

# 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:** June 14, 2017

**TIME:** 6:00PM

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

**ATTENDANCE:** Bellante-Holand, Doble, Robinson and Stephenson

**BILLS:** Petty Cash (Certified Mailing).....\$7.29  
Inquirer & Mirror Inc.....\$95.00  
Office Depot.....\$15

**MINUTES:** As referred in the May 31, 2017 Meeting Agenda

### APPOINTMENTS:

6:00 PM Phil Wallis, Conrad Ello and George Sourati Re: MV Museum – Site Plan  
Review of Parking Plan  
Attendance: ME Larsen, M. Loberg and H. Stephenson

G. Sourati, the applicant's civil engineer and representative referred the Planning Board members to Plan No. C1.0, entitled Wastewater Sewer Plan to illustrate the location of the existing 17 ft. wide drive and location of the proposed 20 ft. wide drive. Board members were advised that the drive was designed to allow two-way traffic on the first leg of the road, and one-way traffic around the loop. The drive had a wider curb cut at the entrance to accommodate emergency vehicles and buses, and a drop off lane in the north arm of the loop.

G. Sourati noted that the road had a 12% grade in the first leg of the road, and a 10 % grade in the first 15 ft. of the north arm of the loop. It was the steepest portion of the road. The rest of the loop was leveled (2-4% incline) because it was designed to accommodate parking. The proposal included an emergency access lane that went around the building within 50 ft. of the museum's front entrance, because the terrain was too steep beyond that point.

B. Robinson inquired about the surface material for the parking spaces. G. Sourati replied permeable gravel, and clarified that the surface for the emergency lane was going to be reinforced turf. C. Ello added that the service lane met the new fire code requirement, which

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 14, 2017

required emergency access to within 50 ft. of the door and to connect to the catering pad for outdoor events, and deliveries.

G. Sourati indicated that they were still waiting to hear from the Fire Chief about the suitability of the 12% slope for emergency access. There was a possibility that the grade would have to be reduced to 10% from the proposed 37 ft. contour on the north arm of the loop down to the curb cut on Lagoon Pond Road. G. Sourati indicated that he was preparing the information, the Fire Chief wanted to submit to the Fire Marshall for a determination. C. Doble inquired if the revision was going to alter the sections of the road. G. Sourati noted that it would change the emergency personnel's path of travel to the south arm of the loop, against traffic. C. Ello believed signage would eliminate any confusion or potential safety hazards. He also felt confident that they would be able to keep the layout, if they just spread some of the grading out to accommodate the 10% slope.

B. Robinson expressed a concern about managing the transition in the north arm of the loop heading down toward the entrance. C. Ello reiterated that they could spread the grade out on the out slope and shave the gradient down so the tray was a bit lower. B. Robinson and C. Doble agreed. B. Robinson indicated that the Planning Board would like to see the revisions, if the Fire Chief asked the applicant to pursue the change in slope.

B. Robinson asked G. Sourati about his proposal to collect the runoff from the road. G. Sourati referred the Board to Plan No. C-2.0 and explained that the storm water runoff from the paved loop and parking area would go into the vegetative swale and catch basin, which was located at the proposed lowest elevation (26 ft.). Due to the archeological restrictions and cost factor, G. Sourati had to rely on three additional drainage pits and two catch basins to address the runoff from the service road and drive.

C. Doble had a couple of concerns with the plan and referred the board members and applicant's representatives to plan no. L 6.0 (Details of Stairs and Furnishings II) in which she questioned the effectiveness of the vegetative swale's ability to absorb the runoff from the road. It appeared very shallow. G. Sourati noted that the runoff was going into a catch basin from the swale. The pitch of the immediate area was designed to direct the flow into the storm water system. B. Robinson noted that the plan included a linear curb in the swale. He assumed it was going to collect and transmit the excess water to the catch basin. G. Sourati mentioned that the curb "was broken in a few spots". B. Robinson thought they could extend an infiltrating pipe, just before hitting the second parking area to manage a little bit more of the load to prevent the storm water from washing over. C. Ello agreed. He thought the pipe would act as a trough to give the excess runoff some time to percolate.

C. Doble expressed concern that the first 12" drain trench on the new drive, approximately 75 ft. in from Lagoon Pond Road would not be able to contain the road runoff. She felt the 12% grade was going to contribute to the velocity of the storm water running down the road and cause it to wash over the drain towards Lagoon Pond Road. G. Sourati mentioned that they could not add another drain below the 13 ft. elevation (groundwater). He recommended adding a similar trench further up the drive at the proposed elevation of 24 ft. C. Ello

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 14, 2017

believed it was the better solution because it would reduce the volume of water heading towards the lower stretch of the drive.

