

# 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 December 4, 2000 Meeting Olde Stone Building

**Members present: Christina Brown, Jane Greens, Megan Ottens-Sargent, Linda Sibley, Richard Toole**

**Staff present: David Wessling,**

**Others present: Russell Bowes, George Martin, Glenn Provost**

**Meeting opened at 5:41 P.M. by Christina Brown**

### **Rattner Pier (DRI #520)**

**After a brief summary of the Commission's review process, Ms. Brown invited comments from the other Members. She also outlined the decision time line for the remaining DRI projects.**

**Ms. Sargent was the first to ask questions. She asked about the "protocol" involving a project that had changed during the Commission's review. The other Members explained that a project change was not uncommon. During the conversation, Ms. Ottens-Sargent was assured by the other Members that the final review rests with town boards.**

**Ms. Ottens-Sargent spoke about the reasons which had prompted her question. She was confused about the West Tisbury Conservation Commission's review procedures and those of the West Tisbury Harbormaster.**

**After more introductory remarks, Ms. Sibley cut to the quick by explaining why she would vote to reject the proposal. Realizing that she "could not make the floating thing go away", she described her affinity with the project's opponents who favored a "wild shoreline".**

**Ms. Brown transformed Ms. Sibley's remarks into a recommendation to deny the project. She supported her viewpoint by citing the Commission's Policy Plan admonition IV-18:**

**The appearance of openness and great space is appreciated by Islanders and visitors, and it**

must be preserved. Manage change and growth to enhance the traditional and natural landscapes of Martha's Vineyard. Require that development plans fit the scale and quality of the inherited landscape so generations to come will have views and open vistas to enjoy.

Ms. Sibley made a point to note that the proposed pier would be visible from the ocean. She then made a motion to recommend denial of the project. Mr. Toole seconded the motion.

During the discussion of the motion, Ms. Greene suggested "conditioning the pier to death" in hopes that the Applicant would not implement his plan. She offered several possible conditions:

Make the pier available to the neighbors

Allow the float to be in the water between July 1<sup>st</sup> to September 1<sup>st</sup>

While Ms. Greene was stating conditions, Mr. Toole said that the proposal's detriments exceeded its benefits.

Ms. Sibley agreed with Ms. Greene's notion: that the project might "go away" if there were many conditions.

The Members continued to discuss possible conditions if the a motion to approve the project is made at the Commission's December 7<sup>th</sup> meeting:

Prohibit access to the beach by construction vehicles

No water service or electricity to the pier

Storm contingency plan

Wooden railings on the float

Ms. Brown concluded the meeting with an agreement that LUPC would recommend the project's denial and that should the "full" Commission consider its approval then LUPC would present its list of conditions.

## Review of Checklist

Ms. Brown reminded the Members that LUPC is responsible for reviewing the DRI checklist. She also mentioned the role of the Policy and Procedure Committee's role in updating the checklist.

## Edgartown National Bank (DRI #508)

Russell Bowes, representing the Bank, presented a revised building design. The revision was a condition of the project's approval by the Commission. As stated in the written decision, LUPC was responsible for the review and approval of the revised design.

Referencing building elevations, Mr. Bowes contrasted the "approved" plan with the revised plan.

The Members commented favorably on the revisions. They also suggested that the new dormers should be relocated. Mr. Bowes agreed to consider relocation of the dormers.

In another matter, Mr. Bowes presented a new plan for the bank's sign. He offered a "post" sign in place of the original "tombstone" sign. The sign change was approved by the Members.

#### **Colonial Inn (DRI #15M)**

Ms. Brown wanted LUPC to review the Applicant's affordable housing offer. She read the written offer into the record.

Ms. Ottens-Sargent wanted to know, in effect, how many hours of work could be obtained with the \$10,000 offer?

The Members, instead, compared the Applicant's with the Commission's policy. They determined that the Applicant's offer exceeded the policy.

Ms. Greene and Mr. Toole desired to connect the offer with an actual affordable housing project. Ms. Brown insisted on having a "mechanism" to track the Applicant's offer.

In reply, Mr. Toole suggested the posting of a performance bond. After more discussion, the Members ended up with a suggestion for a memorandum of understanding between the Applicant and a housing beneficiary. Mr. Toole returned to his point as to a bond.

Later, Ms. Greene discussed the need for and type of liquor license that the proposed restaurant would be seeking. [Note: Tape recording ends.]

The Members agreed that liquor license issue belongs to Edgartown officials.

#### **Mackenty Subdivision (DRI #533)**

Ms. Brown discussed the Applicant's affordable housing offer in order to clarify it prior to the Commission's vote scheduled for December 7<sup>th</sup>.

The Applicant has offered to donate one of the subdivided lots or a sum of money which is consistent with the Commission's policy.

After a lengthy debate, the Members agreed to accept the offer as presented.

Next, the Members discussed the relative sizes of the proposed development envelopes.

After another prolonged discussion, the Members agreed to recommend smaller

sized development envelopes.

Meeting adjourned at 6:53 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling