

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

## Minutes of the Commission Meeting Held on March 16, 2017 In the Stone Building 33 New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs, MA

### IN ATTENDANCE

---

Commissioners: (P= Present; A= Appointed; E= Elected)

P Gail Barmakian (A-Oak Bluffs)	P James Joyce (A-Edgartown)
P Tripp Barnes (E-Tisbury)	P Michael Kim (A-Governor; non-voting)
- Yvonne Boyle (A-Governor)	P Joan Malkin (A-Chilmark)
P Christina Brown (E-Edgartown)	- Katherine Newman (A-Aquinnah)
- Peter Connell (A-Governor; non-voting)	P Ben Robinson (A-Tisbury)
P Robert Doyle (E-Chilmark)	- Doug Sederholm (E-West Tisbury)
P Josh Goldstein (E-Tisbury)	P Linda Sibley (E-West Tisbury)
P Fred Hancock (E-Oak Bluffs)	P Ernie Thomas (A-West Tisbury )
P Leonard Jason (A-County)	P Richard Toole (E-Oak Bluffs)
	- James Vercruysse (e-Aquinnah)

Staff: Adam Turner (Executive Director), Paul Foley (DRI Planner), Priscilla Leclerc (Senior Transportation Planner), Dan Doyle (Transportation Planner).

**Acting Chairman Robert Doyle** called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

### **1. 29 FRANKLIN STREET HISTORICAL DEMOLITION-TISBURY CR 2-2017 CONCURRENCE REVIEW**

---

Commissioners Present: G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole.

For The Applicant: William Westman

#### **1.1 Staff Report**

**Paul Foley** presented the following.

- The applicant is William Westman and Cees Van Eijik.
- The location is 29 Franklin Street, Vineyard Haven, MA Map 7N Lot 5.
- The proposal is to demolish a house in Tisbury built in at least 1850 and possibly earlier.
- The applicant has plans to build a similar style house on the footprint with an addition.
- The applicant has said that he and his partner originally intended to restore the house but when they got inside and began removing plaster and paneling they found the house to be too far gone.
- The proposed floor plans and elevations were shown.
- Key issues include.
  - Does this proposal rise to the level requiring a public hearing as a DRI?
  - Is this house too historically significant and structurally sound enough to allow being demolished?

- Is the proposed replacement house in keeping in style and materials with the historic building?
- Photos were shown of the existing interior down to the studs and the extent of the rot. The porch has fallen off.
- A site visit was done by the MVC.
- The house has an 8 ft x 6 ft Cape Cod basement.
- Correspondence received by the MVC was reviewed.
  - Chris Baer has written that he is very sad to hear that the historic house previously owned by Doug Look and originally owned by Fred C. Luce is proposed to be demolished.
  - Dana Hodsdon has written noting the significance of this historic house which is part of the second wave of houses in early Tisbury. He feels the project should have first been referred to the Tisbury Historic Commission who would have required detailed reasons for the demolition before the house was gutted. He asks that the MVC return the review to the Tisbury Historic Commission.
  - Hyung Suk Lee has written urging the Commission to reject the demolition of this important example of early Holmes Hole and make the applicant perform a proper restoration.
- The William Street Historical District house plan was shown as well as the Holmes Hole town plans of 1790, 1810, 1827 and 1828 that showed the locations of the houses. This was taken from the book "Walking Vineyard Haven" by James Norton.
- A map from 1858 and 1890 was shown identifying the location of the proposed project and house in the outskirts of town.

**Linda Sibley** asked if this house has been designated by any group as historic. **Paul Foley** said it has not been. He looked at the MACRIS cultural page and the town has not designated either.

**Linda Sibley** noted that the house is historic because it has been around for a long time but it has not been designated as such.

**Gail Barmakian** asked who were the immediate prior owners of the property? **Paul Foley** said Doug Look and **Trip Barnes** added that Doug was there in 1960.

### **1.2 Applicants' Presentation**

**William Westman** presented the following.

- When we purchased the house we went to the William Street Historic Commission and they said they could only review houses on William Street.
- We thought we were part of the Historic District but found out that we were not.
- There are a lot of great things about this house. A couple of the windows in the front of the house are thought to be original but the rest are not there are even Anderson windows. When the windows were replaced they cut through the cross beams.
- We salvaged what we could from the home to be used for the new structure.
- The floor collapsed on the first floor.
- The house would need to be raised up and a new foundation put in.
- Two thirds of the home would be replaced in order to retain it due to its current condition.
- We were able to save some of the doors that were still there to also be reused.
- He has done quite a few Greek Revival restores.
- The original millwork is not in the home.
- Some of the beams are rotten out or bug eaten.
- He has been to salvage yards to try and locate period elements for the house.



- For him this is a bit of a heavy heart. It is the first house out of twelve that he has owned that has to be razed.
- He is not a destroyer he is a saver but the house was just neglected too long to save it. Things are falling off the building.

### 1.3 Commissioner's Discussion

**Fred Hancock** said with the site visit it was very apparent that the house is not in good shape and is in worse shape than the Bradley Square house in Oak Bluffs where the MVC approved the demolition. This applicant seems genuine in trying to preserve. His restoration plans will replace the house.

**William Westman** said he grew up in Brewster and he is a Cape Coder and he wants to restore buildings not demolish them. Stop & Shop owns a historic building and if possible he would like to work with them and would love to move that house to this property. That house is a great house.

There was a discussion about how to review for concurrence.

- **Joan Malkin** said the MVC is looking to see if the proposal has regional impact and if we concur to have a public hearing or if it should be sent back to the town. We should be reviewing the proposal which is for demolition.
- **Linda Sibley** noted that if the MVC concurs we have a public hearing and if we don't concur we would not be hearing it at all.
- **Joan Malkin** said she thought for concurrence we were to use our matrix and then make a decision. We have not done that yet so are we talking about the wrong things.
- **Linda Sibley** agreed with Joan Malkin.

**Trip Barnes** said when the house went on the market he went to look at it. He had a friend who moved buildings look at it and it has crossed the line, it is too far gone to restore.

**William Westman** asked if the house to be demolished in Oak Bluffs has been torn down yet and is it the same footprint as his project. **Fred Hancock** said it has not yet been torn down but is it not the same footprint and is two stories.

There was a discussion about what authority the town has over the demolition.

- **Michael Kim** asked if the MVC does not concur what authority does the Town have.
- **Ben Robinson** said there would be a ZBA hearing since it is a non-conforming preexisting structure.
- **Joan Malkin** asked if the ZBA has the right to allow or deny demolition.
- **Ben Robinson** said they would be reviewing what you are adding next to the property.
- **Joan Malkin** asked if the Tisbury Historic Commission has a view can they act on it.
- **Ben Robinson** said no they are advisory.

**Gail Barmakian** said this is either demolition or send it back to the town.

**Joan Malkin** said the MVC has not yet passed the demolition policy. The committee has five criteria to consider: age; historic or cultural impact; design, construction, uniqueness, value; town review; location. **Fred Hancock** added the policy was developed as a guide to rate these types of buildings.

**Ben Robinson** said the MVC could concur and have a public hearing and then we would be able to condition.

**Gail Barmakian** said there might be some relevance to what is going on the property. It would be an issue to her if he put a modular there.

**Adam Turner** said the MVC is deciding whether those questions rise to a level of a public hearing.

**Linda Sibley** said if the MVC holds a public hearing then the replacement becomes relevant. If we feel this is historically, architecturally or culturally important nobody else has any purview over it. If we hold a public hearing and the applicant says the things he has just said it may have an impact on the decision. The MVC could condition the project and have legal authority. But if the MVC sends it back to the town now it is up for grabs on what he replaces the house with. The MVC cannot condition a non-concurrence.

**Leonard Jason** said doesn't the MVC first have to decide it has historical significance and if yes we have to concur. The only way to do that is with a public hearing.

**Christina Brown moved and it was duly seconded to concur as a DRI as it has historical significance.**

- **Joan Malkin** suggested to also add due to design, construction, visibility. She noted that the Town does not have a review for that criteria.

**Christina Brown amended her motion and it was duly seconded to concur as a DRI as it has historical significance due to its design, construction and visibility .**

- **Michael Kim** asked to review the exterior photos. There are criteria that the structure is very old and has pleasing historical proportions. It is in a very visible site. Does that make it regionally impactful?
- **Linda Sibley** and **Gail Barmakian** said if it meets that criteria yes it has regional impact.
- **Adam Turner** said as **Leonard Jason** noted you would have a public hearing to decide that.
- **Joan Malkin** said to the extent to which it is a better resource it has a regional value and if we share these values do we feel it is worthy to be preserved.
- **Michael Kim** questioned if it met that threshold.

