

Charles and Nancy Parrish
52 Mill House Way
Vineyard Haven, MA 02568
508-693-4369

August 21, 2019

Martha's Vineyard Commission
P.O. Box 1447
Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts 02557

Subj: Revers Property

Dear Chair Doug Sederhom and Commissioners,

We wish to supplement our letter to you of July 17, 2019.

We are concerned that the applicant has proceeded and is still proceeding with permitting in a piecemeal fashion, which may end up leaving the future of the historic barn, which sits exactly on the property line, and the neighborhood concerns unaddressed. The 29 Mill House Way property should be addressed in its entirety by you, the MVC; the Tisbury Building Inspector and the Tisbury Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

The issues listed below should be addressed as a set:

1. The barn, as mentioned is historic, and needs to be preserved and protected for the long term.
2. The applicant only applied for a special permit for the pool, which predated, and was separate from the permit application for the main house. This enabled the applicant to avoid addressing considerations unrelated to the pool, such as the ZBA imposed conditions related to the long-term future of the Mill, restoration and preservation of the barn and usual neighborhood accommodations, such as limitations on summer exterior construction.
3. The historic mill, which clearly should be restored and protected for the long term, will become a portion of the otherwise newly constructed house. It clearly greatly exceeds current height limitations. We would all agree that the mill should be approved by the Tisbury Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), as a preexisting and important historic condition. However, it also seems clear that the mill, its height and its future should nonetheless be directly addressed, with specific conditions imposed to assure its preservation and long-term protection, by the MVC, the Tisbury ZBA and the Tisbury Building Inspector.
4. And, the ZBA generally imposes conditions about hours and timing of construction (including precluding exterior construction in the summer) when issuing special permits

on houses. By separating the permits, the applicant has, thus far, been able to avoid this requirement.

We would urge you to impose conditions to: (a) protect the barn and the mill for the long term and (b) **as you recently did regarding the 29 Franklin Street house related DRI**, impose summer exterior construction limitations as part of any action which you might take on this application.

We learned in the Tuesday LUP Committee meeting that there were no engineering or engineering drawings or requirements to protect the integrity of the historic cape cottage prior to its elevation and that the interior walls were even altered or removed further weakening the structure prior to its attempted elevation. We also learned from, and appreciated, the conversation during the meeting that the process failed the owner, builder, and the architect regarding the demise of the 1750 Cape cottage and suggestions made regarding improvements to prevent this sort of occurrence in the future. There have, thus far at least, also been process failures in regard to the adverse effects on the community and neighborhood. These failures need to be addressed as well.

We appreciate all that you can do to preserve the historic buildings on this property and to protect the neighborhood.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,



Charles (Chuck) Parrish



Nancy Parrish

cc:

Ron Rappaport, Reynolds, Rappaport, Kaplan & Hackney, LLC

Jeff Krystal, Chairman, Tisbury Zoning Board of Appeals

Ross Seavey, Building Inspector, Tisbury Building Department

Harold Chapdelaine, Chair, Tisbury Historical Commission