Martha's Vineyard Commission
Land Use Planning Committee
Notes of the Meeting of December 13, 2010

Held in the Stone Building, New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs. 5:30 P.M.

Commissioners Present: Christina Brown; Linda Sibley; Ned Orleans; Chris Murphy; Brian Smith; Fred Hancock; and John Breckenridge.
MVC Staff Present: Mark London; Paul Foley; and Mike Mauro.

1. M.V. Hospital New Parking Lots (DRI 324-M2)

Applicant: Martha’s Vineyard Hospital, Tim Walsh (CEO), Connie Bulman (Project Manager)
Project Location: 82 Eastville Avenue, Oak Bluffs Map 7 Lot 2 (0.56 acres) and part of Map 7 Lot 1 (9.8 acres). The Hospital is 12.99 acres total not including Map 7 Lot 2.
Proposal: To create two new parking lots: one off of Eastville Avenue with 49 parking spaces and one near the helipad with 24 parking spaces.
Present for the Applicant were: Tim Walsh; Cornelius Bulman; Tim Sweet; and John Murray.

Documents:
The LUPC had the following documents before them:
- Plans for the two separate parking lots.
- A PowerPoint presentation of the site.

Presentation:
- Paul Foley gave a brief Staff Report.
  o The M.V. Hospital Traffic Study prepared by FST (Fay, Spofford, and Thorndike) Engineering in 2006 recommended that the Hospital would require 336 short-term parking spaces and 360 long-term parking spaces. The study was done when the Mass. Dept. of Mental Health (DMH) property was part of the proposal. The plan on page 45 of the study shows 256 parking spaces on the Hospital Campus and an additional 82 on the DMH property. When the 82 spaces on the DMH property fell off the plan they were accounted for in the MVC DRI 324-M Condition 12.13 requirement for an additional 60 spaces.
  o The study states that “Existing parking demand estimates identified in the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s Parking Generation (2004) publication implies an existing need of approximately 287 parking spaces. Within the context of the existing 260 space parking supply, a 27-space peak parking demand shortfall is possible during the summer peak season (our count indicated 255 maximum vehicles in 2004). Given the conservative projection of summer peak traffic demands being 17-26% higher than existing demands, it is recommended the MVH parking supply be increased to provide a minimum of 336 spaces in the short term and 360 spaces in the long term.”
- John Breckenridge said that the lot by the helipad had come before the Oak Bluffs Conservation Commission (of which he is also a member) and was approved in September 2010 to allow the temporary parking situation to become permanent with re-designed bio-retention basins. The Conservation Commission approved the 24-parking spaces but said that if that is increased they would have to look at it again. They did not see the 49-space lot located at 82 Eastville Avenue.
• Tim Walsh said that there are currently 265 parking spaces at the Hospital not including these two proposed new lots. These lots would add 73 spaces for a total of 338 parking spaces.
• Chris Murphy asked how the stormwater runoff is dealt with at both proposed parking lots, and what happens to the stormwater going to Brush Pond?
• Connie Bulman said that both lots would be a rap surface.
• Tim Walsh said that the number of cars are parking out at the Portuguese-American (PA) Club lot now varies. But it is costing them $200,000 a year so they want to get these new lots on line soon.
• Tim Walsh said that there are no plans to change the parking lot next to the former Emergency Room.
• A Commissioner noted that the appearance of the 82 Eastville lot from the road will be an issue.
• Mark London said that LUPC had concerns about the Eastville Lot in particular. He added that we normally require plans of the existing situation and the proposal that clearly locate any large existing trees. Another concern is planning for the Shared-Use Path (SUP) that runs along Eastville Avenue, in front of the Eastville property. He noted that they may be able to save some trees if they only had 40 spaces in there instead of 49. He suggested that it should be possible to incorporate large trees, the SUP, and adequate buffering, and still exceed the requirement for 60 additional spaces with the two lots. [Note: when the MVC approved the use of the PA Club lot to satisfy Condition 12.13 to allow the Hospital to get their Certificate of Occupancy the MVC had said that instead of 60 additional spaces the Hospital only had to provide an additional 40 spaces.]
• Connie Bulman said he told their Landscape Architect Kris Horiuchi to look at that and that she had said there were no valuable trees on that lot. [Note: previous discussions about this request referred to trees able to be transplanted in landscaping around the Hospital.] Tim Walsh added that they are providing a 7-foot high stockade fence to screen the lot from neighbors.
• Ned Orleans noted that this lot would not look demonstrably different from the old Emergency Room parking lot.
• Fred Hancock said that the difference is that now the people on the other side of the lot will be impacted.
• Linda Sibley suggested that vegetative screening on or next to the berm in the old Emergency Room parking lot would help screen that lot. She noted that if the MVC had reviewed that original parking lot, it would not have ended up like it is. She suggested that maybe they could mitigate the impacts of the new lot by landscaping the Emergency Room parking lot a bit more.
• Connie Bulman pointed out that the Hospital spent $500,000 to purchase the 82 Eastville lot. Tim Walsh added that works out to approximately $10,000 per parking spot. He said he thinks the 73-spaces on the two lots will satisfy the Hospitals’ need for the foreseeable future.
• Tim Walsh said that the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health (DMH) property across the street was gone forever.
• Mark London added that before a public hearing, we should have Paul Foley conduct a DRI Condition Compliance review.
• Linda Sibley added that we also need to schedule a site visit.