**Roll call vote. In favor: G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, R. Toole. Opposed: J. Joyce, E. Thomas. Abstentions: none. The motion passed.**

**Adam Turner** reiterated that the MVC voted that the proposal is significant enough to hold a public hearing and receive testimony and LUPC will be scheduled for March 27, 2017.

**Linda Sibley** said as Chairman of LUPC if you have comments they should be in writing or somehow documented in advance. It is helpful to LUPC and the applicant. It is nice to have those comments in advance so they can be organized at LUPC.

**Fred Hancock** said there is also the possibility to move another historic building to this site and that information would be important to the MVC when making a decision. **Linda Sibley** said it would be helpful if the applicant could bring pictures of that house.

## **2. BEACH STREET TAKEOUT CAFÉ-CR 3-2017 CONCURRENCE REVIEW**

---

*Josh Goldstein recused himself as his employer is a direct abutter.*

Commissioners Present: G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole.

For The Applicant: Maggie Towles, Doug Best

### **2.1 Staff Report**

**Paul Foley** presented the following.

- The applicant is Maggie Towles and Magnetic North and Doug Best.
- The location is 18 Beach Street, Vineyard Haven MA.
- The proposal is to operate a takeout café serving coffee and pastries in the rear of the first floor area.



- The café will not have a kitchen, pastries will be brought in from off site.
- The building was built in 1796. It is known as the Ritter House or the Jirah Luce House. It is designated as an individual historic property on the National Register.
- The front and the majority of the first floor will be operated as a separate women's boutique. The second floor will continue to be residential.
- Vehicular access to the site would be through the existing driveway on the east side of the building (Chamber of Commerce side). The vehicular exit would be through a former driveway (the curb cut still exists) on the west side of the building (the Mansion House side). An exterior spiral staircase will be removed to make room for cars exiting.
- The site plan shows six parking spaces in the rear with one handicapped space.
- The owner is contemplating relocating the HVAC compressor units, currently located on the ground in the proposed exit driveway next to the spiral staircase, to the rear corner of the building.
- The proposed site plan and site photos were reviewed.
- Interior renovations were shown.
- Key issues include.
  - Does this proposal rise to the level requiring a public hearing as a DRI?
  - The proposal includes the re-use of a previously used second curb cut on the site for vehicular egress. The re-introduction of a curb cut on this stretch of Beach Street is necessary for this plan but is it desirable?
- The site is a small already cleared commercial use in a commercial district. No additional cutting of vegetation is indicated on the plan.
- LUPC voted unanimously to recommend to the full Commission that the proposal does not rise to the level requiring a public hearing.

## **2.2 Land Use Planning Committee Report**

**Linda Sibley**, LUPC Chairman said LUPC felt that the additional curb cut would be better as it is, an exit only curb cut. This way those exiting will not interfere with the road. The applicant's offerings would be so limited it would not be a designation for additional traffic. A local permit is required.

## **2.3 Applicants' Presentation**

**Maggie Towles** said with the one curb cut she was stuck today trying to exit since she had to back out onto Beach Street. With the use of the second curb cut that won't be an issue.

**Doug Best** said a lot of time was given to the traffic plan as well as the handicap access and the location for the resident parking. We did not want to deal with the liability for backing into the road. It is a sensible traffic plan for the location creating flow in and out and eliminating havoc. When ESS occupied the building the other driveway was used.

## **2.4 Commissioners' Questions**

**Gail Barmakian** said the parking will be primarily for those working there or living there so there won't possibly be a lot of in and out. Why was the driveway closed? **Doug Best** said for code reasons because the second floor was residential.

**Michael Kim** asked if the applicant has been to the zoning board. **Doug Best** said yes but they have to come to the MVC first.

