

To the Editor:

My family and I would like to strongly protest Mr. Muckerheide's proposed project for 114-116 Dukes County Avenue. I naively assumed that this overly huge proposal would naturally be rejected by the Martha's Vineyard Commission, and admit to being remiss in not lodging our family's concerns, either with legal representative or in person. Our property, 115 Dukes County Avenue is directly across the street from the proposed project. We have not been able to attend the Commission's meetings as we live in New Jersey, Georgia and Connecticut.

Having said that, we object to the project for the following reasons: 1) An eleven unit, three story housing development on slightly larger than a quarter of an acre with room for twenty-one parking spaces seems to put an unrealistic and an impossible stress on property that size; eg. How would sewage and or trash removal be handled?; 2) The architectural designs have been unattractive and reminiscent of cheap motels with open stairways and hallways, and totally out of sync with the existing streetscape ; 3) The noise emanating from eleven units with open stairways and hallways would put a strain on neighbor's rights to "quiet enjoyment" of property; 4) Parking in this area is already at a premium. Based on Oak Bluffs zoning requirements, 4,300 square feet or about 37% of the total .27 acres would be needed to accommodate twenty-one parking spaces. Because of the lot size, crowded parking would inevitably force tenants/owners to park on an already narrow street with high usage. Traffic jams at the corner of Oakland Avenue and Dukes County Avenue are a daily occurrence. My family members often have to track down persons who illegally park in front of our driveway, which has a town approved "No Parking" sign, in order to exit our driveway. 5) If the project were to be approved, obtain financing and construction begun, it is likely that several delays would occur. The structures could either remain incomplete and/or abandoned. 6) Is there a business plan and does it include a marketing analysis? Given the current and projected real estate market over the next few years, developers and/or buyers might be difficult to find.

In summary, I find it difficult to view this project, completed or not, as contributing to improving the quality of life or the over all value of the neighborhood, but rather increasing the probability of creating an eyesore and deflating property values even more. We have no objection to Mr. Muckerheide's desire to develop his property and realize a profit. We,

however, strongly object to the lack of consideration for his property's neighbors. The M.V.Times' September 4, 2008 article quotes Mr. Muckerheide as stating," he has a list of 20 property owners who support the project". My family and I were present most of this past summer. In fact my wife spoke to him on, at least two occasions. Mr. Muckerheide never approached us regarding this project.

We too have dreams for our property, and have spent a considerable amount of money expanding, rehabbing and updating systems, with the expectation to move to the Island year-round within the next 18 months. This proposed project, along with the existing traffic and noise, will make our life there unbearable. We would, however, be willing to support a vastly scaled down effort (perhaps two to four units). Since that is not the proposal under consideration, we, therefore, respectfully request the Commission to disapprove the proposed project.

Sincerely,
Walter L. Isaacs & Family
222 Sullivan Way B-15
Trenton, New Jersey 08628