



BOX 1447, OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS, 02557, 508-693-3453,
FAX 508-693-7894 INFO@MVCOMMISSION.ORG WWW.MVCOMMISSION.ORG

Martha's Vineyard Commission

Land Use Planning Committee

Draft Minutes of the Meeting of June 6, 2005

Held in the Stone Building, New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs.

Commissioners Present: MVC Chairperson Linda Sibley, MVC Vice Chairman Doug Sederholm, LUPC Chairperson Christina Brown, Chris Murphy, Ned Orleans, Kathy Newman, Carlene Condon, Deborah Pidgeon, Mimi Davisson, and Paul Strauss;
MVC Staff Present: Executive Director Mark London, DRI Coordinator Paul Foley, Senior Planner Bill Venno.

1. DRI Standards and Criteria Administrative Checklist Review

The meeting began with LUPC Chairperson Christina Brown asking each commissioner to say how they feel the issue of reviewing and revising the Development of Regional Impact Standards and Criteria Administrative Checklist should be approached. Thus far the evolution of the Standards and Criteria has been a series of amendments adjusting to circumstances and cases as they arise.

Different approaches ranged from one commissioner suggesting reading "Looking at the Commission" by Executive Director Mark London or the 831 Regulations to another who thought the first step should be to ask ourselves what is our vision for the Vineyard? A commissioner thought it was important that we bear in mind the dangers of ignoring the incremental impact of small projects, especially in specific zones. There was a suggestion that master plans or area plans should be developed by Towns that the MVC could approve and then enter into development agreements for proposals in those zones, a la the Airport Business Development Park. Another commissioner suggested that the LUPC suspend reality for a little while and simply brainstorm ideas without being encumbered by existing DRI's or issues. Another approach to reviewing DRI's would be to differentiate the island based upon critical and non-critical areas.

The discussion turned to whether or not the commission has been over-burdened? The thought was that recently we have not been but that there were times not so long ago when we were. The golf course sagas were seen as the main culprit for this.

We need to create a system to ensure Conditions are followed otherwise what is the point of going through all of the hoops? A commissioner suggested that we should reassess and reassert the mission of the MVC. Others thought we should audit past DRI's and look at our mechanisms for enforcement. It was suggested that relying on Town Boards was inherently unreliable because some Town Boards and Governments are more reliable than others. Furthermore they did not like

the idea of delegating the powers of the MVC. A commissioner asked when have we ever used our powers of injunction?

Methods of ensuring adherence to MVC Conditions were discussed such as having the DRI Coordinator work more closely with the Town's Building Inspectors or even conduct independent inspections. Another suggested that we should have an exit document that an applicant should read and sign saying they understand and will abide by the MVC Conditions. One suggestion was to create a DRI database and put the Conditions for each DRI on the MVC Website thereby allowing interested citizens to keep the MVC apprised of Conditions infractions.

Commissioners returned to what approach to take. One suggested this is a two-part process. The first part is asking ourselves what changes are needed? The second phase/question is what do we want to see? Another suggested that there are two key areas: content and process. It was agreed that the two are interconnected. This led someone to suggest that we should go to the Towns and public and ask them what do you want to protect, promote, and prevent?

Before ending it was noted that the content of the checklist and process need to be reviewed and that one possible amendment would be to have gradations of referrals as well as designating them either major or minor status. There was also some question as to whether the MVC could do area plans with or for the Towns? The meeting finished with one example of how a Town used the threat of being sent to the MVC as a DRI as leverage in order to get what they wanted out of the developer.