Members Present: Richard Toole, Michael Donaroma

Staff Present: Jennifer Rand, Bill Wilcox, David Wessling

Others Present: See sign-in sheet

Meeting opened at 5:30 PM by Richard Toole

Lattanzi’s Restaurant Concurrence Recommendation

The LUPC asked for a summary of the project from staff. Ms. Rand explained that the project was technically required to appear before the MVC for a concurrence vote, as they are a restaurant of fifty seats or more. (3.109-g) Rand further explained that the project was an addition of just over 1,000 SF on Church Street being built with the intention of providing take-out service, which is currently handled from the back-side of the restaurant. The applicant stated they planned to primarily service the existing foot traffic on Church Street. The LUPC members then voted to recommend to the full Commission that this was not a substantial project and should not be sent forward for a full public hearing.

Tisbury Service Center Concurrence Recommendation

The LUPC then heard from the applicants for the aforementioned project. The applicant’s attorney began the presentation with an explanation of the project. Ms. Schwartz explained the project consisted of two fuel pumps with four fueling stations total, an employee kiosk, a public restroom, and a facade modification for the existing service station. The applicant explained that this modification was downscaled from the original application as the oil lube; the inspection and the detailing pieces had been removed. It was further explained that the canopy had been downsized, and there would be nine-foot light poles servicing the station. The applicant’s traffic consultant then went into the details regarding parking, traffic flow and State Road traffic impact. Mr. Toole then asked the applicant if there were any conditions that had not been met from the decision granted in May of 2000. Mr. Wehner answered that he felt there were no conditions that he would consider in non-compliance as he had removed the articles stored outside the building and the other issues he felt he had a year to comply with. Ms. Rand then explained that it was not written that the applicant had up to a year to comply therefore she disagreed with his assessment of the situation. Furthermore, she explained
that item “C” in the previous decision would need to be completely overturned in order to allow the parking plan as currently displayed. Finally, she brought a foreclosure notice to the Commissioner’s attention, as Ms. Rand was unclear if a foreclosure on this property would affect the Commission’s ability to act on a modification of the previous decision.

The applicant then stated his goal of promising and maintaining a promise of lower gasoline prices at his station. When asked how that would happen, Mr. Wehner explained that he had made an offer to fund an attorney’s time to research how to make this offer valid and enforceable. Mr. White, (a TSC partner) then spoke to the benefits he felt would be realized by the Island should this project be approved. These benefits included lower prices on gasoline and fewer trips to and through Five Corners.

The Commissioners then voted to recommend that this modification be heard through the public hearing process. Mr. Toole then summarized the issues he felt would be paramount regarding this project. These issues included but are not limited to: parking, traffic, screening/landscaping, the delivery schedule, and safety relative to gasoline storage, fire safety, water quality and so on. He added that the applicant should have a clear explanation for how the lower prices guarantee would work, as Mr. Donoroma pointed out the Commission has heard that promised before but there has been no way to assure it would remain in place. Mr. Wilcox also asked for a comprehensive package of information regarding the fuel storage system and the leakage detection system and any other pertinent information. The applicant promised to deliver all of that.

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 PM.