

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 November 15, 2018 In the Stone Building 33 New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs, MA

IN ATTENDANCE

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

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

Staff: Adam Turner (Executive Director), Paul Foley (DRI Planner), Christine Flynn (Economic Development and Affordable Housing Planner), Dan Doyle (Regional Planner).

Chairman James Vercruysse called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioners Present: L. Brathwaite, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, K. Newman, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruysse.

1.1 Executive Director's Report

Adam Turner presented the following:

- For a couple of years the MVC has been working on the Population Demographic Statistical Report and the first draft is now finished.
- The report includes peak season population with assumptions and calculations, population demographics, as well as Land Use, Blue Economy, the top six industries by town, finances and real estate, education and health. The report also includes maps.
- We have had the data for many years so it is exciting to present the story and the trends.
- The report will be updated on a regular basis.
- At the next meeting, the Commissioners will receive the report and it will also be given to all of the Towns to review and fact check it. The data has to be correct. It then will be published and will be in a format that can be updated. It will also be available on the MVC web site.
- We have done the first elderly social mapping on the Island. We can see what is redundant and what isn't being provided. Elderly affordable housing is a huge issue.
- At the Finance Committee meeting, the general budget was reviewed and it was decided to move grants out of the regular budget. We will show the DOT money and show what the Towns do and that will be budgeted. If we receive grants that will be used in addition to the budget.

1.2 Reports from Committees and/or Staff

Nominating Committee

Christina Brown, Committee Chairman, presented the following:

- The committee consists of Joan Malkin, Linda Sibley, Josh Goldstein, Gail Barmakian, Leon Brathwaite and Christina Brown.
- The role of the committee is to consider the nominating slate for the MVC officers: Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Treasurer.
- The procedure for the committee is to nominate the slate, and then the MVC will elect the officers. The floor is also open for nominations.
- The current nominations are: Chairman, Doug Sederholm; Vice-Chairman, Josh Goldstein; and Treasurer, Ernie Thomas.

MVC Chairman Report

James Vercruysse, Chairman, said the appointed members of the Town need to be re-appointed and the elected members need to be sworn in before the first meeting of the New Year.

Trip Barnes joined the meeting.

Land Use Planning Meeting Schedule

Paul Foley said at Monday's meeting (November 15, 2018) LUPC will be reviewing the MVCS Campus Plan and The Meetinghouse Subdivision.

Affordable Housing Policy Revision Committee

Fred Hancock said the committee is working on the policy now and meeting weekly on Wednesdays at 9:00 a.m.

2. 284 UPPER MAIN STREET-EDGARTOWN- C.R.8-2018 CONCURRENCE REVIEW

Commissioners Present: T. Barnes, L. Brathwaite, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, K. Newman, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruysse.

For the Applicant: Nils Leaf, Tim McHugh

Doug Sederholm said for the record that he was involved in litigation a number of years ago against Mr. Leaf, and if there were any objections he would recuse himself. **Nils Leaf** said he did not have any objections.

2.1 Staff Report

Paul Foley presented the following:

- The applicants are Nils Leaf and Tim McHugh.
- The location is 284 Upper Main Street, Edgartown Map 20-A Lot 64 (.023 acres).
- The proposal is to remove an existing house and guest house and replace them with a three story mixed use four unit building of 5,356 sf with two commercial condominiums and two residential units. There would be a farmer's porch on the front.
- The applicants went to the Planning Board earlier this year. The Planning Board approved the project (2 commercial and 2 residential condominium units) set back from the road with a direct one-way connection to the Park and Ride.
- The two commercial units would be 700 sf each and be stick built. The two apartments on the second and third floors would be 1,728 sf each and be modular.
- The Planning Board held more than three public hearings for moving the building back; cutting the number of units from 7 to 4; making the exit to the Park and Ride straight (the driveway will

remain a one-way access away from Upper Main Street); saving a tree and other green space in front, and requiring a fence on the north to protect an abutter.