C. Doble inquired about their plans to control runoff from the abutting properties. G. Sourati mentioned that they've had extensive discussions on the topic and decided to add pavement, six inches higher than the Cape Cod berm. They were going to pitch the pavement towards the in slope. The buffer in addition was going to be predominantly wooded with some plantings. B. Robinson inquired about the landscaping. B. Robinson inquired further about one of the corners. C. Ello noted that there was a fair amount of existing vegetation. G. Sourati referred the Board to the planting plans i.e. Site Plan No. L5.2. C. Ello noted that the plans were missing a whole section. He explained that the plans would have illustrated a mix of new and existing vegetation.

C. Doble inquired about the surface for the handicap accessible walkways. G. Sourati replied concrete. C. Ello added that it was a combination of concrete and concrete aggregate, depending on the location of the walkways (i.e. concrete with a sandblasted finish, polymer aggregate). They met the handicap accessibility requirements. C. Doble inquired if the winding path was ADA compatible. C. Ello replied in the negative. He added that the front stairs were not wheelchair accessible, but that in discussions with the Building Inspector, he decided to make it handicap accessible all the way out to the overlook by the flagpole, and then potentially create a fully accessible slope walk that intermingled with the terraces. The latter idea was plan for the future. B. Robinson inquired about the landscape plan for the front lawn. C. Ello indicated that it would remain a meadow. P. Wallis was not introducing any landscaping in the area abutting the pond and road, but hoped that in the long range, it could be a walk and bike crossing. G. Sourati noted that they were planning a wooden walk with handrails in the interim.

H. Stephenson noted that they had not discussed where the buses were going to drop off patrons. C. Doble advised her that they had a drop off lane on the north arm of the loop to stage one bus at a time. The MV Commission did not allow them to stage buses on Lagoon Pond Road. H. Stephenson was concerned about managing school buses. P. Wallis made arrangements with the high school, during the high volume months to stage the access buses in their parking lot. In a simulated exercise, the buses waiting time was only eight minutes.

C. Doble thought they should provide bike racks close to the road. P. Wallis replied that they had one rack at the base of the hill and another near the Vehicles & Vessels building at the edge of the road. She suggested adding another at the bottom of the hill. P. Wallis indicated that he would, but wanted to wait to see if there was a demand.

H. Stephenson inquired if they would consider adding a kayak landing. B. Robinson noted that people kayaked in the area often. P. Wallis agreed. H. Stephenson inquired if they've considered opening the grounds to the public for use as a park. She explained that the community currently used the premises to view the fireworks in Oak Bluffs, hot summer evenings, etc. She questioned if they were locking the premises. P. Wallis replied that he had not considered the possibility at this juncture of the planning phase, but believed that if it

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 14, 2017

was considered they had to implement some measure of security for a variety of reasons. Their vision was to make the interior very public. It was the reason for having a large community room, open conference room and café. He was hoping that it could be as much of an island park as possible, while generating the revenues they needed to sustain the operation. How they accomplished this required further thought. H. Stephenson recommended a system similar by Huntington Gardens, CA where a community membership allowed residents the ability to enjoy the gardens before the facilities opened to the general public. Additional discussions ensued with this regard and B. Robinson thought they could make the sloped area more of a public space in the long term. P. Wallis agreed.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired if they were going to continue the discussions on the landscape design in further detail. B. Robinson replied in the affirmative, and believed they could discuss the landscape in further detail when the applicant's representatives returned with a sketch of the 80 ft. – 90 ft. sidewalk connector on Lagoon Pond Road, the Fire Chief's requirements and comment, and the screening and landscape design.

P Wallis was uncertain about what they could do with the sidewalk connector since they did not own the land. B. Robinson suspected that the Town would have to issue them a Memorandum of Understanding to allow them to secure the permits and construction rights.

C. Ello inquired if the Planning Board was expecting them to pursue the architectural plans, permits and MOU for the sidewalk connector before they gave them an approval for the current project. B. Robinson replied in the negative, and explained that he was just interested in a conceptual design. C. Ello offered to provide the Planning Board with new planting plans, information on the walkway surfaces, and renderings of the landscape buffers for their next discussion.

There being no further discussion, B. Robinson recommended scheduling the continuation of the discussions on June 28, 2017 at 5:30 PM. He asked G. Sourati, if he felt it was sufficient time, given that he was waiting to hear from the Fire Chief. G. Sourati replied in the affirmative, noting that if he did not receive a response from the Fire Chief he would notify the Planning Board and ask for another appointment.

