

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF TISBURY
P.O. BOX 602
TOWN HALL ANNEX
VINEYARD HAVEN, MASSACHUSETTS 02568
(508) 696-4270
Fax (508) 696-7341
www.tisburyma.gov

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: May 17, 2017

TIME: 6:00PM

ATTENDANCE: Bellante-Holand, Doble, Robinson, Seidman, Stephenson

PLACE: Town Hall Annex, 66 High Point Lane, Tisbury, MA

BILLS: Tisbury Printer.....\$280.00
MV Times.....\$ 76.95
Postmaster.....\$ 7.29

MINUTES: As referred in the May 3, 2017 Meeting Agenda
5 April 2017 m/s/c 5/0/0
25 April 2017 m/s/c 5/0/0
3 May 2017 m/s/c 5/0/0

APPOINTMENTS:

6:00 PM Deliberations: Special Permit Application – Vineyard Caribbean Cuisine,
AP 09C01

The Planning Board Chairman opened the deliberations to review the applicant's draft special permit for potential amendments and corrections.

The Planning Board Administrator advised the Board that she added three restrictions to the decision for the Board's consideration. The first pertained to a prohibition against the retail of beer, wine or alcoholic beverages. The second condition required the applicant to complete the review process with the Site Plan Review Board for a final determination on the exterior color(s) of the entry door and signage, and the third obligated the applicant to submit a copy of the recorded decision for the Planning Board's records.

D. Seidman was of the impression that the Board had made a determination on the color of the door. He was advised that the Board delegated the final determination to the Site Plan Review Board. The Board staff explained that the third condition was a requirement the vast majority of applicants failed to complete. Applicants were required to record

their special permits at the Registry of Deeds by state statute, but failed to appreciate the importance of verifying that their compliance with the condition.

B. Robinson suggestion the revision of Condition No. 8. He thought the language should include recycling, and recommended the following text, “ The applicant shall be responsible for providing trash and recycling receptacles, for maintaining the area free of litter, and for securing the tables in the courtyard during inclement weather”. C. Doble and D. Bellante-Holand agreed with the recommendation. They felt recycling should be mandatory.

There being no further comment, D. Seidman entertained a motion on the draft decision. B. Robinson moved to approve the draft decision with the revisions recommended by staff and the one amendment to Condition No. 8. C. Doble seconded the motion. The motion carried. 5/0/0

B. Robinson moved to close the deliberations. C. Doble seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 5/0/0 The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled meeting at 6:10 PM.

7:10 PM Board of Selectmen Re: Housing Production Plan (HPP)
L. Gomez, M. Loberg, ME Larsen, A. Turner, C. Flynn, H. Lee, D.
Hodsdon and T. Israel (arrived at 7:45 PM)

L. Gomez, Chairman for the Board of Selectmen called the joint meeting of the Selectmen and Planning Board to order at 7:10 PM.

D. Seidman explained that the All Island Planning Board agreed to produce an All Island Housing Production Plan with the assistance of the MV Commission. The project was expanded to include the development of a separate plan for each town.

D. Seidman explained that the Tisbury Housing Production Plan was designed to “communicate the community’s goals to developers and housing subsidy programs, to create a policy framework for the ZBA review of comprehensive permits and for town boards and commissions that provide comments to the ZBA, to educate resident business owners and others about local and regional housing needs, and the community’s part to meet those housing needs... for communities to lay out a coherent, realistic strategy to create more low or moderate income housing”. D. Seidman understood that in past discussions, members of the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board expressed an interest in addressing workforce housing, community housing and other types of housing exceeding the state’s affordable income limits up to 150%.

A. Turner, MVC Director realized when he agreed to fund the project that there was a fairly major housing issue beyond the 80% affordable range pertaining to workforce housing, elderly housing and the availability of non-seasonal rentals. The funds the MV Commission agreed to invest in the project allowed the individual town to expand the

scope of the study to include the housing needs of the community beyond those within the 80% affordable range. He therefore thought it important to emphasize that they were not bound by the state's requirement. The town leaders had the right to pursue a course they believed to address the town's needs. He also wanted to clarify that the MV Commission was the only regional agency that had jurisdiction over Chapter 40B developments, so that the towns were afforded some protection. The HPP provided the town with several strategies and recommendations that could be implemented within the next five to ten years.

D. Seidman clarified that the HPP focused on the development of the 80% affordable housing and included references to the other types of housing (e.g. multi-family). He thought it provided the town valuable information.

C. Doble thought the town learned much from the consultants and review process, and that the strategies could be applied to the other types of housing. She did not have an issue adopting the HPP, but was concerned that the plan would become "shelf ware". She felt they had to discuss the proposals more, refine it and address other aspects of their housing policy. B. Robinson thought the plan's adoption was a small detail in the entire process, because it was the information in the plan that was going to serve as the foundation for a more comprehensive housing policy. Its adoption was not necessary, and he questioned the need to debate the plan's adoption. L. Gomez questioned if they were committed to plan if they adopted it. D. Seidman replied in the negative. B. Robinson understood that they could amend the plan to include the other types of housing. D. Seidman agreed.

D. Seidman referred the boards to the first and second goals pertaining to housing options and household types on page four of the Tisbury Housing Production Plan's FY 2018-2022 Executive Summary to illustrate the plan's application to year round workforce housing and housing for municipal employees, seniors, multifamily units, etc. L. Gomez indicated that they were predominantly zoning amendments. He had not seen any movement on the Planning Board's part to develop language. B. Robinson noted that the action items were not all necessarily zoning amendments. It could include funding.

A. Turner recommended the HPP's adoption because it served as a blueprint. H. Stephenson did not find the plan held them to a particular course of action. L. Gomez questioned whether they could get private developers to invest in the development of affordable housing. D. Bellante-Holand questioned L. Gomez's reliance on private development and profit. B. Robinson agreed, noting that there was no profit in affordable housing.

B. Robinson questioned the need to adopt the plan. He did not see any reason why they couldn't just work with the recommended guidelines to produce housing. D. Seidman asked A. Turner if the adoption of the plan gave them access to certain funds. A. Turner thought there might be some grants. H. Stephenson was not prepared to vote on the

document, but did feel that the plan provided them with good ideas that could be explored in further detail.

C. Doble thought the plan was a good starting point. She hoped they could modify the plan as they discussed the recommendations in detail. More importantly, she wanted the Board to make a commitment on a particular strategy or goal, with the understanding that they would have to improve upon the plan to make it more specific. It was her understanding that the plan did not lock them into a specific course of action. D.

Seidman assured the Board that they could modify the plan in any way they wanted, but felt they should adopt the plan to demonstrate their commitment in providing affordable housing to the community.

H. Lee, town resident shared a conversation he had with the two consultants (Judy Barrett, Jennifer XX) when he asked them about the goal(s) for the HPP workshops. He received different answers from different people (Peter Temple, etc.). He was disappointed to see that only 15%-20% of the workshops' attendees were renters, and a smaller percentage representing the business community. In research of the census data, he learned that renters complained about the rent fluctuations, which may be attributed to the seasonal rentals, and the lack of rentals for people interested in selling their homes and staying in the community. It raised questions about the rents, demographics and economics. He recommended against adopting the HPP and thought the Board should have a series of in-depth discussions with the community to begin prioritizing the issues and goals they wanted to address before they made any decision.

M. Loberg thought the HPP provided the town a good framework, and a number of strategies to begin moving forward on addressing the development of housing. It provided them with a good starting point, for the hard work that lies ahead of them.