- The project was referred as a modification. MVC staff determined that the DRI 637 approval was expired. MVC staff determined that the proposal triggered a Concurrence Review as Mixed-Use Project (3.2b).
- The LUPC voted to recommend that this does not require a public hearing as a DRI.
- Site photos were reviewed.

Josh Goldstein moved and it was duly seconded that the proposal does not require a public hearing and to not concur and to send it back to the Town.

- **Fred Hancock** said one of the things in favor to not concur is that the new plan creates housing and the Upper Main Street regulations have some strict regulations.
- **Lucy Morrison**, Edgartown Planning Board member, encouraged the MVC to not concur.

Roll call vote. In favor: T. Barnes, L. Brathwaite, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, J. Malkin, K. Newman, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruysse. Opposed: none. Abstentions: none. The motion passed.

3. BARN, BOWL & BISTRO-OAK BLUFFS DRI 645-M5 MODIFICATION REVIEW

Commissioners Present: T. Barnes, L. Brathwaite, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, K. Newman, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruysse.

For the Applicant: Joshua Dunn

3.1 Staff Report

Paul Foley presented the following:

- The applicant is Larkin B. Reeves, Sam Dunn, and Robert Sawyer DBA MV Bowl, LLC.
- The location is 13 Uncas Avenue, Oak Bluffs Map 11 Lot 153.1 (0.62 acres).
- The proposal is to cut the approved kitchen addition of 264 sf to 160 sf, with the rest becoming a covered porch.
- In early 2018 (April), for DRI 645-M4, the applicant was allowed without a public hearing to expand the kitchen by 264 sf and to build a shed for garbage and recyclables.
- The proposal includes the building of a wooden shed structure for the garbage and recyclables.
- The upstairs residential stair will come straight to the porch.
- There will be no take out window.
- The LUPC voted to recommend to the full Commission that this does not require a public hearing as a DRI and that this is a minor modification.

3.2 Commissioners' Questions

Robert Doyle said there were outstanding compliance issues such as affordable housing and have those issues been addressed. **Paul Foley** said the project is in compliance with the conditions for affordable housing, HVAC and the fence. The LUPC approved the lighting in the parking lot. There are two tenants in the apartments.

Ben Robinson asked where the mechanicals are. **Josh Dunn** said they are planning to move them to the roof from outside the kitchen area.

Christina Brown asked where the mechanicals are in relation to the neighbors. **Josh Dunn** said they are under the small shed roof.

Fred Hancock moved and it was duly seconded that the modification is not significant enough of a change to require a public hearing. Voice vote. In favor: 13. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 2. The motion passed.

Fred Hancock moved and it was duly seconded to accept the modifications as presented.

- **Linda Sibley** suggested that this is a situation where the MVC approved a change and now a change to a change, and the Commission should look at how to file that so that intermediate steps not be acted on, and are removed, and so the file is not misunderstood.
- **Christina Brown** said it will show that it is superseded.
- **Fred Hancock** said in the past the MVC has asked for As Built drawings. It would be useful to have that on the lot, and added it as a condition to the modification.

Fred Hancock amended his motion and it was duly seconded to add the As Built drawings on the lot as a condition of the modification. Roll call vote. In favor: T. Barnes, L. Brathwaite, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, J. Malkin, K. Newman, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruyse. Opposed: none. Abstentions: C. Brown, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm. The motion passed.

4. VERIZON TOWER-TISBURY DRI 677 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioners Present: T. Barnes, L. Brathwaite, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, K. Newman, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruyse.

For the Applicant: Geoghan Coogan

James Vercruyse, Public Hearing officer, opened the continued Public Hearing.

4.1 Staff Report

Paul Foley presented the following:

- A public hearing was held on September 7, 2017 and the hearing has expired. A new public hearing began on August 23, 2018, and was continued to September 20, 2018 without taking testimony, which was continued to October 4, 2018 without taking testimony, and continued to tonight, November 15, 2018.
- The proposal requires a Special Permit from the ZBA and a Building Permit.
- The New England Telephone and Telegraph building was built in 1965. The tower was extended from 60' tall to 77' tall in 1986.
- The proposal is to increase the height of the Verizon Tower used to transmit landline calls and Internet access via narrow width microwave between Vineyard Haven and Falmouth (also handles Nantucket) from 77 feet above the ground level to 130 feet +/- above ground.
- The tower is 86' from the road and the property is 400' deep.
- The parking lot behind the building is at the same elevation as the existing tower. The rear parking lot behind that is 10 feet lower, and after that the property drops of 20 feet to boundary.
- The following existing equipment on the tower will be relocated to a different height:
 - A 6' diameter dish at elevation 55' above ground will be reinstalled at elevation 95'.
 - A 6' diameter dish at elevation 65' above ground will be reinstalled at elevation 102'.
 - An 8' diameter dish at elevation 75' above ground will be reinstalled at elevation 128'.
- The Radio Technician affidavit states: if we were to assume to plot future yearly rise at the current gradual rate, we could see the threshold level will be impacted more frequently as time increases. This will lead to a greater loss in signal strength; which translates to an increase in bit error, which will invariably lead to more service interruptions and eventual loss of service.

- The LUPC requested that a trial balloon be floated at the proposed height. The applicant said they could not float a balloon.
- The MVC drone movie of the tower was shown from various heights from 70 feet to 144 feet, of which the tower would be more visible at that height from the Edgartown-Vineyard Haven Road. The proposed tower would be 130 feet.
- Key issues include:
 - Visibility: Existing and proposed photo simulations indicate that the higher tower will be significantly more visible along Edgartown-Vineyard Haven Road.
 - DCPC: The existing tower is within the Island Roads DCPC. If the tower were moved further back on the property outside of the DCPC, the tower would be less visible while driving along the Edgartown-Vineyard Haven Road.
 - Necessity: The tower is proposed to be heightened by 53 feet (a 69% increase) from 77' to 130' tall in order to avoid future transmission interruption due to tree growth.
 - Alternatives: The tower could be located on the same property at the same elevation with the fall zone on their property outside of the DCPC, but would require money and new studies.
- The applicant was asked to provide a record that shows the signal interruption or intermittent outage when and at what times this has occurred. The applicant stated that outages are monitored and they have dispatch records. There were also questions from the Commissioners about the beacon and its height.
- The applicant submitted a letter on May 10th stating that they could not float balloons, and cannot provide accurate signal interruption data and that lighting is not necessary.
- The applicant submitted a report that expanded the line of sight (LOC) beam to include a "Fresnel" curve that raised the number of trees eventually/potentially in the way to 22.
- The Commission asked for the Section of Fresnel curve with the proposed tower height. It was submitted on September 20th and a revised version was submitted on October 4, 2018.
- The applicant has said that they have now identified at least 22 trees that are in the Fresnel zone of the tower that could lead to signal interruption.
- Originally, the applicant identified four trees (ultimately one was out of the way) that were in the way of the line to line signal.
- Staff estimates that at the proposed height of 130 feet (53 feet higher than existing) that the tallest trees would have to grow approximately another 22 feet to reach the lower level of the RX Fresnel zone, and approximately 30 feet to reach the lower level of the CO Fresnel zone.
- Visibility from the proposed tower versus the existing tower was shown.
- The fall zone was reviewed and the applicant's image indicating the trees in the line of sight was reviewed.

4.2 Commissioners' Discussion

James Joyce asked if the MVC received any additional letters/correspondence. **Paul Foley** said no additional correspondence has been received.

Fred Hancock said that the MVC Minutes for August 23, 2018 are from the first public hearing.

Richard Toole asked if Paul Foley could enlighten the MVC on what was heard about the other tower with regards to emergency services calls. **Paul Foley** said it is a separate system and not tied to this.

Linda Sibley said if she dials 911 this tower would be the one to get the call into the 911 system. The Oak Bluffs tower is how the information gets distributed to the emergency services on the Island.

Katherine Newman said she would like to know how many property owners have Verizon service/landlines.

4.3 Applicants' Presentation

Geoghan Coogan presented the following:

- Linda Sibley did an excellent job of explaining the purpose of the tower.
- The easiest way to explain the needed increase the height of the tower is to look at the slides/charts of October 4, 2018.
- There are two dishes, and the study shows the top of the tower and the bottom of the tower, the existing antenna heights and the trees.
- Trees are within the active beam and the Fresnel zone. The trees are Norwegian Spruce, Oaks and pines.
- We had a local tree expert (Tyler Chronister) walk the line and he gave us the species of the trees, the current height, and how tall they can get. He capped the trees at 100 feet. He said they could get over 100 feet, but on the Vineyard due to the wind conditions, they typically would not get over 100 feet.
- At the proposed height, 22 trees were identified to show maximum impact. Eight are within the Fresnel zone, and we are trying to get out of the main beam 100%.
- There is a tree near Causeway Road, a Norwegian Spruce that is over 100 feet. The ones in this study are 75 feet.

4.4 Commissioners' Questions

Ben Robinson asked how the applicant determined the height of the tower. **Geoghan Coogan** said on the original proposal, they took the existing trees and said they need to get out of the main beam for the tree species.

Ben Robinson said it would be nice to know what the original tree elevation was versus the 100 foot cap. **Geoghan Coogan** said the study that was submitted is with all of the tree species and their heights. The study shows existing conditions, the trees with the new tower, and the maximum impact with the new tower.

There was a discussion about the Fall Zone.

- **Geoghan Coogan** said the Fall Zone shows as if the tower were to fall from the bottom of the tower, but in reality it would crumble like a pine tree and snap in half. It is designed to do that.
- **James Vercruyse** asked how the Town feels about the Fall Zone issue.
- **Geoghan Coogan** said they have not been back to the Town yet.

Fred Hancock asked what the other species of trees are, other than Norwegian Spruce. **Geoghan Coogan** said Scarlet Oak, White Oak and Pitch Pines.

Joan Malkin asked how many years before the trees creep into the Fresnel zone. **Geoghan Coogan** said the Norwegian Spruce is the fastest growing, and it would be within ten years in the proposed expansion.

Joan Malkin asked what the life use of the tower is. **Jennifer McCray**, the Verizon Representative, said they would change out equipment but the tower would not "rot."

Fred Hancock read the growth rate of the Norwegian Spruce, and in poor soil, it is three feet per year. **Geoghan Coogan** said he is relying on the tree expert for the growth rate on the Island.

Michael Kim asked what the precedent is elsewhere in the country if you could not add height to the tower. **Jennifer McCray**, the Verizon Representative, said it is a microwave tower, which is not usually found elsewhere. They have not been in a situation where we could not raise the tower. Cell and Microwave are two different types of towers.

Michael Kim said for any Verizon tower or structure that cannot be augmented, what does Verizon do? **Geoghan Coogan** said you would lose service.

Trip Barnes said it is a microwave tower that is above ground and does not go underwater.

Geoghan Coogan said the only reason you wouldn't increase the tower is a permit issue to deny. The Hyannis tower was recently raised for the same issues as the Island.

Michael Kim said what if you were in New Mexico, as an example, and you had this issue. How would Verizon handle it? **Jennifer McCray**, the Verizon Representative, said there would probably be a cell tower in New Mexico and not a microwave tower, and smaller towers would be built to send signals. It is not a black and white answer; it depends on the type of tower.

Michael Kim asked if Verizon has studied alternatives. **Jennifer McCray**, the Verizon Representative, said we would hope this would not happen and would keep the tower the way it was. We did not want to have to raise this tower. In 2014, we tried to approach the homeowners and they did not want us to cut the trees. We were hoping it was only four trees, but now found it is 22 trees.

Geoghan Coogan said there is not another site. Verizon does not own another site. The only other option is to put a fiber optic cable underwater, which would be extremely costly. This is the only viable option now. Comcast does have fiber optic cable.

Katherine Newman asked what AT&T does. **Geoghan Coogan** said it is just wireless. They don't have landlines. Small businesses and many people have landlines.

Joan Malkin said when the four homeowners were approached, they were not offered compensation or shown what the tower would look like. **Geoghan Coogan** said there was a map that was attached to the line of sight, and before that he sent letters and spoke with the people. They simply did not want the trees cut and they don't see the tower. We did not make a big monetary offer. The first two trees were huge Norwegian Spruces and the homeowners said no, and we stopped there. **Jennifer McCray**, the Verizon Representative, said we also said we would obtain the cost and replace the trees and there was no interest.

Leon Brathwaite and **Joan Malkin** asked if Comcast would share their cable. **Geoghan Coogan** said no, they are a competitor.

Doug Sederholm said assuming a tower is needed that reaches the proposed height, he would also assume that it is technically possible to relocate it farther back from Edgartown-Vineyard Haven Road, and that would be solving the technical problems and would also get it further back from Winyah Lane. There is a significant aesthetic issue here. Why can't the tower be located farther back on the property? **Geoghan Coogan** said realistically the tower is almost abutting the building so the technology goes right to the door. If the tower were moved, you have the unknown as to what would be in the way. There are also cost constraints. The possibility has not been investigated. **James Joyce** said the neighbors had previously said they preferred the tower in front.

Leon Brathwaite asked if newer technology by satellite had been explored. **Jennifer McCray**, the Verizon Representative, said it would be taking a step back in technology. The most reliable way is direct beam via microwave.

Ernie Thomas asked if this is for every Verizon home phone, not just 911. **Geoghan Coogan** said it is for any Verizon landline phone. 911 is emphasized due to safety reasons.

Doug Sederholm asked if it is for all Verizon data, i.e. internet service. **Jennifer McCray**, the Verizon Representative, said it is.

Linda Sibley said a chart of the trees has been submitted. We would probably not want to encourage cutting them down. **Paul Foley** showed photos of some of the trees, as well as the map and the chart of the trees. **Linda Sibley** said these trees are very public, and she is not surprised in the least that the homeowners did not want them cut. She wants to make it clear that the MVC may prefer that the trees not be cut down.

Fred Hancock said we should look at the chart of trees and their present growth rate to determine the height the tower needs to be raised to avoid having this issue again. We also need to look at what is the correct tower height for the next 25 years. We need that information to make a decision.

Linda Sibley said she does not want people thinking that the MVC is advocating cutting trees down, and is concerned about the future and what the technology would be like.

Geoghan Coogan said raising the tower 20 feet gets both panels raised. The bottom panel would be at 95 feet plus 20 feet. **Ben Robinson** asked if the panels were moving together as a group. **Geoghan Coogan** said yes, that is correct.

Doug Sederholm said if the technology changes, and the tower is no longer used to convey data by microwave to Falmouth, what will happen to the tower. **Geoghan Coogan** said at the last MVC meeting, the MVC conditioned the applicant to take it down.

Ben Robinson said there is new information regarding the tree height and the 100 foot cap. We need to determine the delta difference to give a range for the correct tower height.

Linda Sibley said she would like it in the record that an arborist has said the trees would be damaged if they were topped. She asked **Tim Bollin**, and he agreed that it would not be good to top them.

Ernie Thomas said you could top the ones now but you will have additional growth that would then need to be topped again.

There was a discussion about having expert testimony regarding the tree growth rate and height.

