IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioners: (P = Present; A = Appointed; E = Elected)
- James Athearn (E - Edgartown)
- P John Breckenridge (A - Oak Bluffs)
- P Christina Brown (E - Edgartown)
- P Peter Cabana (A - Tisbury)
- - Martin Crane (A - Governor Appointee)
- P Mimi Davisson (E - Oak Bluffs)
- - Mark Morris (A - Edgartown)
- P Chris Murphy (A - Chilmark)
- P Doug Sederholm (E - Tisbury)
- - Ned Orleans (A - Tisbury)
- P Jim Powell (A - West Tisbury)
- P Martin Crane (A - Governor Appointee)
- P Susan Shea (A - Aquinnah)
- P Linda Sibley (E - West Tisbury)
- P Paul Strauss (County Comm. Rep.)
- P Richard Toole (E - Oak Bluffs)
- P Andrew Woodruff (E - West Tisbury)
- P Jim Powell (A - West Tisbury)
- P Doug Sederholm (E - Chilmark)
- P Susan Shea (A - Aquinnah)
- P Linda Sibley (E - West Tisbury)
- P Paul Strauss (County Comm. Rep.)

Staff: Mark London (Executive Director), Bill Veno (Senior Planner), Paul Foley (DRI Coordinator), Jim Miller (Traffic Analyst), Christine Flynn (Affordable Housing Coordinator)

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

1. OTHER

Doug Sederholm recognized Paul Strauss who has been named Conservation Commissioner of the year by the Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions.

2. A.M. FISCHER TRUST: DRI NO. 34-M - PUBLIC HEARING


For the applicant: Glenn Provost, attorney; Arnie and Eleanor Fischer, owners

Christina Brown opened the public hearing.
- The proposal is to subdivide one 12.9-acre parcel off of a 110 acre lot.

2.1 Applicants' Presentation

Glenn Provost represents the Fischer Trust. On a map he showed the entire property and the 13-acre parcel, which has an existing structure.
- The applicants created a building envelope of 1.4 acres, set back 500 feet from the Tisbury Great Pond on the southwest side. On the east side, the envelope is 200 feet back from Short Cove, and 50 feet from the lot line.
- The family would like to impose a series of conditions and restrictions on the subdivision.
- The lot cannot be further divided to create additional building lots.
- The future subsurface leeching area must be set back a minimum of 300 feet from the Tisbury Great Pond.
- The future septic design must incorporate an advanced treatment system such as Bio-Clere for nitrogen reduction.
- The number of bedrooms on the site may not exceed twelve.
- The maximum number of new structures is three, excluding a pool and a tennis court.
- The maximum footprint of all structures, including existing structures, shall not exceed 10,000 square feet, including dwellings, garage, tennis court, shed, but not including decks or patios. The maximum square footage of all structures would be no more than 20,000 sf.
- No asphalt paving will be allowed.
- All new structures must be constructed within the building envelope shown on the plan.
- The area outside the building envelope will be maintained in perpetuity as a hayfield/pasture land. However, the future subsurface leeching area and well may be placed outside the building envelope if necessary to meet various town and state regulations.
- A path to the pond will be allowed subject to the approval of the grantors and the West Tisbury Conservation Commission.
- All proposed landscaping will be native materials.
- To be consistent with DRI No. 34, the applicants would be willing to include the condition that "no hippie communes will be allowed".

Glenn Provost clarified that the subsurface leeching area may be outside the building envelope but will still be no closer than 300 feet from the water bodies.
- He believes that the maximum height of structures allowed is 18 feet.
- The project was referred by the West Tisbury Planning Board.

2.2 Public Comment

Susan Silva, in her letter of April 5th, requested that the family maintain the undeveloped character of the property.

Samantha Look, a neighbor, said her family is sympathetic to what the Fischers are doing. Their only concern is with the little road that bisects their property that accesses the Fischer property. None of them want to be a burden in the process but they want Commissioners to be aware that a new lot could trigger traffic from service vehicles.

Kathy Newman asked if the applicants wanted the Commission to review any aspect of the plan.

Linda Sibley asked if the applicant would be unhappy if the Commission required that, when the lot is developed, the future owners would be required to submit a landscaping plan. The purpose of a landscape plan would be to minimize the visual impact of the house from the Pond.

Bill Wilcox discussed the water quality issues.
• Under Commission guidelines, the loading limit is just over 26 kilograms of nitrogen per year. The applicants are coming in at 8.8 kilograms with a nitrogen reduction system.
• He accepts the applicants’ estimate of 2.7 kilograms of nitrogen for every 10,000 square feet of fertilized turf.
• He agrees with the applicants’ offer to denitrify wastewater. He had suggested a limit of 6,000 square feet of maintained turf and landscape area, but that number is not as important because the proposed nitrogen load limit is much higher than he originally thought.
• Currently, the land is pasture; it hasn’t had petrochemically produced fertilizer in 30 years.

**Linda Sibley** asked about the area outside the building envelope being kept as hayfield or pasture. **Glenn Provost** said the idea is for the Fischers to keep the land as pasture, but the main idea is the land stays open. The applicants are not proposing any conditions about the woods.

**Mimi Davisson** asked about fencing. A future owner could fence along the lot line.

**Chris Murphy** asked whether it would be possible to tie the existing building’s septic system into a new denitrification system. **Glenn Provost** said he believes that the existing system wouldn’t meet Title 5 requirements and would have to be upgraded and meet conditions.

**Doug Sederholm** asked whether the applicants would place a condition on future owners putting a dock on the pond. **Glenn Provost** said from a regulatory standpoint it has become extremely difficult to put a dock on the pond. The owner would have a path to the pond. He’s not sure whether the applicants, as grantors, would want to prohibit a future owner from applying for a permit.

**Mimi Davisson** asked whether the applicants would want to limit the type of fence a new owner could put up. **Glenn Provost** said it wouldn’t be unreasonable for the grantors to add a condition that they would approve any fencing so it would be consistent.

There was a discussion of fertilizing lawns or fields.

• **Doug Sederholm** asked about limiting the amount of fertilized space.
• **Bill Wilcox** said some limitation would be appropriate. 20,000 square feet of landscaped area would be reasonable given the nitrogen numbers. He added that native plantings wouldn’t require much fertilizer, anyway.
• **Glenn Provost** said 20,000 square feet would be reasonable as a condition.
• **Linda Sibley** said the language should distinguish between lawn and turf.

**Christina Brown** closed the public hearing.

*Jim Powell moved, and it was duly seconded, to dispense with referral to LUPC and go directly to deliberations. In favor: 12. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0. The motion passed.*
3. DRAFT PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION PLAN

Jo-Ann Taylor presented the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan.

- It examines the natural hazards that are likely to impact the area, assesses the vulnerability associated with those hazards, and makes recommendations to mitigate the affects of the typical natural hazards.
- The plan can save lives and property.
- Communities with approved disaster mitigation plans may be approved for funding for projects.
- Martha’s Vineyard is at low risk for tornadoes and earthquakes and is at higher risk for hurricanes. A lot of development has taken place since the Island has experienced a Category 3 hurricane.
- Storm surge causes the most damage. Blizzards can cause damage because of their frequency and duration.
- Wildfires are less familiar as a hazard, but are possible and have occurred on the Island.
- The State Forest has a wildfire management program; the mitigation plan identifies vulnerable areas.
- Island dams cre vulnerable to failure, which could cause property damage or injury.
- Critical facilities were assessed for vulnerability.

Kathy Newman said there seems to be a missing link related to the communication center and GIS mapping; there is a lot of detailed information about the roads that the communications center is missing. Mark London said he would talk with Chris Seidel, GIS Coordinator, to delineate what actually might be missing.

Jo-Ann Taylor explained that the plan is in draft form. It’s available on the Commission website.

4. A.M. FISCHER TRUST: DRI NO. 34-M - DELIBERATION & DECISION


Andrew Woodruff moved, and it was duly seconded, to reconsider the earlier decision to make a decision at this meeting, in order to allow for a site visit.

- Andrew Woodruff: He said he is reminded of a site visit that triggered a lot of concerns. This site is a lot more visible and he is concerned about voting on this subdivision without a site visit.
- Richard Toole said in the last DRI, Commissioners were concerned with the public view from the water.
- Linda Sibley, referencing the Fialkow site visit, said it was a condition that a site visit take place prior to approval of the landscape plan. That kind of a condition might be appropriate. A site visit might convince Commissioners to impose a condition that a landscape plan be approved after the house is built.
- Mark London said a site visit might inspire Commissioners to change the building envelope.
• John Breckenridge agreed that a site visit might be useful in terms of looking at the building envelope.
• Andrew Woodruff said it would consistent to have a site visit before voting on a DRI.
• Doug Sederholm said it would be unprecedented for the Commission to vote on a DRI without a site visit.
• Mimi Davisson asked whether it would be possible to expedite the vote to next week. Commissioners agreed that it would be possible to deliberate and decide at the April 12th meeting and agreed that the meeting would start at 7:00 p.m.