D. Bellante-Holand did not understand why they were discussing the plan's adoption after spending \$150,000.00 on consultants that scheduled several workshops with the community to solicit their feedback on a proposal the town requested to address. She questioned the benefit in expanding all this energy on the discussion of action items, when everyone had expressed an interest in acting on the strategies and moving forward on the project. She questioned the benefit in holding the debate. B. Robinson noted that the HPP lacked specificity. It was difficult for him to accept the goals when they were vague. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if the purpose for the discussion was to discuss the goals in greater detail to develop a prioritized list or simply conversation. B. Robinson believed board members were finding it difficult to vote on the document when the goals were not vetted. B. Robinson inquired if any of the other towns had adopted the plan. C. Flynn replied in the negative.

B. Robinson believed it was an issue the towns often experienced with consultants. They failed to see the nuances of the community, and the communities did not invest in the process to give the consultants sufficient information to develop a plan that was specific enough for people to embrace.

C. Flynn agreed with B. Robinson to an extent, noting that the consultants had reviewed the Comprehensive Island Plan (2009), the Housing Needs Assessment (2013) and the extensive zoning analysis and opened it up for discussion on a town level basis.

A. Turner thought it was important for the town to adopt a policy that clearly identified their vision for housing in the next ten years. If the HPP reflected their vision, they should adopt the document. The strategies on page seven of the Executive Summary gave them several options and strategies that were specific to the town. H. Stephenson did not agree with all of the recommendations. It appeared to her that if they adopted the plan, it would implicate that they were in agreement with all of the recommendations if they adopted the plan.

D. Seidman did not think so. B. Robinson thought it curious that none of the other towns voted to adopt the plan, and solicited the information from A. Turner. A. Turner explained that none of the towns have held the discussions the Town of Tisbury had regarding the plan, prior to town meeting. D. Seidman noted that all of the towns were given copies of their plans in December 2016 for their comments, and reissued a copy in March 2017 when none responded.

H. Stephenson did not have an issue amending their zoning regulations to permit affordable housing. The plan was not specific enough to tie them down to a particular strategy. They were guidelines. B. Robinson indicated that it was the reason he did not think the adoption of the plan really mattered. They had to take the next step and act. L. Gomez indicated that it was the point he wanted to make earlier in the discussion. While everyone agreed that the zoning regulations had to be modified, the Planning Board has not moved forward on implementing the modifications.

H. Stephenson explained that they had to recodify the regulations. The consultants advised them that they were outdated, difficult to maneuver and in some instances contradictory. It was a project the Planning Board wanted to address with the MV Commission.

M. Loberg referred the Board members to the section entitled Tisbury's Housing Vision on the third page of the Executive Summary and thought the text was an accurate reflection of their aspiration for the future. She did not have an issue adopting the template, and refining the language as they moved forward. C. Doble thought they could use the Vision Council to refine the document. It did not preclude them from adopting the document. Tristan Israel arrived at 7:45 PM

C. Doble felt they had to continue the conversations, and focus on their goals. It also meant that people had to take on the responsibility of following through with the workload. B. Robinson agreed, adding the people had to get comfortable with the idea of affordable housing before they explored the specifics. M. Loberg felt they had to go

through the process and agree upon the vision and the framework in order to develop their strategies.

D. Bellante-Holand did not understand the direction of the discussions, when they've already paid consultants \$150,000.00 to develop the framework and strategies for constructing ten units a year. She did not think they had to go back to the drawing board because of a difference in opinion.

T. Israel recalled seeing language in the HPP that recommended a bylaw amendment to allow the development of non-conforming lots for affordable housing. He thought the Planning Board should be able to develop language for next spring. H. Stephenson understood that the HPP was one way of addressing the need for affordable housing. If they wanted to amend the zoning regulations to increase in density to provide affordable housing, they had to be careful that they did not increase density for the benefit of the more affluent. The HPP provided a good set of guidelines for developing affordable housing.

B. Robinson thought it was important to understand the root of the problem. He believed they had sufficient housing to accommodate their housing needs. The issue was that they were all going towards seasonal market rate rentals. The solution was not to construct more housing, but to convert some of the market rate units to year round housing. They needed the funds to purchase housing, and that meant that they had to become a market player.

