Applicant.

Mr. Provost started his presentation with a "refresher". He reviewed the outcome of the prior LUPC meeting and explained how the current plan responds to LUPC's guidance. He showed a plan of the area for orientation, a site plan indicating boulders in the water, existing and proposed structures and the location of eel grass beds.

In reply to Ms. Brown's questions, Mr. Provost explained why the pier is located as shown on the plan.

Mr. Israel and Ms. Brown discussed the definition of barrier beach and its significance. Afterwards, Mr. Israel asked questions about access to the proposed pier. Mr. Provost said that he would provide such details later. Ms. Brown urged Mr. Provost to provide pictures of the site to be displayed at the public hearing.

Also, the Members requested the following information:

- a letter from the Shellfish Constable as to eel grass beds and shellfish,
- a letter from the Harbor Master,
- public access stairways, and
- shoreline change data.

As well, Mr. Provost's presentation included a description of construction methods, type of boats that would use the pier, maintenance of the pier and the removable decking.

Finally, the Members asked Mr. Provost about his client's affordable housing offer. Mr. Provost said that he was not familiar with the Commission's policy.

Given the additional information that the Members requested, Mr. Provost said that he would continue discussion of the project with the Commission's Staff. The meeting ended without a scheduled public hearing date.

Cottage City Distributors (DRI #527)

Ms. Cini was not present. Thus, Ms. Brown and Mr. Israel discussed the project with the Applicants, Mr. and Mrs. Fitzpatrick.

They discussed the application process, the Edgartown Building Inspector's referral, the types of goods to be sold and not sold.

Ms. Brown and Mr. Israel suggested that the Applicants' submittal should include:

- a list of goods to be sold,
- a detailed site plan,
- detailed landscaping and lighting plans,
- an estimate of daily and weekly deliveries,
- a parking diagram,
- letters from Town of Edgartown officials and from the Business Park officials,
- and
- an affordable housing offer.

The Members emphasized the importance of providing information about all the activities on the entire site.

Another meeting will be scheduled upon completion of the application.

Meeting adjourned at 6:54 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling

