DRI 670 – Lampost Conversion – Post-Public Hearing Review

Present: Adam Cummings (owner); Geoghan Coogan (attorney).
Applicant: Adam Cummings
Proposal: To convert the top three floors of a five-story nightclub/restaurant to workforce housing in two phases.
Location: 6 Circuit Avenue, Oak Bluffs. MA
Purpose: To review the project, discuss the offers and possible conditions, consider the benefits and detriments and decide whether or not to make a recommendation to the full Commission to deny, approve, or approve with conditions.

Held in the Stone Building, New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs. 6:00 p.m.
Commissioners Present: Linda Sibley; Fred Hancock; Ben Robinson (at 6:10). Rob Doyle recused himself.
MVC Staff Present: Paul Foley

Staff Update:
Staff noted that after the close of the public testimony and before the close of the written record the applicant submitted offers. There was no public correspondence. Staff added that they had been sent an email with a list of issues that had been raised at the public hearing such as whether there were enough bathrooms and living space in phase one, a clarification of the details with regard to the proposed "workforce” housing, and details on the construction and phasing.

Discussion of Benefits and Detriments:
- **Wastewater and Groundwater:**
  - With respect to wastewater and groundwater the LUPC finds that the project is a slight benefit because the project will continue to be connected to the town sewer but should take up less capacity.
- **Open Space; Natural Community & Habitat:**
  - With respect to open space, natural community and habitat the LUPC finds that the proposal will have no change and that there is currently no open space or habitat and it is appropriately located in the commercial downtown.
- **Night Lighting & Noise:**
  - With respect to night lighting the LUPC finds that the proposal will have no change.
  - With respect to noise the LUPC finds that the proposal is a benefit because the workforce housing should create less noise than the night club.
- **Traffic & Transportation:**
  - With respect to traffic and transportation the LUPC finds that the proposal is a benefit.
- **Scenic Values:**
  - With respect to scenic values the LUPC finds that the proposal is a benefit because the proposed design of the building is in keeping with the mass, scale and design of the current building and the historic downtown.
- **Character & Identity:**
  - With respect to character and identity the LUPC finds that the proposal is a benefit because the proposed design of the building is in keeping with the mass, scale and design of the current building and the historic downtown.
• **Impact on Abutters:**
  - With respect to impact on abutters the LUPC finds that the proposal is a benefit because the workforce housing should have less impact than the nightclub.

• **Housing:**
  - With respect to housing the LUPC finds that the proposal is a benefit because it incorporates workforce housing for this business and may accommodate the workforce housing needs of other businesses.

• **Impact on Services & Burden on Taxpayers:**
  - With respect to impact on services and burden on taxpayers the LUPC finds that the proposal is a slight benefit because it will have no impact on schools and may decrease the impact on police services.

• **Consistency with Town Plans:**
  - With respect to consistency with town plans the LUPC finds that the proposal is a benefit.

**Conforms to Zoning and DCPC Regulations:**
- With respect to zoning the LUPC notes that to their knowledge the proposal is consistent with zoning.

**Is Essential in view of the Alternatives?**
- With respect to whether the project is essential in view of the alternatives the LUPC finds that it is and notes that the project provides needed workforce housing and is improving an existing historic building in a manner that is in keeping with the mass, scale and design of the historic downtown.

**Motions:**

*Linda Sibley made a Motion to recommend to the Full Commission that the MVC approve the proposal with the offers of December 8, 2016 and because the benefits outweigh the detriments. The Motion was seconded by Fred Hancock. The Motion passed unanimously (LS, FH, BR).*

---

**DRI 369-M3 – Vineyard Decorators Expansion – Post-Public Hearing Review**

**Present:**
- Applicant: Whitney Brush (owner).
- Proposal: To add a 4,518 sf addition to an existing 12,504 sf metal building for furniture storage, loading docks and processing at a home furnishings store.
- Location: 35 Airport Road, Edgartown Map 24 Lot 1 1/2 (1.38 acres)
- Purpose: To review the project, discuss the offers and possible conditions, consider the benefits and detriments and decide whether or not to make a recommendation to the full Commission to deny, approve, or approve with conditions.

Held in the Stone Building, New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs 6:30 p.m.
- Commissioners Present: Linda Sibley; Fred Hancock; Rob Doyle and Ben Robinson.
- MVC Staff Present: Paul Foley

**Staff Update:**
Staff noted that after the close of the public testimony and before the close of the written record the applicant submitted revised plans showing the storm water containment system. There was no public correspondence.
DRI 670 Lampost Offers – December 8th, 2016

1. Wastewater, Groundwater, Flooding, and Risk from Other Natural Hazards
   1.1 Stormwater Management: N/A
   1.2 Flooding Mitigation: N/A
   1.3 Risk from Other Natural Hazards
   1.4 Wastewater: The premises is tied into the Town sewer. The project will reduce the necessary flow by over half.

2. Open Space and Landscaping
   2.1 Landscaping Plan: N/A

3. Night Lighting, Noise
   3.1 Exterior lighting shall be limited to external sign illumination, security lighting, and emergency lights required by code, which are downward-shielded to prevent light spilling off the property. There shall be no flood lighting.
   3.2 All exterior lighting – except for security lighting, which shall be on motion detectors – shall be on timers and shall be turned off during the day as well during the night from one hour after the store closes at night to one hour before it opens in the morning.
   3.3 A final exterior lighting plan shall be submitted to and is subject to the approval of the MVC LUPC prior to the issuance of a CO.
   3.4 There shall be no formal or informal activities on the property that exceed the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection's Noise Control Regulation 310 CMR 7.10 at all boundaries of the property or that exceed the Town of Tisbury noise regulations.

4. Scenic Values
   4.1 Building Design: Final architectural plans and details, to be substantially the same as the plan approved by the Commission, shall be submitted for the review and approval of the MVC Land Use Planning Committee before a Building Permit is issued.

5. Workforce Housing
   5.1 Workforce Housing: The units will be rented to employees of local businesses either permanent year-round housing or temporary housing as needed.

6. Construction Process
   6.1 Construction Management Plan: A Construction Management Plan shall be submitted for the review of the Martha's Vineyard Commission Land Use Planning Committee how construction will be staged and the timing of any sidewalk interruptions.

7. Modifications to this Decision
   7.1 Required MVC Approval: The applicant shall not alter the design or use of the premises from the approved plan, uses, and operating conditions without the approval of the Martha's Vineyard Commission.