



BOX 1447, OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS, 02557, 508-693-3453,  
FAX 508-693-7894 INFO@MVCOMMISSION.ORG WWW.MVCOMMISSION.ORG

## **Martha's Vineyard Commission**

### **Land Use Planning Committee**

# **Minutes of the Meeting of February 6, 2006**

## **DRAFT**

Held in the Stone Building, New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs.

*Commissioners Present:* LUPC Chairperson Christina Brown, Ned Orleans, Kathy Newman, Megan Otten-Sargent, and Linda Sibley

*MVC Staff Present:* Mark London, Paul Foley, Bill Wilcox

### **1. Vineyard Assembly of God (DRI 322-M) Concurrence Review**

---

**Project Location:** State Road, Tisbury, MA.

**Proposal:** To build a 2200 square foot parsonage for the pastor on the Church grounds.

*Present for Applicants:* Dwayne Vogt, Gail Barmakian, (lawyer), Bonnie and Mike Furtalis (Parsonage Committee)

Chairman Brown opened the meeting at 5:39 pm.

#### **Background:**

- Proposed addition is behind the church to serve as modest housing for pastor. The Pastor is presently facing a loss of housing.
- This may be an issue of whether or not they can attract a pastor.
- The addition is designed for only one residential unit, the applicant feels this means it should not increase the traffic at all (possible decline).
- Last year when the Vineyard Assembly of God was briefly at the MVC the proposal was for a house with 2100 sf - now the proposal is at 1188 sf. and is 3-4 feet lower than existing Church.
- There is a "Breezeway" planned between the Church and the House. If residence were totally separate from Church it would require a variance.
- Concerns at the time of the original MVC Decision were almost exclusively about traffic. None of those concerns appear to have been realized.

#### **Discussion:**

- Concurrence or not? Is it a minor modification?
- Should not really count walkway/breezeway as living space. First floor is mean grade. Pastor had hoped to have residence as separate as possible, but zoning requires it be attached.
- Mark Hutker who also designed the Church designed the parsonage.
- Location of driveway will help to hide this addition.
- Staff to check lighting and planting plan of original.

- There is a lighted sign on the berm on a separate circuit on a timer (sunset – winter 6-9). Other ground lights are on separate timer. Some complaints about lights have led them to turn the lights off altogether when there are no services. On Wednesdays they are set to go off at 10 pm.
- Landscaping:
  - A commissioner asked if the intention is to plant on the berm at all?
  - Beefing up the landscaping could help us reach our rural character objective.
  - Applicants have no problem with more plantings, native etc....
  - A commissioner wondered what they plan in the space between church and road?
  - Were only concerned with blocking their line of sight, otherwise happy to plant more indigenous plants.
  - In general not a good idea to plant too much on top of a leaching field. As long as they are shallow rooted would not recommend anything larger than 4-6 foot tall shrub (blueberry, inkberry, etc...)
- **Linda Sibley moved and it was duly seconded that the LUPC recommend to the full commission that we not concur that this proposal (as outlined) is a DRI and that the proposed modifications are not significant enough to warrant a public hearing as a DRI. Added to the motion of recommendation was a note that LUPC would also like to amend the original condition to allow additional modest low-level lighting to improve safety at the entrance and to add a few bushes (in existing proposal). Ned Orleans seconded. LUPC was Unanimous.**
- Applicant's to work with staff to have document outlining exact proposal.

## 1. Other Business

### Landscape Guidelines

- A Commissioner would like an LUPC for landscaping guidelines.
- On the other hand we could just have the subcommittee meet again.
- Another Commissioner noted that the Committee did its work and will present. At what point do you present items? Why should one subcommittee have its work reviewed by another subcommittee?
- One believes MVC should meet as a "committee of the whole" at times.
- Foresee a lot of discussion - as the beginning of a policy manual.
- We need to sufficiently separate policy from DRI Guidelines. Some think the documents are trying to be both.
  - We should have a policy section with explanations
  - The guidelines for DRI do not have explanations. It's more of a list of expectations.
  - The audience for policy statements is the public. More will pay attention if it is written simply and clearly.
- We should leave each meeting with a discussion of what happens next (task, dates, etc...)
- We throw out these terms - Guidelines, performance standards, policy plans....
- We need to have a sub-committee to define these terms. We have to agree on what we are talking about. We have too many irons in the fire. We need to set goals and dates.

- First Monday in March the discussion will be wholly devoted to Standards and Criteria. If you are on one of the sub-committees of the S&C review please be prepared to bring in relevant written documents.
- Send out notice re: S&C
- Ned Orleans volunteered to create definitions for "policy", "goals", "objectives", and "strategies". Will make an effort to draft a document for the basis of discussion to define the terms and how they fit together.
- Would like to propose that we set a date for when we are going to do it, start the meeting at 6:00 (with food) so that we have four hours before people get too tired.
- Item 1 Content, Item 2 Form.

Adjourned 7:00