

Latest Staff Notes 1-07-21 - Hob Knob

jane Chittick <jane.chittick@icloud.com>

Tue 1/12/2021 1:29 PM

To: Alex Elvin <elvin@mvcommission.org>; Adam Turner <turner@mvcommission.org>; Chris Seidel <seidel@mvcommission.org>;

Cc: malkin@mvcommission.org <malkin@mvcommission.org>;

Dear Adam (and, Alex, Chris):

Having just read the new Staff Notes, I have to write (once again - as I have several times before) for corrections to be made.

1) I don't understand why the staff *persists* in writing the Staff is still confused about **R-5 parking requirements**?

"Staff looked at the parking requirements in the R-5 Residential District, the B-I Business District, and the B-II Upper Main Street District **for comparison** [Why compare? We are R-5, period.]:

- *The R-5 District calls for two off-street parking spaces per dwelling unit.*
- *The B-I District calls for one space for each guest unit, plus one space for every eight guest units or any fraction thereof.*
- *The B-II District calls for one space per guest unit, plus one space per 12 guest units or any fraction thereof.*

The Edgartown Zoning Bylaw parking requirements for this use are unclear."

I've corrected that falsehood several times in meetings and in emails to you. There's absolutely **no confusion** about what zoning district we are in. It's Residential - period. I believe Sean Murphy and Patrick Ahearn may be trying to confuse the Commissioners and pretend we are in a business zone, so they will be ignorant of our R-5 By-laws. However, you, the MVC, cannot knowingly promote a partisan falsehood, which all this "confusion" appears to be. In fact, in another part of this report, you even *acknowledge* our correct R-5 status: "**1.4 Zoning: R-5 Residential**", so why would the staff say "parking requirements for this use are **unclear**"?

2) **"Surrounding Land Uses: R-5 Residential, B-I Business District, B-II Business District; Ashley Inn, the Richard Hotel, Daniel Fisher House."**

I have also questioned before, in person and in writing, why the Dr. Daniel Fisher House is listed as "Mixed-Use" and not "Exempt"? Both the Old Whaling Church and the Dr. Daniel Fisher House [and the Vincent House, which Chris Seidel has omitted from your map] belong to the Preservation Trust. These properties and the gardens are private tax-exempt non-profit 501(c)(3) and are open to the public ONLY by invitation. The Dr. Daniel Fisher House is therefore "EXEMPT", but you have it as "MIXED USE". You also also have

the 1672 Vincent House as "Mixed-Use". It sits on the Preservation Property, is clearly a museum, yet is colored "pink" (mixed-use) on your map? How can any body like the MVC with a staff cartographer get zoning *so absolutely wrong*? (Chris Seidel, cartographer: please let me know how you researched this map. Might this possibly be a product that Patrick Ahearn gave you as reference?).



Fisher House (1840)

Whaling Church (1843)

Vincent House (1672)

All 3 structures on the same property

N.B., Again, the Fisher House is **NOT** A HOTEL OR INN. It is a private, non-profit, tax-exempt organization. The Whaling Church is **NOT** a Church: it was deconsecrated in 1980 when the Preservation Trust acquired it. The Church is a **PRIVATE NON-PROFIT WITH NO RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OR USE**. The Vincent House is the oldest known extant house in America - it is certainly not a "mixed-use". All properties are on the same land. **All three properties on your map should be colored grey - not pink.** They are not "mixed-use" but tax-exempt non-profits (again with **NO** religious affiliation whatsoever)

3) Finally, if the Commissioners can't rely upon your MVC Staff Notes for **accuracy**, they will be making decisions based on falsehoods and erroneous information that has been given to them. Before the meeting on the 21st, these items should be corrected and brought to the attention of the Commissioners. If not, they will be voting on erroneous information and false statements which could compromise the validity of their votes.

Thank you, again,

Jane Chittick