

**Land Use Planning Committee
Summary of August 13, 2001 Meeting
Olde Stone Building**

Commissioners Present:

R. Toole, C. Brown, D. Flynn, A. Woodruff, M. Cini, Megan Ottens-Sargent, K. Warner

Staff Present:

Jennifer Rand

Others Present:

See attached list

Meeting opened at 5:40 PM by Richard Toole

Beach Road Realty Trust

The LUPC heard another informal presentation regarding the Beach Road project and the changes that were made to accommodate the concerns of the commissioners. The major points of the project, as discussed, are as follows:

The building has been set back about 50' to be even with the ArtCliff Diner

There will be flexible points of entry

It is likely there will be 6 tenants but that number could flex

The square footage has dropped from approximately 13,000 SF to approx. 11,500 SF

A plinth has been designed to handle the floodplain issues. It will likely be at 30"

perhaps set back from the street lot line to allow for trees to provide an edge

The architect is trying to design a less formal elevation

The new design has more roof area which will provide more run-off

The applicant has been in discussions with the town for a bike path along the easement in the back of the property

K. Warner commented that she had a problem with the plinth, she felt the building was too far removed from the street, she didn't feel that small parks in front of buildings were ever very successful and she felt the middle building did not fit architecturally.

S. Evans from the Tisbury Site Review Committee was concerned about the building's setback and the context of the area.

A. Woodruff said he had been concerned with the mass of the original building and wondered if the new design could be pulled forward and perhaps separated into two buildings.

J. Weiseman of the Tisbury Site Review Committee said he had liked the scale of the original building design, he felt that either design would be acceptable, he wanted a walking entrance not a driving entrance, he felt the windows were too grouped, felt the setback would benefit the ArtCliff. that the building should not provide any parking, if there was a plinth that it should have an 18" high step to break up the front and was concerned about handicapped accessibility with the multiple entrances.

The LUPC determined that it made sense for the applicant to meet with the site plan review committee in Tisbury, come back one more time informally to the LUPC and then begin the formal hearing process.

Vineyard Clay House

The LUPC then heard from L. Spain regarding a request to allow entertainment at the Vineyard Clay House. She was asking the LUPC not concur that this was modification requiring a public hearing. Staff explained why the project had been referred back, which was a lack of approval during any of the previous modifications for entertainment. Staff also pointed out that the applicant had been specifically asked if they planned to provide entertainment and her answer at that time had been no. The applicant then explained that she hadn't realized that she needed to come back as she felt that it was less "entertainment" and more people sharing various forms of art – particularly where she made no money off the venture. She also pointed out that she felt she was no different from SodaPops, which had also been a DRI and had not received approval for entertainment. Additionally, she was hoping that she would not be subject to a formal hearing as she felt it was expensive and she was not making money from the music and she had other mounting legal bills due to issues with her landlord. The applicant also pointed out that the Clay House was now the only place some people could see these performers and that the entertainment was an asset to the community.

The LUPC took the opportunity to speak with K. Barwick, Building Inspector from Tisbury about specifics in the case of the Clay House and what permits would be required from the town. He said that since they had received a variance for parking from the ZBA they would need to go back to the ZBA to see if the parking scheme was still adequate. He was also asked about SodaPops to which his reply was they had not received a parking waiver, but he was unsure about whether they had ever received any approval for the entertainment. Staff was asked to look into that decision.

Mr. Barwick was also asked about handicapped access at the Clay House. He said they had received a variance from the Access Review Board. K. Warner pointed out that this might be an issue now that there were activities provided upstairs. The applicant said that if there were access issues on any given night the performance could be moved downstairs.

Ultimately, there was a motion by K. Warner seconded by A. Woodruff to recommend that this modification be subject to a full public hearing process. The motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM. (meeting was recorded)