

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 November 20, 2000 Meeting Olde Stone Building

Members present: Christina Brown, Marcia Cini, Linda Sibley, Richard Toole
Staff present: David Wessling, William Wilcox
Others present: See attached list

Meeting opened at 5:37 P.M. by Christina Brown

Mackenty Subdivision (DRI #533)

With the close of the public hearing and the close of the public comment period, the purpose of this LUPC session was to formulate recommendations.

Ms. Brown asked Mr. Wilcox to proceed by evaluating the project's likely nitrogen loading effects. (See his memorandum dated October 24, 2000.)

Commission Members and Mr. Wilcox discussed nitrogen load calculations, their assumptions, and alternative loading limits.

Ms. Brown and Ms. Sibley were concerned about the Edgartown Great Pond's loading limit and the project's nitrogen balance. Their comments led to philosophical speculation as to nitrogen load transfers within the watershed and potential enforcement problems.

Ms. Sibley favored nitrogen load transfers only "in order to benefit a public project".

Mr. Toole then questioned Mr. Wilcox about the relative costs of alternative methods of septage treatment. The exchange between Mr. Toole and Mr. Wilcox caused Ms. Cini to inquire about a "nitrogen profile" for the site.

Mr. Wilcox resumed his presentation.

Ms. Brown and Ms. Sibley again questioned Mr. Wilcox about transferring nitrogen loads, conservation properties and conservation restrictions/easements. Afterwards, the Members discussed the potential disadvantages of agricultural practices. Of practical concern was the use and application of pesticides, herbicides and fungicides. Ms. Brown moved to ban agricultural chemicals. After considerable discussion, the Members

directed its Staff to draft such a condition. Ms. Sibley, however, disagreed. She stated that not all agricultural chemicals are harmful. She continued, "...to say no to 'cides' is to say no to farming". After debating the issue, the Members agreed that a 2-5 renewable agricultural management plan would be appropriate. Ms. Cini added that the plan should be approved by the Edgartown Conservation Commission.

Before reaching a decision on the plan, Ms. Brown and Ms. Sibley talked about the property's agricultural areas and their proximity to the Edgartown Great Pond.

As the meeting progressed, the Members examined the location of the proposed development envelopes. At the request of the Members, Doug Hoehn explained the design concepts and rationales. Ms. Sibley suggested an LUPC site visit. With the Applicant's consent, the Members agreed to hold a site visit on Sunday, November 26th at 2:00 P.M.

As to the proposal's density, Ms. Sibley objected. She stated that 8 lots sited on 44 acres would be "too dense". She suggested that 7 lots would be acceptable.

Turning to the Applicant's affordable housing offer, Ms. Cini and Ms. Sibley agreed that the Applicant's offer to contribute money to the housing fund was more desirable than the offer of 1 lot. Mr. Hoehn was called to explain the Applicant's affordable housing offers. Ms. Brown concurred with the opinions of Ms. Cini and Ms. Sibley.

Prior to ending the meeting, Ms. Brown said that the LUPC's deliberations would be continued to November 27th. She also indicated that a vote by the Commission should occur on December 7th.

Colonial Inn (DRI #15 M)

At the outset, Ms. Sibley apologized for not attending the site visit.

Ms. Brown requested copies of correspondence received during the public comment period. The material were distributed by Mr. Wessling. After reading the letters, Mr. Toole summarized his impressions of the project based on the site visit. He remarked on a proposal to incorporate a loading zone on the property.

Mr. Wessling presented an analysis of the on-site loading area. Based on standard turning radii, he concluded that for large delivery trucks (30'+ or more in length) the proposal was not practical. Smaller sized delivery trucks, though, would be more appropriate.

Ms. Sibley requested an additional site visit. Ms. Sibley then scheduled a site visit which will be held on Sunday, November 26th at 1:40 P.M.

Commenting generally, Ms. Sibley noted that the proposed additional 10 guest rooms would be "too dense" and that the general area in which the hotel is located "is under stress". Mr. Toole, on the other hand, favored the project because the proposed improvements would upgrade the property. Ms. Sibley doubted that the proposal would be "compatible with the surrounding businesses. Ms. Brown, citing the need to promote

the vitality of town centers, spoke of the need to balance the project's economic benefits and preservation of downtown Edgartown's character.

She and Mr. Toole commented on the parking space crisis in Edgartown. Those remarks led to a general discussion on the Applicant's offer to reimburse hotel and shop patrons their transit costs. While questioning Mr. Nugent on the proposed reimbursement program, Ms. Sibley urged the other Members to require the Applicant to contribute a sum of money to the Transit Authority.

Before concluding, the Members and Mr. Nugent reviewed the Applicant's affordable housing offer.

The meeting was continued to November 27th and Ms Brown stated that the Commission's vote on the project would be scheduled for December 7th.

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling

Note: An audio tape of the meeting was not made.