

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES - JULY 22, 1991

Present: Schweikert, Sibley, Colaneri, Donaroma, Greene, Jason

BOCH DRI -

Mr. Schweikert called the meeting to order at 5:20 p.m. and asked all to read the letter from Schofield, Barbini and Hoehn regarding the Boch DRI. Mr. Colaneri felt that all points seemed to be in agreement; Ms. Sibley disagreed.

Mr. Schweikert felt that most things had been agreed to and others in theory. He discussed some of the specific items that were asked for.

Ms. Sibley discussed her feelings on the matter of increasing fast turnover due to the uses remaining on the site. She discussed half day parking and its relationship to half hour. She felt that the combination of half day parking plus the businesses equalled rapid turnover.

A discussion of the number of parking spaces for the businesses followed.

Mr. Jason discussed what was currently before the Commission and what was in the letter.

Ms. Sibley discussed what was contained in the letter.

Mr. Jason felt that the proposal was fair.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the issue of the stacking of cars and where the curb cuts should be.

A discussion of which curb cut was best to keep followed. Mr. Jason discussed where the existing curb cuts were and how the system may work.

Mr. Jason discussed what was before the Commission.

Ms. Greene discussed what was in the letter and her feelings on each item. She further discussed the issue of addressing boat storage.

Mr. Colaneri questioned whether this was a proposal less a plan and that something was needed to indicate where each feature would be located.

A discussion of the surface of the parking lot, its removal and/or testing followed.

Mr. Schweikert questioned whether the LUPC was then rejecting the letter proposal.

Mr. Donaroma felt the proposal was vague.

It was noted a third time that Thursday was the end of the extension period.

Mr. Donaroma felt that the door should be left open and let the applicant return with further information.

Ms. Sibley felt that the LUPC had encouraged the applicant to present this proposal. She further discussed his feeling on this issue. She did not feel it was fair to just give up and reject out right.

Ms. Greene discussed her recollection of the past meeting and what

was asked for.

Mr. Schweikert attempted to sum up the feeling of the Committee.

Mr. Schweikert asked for specifics of what was to be asked for.

Committee: new site plan with curb cuts; elevations; music building; delineation of office-retail parking vs rental parking; landscape plan; lighting plan; materials to be used on surface; targeted number of outside employees to be using lot; section or elevation showing cars; who would do traffic study.

Mr. Schweikert suggested contact with Mr. Barbini and possibly an additional meeting to discuss these issues. He suggested seeking a further extension. He suggested indicating that the response was inadequate and more information was needed and specifically a new site plan with more detail and request an extension and an additional meeting with Mr. Barbini to fine tune the proposal.

A discussion of this issue followed.

A discussion of how positive a letter was needed followed.

Mr. Colaneri discussed phasing and the need for same.

Mr. Schilling discussed the calling of the applicant due to the time frame. A discussion of this matter followed.

Ms. Sibley discussed phasing and the need for two plans; one with the reduced lot and one with a full lot.

A discussion of a guaranteed lot or not followed.

Mr. Sullivan discussed marine uses and his feeling on the plan.

FISHER DRI -

Ms. Greene asked if there had been any plans from Mr. Butman and where the Water Company easement was.

Mr. Schilling read the letter from Mr. Butman.

Ms. Greene further discussed the issue of the easements and their location.

A discussion of this issue followed. A discussion of the legality of the moving of the right-of-way (ROW) followed.

Mr. Sullivan suggested wording indicating no obstruction to ROW and usage to continue.

Mr. Colaneri discussed tightness of area.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the existing situation and the need to have area delineated and signed.

Ms. Best discussed certain possible wordings for dealing with the ROW.

Mr. Jason raised the question of whether the plan was good or bad.

Mr. Schweikert asked for benefits and detriments.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the Dodson report and the relationship to the proposal. He discussed the items that the applicant had offered: brick walkways; pedestrian friendly access; landscape area; downsize building; increase set-backs.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the consistency with the Dodson plan and further down-sizing of the proposal. A discussion of benefits vs detriments followed.

Mr. Colaneri discussed his feelings regarding the benefit of completing the area with business use.

Mr. Best discussed the business aspect of the proposal, the size of the proposal and types of uses. He wondered what commercial use could fit site and be benefited. He felt the building was poor. Ms. Sibley questioned any benefit for added commercial space. She discussed the need or lack of for such a proposal. She felt it was consistent with Dodson. She did not feel there was no economic benefit to the community.