Motion:
• Christina Brown moved and Chris Murphy seconded to recommend to the full Commission that this is a significant modification to the approved plan that requires a public hearing review as a Development of Regional Impact. A voice vote was held. In favor: 7. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0. The motion passed unanimously.
2. Bradley Square Demolition (DRI 612-M2) Pre-Application Review

Applicant: Island Affordable Housing Fund (Ewell Hopkins – Executive Director)

Project Location: 96 Dukes County Avenue and 8 Masonic Avenue, Oak Bluffs Map 11 Lots 193 & 195 (6,098 sf and 12,632 sf = 0.43 acres). The property may have been merged during the Bradley Square permitting process. Staff is investigating the status of the lots.

Proposal: To be permitted to demolish a 3,049 square foot historic building.

Presentation:
- Paul Foley gave a brief Staff Report.
  - The Building was built in 1895 as a mission to help Portuguese immigrants assimilate into American society.
  - In the 1920’s the building became the Bradley Memorial Church, the first primarily African-American Church on the Island. The building has been largely abandoned for several decades.
  - The properties were purchased on June 29, 2007 for $407,250 and $497,750 for a total of $905,000 by the Island Affordable Housing Fund, Inc.
  - The Island Affordable Housing Fund and Island Housing Trust were approved by the MVC in 2008 to renovate the existing Bradley/Denniston building to create a meeting room with one residential unit and an office and to build two new 5,000+ sf buildings with five and four residential units respectively. The project would have had a total of ten units with 13 bedrooms, one market rate commercial unit, one office unit, and one 710 sf meeting room.
  - A 40B Comprehensive Permit was required for the project.
  - The current status of the lots needs to be determined.
- Ewell Hopkins, Executive Director of the Island Affordable Housing Fund, said his goal is to determine the land value of the property. He was not aware of the historical restrictions before. He requested funding from the Oak Bluffs Community Preservation Committee (CPC) last year for historical preservation but was turned down.
- He is asking for the permission for the option to demolish the Denniston building if that is the course they have to take.
- Linda Sibley noted that MVC Counsel had recently told the Commission that there is a process whereby Applicants who have not acted on their approval can surrender their approval.
- Mark London suggested that they could sell the two lots separately. It might be to their benefit to sell the commercial lot with the right to build. They would have to return to the MVC for authorization to proceed with only that part of the project.
- Ewell Hopkins confirmed that they are marketing the property as three lots, one residential and two commercial.
  - [Staff Note: The property was merged during the 40b process and, according to the Oak Bluffs Assessors, is now one 18,730 sf lot.]
- Ewell Hopkins said that they had explored moving the house and he thinks it is viable if he could find a taker.
- David Wilson, of the Oak Bluffs Historical Commission, speaking extemporaneously said that the O.B. Historical Commission designated the building as “preferably preserved” which began a six-month demolition delay.
- Ewell Hopkins asked if the Town, IAHF, and MV Saving Bank came up with a plan could they get a conditional permission for demolition. He added that in his opinion IAHF cannot responsibly hold onto the property.
• Chris Murphy said there appear to be a couple of options. They could ask for a modification to the previous approval. They could request that we allow them to surrender the previous approval.

• Mark London noted that in some other communities, demolitions are not allowed unless there is an approved specific replacement plan.

**More Information:**

• The LUPC will need more information in the following areas:
  o History of the Building – We need more information on the historic importance of the building. The O.B. Historical Commission has designated the building preferably preserved and the previous proposal promoted the historical preservation aspect of the project.
  o Physical Condition of the Building -
  o Structural Integrity of the Building -
  o The status of the lot – The two lots were merged during the Comprehensive Permit process so there is only one 18,730 sf lot at the present time.
  o Property Values - With and without the building.

Adjourned 7:05 p.m.