H. Lee thought the community did not have a sense of the town's overall goals, and questioned whether the plan was thorough in its address of the town's housing needs. He thought the Board was premature in adopting the plan when they did not know what the actual goal should be. He feared that the plan opened up town to development by private developers and sprawl development. The additional fifty units recommended by the HPP only served to invite more people, and increase density without addressing economic development or any other issues relevant to the social fabric of the community. They were inadvertently endorsing more development.

D. Seidman indicated that the town was trying to provide their citizens with decent living quarters, and nothing more. H. Stephenson reiterated that the island did not have affordable housing for its current residents, and it was incumbent upon them to develop strategies to create affordable units. If zoning amendments were required, they had to be careful that the regulatory modifications accomplished what they intended and not benefit the more affluent.

C. Flynn noted that the year round population from the 1970s to 2000 increased each decade by 30%. In 2010 the population increased by 10%, and in the last thirty years, the real estate market has not been able to keep up with the year round housing market, that was essentially unaffordable and unsustainable. She felt purchasing real estate to maintain their affordable housing stock was a great strategy that could be funded by municipal

affordable housing trusts. She did not think they should get discouraged by the details, because there were a number of creative solutions.

T. Israel believed they all knew the issue. The problem was finding the solution(s) to provide the housing they needed for the seasonal workers, year round tradesmen and professionals, service personnel and elderly. They have a local housing trust, and have been adding funds over the years from the CPC coffers, but it wasn't enough. He felt they had to search for other sources of revenue if they were going to meet their goals.

M. Loberg understood the state legislature was considering a regulation that would allow municipalities to collect up to a 6% tax on short term rentals. The legislation included an addendum to allow Cape Cod the ability to collect an additional 2.5%, and municipalities were allowed to use the funds for wastewater infrastructure. She felt the tax would provide them with the funds they needed to create the incentive to convert short term rentals to year round accommodations.

D. Seidman redirected the discussions to the HPP, and asked members of the Planning Board if they agreed with the HPP's scope of address and recommended its adoption to the Board of Selectmen. H. Stephenson requested a clarification. She inquired if the Planning Board had to vote to accept the HPP or ask the Board of Selectmen to adopt the plan. D. Seidman replied that it was the latter.

D. Bellante-Holand moved to recommend the Housing Production Plan's adoption to the Board of Selectmen. H. Stephenson seconded the motion. Board voted 4//0/1 B. Robinson abstained.

T. Israel noted that plans could be amended. A. Turner agreed, and noted that plans could also be implemented. L. Gomez entertained a motion. T. Israel moved that the Tisbury Board of Selectmen adopt the Tisbury Housing Production Plan. M. Loberg seconded the motion, and the motion carried 3/0/0. There being no further discussions M. Loberg moved to adjourn the Board of Selectmen's joint session with the Planning Board. L. Gomez seconded the motion. The motion carried. 3/0/0 Time: 8:15 PM

BOARD DISCUSSIONS:

1. Cheryl Doble
RE: Curb cut on 55 Church Street

C. Doble informed the Board that she took photographs of the property during a quick site visit for tonight's discussions. Board members reviewed the photographs as she described the property. She mentioned that the property was extremely narrow and cramped.

She asked K. Burke about the property owners' reason(s) for abandoning the use of their current access on Howland Lane for a new curb cut on Church Street. K. Burke indicated

that the lane was difficult to use. Given that the property owners also owned the abutting property on the other side of the lane, they wanted to landscape the area, and fence it off to prevent anyone from parking over the septic system. An alternate curb cut on Church Street suited the use of the property.

C. Doble noted that they'd have a wide stretch of cars sitting along the entire road with the additional curb cut. She further noted that the vehicle would have to back out onto the road, and this presented an issue for pedestrians and motorists, given that it was a very busy road. They would not have the same safety issue, if they had to back out from Howland Lane.

K. Burke indicated that the property owner was willing to create a circular driveway up front or to extend the driveway to the backyard, where there was sufficient area to turn around and head out to Church Street. D. Seidman commented that the latter option led the vehicle to the septic system. K. Burke thought they might have some space between the house and septic system for the car. D. Seidman did not think they had sufficient space up front to prevent a car from backing out of the property onto Church Street.

