



LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

August 30, 2004

Minutes

The Land Use Planning Committee of the Martha's Vineyard Commission met at 5:30 P.M., Monday, August 30, 2004, in the Olde Stone Building, New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs.

Present: LUPC Chairman Christina Brown, MVC Commissioners Bob Schwartz, Ned Orleans, Megan Ottens-Sargent, John Breckenridge, Kathy Newman; MVC staff Executive Director Mark London and DRI Coordinator Jo-Ann Taylor. Present for the Applicant: Moira Fitzgerald, architect. Others present: Deborah Medders, Walter Kennedy.

Chairman Christina Brown opened the meeting at 5:39 P.M.

4 CAUSEWAY ROAD - DRI # 574-2, Pre-Public Hearing Review (noticed as DRI #574, Mid-Public Hearing Review)

Proposal: a flexible plan for up to 9 office units in a new building set back from State Road; a new 2 BR residence at the front of the property, which could be used for office space; existing law office to be used for office or residence alternatively with the new 2BR residence; per plan presented, dated August 30, 2004.

Architect **Moira Fitzgerald** presented the plan and discussed the new design

- New building consisting of 2 floors with a full basement to be used as a basement in all but unit 1, at the northern end, where the basement would be walk-out rentable space; total rentable space (including 1 basement unit) 4,747 square feet
- Renters could take one or two floors
- Applicant would like approval to potentially convert to 4 residential town houses, no retail, or to convert to mixed use.
- New 2 BR residence proposed closer to State Road, 1,225 square feet; would most likely be the affordable housing offer, to be rented year 'round to a renter or renter family 80-100% of median income; may be interchangeable with the law office; each structure could house residential or office use, but one would always be a residence
- In comparison with previous proposal for 8 office units and 1 residence, this proposal could include up to 10 office units and 1 residence; much smaller area of new construction proposed, 7,271 square feet for the previous proposal, compared to 5,972 square feet for this proposal (both figures exclusive of the existing law office).
- No sidewalk is proposed, only extension of existing path

There was some discussion of the pros and cons of continuing the June 10 hearing or starting over.

Advantages of starting over:

- Wouldn't have to compare this proposal with the previous editions.
- Commissioner count would start fresh.
- Would start fresh with public input
- Would clear the earlier editions from consideration.

Advantages of continuing the hearing:

- Could compare this proposal to the previous editions and show how the Applicant has responded to comments.
- Would include the testimony, staff reports, etc. from the previous efforts.
- Would not allow the Applicant to offer earlier editions for consideration (as alternative).

Ned Orleans made a motion that LUPC record consensus that the project should require opening a new hearing. **Katherine Newman** seconded. There was general consensus that the project should be heard through a new public hearing.

Moira Fitzgerald asked for Commissioner response to the new proposal, particularly in comparison with the last edition (plans dated May 10).

Christina Brown entertained opinions of Commissioners on the subject, reminding them and the Applicant that they are being asked for a preference between plans, not a statement of intention to vote for approval of the overall project.

Ned Orleans said that, subject to what he might hear at public hearing, his first impression is that the new proposal might be better.

John Breckenridge said that the new concept might be better, with the buildings lower, and landscaping could hide the cars; still looks like a large mass – why not separate the units?

Bob Schwartz would like to see the units separated.

Katherine Newman first questioned seeing the parking in front. **Moira Fitzgerald** responded that the proposed parking would be where the existing parking is, and not prominently visible from State Road. **Katherine Newman** then said that the new proposal should have less visual impact than the last.

Megan Ottens-Sargent said that she prefers this plan, but would like to see less of a mass, wondered if the units could be jogged out of line and remain connected for elevator utility. She added that the impacts of residential vs. office uses would be different; the flexibility may not be doable.

Christina Brown said that she preferred the last prior plan, for continuity with the existing streetscape of buildings set closer to the road.

There was a discussion of items to be presented at the public hearing, including items asked for at the last hearing:

- Distinct affordable housing offer
- Traffic and septic updates reflecting all the potential uses, possibly in chart form
- Accident history for Causeway/State intersection
- Line of sight out of Causeway, with and without the proposal (may no longer be necessary)

- Elevations of proposed residence
- Scale illustration for front and back views
- Cross sections from Causeway (may not be necessary)
- 100-year floodplain shown on plan
- Landscaping plan showing what's existing and what's proposed
- Letter from Fire Chief

A site visit was planned for 8:00 A.M. on Monday, September 20, with a repeat at 9:00 A.M. Commissioners asked to see trees slated for removal flagged.

The Meeting was adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

jat