Mr. Sullivan felt that the proposal overintensified the lot and discussed his feeling on the matter.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the overintensification and the history of the area. He noted that the use had always existed there. He discussed the economic argument and the need for business uses or the lack of need. He discussed the potential of a positive economic benefit. He felt that there should be parking in the area or trade for Kelley's Kitchen. He felt it was a complicated mess.

Ms. Greene did not want to negotiate. She felt there was too much congestion in the area, the blocking of a right-of-way, lack of say, if sold, lack of economic benefit, too much on too little.

Mr. Jason discussed some of the past problems between the A & P and the town. He felt there were certain economic benefits to the proposal. He felt that the applicant had worked with the town in the past and the town owed him fairness. He also felt the site was maximized and overcrowded, the design was inappropriate and the detriments out weighed the benefits and that the ROW was a problem. He felt the usage had been storage and the need to consider always would be best.

Mr. Schweikert indicated that all seem to feel that the site was too overcrowded; too much on too small a site; there were differences on the economic issue.

A discussion of island economics followed.

A discussion of the feelings of the local planning board followed.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the matter of the board feelings. Mr.

Colaneri discussed the relationship of the proposal to the island economy.

Mr. Schweikert noted that the LUPC was recommending denial because it was too large and inappropriate.

Ms. Greene discussed the various points in Section 15 of Chapter 831.

A discussion of the relationship of this section to the proposal and its benefits and detriments followed.

Ms. Sibley discussed the issue of competition and felt that in a different economy then there may be a grater need for commercial space. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of competition followed.

Mr. Schweikert discussed the reasons for the LUPC decision:

He read down through Section 15 again. All agreed on a response to each of the items.

15a - the majority felt favorable.

15b - the majority felt adversely.

15c - the majority felt adversely.

15d - the majority felt no affect.

15e - the majority felt no affect.

15f - the majority felt favorable.

15g - a discussion of any future access road in the rear followed. - the majority felt favorable.

15h - the majority felt consistent (favorable).

A discussion of the reasons for denial followed.

Mr. Colaneri asked if the applicant would be given a chance to seek an extension.

Ms. Sibley discussed the issues related to this matter and the differences between the proposal and other proposals.

Ms. Greene discussed the need to stop the negotiations and deal with what is placed before the Commission.

Mr. Schweikert questioned whether it was wrong to meet with applicants to discuss various matters.

Ms. Greene discussed her understanding of the role of the LUPC and how it had changed. A discussion of the roll of the LUPC followed.

A number of those present discussed how they understood the roll of the LUPC. A discussion of the need to clearly articulate each issue to an applicant so that things are very clear. Mr. Donaroma and Mr. Colaneri each discussed the planning process that the LUPC goes through on each project.

Ms. Greene felt that the LUPC was being used improperly.

A discussion of what was being considered by certain applicants as to the roll of LUPC followed.

Mr. Schweikert indicated that the LUPC needed to be up front with the applicants and tell them up front what the concerns were.

A discussion of what Herring Creek had been asked to address followed. Ms. Sibley expressed her feeling as to how to deal with such applicants. A discussion of this matter followed. Each expressed their feelings on how to make the process work.

Mr. Jason discussed the various matters which were appropriate to discuss and those items that were inappropriate to be discussed with LUPC.

Ms. Sibley questioned whether there should be a meeting or not with the applicant. A discussion of whether there should be a meeting with the applicant or not followed.

A discussion of what the purpose of the meeting with LUPC should be.

The Committee finally agreed to meet with the applicant to discuss certain matters.

Mr. Colaneri raised a question on the Crow Hollow DRI with respect to the concerns of the West Tisbury Planning Board. Mr. Schweikert explained what had been discussed with the applicant. Ms. Sibley discussed what the West Tisbury Planning Board was seeking.

Mr. Donaroma discussed some of the confusion regarding this proposal.

Ms. Greene noted what she felt the steps should be.

Mr. Jason raised issue with the continuation of the right-of-way.

Mr. Best raised the issue of smoking at public meetings. A discussion of this issue followed. It was agreed that there would be no smoking during LUPC or MVC meetings.

Mr. Colaneri asked for clarification of what issues would be discussed at LUPC regarding Crow Hollow - everything would be open for discussion. A discussion of what was being submitted followed.

A discussion of what Mr. Jette wanted from the Commission followed.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