K. Burke mentioned that the potential buyer was interested in learning if the off-street parking requirement could be interpreted to mean that parking accommodations were required on site. M. Loberg was asked for a comment on the town's parking requirements. B. Robinson referred the Board to the zoning regulations for residential districts. M. Loberg could not respond because the parking restrictions varied in town. She did mention that residents were allowed a parking permit, under certain circumstances. C. Doble and D. Seidman did not see any advantage to abandoning their current access on Howland Lane.

Board members requested a clarification regarding the purpose for the discussions. K. Burke explained that she could not find a policy or regulation that explained the town's standards or rules for curb cuts. Her inquiry led to a discussion with the DPW Director, R. Tatterstall, who referred the matter to the Planning Board for a recommendation. She asked the Board to confirm or explain the town's regulations for curb cuts.

D. Seidman felt it was difficult to offer an informed decision without a design that illustrated the curb cut's location, dimensions, etc. H. Lee recalled reading language in the zoning regulations pertaining to one means of access per property, a sufficient parking area to accommodate two cars, and a prohibition against the backing out of a driveway onto a road. C. Doble added that they were obligated to look at the line of site, and the curb cut's impact on pedestrian traffic. She felt it fair to state that the Planning Board has been working to reduce the number of curb cuts to create a stronger and safer network of walks.

D. Seidman inquired about the condition of the existing lane. C. Doble said it was well maintained. D. Seidman inquired if an emergency vehicle could use the lane without any difficulty. M. Loberg noted that the trash trucks traveled on the road. K. Burke reiterated

her questions about the requirement for on-site parking. B. Robinson clarified that the Planning Board was specifically addressing the adequacy of the curb cut.

H. Stephenson inquired if the Planning Board could vote against the proposal for a curb cut on Church Street, if they did not believe it was a good idea. D. Seidman replied that they could recommend against the curb cut, because the DPW Director was ultimately responsible for the final determination.

K. Burke inquired about the process and time frame. D. Seidman explained the process, noting that a site plan with the location and dimension of the curb cut and driveway would facilitate a determination. She was informed that the Board met twice a month, and was willing to entertain the request for a curb cut at any meeting provided she submitted the information they requested.

2. Ewell Hopkins, Oak Bluffs Planning Board Chairman
RE: Gary Harcourt, 10 Great Rock Road, Oak Bluffs, MA

E. Hopkins indicated that he was interested in soliciting the Tisbury Planning Board's impressions on Mr. Harcourt's application for a special permit and decided to attend the meeting to listen to their discussions to make sure he understood their issues and concerns regarding Mr. Harcourt's request for an alternate means of egress through Vineyard Haven.

B. Robinson inquired if the second means of egress was for residential or commercial purposes. E. Hopkins did not know, but felt that they should assume the worst case scenario e.g. an intense commercial use. D. Seidman inquired if E. Hopkins had the opportunity to read their staff's email. E. Hopkins replied in the affirmative. D. Seidman affirmed that the Tisbury Planning Board did not endorse deep lot divisions with the intervening lot, or accept frontage on private property.

E. Hopkins noted that the Oak Bluffs Planning Board had the exclusive authority over the application, but was interested in soliciting the Tisbury Planning Board's concerns since the property bordered both their towns. The solicitation of their opinions was a neighborly gesture on his part.

B. Robinson believed the property owner of the flag shaped lot on Megan's Way was required to submit an application for a Form C Subdivision to create the road. Mr. Harcourt needed to obtain frontage on Edgartown Road. The application would require the two other property owners' consent because they were obligated to formulate and join a road association, as required in their local subdivision regulation. B. Robinson noted that it would require the expertise of a surveyor to design the road. The property owner of the flag shaped lot may not be supportive if he/she had to surrender land to continue the 30 ft. wide layout and turn around at the end of the road to accommodate emergency vehicles.

