

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 January 29, 2001 Meeting Old Stone Building

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

Staff Present: David Wessling

Others Present: Thomas Ford, "Bud" Moskow and James Langyel

Meeting opened at 5:30 by Richard Toole

Airport Ministorage (DRI #530)

Mr. Toole summarized unresolved planning issues. He began by directing the Committee's attention to the Applicant's affordable housing offer. Ms Brown asked about the offered amount and beneficiary. The Committee agreed that the Regional Housing Authority would received the offered funds.

Mr. Toole said that the housing policy formula suggests a contribution of \$21,800. Ms. Brown, surprised by the amount, rationalized the Applicant's offer which she termed as "common sense". Ms. Sibley clarified Ms. Brown's reasoning. She added that she tried to recodify the policy several months ago by basing it on common sense.

Mr. Ford, the Applicant, was invited to speak. He explained how he arrived at the \$7,500 offer. He mentioned application and review fees, design changes and project development costs.

Ms. Sibley and Ms. Brown, after hearing the Applicant's tale, suggested that the MVC should inform the Airport Commission of the DRI review process. Mr. Toole said it was a good idea.

Ms. Sibley favored accepting the Applicant's affordable housing offer and the others also assented.

Ms. Sibley said she "was concerned about the [project's] lighting". Mr. Ford was called on to explain the type of lighting being proposed. Ms. Brown supported Ms. Sibley. Mr. Ford clarified his offer as to type, location and duration of lighting. In reply to Ms. Sibley's questions, Mr. Ford said that after 9:30 P.M. only motion-detector exterior lighting would be "active".

Ms. Brown and Ms. Continued to quibble about the lighting.

Mr. Toole then brought up the matter of type of goods to be stored on the premises. The Members review a sample lease prepared by the Applicant. Mr. Ford said that a camera system will record goods entering the warehouse.

Ms. Sibley continued the discussion by saying that the Applicant's offer to restrict the types of stored goods would be acceptable.

The Members formulated 3 recommended conditions – affordable housing, lighting and types of goods stored.

Before ending the session, Mr. Toole reminded Mr. Ford that any project modification would have to be reviewed by the Commission. His remarks led to a general discussion about the fee schedule. Ms. Brown said that the fee schedule should be reviewed by the Finance Committee.

Afterwards, Ms. Sibley and Ms. Brown added that the Applicant's landscaping plan should be accepted as submitted.

With those 4 conditions, the session formally ended.

Before leaving, Mr. Ford asked questions about the reaming steps. Members answered his questions and assured him that the project would likely be approved.

There was more discussion about DRI modifications and review fees.

Note: Mr. Donaroma was not present.

Thimble Farm (DRI #447M)

"Bud" Moskow, the Applicant, introduced himself to the Members and then asked James Lengyel of the Land Bank to describe the proposed subdivision.

Referencing property plans and other documents, he outlined the benefits of the proposal:

1. maintain the farm,
2. creating a circumferential trail, and
3. linking of conservation/recreation/agriculture properties.

Mr. Moskow , in reply to Ms. Sibley's questions, described the present residential buildings and their preservation.

Ms. Sibley summarized the issue before the Committee as to determining the significance of the proposed subdivision. Mr. Toole read into the record Mr. Moskow's written explanation of the project. Ms. Sibley returned to the issue of a "modification". After reviewing the "checklist, the Members were satisfied that there weren't any other planning issues.

Ms. Sibley and Ms. Brown, though, were concerned about "clear cutting" and further residential construction. Mr. Lengyel defended the proposed plan and potential public benefits as did Mr. Moskow. Ms. Sibley remained skeptical.

Mr. Moskow reminded the Committee that he could have developed the property in a more intensive manner.

Ms. Sibley, Ms. Brown and the Applicant continued their polemic until Mr. Donaroma reminded the women that "it's just about lines".

Ms. Brown and Ms. Sibley studied the referral checklist and determined that no other referral item applied.

Mr. Donaroma moved to recommend that the project would be insignificant. Ms. Sibley asked the Members to imagine what the public "would complain about"?

Mr. Toole called the vote and the recommendation was unanimous.

Mr. Moskow asked about the next steps and was answered by several Members. Mr. Toole said that he would confer with the Commission Chairman as to scheduling a vote at the February 1st meeting.

After the Members traded anecdotes, jokes and stories, the meeting drifted to its end.

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling