

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 May 21, 2001 Meeting Old Stone Building

Members present: John Best, Christina Brown, Marcia Cini, Michael Donaroma, Daniel Flynn, Megan Ottens-Sargent, Linda Sibley, Richard Toole, Kate Warner, Andrew Woodruff

Staff Present: David Wessling

Others Present: Bruce MacNelly, Anthony Peak

Meeting opened at 5:35 by Richard Toole

Beach Road Realty Trust (DRI #530)

Mr. Toole summarized unresolved planning issues that arose from the previous LUPC meeting. He cited the proposed building's size and its un-Island-like character.

He also informed the Members about procedural deadlines.

The Members then discussed whether or not the public hearing should be reopened. During the discussion, Members considered waiving the "60-day" deadline with the Applicant's consent.

Without resolving the matter, Ms. Sibley stated that the project ought to be "denied: She reasoned that the site is "an inappropriate location for a building of this mass"...and "that it blocks views". She concluded by saying, the "opinions of town officials won't change my mind".

Mr. Toole and Ms. Ottens-Sargent agreed with Ms. Sibley and urged the Applicant to withdraw the proposal.

Ms. Ottens-Sargent explained her view by offering interpretations of the Tisbury Zoning Bylaw and the site plan review criteria. Like Ms. Sibley, she was "not comfortable" with a redesign of the project by the LUPC.

Ms. Warner followed Ms. Otten-Sargent's line of attack. She opposed the proposal, in effect, because it would be out of scale and out of character with the general surroundings. Her argument against the project clung to her opinion that the proposal "doesn't meet the intent of the Waterfront Master Plan".

Ms. Brown disagreed. She believed that the project did fit the plan's intent and that the Site Plan Review Committee members (who approved the project with some minor changes) were aware of the Master Plan. She reminded the other Members that the role of the LUPC is "not to question a local board's decision" but to take a "regional view" and examine the larger "patterns of uses".

Ms. Sibley countered Ms. Brown's remarks by saying that the "building works elsewhere", restated her objections, and ended by saying that "a Special Permit" is needed".

Mr. Best explained why he would vote against the proposal. The building's height, mass, and location were disturbing to him. Ms. Sibley was quick to agree. She then made a motion to recommend rejection of the proposal. Ms. Ottens-Sargent seconded the motion.

During the discussion of the motion, Messrs. Donaroma, Flynn and Toole stated that the building was "too big" and that the Applicant rather than the LUPC should redesign the project.

Almost as an afterthought, Ms. Sibley linked the building to the "failed" State Road. And surprisingly, she suggested that if the Commission approves the project, then the building's use should be limited to offices. An office building, she contended, would be less detrimental than a building designed for retailing.

However, Mr. Best said that he didn't "want the office building to look like an office building". The redesigned office building should look like the "working waterfront" buildings. Ms. Brown truthfully noted that an office building should look like an office building.

Mr. Woodruff candidly remarked that truthful guidance from the LUPC could shape an improved proposal.

Mr. Toole called the vote. The motion to recommend denial of the proposed office building passed unanimously.

Mr. MacNelly and the Members then discussed how the building's design could be modified before adjourning at 6:21 P.M.

Summary prepared by David Wessling