The following are the main changes made to the Martha's Vineyard Commission DRI Checklist. These changes include several areas where provisions were eliminated.

- The commercial thresholds in Section 3.1 were raised by 500 square feet in each subsection. For example, in Section 3.1 a, the threshold was changed from 3,000 square feet to 3,500 square feet.

- The mandatory referral for developments that divide buildings into four parts in Section 3.1 e of the previous Checklist was removed. It was felt that the square footage requirements would capture those parcels, and the simple division was hard to enforce.

- The requirements of 3.1 f of the previous Checklist were simplified to now refer to Farmland, rather than traditional farming activities and plant stock.

- The Commercial parking lot regulations in Section 3.1 j of the previous Checklist were further defined as those charging a fee to park, and referrals are now based on the number of spaces, as opposed to the square footage of the parking lot.

- Section 3.1 k of the previous Checklist, regarding development outside of the Airport business park, was removed. It was felt that this section was redundant and was regulated through the regular DRI sections. A note has been added reminding parties that a development agreement between the Airport Authority and the MVC regulates development within the airport.

- A Mixed Use Development Section (3.2) was added in response to mixed use referrals existing in both the residential and the commercial sections that were not consistent with one other. The standards were increased to 3,500 square feet; the threshold number of units was raised from two to three; and the rental terms requirement was increased to six months to further deter from strictly seasonal use.

- The threshold requirements in Section 3.3 were raised to 4,500 square feet for Towns that have Area Development Plans. These changes reflect the fact that Towns have a higher sophistication towards land use and can handle projects up to those sizes in commercial districts, provided that comprehensive development plans have been prepared and approved.

- Section 3.4 f of the previous Checklist regarding referral based on a property needing relief from town parking regulations was removed. It was noted that this provision had not been used once since it was added to the Checklist.

- Section 3.4 g was revised to state that referrals are only necessary for containers that are visible from a public way. This section regarded the visual impact of shipping containers from roadways, but did not distinguish from parcels that are not visible. The revision reflects the prohibition of placement of a container in view from a public way.

- Section 3.5 of the previous Checklist regarding mandatory referrals for any demolition in a commercial district was removed. It was felt that this item had not been used and seemed arbitrary.
• Section 5.1 regarding development adjacent to water was revised to better define the Commission’s jurisdiction from the mean high water mark to 25 feet landward of the mean high water mark. This revision corrects a standard that was problematic on whether or not the Commission could review beach and other armoring issues.

• Sections 6.1 and 6.2 for public and private recreational and institutional uses have been revised to reflect higher thresholds consistent with the commercial thresholds.

• Section 6.3 of the previous Checklist regarding county and town acquisition programs was removed. The Commission was not aware of any of these plans in existence.

• Section 7.1 regarding transportation issues has added bicycle paths to the projects reviewed for referral.

• Section 8.1 regarding demolition was amended to remove the exterior renovation of properties meeting the historic criteria from the checklist.

• Section 8.2 regarding archeology was revised to include excavation as well as development as a criteria for referral.

• Section 8.5 was revised to remove the referral for critical open space until a defined map was created that identified such properties. The previous Checklist 12 included reference to multiple maps that might be considered to meet this requirement rendering large areas subject to commission review under this section.

Please contact Paul Foley (foley@mvcommission.org), Lucy Morrison (lmorrison@mvcommission.org), or myself (turner@mvcommission.org) if you have any questions.