**Linda Sibley moved and it was duly seconded to not concur as the proposal does not rise to the level requiring a public hearing and to send it back to the Town. Roll call vote. In favor: G. Barmakian, T.**

*Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole. Opposed: none. Abstentions: none. The motion passed.*

### **3. VINEYARD VINES ON MAIN STREET –TISBURY CR 4-2017 CONCURRENCE REVIEW**

---

*Josh Goldstein rejoined the meeting.*

*Commissioners Present: G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole.*

*For The Applicant: Sean Murphy*

#### **3.1 Staff Report**

**Paul Foley** presented the following.

- The applicant is Vineyard Vines and Sean Murphy (Agent).
- The location is 44 Main Street, Vineyard Haven, MA Map 7N Lot 5.
- The proposal is to operate a “Formula” retail store on Main Street.
- The site was reviewed.
- The reason for the referral is that there are more than 10 Vineyard Vines stores in the world thus triggering concurrence review as a “Formula Retail” store.
- The first Vineyard Vines store was in Edgartown at Nevin Square. It is now located on North Water Street in the Fligor building. They also have a store at the foot of Circuit Avenue in Oak Bluffs and eight other stores around the country.

#### **3.2 Land Use Planning Committee Report**

**Linda Sibley**, LUPC Chairman said LUPC voted unanimously to recommend to the full Commission to not concur as the proposal does not rise to the level requiring a public hearing and to send it back to the Town. The MVC adopted the “Formula Retail” trigger as we were worried about off Island businesses pushing out local businesses. This is a local business and we did not feel the intent of “Formula Retail” applied.

#### **3.3 Applicants’ Presentation**

**Sean Murphy** said the first store was in Edgartown. The applicant has purchased the building on Main Street in Vineyard Haven and it is a long term investment. It is not really a ‘Formula Retail’ store.

#### **3.4 Commissioners’ Discussion**

**Ben Robinson** said it is a little bit of a miss representation as a local business. It is headquartered in Connecticut and approximately 90% of the business is done off Island.

**Linda Sibley** said our main point was this was the trigger but was not the intention of the Checklist. The Black Dog could be considered “Formula Retail”.

**Joan Malkin** said it is not the introduction of a chain store. It doesn’t appear that Vineyard Vines would offend any of the principles of what is in the Checklist. So for that reason it does not have regional impact.

**Richard Toole moved and it was duly seconded to not concur as the proposal does not rise to the level requiring a public hearing as a DRI.**

- **Michael Kim** asked what is the MVC definition and rules for “Formula Retail”.
- **Fred Hancock** said the definition is in the MVC Checklist.
- **Paul Foley** said the definition is included in the Staff Report.
- **Michael Kim** said if rules are going to be bent then that should happen every time.



**Roll call vote. In favor: G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole. Opposed: none. Abstentions: none. The motion passed.**

**Christina Brown** noted that some of the DRI Checklist items are absolute and some are with concurrence. So with concurrence it gives the MVC the right to look at it more clearly.

**Michael Kim** said when an applicant is submitting something it should be definitive to the rule.

#### **4. CAPE COD FIVE BANK-TISBURY DRI 631-M2 EXTENSION REQUEST**

---

*Linda Sibley said she is abstaining from the extension request because until recently she owned the adjacent building to the bank.*

*Commissioners Present: G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole.*

*For the Applicant: Geoghan Coogan, Richard Leonard*

##### **4.1 Staff Report**

**Paul Foley** presented the following.

- The proposal is an extension on the condition requiring the bank to come back with a Phase 2 plan for the further development of the site. The condition was for August 2017 and the applicant is requesting a two year extension to August 2019.
- The site and the elevations were reviewed.
- The applicant believed that the bank as it exists now does not look like the "trailer" that some of the Commissioners had envisioned.
- The MVC approved the original proposal and in the future the applicant was to build a larger building and come back to the MVC within two years with the plans or remove the current building.
- In order to build the larger building the applicant needs to connect to the sewer and a letter was received from the Tisbury Board of Selectmen stating that the Town is actively involved in the planning for the expansion of their existing sewer service area. The Town is still committed to installing sewer service on High Point Lane.

##### **4.2 Applicants' Presentation**

**Geoghan Coogan** said there were two dates; August 2017 for the plan and to take down the existing structure by 2019. There is no point to further development until the sewer is in. The applicant is asking for a two year extension.

- **Robert Doyle** said the extension request is August 2019 to submit the plans and June 2021 to take down the modular building.
- **Richard Leonard** said the original plan was four years to remove the original building so now we are asking for the same two additional years.

##### **4.3 Commissioners' Discussion**

There was a discussion about the Town of Tisbury's plans to extend their sewer service.

- **Josh Goldberg** said he serves with Melinda Loberg on the Town Sewer Advisory Board and we are moving forward to set this on the Town Warrant.
- **Melinda Loberg** clarified that acceptance by the Wastewater Commission has been voted on. We have a USDA grant for the Town and we have to spend it by 2019. That is complete and ready to go. We have the loan in place to complete this sewer project.

- **Joan Malkin** asked for clarification that the Town has the money and it must be spent by 2019 and they intend to spend it.
- **Melinda Loberg** said the Town has the money to get the pipe from the plant to the intersection of High Point Lane and State Road.

**Gail Barmakian** and **Michael Kim** said the plan is to have the pipe in and asked the applicant why wait two years, why not submit the plan now to happen in 2019. **Richard Leonard** said there was uncertainty until recently on how that sewer line would be done.

**Melinda Loberg** said the Town had to negotiate with USDA on how to spend and allocate that money and that just happened.

**Leonard Jason** said in the end it came out to be a good project so why not give the extension.

***James Joyce moved and it was duly seconded to approve the extension for two years.***

- **Gail Barmakian** asked for clarification that the proposal is the plan for 2019 and demolition by 2021 but she still questions why they can't move forward now with the plan.
- **Josh Goldstein** said as a business owner he would not want to spend the money until he knew the pipe was in the ground.
- **Fred Hancock** said the MVC is changing the Written Decision so we are looking at a modification.
- **Joan Malkin** said one of the issues for the temporary structure was to see how the applicant's business developed and asked if it has been successful.
- **Richard Leonard** said the bank is doing very well.

***Roll call vote. In favor: G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, R. Thomas, R. Toole. Opposed: none. Abstentions: L. Sibley. The motion passed.***

## **5. DAMROTH SUBDIVISION-CHILMARK DRI 672 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

***Commissioners Present:*** G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole.

**Linda Sibley**, Public Hearing Officer opened the continued Public Hearing and continued it without taking testimony to April 6, 2017.

## **6. MAYHEW SUBDIVISION-CHILMARK DRI 673 DELIBERATION AND DECISION**

***Commissioners Present:*** G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole.

### **6.1 Land Use Planning Committee Report**

**Linda Sibley**, LUPC Chairman said LUPC recommends to the full Commission to approve the proposal with the offers and noted there was one clarification.

- **Fred Hancock** and **Paul Foley** said the applicant had submitted a plan with the Building Envelope but we did not see it at the MVC meeting.

***Linda Sibley moved and it was duly seconded to approve the proposal with the offers and all submissions of the applicant.***

- **Adam Turner** clarified that LUPC did go over the Benefits and Detriments.



## **6.2 Benefits and Detriments**

### **Benefits**

Wastewater and Groundwater; the applicant will be installing denitrification and are not using the full density under zoning.

Open Space and Habitat; the open space is a big plus with this project.

Scenic Values; more land, paths and trails are being added.

Character and Identity; the project is consistent with the character and identity of the Island.

Impact on Services and Burden on Taxpayers; the project will be a benefit to the taxpayers.

Consistency with/and Ability to Achieve Town, Regional, State Plans and Objectives; it is consistent especially with the Land Bank receiving the trail lot and trail easement. It conforms to zoning.

Appropriate in View of the Alternatives; it is and is providing open space and housing.

### **Neutral**

Night Lighting, Noise; it is not applicable.

Traffic and Transportation; it has no major impact.

Impact on Abutters; it is negligible and the project is separated by other abutters by the roadway. There is only one roadway to the other abutters.

Use Efficiently or Unduly Burden Other Facilities; there is no burden on public facilities.

## **6.3 Commissioners' Discussion**

**Linda Sibley** showed the submission after the public hearing. The plan shows the setbacks. There are setbacks between the building envelopes.