A voice vote was taken. In favor: 10. Opposed: 2. Abstentions: 0. The motion to defer a decision passed.

Commissioners agreed to postpone the YMCA site visit and schedule the Fischer site visit for Monday, April 9, 2007, meeting at Alley’s at 4:00 p.m.

5. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN


Mark London reported that the plan is at its final stages.

Jim Miller explained that this iteration is an update and revision of the 2003 Regional Transportation Plan. As the Island Plan is developed, the transportation plan will probably have a more cohesive revision.

- The major changes are in the pedestrian and bicycle plan. Surveys show that people don’t really want to expand the roads and capacity. Increasing the VTA and ridership is a goal.
- A few chapters have been added, including on safety, security, and environmental considerations as required by the federal government.
- A list of planned projects through 2030 is included.
- The plan is the result of a long process and involved a lot of public input. It doesn’t just satisfy the federal government but is a plan they can work with.

Mark London said the reclassification of smaller Island roads wasn’t included but it was suggested that they’d look at doing that.

Richard Toole asked about an article about the transportation finance committee coming out with a dire report on costs for maintaining roads versus the amount of money that would become available. Jim Miller said the Island should be getting a significant bump in funds in 2011.

Jim Powell asked about off-Island intermodality in the plan. Jim Miller said that chapter 11 discusses intermodality, but mostly on-Island. Mark London said he has attended some meetings of the Cape Cod Transit Task Force, that looks at these issues.

Mark London, responding to Linda Sibley’s question, said that the plan states that a new road classification system may be devised for the Island.

Linda Sibley said there is decent public transportation on the Cape. If Islanders are serious about intermodal transportation, one small thing could be to publish a brochure on how to get to places on the Cape without taking your car. Information has to be distributed.
John Breckenridge moved, and it was duly seconded, to approve the 2007 Martha's Vineyard Regional Transportation Plan. In favor: 12. Opposed: 0. The motion passed.

5. DRI NO. - 15 SUMMER STREET - ADOPTION OF WRITTEN DECISION


Commissioners agreed with the following changes:
- Line 27 - all of which are to be sold as condominiums
- Line 85 - Mr. Bongiorno, member of the board of directors (not director)
- Line 103 - all units will be sold as condominium units
- Line 264-266 - As agreed on with the applicants' attorney, at the meeting of April 5th: The applicant will donate or sell the housing units at or below the construction costs to the Island Housing Trust on the condition that the Trust will use the units to provide affordable housing in perpetuity according to its charter.

Jim Powell moved, and it was duly seconded, to adopt the written decision as revised. A roll call vote was taken. In favor: J. Breckenridge, C. Brown, J. Powell, D. Sederholm, S. Shea, L. Sibley, R. Toole. Opposed: None. Abstentions: C. Murphy, K. Newman. The motion passed.

6. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

6.1 Grants


Mark London outlined a list of grants:
- $8,500 from the Edey Foundation for the Island Plan.
- $1,000 from the Permanent Endowment Fund for the Island Plan.
- $20,000 from the Department of Environmental Protection for water testing and analysis of the history of ponds.
- $90,000 from the Department of Housing and Community Development for streamlined.

Linda Sibley moved, and it was duly seconded, to accept the grants. A voice vote was taken. In favor: 12. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0. The motion passed.

6.2 Martha's Vineyard Cost of Living Index

Mark London described the Martha's Vineyard Cost of Living Index.
- This dry run of developing a cost of living index for the Island indicates that the Vineyard is almost 60% more expensive than national average.
- Boston is about 40% higher; Martha's Vineyard is about 12% higher than Boston.
- The health numbers aren't really reliable.
• The index doesn’t deal with the ‘Susan Wasserman factor’, namely that there might be some things that cost more here, but the lifestyle may not require some expenses; fancy clothes might be more expensive, but we don’t need them.
• Housing costs are 96% higher than the national average.
• Transportation costs are higher than Boston.
• The index doesn’t indicate what the causes of the higher costs are.

Doug Sederholm encouraged listeners to go to the Commission website to review the document.

Mark London reiterated that the report is in draft form and shouldn’t be used for legal reasons or by employers.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.
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