- **Ben Robinson** asked if the MVC would like a tree expert/arborist to testify.
- **Geoghan Coogan** said he had asked Ray Tattersall, the Tree Warden for Tisbury, and he was not comfortable testifying since he was new to the position.
- **Ben Robinson** said it would be helpful if we could ask questions of the experts regarding growth and height of trees.
- **Leon Brathwaite** said that could be done in writing.
- **Ben Robinson** said it might be more expedient to have them come to the MVC meeting.
- **James Joyce** said he did not feel it was necessary.
- **Fred Hancock** said he thinks it is the question that needs to be reviewed.
- **Ben Robinson** said it is a question we need to understand.
- **James Joyce** said at first you would notice the tower, but then you get used to it and you don't see it any longer, similar to the poles on the Edgartown-Vineyard Haven Road.
- **Doug Sederholm** said if the MVC really wants to know about the growth and health of these trees, the Commission should hire an independent expert to do that.
- **Linda Sibley** agreed with Doug Sederholm and said it is like a traffic study and a peer review. And like a traffic study, the MVC would have the applicant pay for it and it should not be terribly expensive.
- **Trip Barnes** said the applicant is trying to do this so they won't have to come back for another 25-50 years. We are beating this to death. We should just make a decision. We need the tower for public services. We should move ahead.

- **Katherine Newman** said with the so many unknowns, she is not sure she can support the project. She would feel more comfortable adding a large height structure to the vista knowing definitively how the tree height would impact the tower.
- **Adam Turner** said that normally the applicant has a chance to review the peer review and comment on it.
- **Linda Sibley** asked if the MVC could keep the public record open for an undetermined amount of time.
- **James Vercruysse** said we would have to leave it open for at least a month to receive information from an expert.
- **Geoghan Coogan** said a tree is a tree and the soil is what it is. You could call Polly Hill and they probably are a great source for a review.
- **Adam Turner** said that is a good idea and we might be able to use the information that they have.
- **Fred Hancock** said we need to know the growth height of these trees.

Michael Kim said the proposal is based on the assumption that the tower must be on this footprint and for the MVC to accept it has to be in the current location and he is not comfortable with that. **Doug Sederholm** said the only thing before the MVC is the application which is for the stated location.

James Vercruysse, Public Hearing Officer, continued the Public Hearing until December 6, 2018.

5. NOVA VIDA ALLIANCE CHURCH-OAK BLUFFS DRI 603-M4 EXTENSION REPORT

Commissioners Present: T. Barnes, L. Brathwaite, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, K. Newman, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruysse.

5.1 Staff Report

Paul Foley presented the following:

- The applicant has requested an extension of three months.
- The applicant came back to the MVC two years ago and an extension was approved due to delays in financing and securing the building permit.
- The landscaping plan requires approval by LUPC before construction can begin.

Doug Sederholm moved and it was duly seconded to grant a six month extension. Roll call vote. In favor: T. Barnes, L. Brathwaite, C. Brown, R. Doyle, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, J. Malkin, K. Newman, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruysse. Opposed: none. Abstentions: J. Goldstein. The motion passed.

6. COOK ROAD NEW BUILDING-TISBURY DRI 646-M CONCURRENCE REVIEW

Commissioners Present: T. Barnes, L. Brathwaite, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, K. Newman, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruysse.

Adam Turner suggested tabling the Cook Road Concurrence Review. The applicant is not present and the MVC needs to have them to describe the project and to determine if the project needs a public hearing.

Ben Robinson said the Tisbury Planning Board is reviewing the project via the Special Permit process.

Leon Brathwaite said he was confused, is it a concurrence review, public hearing or an acceptance?

Adam Turner said the MVC has two options: to vote to have a public hearing, or it goes back to the Town.

Joan Malkin said if we vote to have a public hearing, then we are prejudicing the applicant's right to have a public hearing. She would think that the applicant would like to have an opportunity to present. Do we know why they are not here?

James Vercruysse, Chairman, suggested postponing until the applicant was present and that was the consensus of the Commissioners.

7. MINUTES

Commissioners Present: T. Barnes, L. Braithwaite, C. Brown, R. Doyle, J. Goldstein, F. Hancock, J. Joyce, M. Kim, J. Malkin, K. Newman, B. Robinson, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, E. Thomas, R. Toole, J. Vercruysse.

Robert Doyle moved and it was duly seconded to approve the minutes of June 28, 2018 as amended by Richard Toole to change the location to the Katharine Cornell Theater. Voice vote. In favor: 13. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 2. The motion passed.

Leon Braithwaite moved and it was duly seconded to accept the minutes of July 26, 2018 as written. Voice vote. In favor: 12. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 3. The motion passed.

Leon Braithwaite moved and it was duly seconded to approve the minutes of August 2, 2018 as written. Voice vote. In favor: 13. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 2. The motion passed.

Joan Malkin moved and it was duly seconded to approve the minutes of August 23, 2018 correcting the typo as noted by Doug Sederholm on line 49 ("fro" should be "for"). Voice vote. In favor: 13. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 2. The motion passed.

Leon Braithwaite moved and it was duly seconded to approve the minutes of September 6, 2018 as amended by Ben Robinson to delete the word small on line 55. Voice vote. In favor: 14. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 1. The motion passed.

Josh Goldstein moved and it was duly seconded to approve the minutes of September 20, 2018 as written. Voice vote. In favor: 13. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 2. The motion passed.

Josh Goldstein moved and it was duly seconded to approve the minutes of October 4, 2018 as amended by Doug Sederholm to correct the typo on line 44 "about". Voice vote. In favor: 11. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 4. The motion passed.


Josh Goldstein moved and it was duly seconded to approve the minutes of October 18, 2018 as amended by Ben Robinson to correct the language on line 187 "does the parking lot" and on line 244 the dates should be 2021 and 2016 for scheduling new boat construction. Voice vote. In favor: 13. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 2. The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO DURING THE MEETING

- Minutes of the Commission Meeting – Draft, Held on June 28, 2018
- Minutes of the Commission Meeting – Draft, Held on July 26, 2018
- Minutes of the Commission Meeting – Draft, Held on August 2, 2018
- Minutes of the Commission Meeting – Draft, Held on August 23, 2018
- Minutes of the Commission Meeting – Draft, Held on September 6, 2018
- Minutes of the Commission Meeting – Draft, Held on September 20, 2018
- Minutes of the Commission Meeting – Draft, Held on October 4, 2018
- Minutes of the Commission Meeting – Draft, Held on October 18, 2018

- Martha's Vineyard Commission DRI #645-M5 Barn Bowl & Bistro Kitchen Change MVC Staff Report 2018-11-14
- DRI #645-M5 Barn Bowl & Bistro Kitchen Change Applicant's Narrative, Dated November 2, 2018
- DRI #645-M5 Barn Bowl & Bistro Kitchen Change Elevation and Proposed Floor Plan Dated, November 2018
- Martha's Vineyard Commission DRI #637-2 / CR 8-2018: 284 Upper Main St. Mixed-Use MVC Staff Report 2018-11-14 Concurrence Review
- Letter to Edgartown Planning Board from Nils Leaf and Timothy McHugh, Dated April 27, 2018
- Martha's Vineyard Commission DRI # 677 Verizon Tower Height Extension MVC Staff Report 2018-11-15
- Executive Summary for the Path Calculation Design for the Verizon Tisbury Tower, from Edmond G. Coogan Law Office, Dated May 10, 2018
- Affidavit of Michael E. Shea, Dated August 8, 2018
- Vineyard Haven RSL Signal Degradation, Received by the MVC on August 23, 2018
- Extension request from Rosemarie Haigazian for DRI # 603-M4 Alliance Church, Dated October 25, 2018
- Extension request from Rosemarie Haigazian for Alliance Church, Dated November 10, 2016



 Chairman

12.6.18

 Date



 Clerk-Treasurer

6 DEC 2018

 Date