Board members were advised that Mr. Harcourt was asking the use of an access easement on private property in Vineyard Haven to Edgartown Road in lieu of a road. H. Stephenson requested a clarification about Oak Bluff's jurisdiction regarding the proposal. She was informed that the property in question lies in the Town of Oak Bluffs. The applicant, Mr. Harcourt submitted an application for a special permit to the Oak Bluffs Planning Board asking them to allow him the right to change his access in Oak Bluffs. The access crosses the town boundary into Vineyard Haven through a private driveway, named Megan's Way. H. Stephenson asked E. Hopkins if the property was in Oak Bluffs. E. Hopkins replied in the affirmative. H. Stephenson noted that the access was in the Town of Tisbury. E. Hopkins replied in the affirmative. B. Robinson believed the alternative means of access was a better alternative. B. Robinson noted that the applicant had two options. He could use his existing access on Great Rock Road or a subdivision road off Edgartown-Vineyard Road, if the property owners agreed to create a road.

E. Hopkins suggested that the Tisbury Planning Board table the discussions if they did not have sufficient time to study the proposal. B. Robinson asked E. Hopkins where the Oak Bluffs Planning Board was in their review process. E. Hopkins refused to respond. He did not want to prejudge the application and risk recusing himself from the Oak Bluff's review process. His interest in the discussions was to understand their concerns.

C. Doble thought they should consider referring the matter to town counsel. Planning Board staff advised the Board that they had to consider additional ramifications, such as emergency response with the change in access, because emergency personnel would have to gain access in Vineyard Haven to address an emergency in Oak Bluffs. E. Hopkins concurred. B. Robinson noted that the applicant would have to meet the new Fire Code's minimum requirements for access, regardless of the township. E. Hopkins noted that they were not going to be able to respond to this property through Oak Bluffs because the existing road ends just before 10 Great Rock Road.

H. Stephenson inquired if the change in access would allow the property owner in Oak Bluffs to partake in additional town services within Tisbury, such as school enrollment, garbage collection, etc. Board members did not believe the applicant would be entitled to additional town services.

D. Seidman noted that the Oak Bluffs Planning Board could in theory grant the applicant access up to the town boundary line. He confirmed that the Town of Oak Bluffs granted 30 ft. wide roadways. Discussions ensued with regards to development of lot, and the requirement for a subdivision road, which would have to comply with the Town of Tisbury's minimum requirements. B. Robinson noted that the applicant still had two choices. He could use Great Rock Road or gain access on an approved subdivision road that met their minimum standards. The Board staff questioned the second recommendation, because the applicant did not own or have an interest in the abutting properties on which the subdivision road would have to be constructed. B. Robinson clarified that the option was viable if the abutters agreed. If they did not agree, the applicant had no choice but to use his access on Great Rock Road.

H. Stephenson asked if the applicant could use an access easement. She was advised that their local subdivision rules and regulations prohibited an overburdening of an easement, and frontage on a subdivision road, public road or and existing private way of suitable grade, width, etc. Additional discussions ensued with regards to the existing conditions, and D. Seidman suggested contacting town counsel for a recommendation. D. Bellante-Holand questioned the need to refer the matter to town counsel, if their regulations addressed it.

E. Hopkins clarified that he was solely interested in soliciting the Board's impressions because he did not want to rely on their administrative staff's conversations before Oak Bluffs began to deliberate on the application. He wanted to make sure he understood that the communication they've received from staff reflected the Tisbury Planning Board's comments.

Planning Board staff referred the Board to the 1987 revisions to the subdivision rules and regulations pertaining to the overburdening of an access easement, and the abandonment of the three lot Deep Lot division of land. D. Bellante-Holand did not recommend a favorable advisory opinion.

E. Hopkins indicated that he hoped to obtain documentation confirming the Board's agreement with the conversation their staff have shared on this subject via email. D. Seidman believed staff's email reflected their opinion. E. Hopkins inquired if the Tisbury Planning Board endorsed their staff's email. D. Seidman replied in the affirmative. Board members were asked if they agreed. D. Bellante-Holand indicated that the issues were not as clear when she first read the email. Following the discussions, she wanted a few minutes to review the email before she answered D. Seidman.

