Minutes of the Commission Meeting
Held on August 28, 2008
In the Stone Building
33 New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs, MA

IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioners: (P = Present; A = Appointed; E = Elected)

P James Athearn (E – Edgartown)
P John Breckenridge (A – Oak Bluffs)
P Christina Brown (E – Edgartown)
P Peter Cabana (A – Tisbury)
P Martin Crane (A – Governor Appointee)
P Mimi Davisson (E – Oak Bluffs)
P Mark Morris (A – Edgartown)
P Chris Murphy (A – Chilmark)
P Katherine Newman (A – Aquinnah)
P Ned Orleans (A – Tisbury)
P Jim Powell (A – West Tisbury)
P Doug Sederholm (E – Chilmark)
P Susan Shea (A – Aquinnah)
P Linda Sibley (E – West Tisbury)
P Richard Toole (E – Oak Bluffs)
P Andrew Woodruff (E – West Tisbury)

Staff: Mark London (Executive Director), Bill Veno (Senior Analyst), Christine Flynn (Affordable Housing and Economic Planner), Paul Foley (DRI Coordinator), Bill Wilcox (Water Resource Planner), Jo-Ann Taylor (Coastal Planner/DCPC Coordinator)

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

1. ALEXANDER & DYKE: CR NO. 5 – CONCURRENCE REVIEW


For the applicant: Alex Alexander (owner), Dick Barbini (engineer and agent)

Paul Foley gave the staff report.

- The project is located at the confluence of the Edgartown-Vineyard-Haven Road, Beach Road, and Upper Main Street in Edgartown.
- The proposal is to convert a single-family residence into an air-conditioning office for three full-time employees.
- The site is in the B-2 zone.
- There are no plans for physical changes to the house.
- The applicants would like to create a new access to allow people to enter the property from Edgartown Park-and-Ride and exit taking a right.
• Three year-round staff members work at the main office. Four or five year-round employees work in the field.
• The Edgartown Planning Board referred the project. They recommend that it not be designated a DRI and stated it would be properly reviewed by the planning board.
• LWPC unanimously voted to recommend that the project does not require a public hearing.

Christina Brown moved, and it was duly seconded, that, given that this is a low traffic generating use and given that Edgartown has a review process for the district, the project is not sufficiently substantial as to require a public hearing.
• Chris Murphy thanked the Edgartown Planning Board for sending the referral and the Commission has every confidence that it will do the required review.


2. ISLAND PAINT & TOOL: CR NO. 4 – CONCURRENCE REVIEW


Applicants: Rachel Baumrin, Michael Ryan, Jeff Kirk, Jr.

Doug Sederholm recused himself.

2.1 Staff Report

Paul Foley gave the staff report.
• The site is in the West Tisbury business district.
• The Planning Board approved the proposal in September 2007. It should have been sent to the Commission at that time because it’s on the high-traffic-generating list.
• Although the use is on the high-traffic-generating list, this is a case of an existing building which has been used for office and retail purposes, and already has two exits onto State Road.
• LWPC voted unanimously to recommend to the full Commission that this does not require a public hearing based on the West Tisbury Planning Board’s recommendation that the project is appropriate and has adequate parking.
• LWPC noted that it would like to see a site plan and a condition that the containers would be removed within six months. The applicants have painted the containers and said they would be willing to move them and plant around them.
• Traffic is minimal. They have good site lines. Traffic could increase. On the other hand, the store might be diverting traffic from going Down-Island.
• He showed a series of slides.
• The building has three parking spots in front, and handicapped and employee parking in the back.
• They have a lot of signs that West Tisbury will be dealing with.
• It’s part of the application that the applicants will come back to the Commission if the containers are not gone in six months.

2.2 Commissioner Questions and Discussion

Jim Athearn asked why this doesn’t trigger a DRI but Hart did. Paul Foley responded that Hart was new construction over 2,000 square feet and was a high traffic generating use. This project doesn’t trigger the square footage, it had been commercial and there’s no change in the building.

Paul Foley mentioned that the building is in a critical watershed, but all past, present, and future uses will probably have an issue with nitrogen.

John Breckenridge asked if it’s a non-concurrence, what would trigger their return to the Commission six months. Paul Foley and Christina Brown explained that non-concurrence letter sent to the town would specify that it is based on this ‘condition’, and, if not fulfilled, it should be re-referred as a DRI.

Bill Wilcox, in response to a question from Susan Shea about the wastewater, said that the project site is just in the Tisbury Great Pond watershed, which is nitrogen restricted.
• The building was a three-bedroom house.
• The nitrogen generation produced by the proposed use is well below the potential use of a three-bedroom house.
• A new building would have to meet more stringent guidelines.

Commissioners and the applicants discussed containers.
• Kathy Newman noted that the applicants wanted the containers for toxic and flammable materials.
• The applicants said that, in six months, they might be able to build a safe storage unit inside the building.
• Christina Brown explained the Commission is aware that containers on commercial properties are beginning to pop up on properties. The Commission intends to talk with planning boards to clarify current regulations and possibly propose new ones.

Jim Powell moved, and it was duly seconded, that the Commission not concur with the referral provided that within six months of this approval, the containers are removed or the Applicant has returned to the Commission and obtain approval for their permanent installation on the site, including an adequate screening plan. A roll call vote was taken. In favor: J. Athearn, J. Breckenridge, C. Brown, P. Cabana, M. Morris, C. Murphy, K. Newman, N. Orleans, J. Powell, S. Shea, L. Sibley, R. Toole, A. Woodruff  Opposed: None. Abstentions: None. The motion passed.

3.  FIELD CLUB/AFFORDABLE HOUSING: NO. DRI 551-M4 – PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioners present: J. Breckenridge, P. Cabana, M. Davisson, M. Morris, C. Murphy, K. Newman, N. Orleans, J. Powell, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, R. Toole, A. Woodruff
Applicant: South Village Reality Trust; Field Club LLC

Doug Sederholm opened the public hearing on the proposal to change the applicant’s affordable housing mitigation from the donation of three affordable housing lots to the payment of $1.8 million to the Edgartown Affordable Housing Committee.

Christina Brown said some questions have been raised about her role.

• She’s a member of both the Martha’s Vineyard Commission and the Edgartown Affordable Housing Committee.
• She has no pecuniary interest in the issue or in either of the roles.
• The state conflict of interest law is clear that a person can be a member of more than one committee.
• She has been active in the discussion with Edgartown and has been an advocate of the change.
• Although she has no technical conflict of interest, because the question has been raised and she doesn’t want to distract from the issue, she recused herself from the discussion and decision.

Jim Athearn said he has a financial interest next door and recused himself.

Christina Brown and Jim Athearn left the room.

Chris Murphy said it’s important to the functioning of this board that Commission members who are on various boards can allow information flow between boards.

Doug Sederholm said there was suggestion that he has a conflict because he works in the same office building as Robin Bray. He clarified that Robin Bray is not his employee and that he had nothing to do with the letters that she had written about the project.

3.1 Staff Report

Paul Foley gave the staff report:

• The proposal is to modify a previous Commission affordable housing condition to allow a $1.8 million monetary contribution instead of three lots within the subdivision.
• He summarized the history of the DRI as outlined at the last meeting, and listed the letters that have come in since the concurrence review.
• Some of the key issues are:
  • What are the relative benefits and detriments of the cash contribution versus the three lots?
  • If more affordable lots can be generated with the cash contribution, how does this compare with fulfilling the objective of having people of different income levels living in the same subdivision?
  • Is the proposed contribution reasonable amount in light of the market rate of the three lots?

Christine Flynn explained that this proposal is being initiated by the Town in conjunction with the applicant.
• It's not uncommon for the Commission to deviate from the strict application of the Affordable Housing Policy, as long as the offer meets the spirit and intent of the policy.
• A question is whether the monetary contribution is satisfactory. There is a difference of opinion on how to apply the mitigation.

3.2 Applicant’s Presentation

Art Smadbeck, Edgartown selectman, said that the Edgartown Board of Selectmen fully supports the requested change. At Edgartown’s October Town Meeting, voters will be asked to create a Housing Trust Fund. The Field Club money will go into the Housing Trust Fund.

Dick Barbini, representing the applicant, said they would like to defer to the resident homesite committee to do the presentation.

Alan Gowell, member of the Edgartown Affordable Housing Committee, said they haven’t gone into this recommendation lightly.
• They considered other possibilities, including building duplexes.
• They think they can do more with $1.8 million than they can with three lots at the Field Club.
• Edgartown has done alright with mixing income levels. Morgan Woods has mixed income and Edgartown passed a by-law that allows less than ½-acre lots in Dodgers Hole and other subdivisions.
• There’s a lot of concern about what’s best for mixed income. The Town will do a better job and create more opportunities with $1.8 million.

Doug Ruskin noted that they have officially changed their name from the Resident Homesite Committee to the Edgartown Affordable Housing Committee.
• He stated that the Committee has a good track record. Since 1988 there have been 106 approvals on properties for affordable housing use. 95 are completed and occupied.
• 38 are ownership properties and 68 are rental properties.
• They are confident that they can parlay $1.8 million into 5 or 6 ready-to-move-in residences in a lot less time than starting with three lots.

Sharon Purdy, Affordable Housing Committee member, said she was on the subcommittee that spent many months of study and discussion with the Field Club.
• She and Melissa Vincent were asked to formulate a reasonable substantiation of the valuation of the three lots and they are satisfied with the outcome.
• Based on statistics on sales in Katama over the last three years, they believe $600,000 per lot is very fair.
• The sub-committee explored what they might do with the three Field Club Lots. She outlined the economic issues of developing the lots at a minimal cost of $255,000 and how the lots could not help fulfill the greatest need which is in the 80 – 100% AMI range.
• The sub-committee explored how they could best use the money and concluded that the best use is buying existing housing stock. Housing prices have been favorable. They can parlay the money into five or six good, even brand-new, houses, including closing costs.
• They're enthusiastic about exchanging three undeveloped lots for three 120% AMI recipients for six houses for 80–100% AMI recipients, especially since there's not a great demand at the 120% AMI level.

**Doug Ruskin** clarified that about 85 percent of the need for housing is for Islanders below the 80% AMI level.

### 3.3 Public Comment

**David Vigneault** Dukes County Regional Housing Authority, has worked with Edgartown Affordable Housing Committee but the Authority hasn't taken an active part in this discussion.

- He read the Authority's letter to the Commission supporting Edgartown Affordable Housing Committee's proposal for purchase of turnkey homes versus development of raw lots.
- The Authority recognizes the Commission's desire for public review.

**Bob Jilkes** said he has been an affordable housing owner since 1993. He's here to support the committee and the good work they've done and he hopes the Commission will back them up.

**Tom Benedict** said there seem to be two questions.

- One question is the money and the Commission protecting the process.
- The second issue is the diversification of neighborhoods which is a philosophical question.
- It may be somewhat presumptuous to think that in order to diversify this project, someone would actually want to live in this neighborhood where they would be isolated in the winter.

**Doug Sederholm** said the question of where the housing would be located is one of the factors for consideration in affordable housing, one of the issues in the discussion.

**John Breckenridge** asked for confirmation that the money would be used for actual affordable housing opportunities. **Alan Gowell** confirmed that the money would be used specifically for affordable housing opportunities to try to meet the 80–100 % AMI need.

**Sharon Purdy** said there is a need at the below 80% level, but the Committee may not be able to meet that need. Habitat for Humanity meets that need better than they do. The Committee needs some flexibility in the numbers. They will provide as much housing as they can, based on the market, on the need and the amount of money they have to work with.

**Janet Hathaway** added that in 1998, there was a need for 120-150 % AMI housing. Now the need is at the 80% AMI level demonstrated by about 75 people on the waiting list for four one-bedroom rental apartments.

**Susan Shea** asked how many people on the list are at 80% AMI or under. **David Vigneault** responded that the 315 people are on the waiting list; roughly 1/3 (105 people) are below 60% AMI; 210 are between 60 and 140%; 30 are above 100%.

**Doug Sederholm** said each of the three Field Club lots would allow four bedrooms affordable housing in a sewered community. The lots could be developed as houses, duplexes or condominiums. He asked whether the committee considered the flexibility it would have in developing the lots and the total number of units that could potentially be developed.
Janet Hathaway responded that they did consider the number of units they could develop but concluded that it was not desirable to develop a sub-neighborhood within a neighborhood.

- The committee wanted people to feel like they were part of a neighborhood that was lively in the winter.
- They considered landlease option, putting two or three families in one structure, but that adds a different dynamic.
- The mission statement is focused on providing single-family homes for people who would not otherwise be able to afford to develop the property.
- The committee felt that putting people in a year-round neighborhood was a better choice.

Sharon Purdy said construction is not really their purview. Even when they had a developer builder there were massive amounts of time put in by committee members. Additionally, the committee doesn’t have money to fund a project and there is not a benefit to doing that over to what they’ve proposed.

Doug Sederholm noted that the comparables were unsewered and asked whether a sewered lot would potentially have more value; an unsewered, half-acre lot would generally not be approved for four or five bedrooms. Sharon Purdy responded that a sewered lot would not have greater value unless you could get more bedrooms. Dick Barbini said a half-acre lot on town water could have six bedrooms.

Sharon Purdy said they did not address membership in the Field Club at all because it’s their understanding that the lots would be sold without membership. Dick Barbini said that in the development, memberships are not part of the lot purchase price.

Prudy Burt, West Tisbury, commented on the modification and related discussion.

- The amount of money doesn’t seem like enough.
- She took issue with the comment attributed to Richard Toole that ‘we shouldn't make these people go live in this neighborhood.’ When she got her youth lot five years ago, comments were made that ‘these people should be thankful for anything they get.’
- It’s not safe to assume that everyone will have kids and will want to live in a neighborhood.
- Given the Commission’s math on the affordable housing mitigation, it seems the money should be $2.4 million.

Doug Sederholm asked if the removal of the affordable housing lots in this project has an impact on the value of the remaining lots. Sharon Purdy responded that there are not enough specifics to calculate an impact on value.

Sharon Purdy said she believes the lots are not publicly listed at this point in time but there are about 10 under contract. The net figure is close to $600,000 per lot.

Dick Barbini, Edgartown resident, said he doesn’t know that there are any slums in Edgartown. A lot in Edgartown is not going to be a substandard lot. The subdivision has changed since it was originally proposed. It isn’t a year-round neighborhood anymore.

Melissa Vincent said she lives in a dark neighborhood. There aren’t neighbors. There isn’t a community, though it was at one time.
An affordable housing recipient said Dodgers Hole just raised their dues by 25%. He imagines the Field Club neighborhood would have high dues.

**Michael Donaroma** said Commissioners should keep their eyes on the ball.
- It’s not who lives where. It’s taking three dirt lots that the committee has no money to do anything with and trading them for five or six homes.
- BADD Company sold the lots for $400,000. The Field Club developers have put money into it and are selling them for $600,000.
- The committee’s done a lot of work and has decided to do the deal at this time and make the trade, without knowing exactly what the future prices will be.

**Doug Sederholm** closed the public hearing.

4. **FIELD CLUB/ AFFORDABLE HOUSING: NO. DRI 551-M4 – DELIBERATION & DECISION**

Commissioners present: J. Breckenridge, P. Cabana, M. Davisson, M. Morris, C. Murphy, K. Newman, N. Orleans, J. Powell, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, R. Toole, A. Woodruff

Linda Sibley moved, and it was duly seconded, that the Commission waive referral to LUPC and move directly to deliberation and decision. A voice vote was taken. In favor: 12. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0. The motion passed.

Linda Sibley moved, and it was duly seconded, that the Commission approve the change in offer as presented.
- **Linda Sibley** commented that she fought hard to have the hearing. It was important to have the information and appreciated that Michael Donaroma clarified something that was bothering her. He made a good point that you have to make a decision about what you think is a good deal. She’s now persuaded now that the $1.8 million is a fair number. She’s content and she’s glad they had the public vetting. It is important that they acknowledge that they read the letters that raised serious issues which have now been responded to.
- **Susan Shea** said she’s glad they had the public hearing and the due process.
- **Richard Toole** responded to Prudy Burt. His comments were made at LUPC after the benefit of hearing from the affordable housing committee members. The point he was trying to make was that he felt personally he wouldn’t be comfortable living there. Also, considering the income level, it didn’t make much sense. Additionally, there would be huge expenses associated with living there.
- **Peter Cabana** said he believed the process worked and the public hearing wasn’t necessary. The only issue seemed to be the amount of money and he didn’t that was in the jurisdiction of the Commission. He didn’t hear anything at the public hearing that was different from what was presented at LUPC.
- **Andrew Woodruff** said that many Commissions had not attended LUPC and it was important for him to hear the information at the public hearing. He had mixed emotions about money and moving affordable housing from a Katama neighborhood. He doesn’t
think there’s anything wrong with keeping housing in that neighborhood. He believes that enough evidence was given for him to understand that this is the right decision.

- **Doug Sederholm** said, when the Commission writes its decision, it will be clarified that the money will be used 100% for affordable housing.
- **Jim Powell** said Commissioners need to review DRIs, but not squelch creativity. He’s grateful for the efforts of the committees in providing more affordable housing opportunities.
- **Mark Morris** said the committees have worked hard and done a wonderful job.
- **Doug Sederholm** said the presentation tonight answered the questions that had been raised.


5. MUCKERHEIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING: DRI NO. – PUBLIC HEARING (CONT.)

Commissioners present:  J. Athearn, J. Breckenridge, C. Brown, P. Cabana, C. Murphy, J. Powell, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, R. Toole, A. Woodruff

Applicant: D. Muckerheide

**Richard Toole** reopened the public hearing.

- The proposal is to add seven modular units and reconfigure the existing building with four units for a total of eleven units.
- The stated goal of the project is to provide housing for Island residents and sell the units as condominiums at a price that corresponds to the affordability requirements of residents in the 120% to 150% AMI range.
- The applicant had planned to present to and get feedback from the Oak Bluffs Planning Board.

5.1 Staff Report

**Paul Foley** gave the staff report.

- Commissioner packets include updated offers, letters, notes from the Oak Bluffs Planning Board, and preliminary suggestions.
- The applicant has submitted a cover letter and the full 21E report.
- The applicant submitted the list of 20 neighbors who had supported the project.
- Annie Parr and Chester Bartles submitted letters.
- The applicant submitted a 25-year stormwater plan, which has been reviewed by Bill Wilcox.
- The applicant submitted as-built plans of the existing building.
- The applicant submitted a site plan with numbered parking spaces. Staff recommends a number of parking spaces be eliminated.
- The applicant has changed his offer from nine units of residential housing with no short-term rentals, to a 40B equivalent of eleven units, three of which would be at 80% AMI.
- He proposes to add seven modular units and create four units within the existing space.
• The fence along the side of the property would also continue along Dukes County Avenue.
• Staff recommends removing parking spaces number 18, 20, 19, 12 and 13 so the lot wouldn’t need a second curbcut. The Planning Board suggests reducing parking by six spaces.
• He showed a slide show of the neighborhood and existing building.

5.2 Applicant’s Presentation

Don Muckerheide made the following comments and gave the following information.

