

**Land Use Planning Committee
Summary of August 18, 2003 Meeting
Olde Stone Building**

Members Present: C. Brown, B. Schwartz, L. DeWitt, R. Toole, P. Strauss, D. Sederholm, J. Best, K. Newman, T. Isreal, M. Otten-Sargent
Staff Present: J. Rand, B. Veno, B. Wilcox,
Others Present: Mike Diaz, Tim & Susan Anthony, Bruce MacNelly, Moira Fitzgerald, Gerald & Martha Sullivan

Meeting opened at 5:35 PM by Christina Brown & adjourned at 7:10

Humphries:

Mike Diaz talked about the meeting he had with staff to discuss the next steps. He then met with David Wessling a few times to determine trip generation. They used register receipts from the Edgartown store as a base of information. They determined from those calculations that the number of car trips generated were well below the gas station, and David told him that he had spoken to the MVC Executive Director who had spoken to the MVC attorney who said that if the generation was well below the gas station he would not have to do a full traffic study. Diaz said from that information he worked with David to create a traffic impact study.

C. Brown asked what methodology was used. Diaz said Wessling provided him with the traffic study from the gas station, the Healthy Additions store and the Scottish Bakehouse.

D. Sederhold asked why he was using the Edgartown store not the WT store as a model. Diaz said he was using customer numbers at Edgartown, not car trips because he feel the new store would do a comparable level of business with Edgartown due to existing competition. He said the retail space in Edgartown is about 250 SF and about 450 SF in WT, the new store would have about 400 SF of retail but no seats.

Diaz showed two different plans, one with access & egress out of the same curb cut on State Road and one with an exit into Colonial Drive. B. Schwartz said the parallel spaces were too short they should be 20' not 15'.

Diaz was asked to provide the number of required parking spaces at the public hearing.

L. DeWitt asked if LUPC had discussed working with Cronig's on a joint parking & access plan. Diaz said yes, and he felt it would be a benefit but at this time Mr. Bernier was not willing to commit to anything.

When asked Diaz said the parking spaces were 10'x16' and the building is about 60' from the rear lot line.

T. Isreal said that he had been driving by the WT store and noting the number of cars at peak times and it appeared to be between 15 and 25 at any one time. He said he was concerned that this site would bring the same amount of traffic.

R. Toole said the applicant should look at completely eliminating the curb cut to this site. Diaz said he didn't think he would be comfortable doing that, but he said he would not rule it out

completely. K. Newman said perhaps if the Cronig's signpost added a sign for Humphries that would help.

C. Brown said she was going to continue the traffic scope approval until next Monday so that David Wessling could attend and shed some light on the scope.

Beach Road Realty Trust:

Bruce MacNelly explained that the project was an office building that was approved by the MVC, and that he was not asking to do anything other than move the buildings forward to better accommodate truck turn-around in the parking lot. He added that by moving the large building there would also be more room for bikes if a bike path easement were sought. The large building would be moved about 4' in, and the smaller building would be moved about 15' feet closer to the Art Cliff Diner. This would result in the grass area between the buildings being narrowed. There would still be a vegetative border between the Diner and the office building.

T. Isreal said he felt the change was not significant enough to require a public hearing. J. Best said he was concerned that the smaller building will loom over the Diner. He asked what would be planted between the buildings. MacNelly said it would be Aborvitea. D. Sederholm asked if it was possible to remove the tree in the back of the lot and not move the smaller building.

R. Toole made a motion that the change was insignificant and would not require a public hearing. He added that the Commission had spent a long time working on the project and it was something they should be proud of. The motion was seconded by T. Isreal. The vote was 8 in favor with one abstention.

M. Otten-Sargent said maybe the Commission should look at reducing the size of the buildings instead.

MacNelly asked if during the meeting on Thursday the Commission decided they wanted the building size reduced could he withdraw his request to move the buildings. Staff said yes.

4 Causeway Street:

Gerald Sullivan introduced himself as the owner of the property. He said his wife's family has owner it for over 60 years and they truly care about the property. He said it is a 28,000 SF lot with one building on it which houses Ed Coogan's Law office. He said he wanted to more fully utilize the land. He also said he knew that traffic was bad at the intersection of Causeway and State Road and his project would add traffic to that problem and he was concerned that he not be penalized for not taken greater advantage of his property earlier.

Moira Fitzgerald, architect for the project, then outlined the project. She said there was a new 8,000 SF office building planned for between the existing building and the parking. It was going to have a floor that opened onto the level of State Road, and one that opened onto the parking lot level. In total it would be three floors. On the third floor there was a plan for a 900 SF apartment and a small office. In total there is planned seven office or retail spaces. Mr. Sullivan said, when asked, that he didn't have anyone signed on yet, as it was too early in the process. The land is located in the B1 district, which has no setback requirements from the street. This building is proposed to be set back twenty feet. The height of the building is 28' from mean natural grade. There is no sidewalk along State Road, but the applicant plans to put a footpath in from of the building.

The applicant was asked to provide setback information for neighboring buildings and explain where the height is measured.

Staff explained to LUPC the concern held by the applicant regarding the expense of a traffic study if the project could be denied due to traffic. J. Rand suggested that perhaps the applicant could do some preliminary work on the study, and come back to LUPC to take the temperature of the Board before committing more funds to a full study. T. Isreal said he would not want to give the applicant the impression that if they said the traffic was not a deal breaker that it was going to definitely be approved. That being understood, R. Toole made a motion to approve the traffic scope proposed by the applicant. D. Sederholm seconded the motion; the vote was unanimous. When the applicant asked what information might help determine if they should go forward with the full study and project they were told they could bring forward whatever information they would find informative, and T. Isreal said he would be interested in the delays on State Road, the delays turning on to State, the delay at Edg/VH & State and the delay on Skiff.

R. Toole said that his concern was the aesthetics of the building, even though this was a business district, it was right on the edge, and should be sensitive to the neighborhood. Other Commissioners echoed that concern.