B. Robinson inquired if the Oak Bluffs Planning Board evaluated Great Rock Road, E. Hopkins replied in the negative. B. Robinson thought they should support their staff's report and moved the recommendation. D. Bellante-Holand agreed and seconded the motion. Board members voted 5/0/0

E. Hopkins asked the Board's staff to resend the email with a confirmation of the Board's vote for their record.

3. Parking Committee

RE: Recommendations to the Board of Selectmen & Minutes

B. Robinson submitted a copy of the Parking Study Committee's minutes of May 4, 2017 and a summary of their recommendations to the Board of Selectman. H. Stephenson understood that the recommendations were presented to the Board of Selectmen the previous evening at a meeting she could not attend.

B. Robinson recommended a short term residential exemption (1/2 hour grace period for errands) if the town opted to use metered parking. The meters could be programed to accept a code. M. Loberg indicated that they were looking into two different technologies (software) that were available. She noted that they were looking to invest in meters for the Park-N-Ride and old fire station parking lots. The proposal did not include the Water Street municipal parking lot. D. Seidman inquired if they were considering gating the parking lots. M. Loberg indicated that they were not proposing to gate the parking lots, because it would interfere with the MVTA's operations. B. Robinson inquired about the expense for a two year trial period. M. Loberg thought the question was whether they wanted to extend the use of meters to other parts of town. They already had the funds to purchase the meters.

D. Bellante-Holand thought it was counter intuitive to charge people for parking at a location they want to encourage the public to use. M. Loberg noted that it was meant to address the long term patrons (free four day stays). The current system did not allow patrons to use their credit cards to pay for additional days or purchase stickers after town hall's business hours.

H. Lee did not understand how the town currently monitored and fined vehicles staying over the four day period or to prevent patrons from circumventing the honor system by driving out after four days and returning for another four days. D. Seidman noted that they would need a sensor. It was the purpose for suggesting Smart Parking two years ago. The system worked similar to EZ Pass, with a surveillance cam. The company running the surveillance sends out the bill for collection. M. Loberg thought they needed "volume". In absence of the system, he thought the people would abide by the rules, if the police department issued tickets. In Korea, police departments were issued quotas that they had to meet.

M. Loberg noted that they had to address the off-island commercial companies that have been taking advantage of the Park-N-Ride. They have multiple vehicles and pay very little for a parking space. They need to find these companies and have them purchase a permit. The Parking Committee recommended increasing the seasonal and annual parking fees. In absence of a sophisticated system to monitor the Park-N-Ride, D. Bellante-Holand recommended hiring a seasonal parking attendant to monitor the activity. ME Larsen thought they were making it much too cumbersome. She recommended utilizing an automated system. M. Loberg wanted to avoid using a gate. D. Seidman thought it was unavoidable.

H. Lee noted that the town was not regulating or enforcing its current regulations. Once they did, they were going to spend on manpower (summer police). He therefore recommended being proactive by offering residents a rebate at the end of the month and a "Charlie Card" for non-residents similar to the system used in London. B. Robinson agreed that the Park-N-Ride should be revenue positive. M. Loberg noted that the revenue increased when the police started enforcing the regulation. The issue was that they had to maintain the enforcement.

4. Tisbury Street Fair
RE: Booth Application

5. Tisbury School Building Committee

H. Stephenson was concerned that the Committee was going to make a decision on a site. She felt the Planning Board had to offer an opinion on the matter that included a comment about the planning issues associated with the different sites.

She mentioned that she had prepared a letter on the Board's behalf to submit to the school building committee on May 24, 2017. C. Doble did not think the School Building Committee was prepared to make a decision until June 2017.