• This is the beginning of the change of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is not beautiful. The neighborhood is on the rebirth. This project may be what other people will be trying to achieve.
• With respect to parking:
  - Parking space number 12 can stay and the space behind 12 can stay.
  - Regardless of what Commissioners think, he’s been parking cars there for thirty years, and it’s not a problem.
  - Space number 13 is replaced by trash bins.
  - Space number 21 has been eliminated.
  - Regarding 19 and 20, he commented that the Planning Board seems to think a little bit of grass is more important than parking.
• There are trees and a three-foot strip of groundcover.
• Losing the curb cut would be a safety and aesthetic issue.
• As he didn’t get an enthusiastic response to the weekly rental issue and, because he doesn’t want to risk the project being rejected and the property being condemned to DRI status forever, he is proposing a 40B-like project with three one-bedroom units at 80% AMI.
• Two units will be one-bedroom, 840 sq. ft. townhouse type units. The third unit would be a one or two-bedroom, 700-800 sq. ft. one unit. The outside of the new building is affected only by the location of a couple of windows.
• The affordable in perpetuity documents will be the same as those administered by the Dukes County Housing Authority or Oak Bluffs Resident Homesite Committee.
• The condo fees for the 80% AMI units will be proportional to the cost.
• The ground floor units will be ADA modifiable. Under LIP/40B guidelines, one-bedroom units are required to be handicapped modifiable. One-bedroom units are allocated toward handicapped and elderly, and are recommended to be on the ground floor.
• He is partially removing the no-rental policy from the other units. The goal is to sell the units to year-round residents of Martha’s Vineyard for $350,000-$375,000. Weekly rental will be prohibited and suggested rental, through the condo documents, will be 30 to 90 days.
• This project is allowed by right by Oak Bluffs Zoning. There is no need for 40B relief. He is using 40B as a guide.
• The Department of Housing and Community Development, with which he has spoken, tends to like the project.
• The project meets Oak Bluffs parking regulations.
• The project meets zoning regulations, Mass. State Building Codes, and will meet or exceed EnergyStar and/or R 2000 standards, including conversion of the existing building.
• The project will use all EnergyStar rated appliances and high-efficiency, propane, on-demand heating and hot water units.
• Solar collectors will be used to heat potable water if subsidies can be found. Photovoltaic will not be used because it is not cost effective.
• The project exceeds Commission affordable housing guidelines.
• The property is hard to see from the road. The only viewscape is Dukes County Avenue. The property is 150 feet from Viera Park.
• There is excess parking. A picnic area could be set up along Arch Avenue.
• With regard to building massing, Wesley House is at the other end of Dukes County Avenue and looks fine next to little cottages. His building is broken up by the gables and deck roofs.
• The existing building is 52 feet on Dukes County Avenue; the new building is 66 feet. The existing building is 73 feet deep on Arch Avenue; the new building is 88 feet. The existing building is 2830 sq. ft. The new building footprint will be 3734 sq. ft.
• The patio will be rap with a top coat of white shell and will be a solid, semi-pervious surface.
• Roof decks combined are 1800 sq. ft. The private decks total 840 sq. ft. The patio area is 1640 sq. ft. There is 4290 sq. ft. of people space.
• In addition to the housing this creates, there are many craftsmen who would like to work on the project.
• There's a certain level of income in which people don't go to the housing authority. There isn't new, efficient housing available in the $300,000 to $400,000 range.

5.3 Public Officials

John Bradford, chairman of the Oak Bluffs Planning Board, said they started using criteria of Site Plan Review in looking at the project. They have some concerns and recommendations.
• For appearance of the streetscape, it would be beneficial to do away with the six spaces that abut Dukes County Avenue and the curb cut and add some green space.
• They would like the applicant to provide more detail and fenestration plans so they can see the design and placement of windows and doors, and details of railings and decks.
• They felt that the extension that overhangs the roof could be increased to give it more of a feel of other structures in the neighborhood.
• They recommended something be done on the south façade to break up the massing. They recommend there be more windows.
• They would like to see something from the Fire Chief sent to the Planning Board and Commission pointing out if he has any concerns about the project.
• They suggest the height of the fence along Dukes County Avenue shown as six feet be reduced so it offers a more open feel. The design around the perimeter should be such that it enhances both the project and neighborhood.
Linda Sibley asked whether the Planning Board or any other board has authority to implement the suggestions. John Bradford responded that the Site Plan Review gives the Planning Board authority to approve or approve with modifications; authority over curbcuts would be the Highway Department; the Planning Board has authority over parking and usually sets the minimum requirement at least one per unit; it could require him to reconfigure the spaces.

John Breckenridge asked whether, as part of Site Plan Review, the Planning Board has authority to reduce the height of the building. John Bradford responded that they do not; they can ask the applicant to make the building conform more to the character of the neighborhood through negotiating design characteristics; they can put conditions on a project, but they can’t turn down the project.

5.4 Public Comment

Holly Alaimo, owner of Dragonfly Gallery, commented on the project.
- She believes what Mr. Bradford said is an indication of how a lot of people feel in the neighborhood about the development. She doesn’t think people are opposed to the idea of developing the neighborhood, but more attention needs to be paid to the design of the project.
- There had been an earlier proposal done by a developer and architect that was done with beautiful natural materials, appropriate setbacks, retail space, parking and nineteen one-bedroom units. It was big, but was very well-designed.
- Her assumption had been that the plan Mr. Muckerheide was presenting was based on the previous plan.
- She realizes that development is going to happen in the area, but would very much hope that more detail would be required with more consideration for design, landscaping and parking.

Donald Muckerheide said the prior plan was done by someone who was interested in buying and developing the property, but did not proceed.

Michael Hunter, nearby business and property owner, commented on the project.
- He wondered if a traffic study had been ordered. He would want to make sure the same traffic issues are applied to this project as to Bradley Square.
- He’s all for growth and the right of someone to develop their property.
- He would like to see more look into traffic impact, the materials of the proposed building, and architectural detail.
- It’s a thoughtful neighborhood. It’s delicate and care needs to be taken in developing it.