**Robert Doyle** said the offers are incorporated in the Decision.

**Linda Sibley** said the offers don't list the trail but the trail is on the plan.

**Fred Hancock** said the trail is a lot.

**Christina Brown** asked for clarification that the plan that the MVC is approving is the new one.

**Linda Sibley** said it is the plan that was offered and the one which has the setbacks.

**Roll call vote. In favor: G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole. Opposed: none. Abstentions: none. The motion passed.**

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

**Commissioners Present:** G. Barmakian, T. Barnes, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, L. Jason, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, B. Robinson, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole.

### **7.1 Executive Director Report**

**Adam Turner** presented the following.

- The MVC hosted a group from Falmouth with our consultant that gave a talk on wastewater. It was very informative.
- This week there was an agricultural meeting with David Foster.
- He welcomes Lucy Morrison as the MVC Administrative Assistant.

**Robert Doyle** said the presentation from Falmouth was terrific.

**Richard Toole** noted that it was well attended and thanked Adam Turner for setting it up.

**Linda Sibley** said Falmouth has utilized the resources from Woods Hole and because of that they are in a position to do something that is ground breaking for cleaning up coastal ponds.

## **7.2 Scheduling/Discussion**

**Fred Hancock** noted that Eversource sent out a proposal to spray herbicides on their rights of way. He is asking the Executive Director to coordinate a response with the towns. The deadline is March 27, 2017.

***Linda Sibley moved and it was duly seconded that the MVC should send a letter to Eversource.***

- **Ben Robinson** said he is in favor of a letter but Eversource does this every four years yet the landscapers and homeowners do it on a daily basis. To be preventative you really need to look at a ban and control Island wide. It is not just Eversource, they are just a piece of it.
- **Linda Sibley** said perhaps what was done for the fertilizer regulations should be done for herbicides. There was a committee for the fertilizer regulations.
- **Joan Malkin** questioned if a home rule was needed for this; to regulate the application of herbicides and pesticides such as was done for Squibnocket Pond.
- **Linda Sibley** said for the fertilizer regulations it was done as a DCPC and taken to every town. DCPC's do have powers that towns don't. We should ask counsel to look at it.

***Voice vote. In favor: 13. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0. The motion passed.***

***Linda Sibley moved and it was duly seconded to move the regular MVC meeting from April 20, 2017 to April 13, 2017 due to school vacation. Voice vote. In favor: 13. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0. The motion passed.***

## **7.3 Reports from Chairman, Committees and/or Staff**

**Joan Malkin** said the MVC will be looking at the Demolition Policy on March 23, 2017.

**Leonard Jason** asked how the Compliance Committee made out with Windemere. **Robert Doyle** said Adam Turner reviewed the DRI and he is sending a letter to the hospital.


The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

## **DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO DURING THE MEETING**

- Martha's Vineyard Commission C.R. 2-2017 Westman/29 Franklin Historic Demolition MVC Staff Report – 2017-03-16 Concurrence Review
- Correspondence from Chris Baer, Dana Hodsdon and Hung Suk Lee Re: 29 Franklin Street Historic Demolition
- First Floor, Second Floor Plans and Elevations 29 Franklin Street, Vineyard Haven, MA, Dated 11/9/2016
- Historic Town Plan Vineyard Haven, MA
- Martha's Vineyard Commission C.R. 3-2017 Beach Street Takeout Café MVC Staff Report – 2017-03-16 Concurrence Review
- Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System, Inventory No: TIS.56
- Site Plan, Tisbury 18 Beach Street
- Martha's Vineyard Commission C.R. 4-2017 Vineyard Vines on Main Street Vineyard Haven MVC Staff Report – 2017-03-13 Concurrence Review
- Definition of Formula Retail from MVC DRI Checklist Version 12
- DRI 631-M2 Cape Cod Five Extension Request, Dated December 16, 2016



- Letter from Town Of Tisbury Office of the Town Administrator, Re: DRI 631-M2, Request for Extension, Cape Cod Five Cents Savings Bank, 412 State Road Tisbury, Dated March 9, 2017
- MVC Decision-DRI No. 631-M2 – Cape Cod Five on High Point Lane pages 6-9
- The Cape Cod Five Cents Savings Bank Martha's Vineyard Branch Proposed Elevations and Site Lighting Layout, Dated 5/15/2015 and Revised 6/1/2015
- Mayhew DRI 673 Offers, Dated March 7, 2017

  
Chairman

7.13.17  
Date

  
Clerk-Treasurer

7-1-2017  
Date