H. Stephenson explained that the letter highlighted the importance of addressing the planning issues associated with each of the sites. She noted that the letter recommended the current location for the school and the need to initiate a comprehensive review of the school's needs starting with renovations and expansion, before exploring a whole new construction at a new site.

H. Stephenson indicated that former Planning Board member, Henry Stephenson had studied alternative options and re-designed the school to meet their space needs within the existing footprint. The current proposal doubled the size of the school and eliminated parking, etc.

B. Robinson inquired if they were planning on submitting the letter at the School Building Committee's meeting on 5/24/17. D. Seidman and D. Bellante-Holand requested time to review the letter. C. Doble agreed. B. Robinson thought they could edit the letter and have a final draft ready for the meeting on 5/24/17.

C. Doble thought the Planning Board should prepare the letter, go to the meeting on May 24, 2017 and present the letter to the School Building Committee at the following meeting. D. Seidman supported C. Doble's recommendation.

B. Robinson noted that there was a "disconnect" between the realities of the community and the majority of the school building committee members.

D. Seidman recommended giving the Planning Board members an opportunity to review the letter at their meeting on May 31, 2017 to agree upon a final draft that could be presented to the school building committee at their meeting on June 3, 2017. H. Stephenson inquired if the Planning Board would consider having a public opinion prepared for the meeting on May 24, 2017. D. Seidman preferred hearing the public's comments.

H. Bellante-Holand recommended adding salient bullet points for the physical size and footprint, and headings for each of the points listed in the draft letter. She then offered to

edit the letter with her recommendations. D. Seidman asked H. Stephenson if she could send the board members a copy of the letter so that they come prepared with their edits.

H. Lee questioned whether the Planning Board could designate a member or two to edit the letter on their behalf. Board members wanted to see the final document before they delivered it to the intended party. D. Seidman agreed to present a simple statement for the meeting on May 24, 2017. He suggested "The Tisbury Planning Board is in favor of keeping the Tisbury Elementary School at its present site and prefers the renovation and possible expansion of the existing school rather than a new building". C. Doble questioned whether they should include a comment about the broader issues with a new location. She noted that it was moving the school out of town, developing land that was set aside for preservation, and creating a financial burden the town had to absorb with the additional infrastructure. D. Bellante-Holand thought they could revise their statement to add "a more compact design, limits the disruption to students, destroys an environmentally sensitive area, and preserves the heart of the community.

C. Doble recommended contacting Colleen Andrews to inform her of the Planning Board's statement prior to the meeting to avoid any conflicts with the school building committee, given that she and D. Seidman were members of the same committee. D. Seidman agreed.

B. Robinson recommended and moved to enter the following statement at the School Building Committee's meeting on May 24, 2017 "He suggested "The Tisbury Planning Board is in favor of keeping the Tisbury Elementary School at its present site and prefers the renovation and possible expansion of the existing school rather than a new building". D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion. 5/0/0

C. Doble asked that the Planning Board members to review H. Stephenson's letter and to come prepared with their edits on 5/31/17.

6. Tisbury Planning Board Meeting Agenda 5/31/17

RE: Topic Items

D. Seidman indicated that they had to elect officers, and appoint representatives to various committees. C. Doble asked that the letter to the School Building Committee is listed as the first topic. B. Robinson asked that they include Gary Harcourt's application for an alternative access in Tisbury.

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:

1. Tisbury Board of Appeals

- A. Special Permit #2281 – Xi Yu, AP 07C09 ((Food Service Operation)
- B. Special Permit #2282 – Charles & Anne Downing, AP 07C09 (display merchandise outside)

2. Oak Bluffs Planning Board

RE: Hearing Notice – Gary Harcourt requests access from Megan's Way

B. Robinson expressed an interest in attending the hearing.

3. MV Commission

RE: 12 May 2017 Extended Schedule

4. Thomson Reuters

RE: Zoning Bulletin, 25 April 2017

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

PRO FORM

Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 8:55 P.M.
(m/s/c 5/0/0)
Respectfully submitted;

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

APPROVAL:

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

Date

Benjamin Robinson
Chairman