Paul Foley said LUPC waived the traffic study because of the previous uses, the proposal is not for commercial use, and the applicant is not proposing a function room and office.

Sue Dawson of the Alison Shaw Gallery said that because this is a B-1 street, density and scale are not the issues for her. Her concern is architectural design and the overall aesthetic. She would like to see a lot of work in those areas.

David Wilson, Oak Bluffs, commented on the project.
• He was surprised when he saw the drawing in the paper, given the attention that has been given to other projects’ mass and scale.
• He’s concerned about human scale.
• The project is smart growth, being close to town.
• He can’t comprehend the design. He thinks there’s another approach that would come up with the same number of units while fulfilling the aspirations of the Island Plan.
• He can’t accept the argument that it’s not going to be visible.
• If this project were approved, he wouldn’t be able to imagine why there’s a Martha’s Vineyard Commission.
• Quoting from the Island Plan, he said, “Just a few poorly designed buildings in highly visible locations can seriously undermine the Island’s character.”
• He feels the project will have a negative effect on property values. He’s concerned that the units won’t be able to be sold for the projected price.
• Much work needs to be done on the design. He urges that the project be broken up into smaller units.
• Dukes County Avenue is predominantly cedar shingles.
• As the project is presented, he’s strongly opposed to the project.

Jan Meersom, owner on Circuit Avenue, said the project should be judged on the project’s merits, not on some of his rough comments. He’s more sincere than a lot of other applicants.

Mark London noted that John Bradford’s comments had been limited to what falls into the limited purview of what Site Plan Review can address and asked whether the Planning Board could be in a position to make broader recommendations to the Commission. John Bradford said the Planning Board could review the plans that were presented and talk about recommendations.

Jim Westervelt, Oak Bluffs Planning Board, said the proposal they received in February and referred to the Commission is different from what they’re seeing now. They haven’t received professional plans and there is no architectural oversight, so it’s difficult to give a recommendation based on the model. He’s still very confused about the proposal.

Moira Fitzgerald said that the applicant’s intention is to do the best and provide the most housing he can. He’s very committed to that.
• He could get five units out of the existing space and add two modulars for a total of seven units. That would give him enough parking.
• Aesthetically there’s a great opportunity, a lot of potential.
• The building should be designed for the people who potentially are living there. People should have their own green space and private entrances. There’s a way of creating those things.

Jim Athearn asked David Wilson about the future of this area and whether he sees how a building of this mass could fit into the neighborhood. David Wilson said that the proposed massing isn’t the future of the neighborhood; there are a lot of ways to make this project work by breaking up the large mass of a single building into smaller units; it’s a social issue with what kinds of buildings work with multiple units; successful models break buildings down into smaller units.
Chris Murphy said the applicant has presented a number of different ideas. His own hope is that there is one idea Commissioners can vote up or down. He asked whether the applicant has any further questions that will help him make a decision about what he wants to present.

Donald Muckerheide said he doesn’t think anyone’s looked at the picture. The vinyl siding looks like clapboard with corner boards. This is not a subsidized project. The affordability is a function of scale.

Jim Powell asked the Planning Board if they had examples of overhang and fenestration. John Bradford said they probably don’t, but they could take some pictures around town.

Alison Shaw said she is not at all opposed to the concept of the project, but the architectural design and landscaping need a lot more work. It is not simply a matter of taking a few photos of some details of other Oak Bluffs buildings and pasting them onto this project. There should be a serious, professional study of what could work there. The current presentation is inadequate.

Linda Sibley said she is nagged by the question of whether there is a market for year-round Islanders. Donald Muckerheide said there is a market which might not show up on the Dukes County Housing Authority list; it’s a demographic that can afford $2,000 a month for rent but can’t afford $500,000 for a home.

Don Muckerheide explained that he hired Terrain Associates to do a rendering of the proposal.

Jim Athearn encouraged the applicant not to jump to conclusions about the Commission’s vote on the project.

Linda Sibley moved, and it was duly seconded, to suspend the rules for ten minutes. A voice vote was taken. A majority of Commissioners voted in favor.

Richard Toole continued the public hearing until September 18, 2008.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.
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