

**Land Use Planning Committee
Summary of March 11, 2002 Meeting
Olde Stone Building**

Members Present: R. Toole, C. Brown, R. Wey, B. Zeltzer, J. Athearn, M. Otten-Sargent., M. Donaroma, J. Best, T. Isreal
Staff Present: Jennifer Rand, Christine Flynn
Others Present: See Attached

Meeting opened at 5:30 PM by Richard Toole & adjourned at 7:00

Tisbury Inn

Mr. Goldstein ran through the highlights of the rebuilding of the Tisbury Inn. The Inn will be maintaining the same number of rooms (32) but will be rearranging them and adding suites, thus the fourth floor attic will be redesigned as floor space. The height of the proposed roofline is four inches lower than the current cupola, and there will be a cupola on the new Inn. The basement, once the building is demolished, will be lowered to provide more space for the fitness club. The new pool will be 75', which is considered a standard lap pool, the old pool was shorter. There will be new retail space on the basement and first floor levels. The first floor will have a conference room, which the old Inn did not have. The bay window that projects onto the street on the first floor will be eliminated to enhance the streetscape. The handicapped access into the Inn will be reconfigured and more convenient. The existing restaurant will not have many changes. The new cupola will house the elevator shaft and mechanical fixtures as well as provide access to the roof deck. Relative to parking issues, Mr. Goldstein pointed out that the Inn has a 28-space parking lot, and their reservation attendants are instructed to encourage guests to leave their cars at home. When asked, Mr. Goldstein said the new Inn rates would not increase dramatically over the past rates. Mr. Goldstein also mentioned the plan to restore the historic name "Mansion House" to the Inn.

Mr. Zeltzer asked if this project was consistent with local plans to which Mr. Isreal replied it was, and in fact the loss of the Inn to the fire has proven to be an economic disaster for Tisbury. The Commissioners concluded the discussion by outlining the additional information they would want for the public hearing. This included a landscaping plan, a lighting plan, a drainage plan, information about the Vietnam Memorial and a comparison chart between the old and the new with retail space, health club square footage, historic, current and planned architecture.

Fair Winds

Thomas Richardson introduced the project to the LUPC. The plan is for 24 units on one parcel of land. The zoning is R10. There will be no lot lines; the project will be developed under a condominium concept. The units will be grouped with on-site septic systems that will not conform to local Board of Health regulations, but will conform to Title 5 regulations. The plan shows the building footprints to be 26'X34', not all the houses will be the same size, but they will fall in that range. The applicant is planning to pave the access road. The applicant pointed out that there were details of the plan that needed to be amended to reflect some recent changes. The lot is approximately 160' wide, along the southern boundary of the property the applicant noted there is an existing 10' strip of land that is owned by an abutting property owner allowing her legal street access to her property. There are no plans to ever use this access as this property owner has another entrance to her property. The applicant talked about the affordable units saying they would remain affordable for at least 15 years, and they were going to be scattered through the development so that it would not be obvious which were the affordable units.

Commissioner questions and comments included:

- why the applicant chose 24 units (economics);
- what the surrounding neighborhood density is(will provide tax map);
- the relationship of the property's hydrology and Lake Tashmoo (will provide);
- what the distance would be between houses (approx. 20');
- how the property access would be laid out (depicted on plan);
- why the applicant was building single family homes (reflected character of neighborhood); whether the applicant planned to build the entire property at one time (probably 8-12 a year);
- what would the site design look like in more detail for a row of units (will provide);
- will there be a standard condominium covenant (yes);
- how will affordability work (right now at least 15 years, will discuss);
- provide a planting plan;
- address intensity of use;
- important to provide a play space for children