6:55 PM George Sourati re: Alternate access on 55 Church Street (curb cut)

G. Sourati submitted a property line survey of 55 Church Street depicting the location of the house, shed, and septic system (tank and leaching field). The plan included other details, such as the concrete sidewalk, telephone pole, and two assigned parking spaces. He explained that he was asked to design a curb cut on the property that would allow a car or truck to navigate a three point turn to prevent the vehicle from backing out of the property into the road.

As per the site plan, G Sourati was proposing to eliminate the handicap ramp next to the lilac hedge that separated the abutting parking spaces. H. Stephenson did not think the area was wide enough to accommodate a car. M. Loberg thought they might have to remove the

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 14, 2017

hedge. C. Doble inquired about the applicant's reason(s) for abandoning the use of the existing alley. The potential buyer did not want enter the house from the rear through the kitchen. C. Doble thought a walk to the front door was a simpler solution.

G. Sourati noted that the curb cut was designed to accommodate a 7 ft. wide X 18 ft. long truck. He ran a simulation to demonstrate that an average driver could easily navigate the three point turn. H. Stephenson inquired if the Planning Board had the ability not to approve the proposal, if in their opinion they believed the design was a bad idea. B. Robinson replied in the affirmative. He clarified for the record that the Planning Board was asked for an advisory opinion from the DPW Director who had the only authority to approve or deny the request.

G. Sourati referred to the property's deed restriction which listed Church Street as its address, and assumed they utilized Howland Lane for access when they added the handicap ramp. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if the property owner would consider accessing the property from Church Street and exiting from the rear on Howland Lane. G. Sourati explained that they couldn't because of the location of the septic system. H. Stephenson agreed with C. Doble and favored the use of a walkway from the rear to the front of the house. She did not see why the applicant would prefer destroying the front lawn and the view to the house from the street to park a car. G. Sourati advised the Board that the applicant was open to suggestions. C. Doble understood that H. Stephenson was concerned that the front lawn was going to become another parking lot similar to the abutting property.

C. Doble recommended using crushed stone for the driveway and reinforced turf for the lawn to preserve the aesthetics. B. Robinson recommended parking the car further back beyond the front edge of the covered porch, about an additional five feet. D. Bellante-Holand noted that the house currently had two apartments and an office. She asked if the buyer was going to revert the use of the building to a single family residence. G. Sourati was of the impression that it was a single family residence. D. Bellante-Holand agreed that the additional parking space up front would detract from the charm of the house. It did not help that the abutting property had two parking spaces right next to the proposed parking area, or that the tennis courts had several parking spaces across the street. It was going to destroy the character of the neighborhood.

H. Stephenson inquired if the lilac hedge was being removed. G. Sourati replied in the affirmative. It was being replaced with a fence. He offered to explore other plantings to replace the hedge. Henry Stephenson did not believe the applicant's request qualified as a hardship or handicap to require the introduction of a new curb cut, when they already had access from the rear. Many people access their home from the kitchen. Their preference to enter their home from the living room did not justify the removal of the lilac hedge, the front lawn and the negative impact it would have on the character of the street. He recommended that they not issue the DPW Director a favorable advisory opinion.

G. Sourati noted that he had designed an access from which one could pull into safely , park and pull out of safely. The DPW Director did not have an issue with the design, and was

JUNE 14, 2017

prepared to approve the plan, pending the Planning Board's advisory opinion. H. Stephenson spoke against the addition of a curb cut. She thought it made it look like a back lot with the three point driveway. B. Robinson asked the Board if they felt they had sufficient information to formulate an advisory opinion on the request for a curb cut. H. Stephenson was prepared to vote against the curb cut because she felt it was unnecessary and bad for the "village". C. Doble did not believe the additional curb cut was necessary. She did not like it, but felt they were obligated to vote in favor of the proposal. D. Bellante-Holand thought it would be advantageous to do site inspection as a group to see how the curb cut would impact the property and neighborhood.

B. Robinson thought the final location of the car was important, so that it would be better to park the car further back. The loss of the lilac hedge was an important consideration because it reduced the visual impact of the abutting parking spaces. D. Bellante-Holand thought it was important to include some plan to replace the vegetation. Additional discussions ensued, and B. Robinson asked the Board members for a date and time to schedule the site visit. Board members agreed to June 28, 2017 at 5PM at 55 Church Street.

B. Robinson asked that Ray Tattersall be invited to site inspection and meeting for the discussion.

7:30 PM Darren Reubens and Peter Breese (Breese Architects) : Public Hearing - Special Permit Application: The Net Result, AP 09B19.1-.3 (Second floor addition/office & storage)

Hearing commenced in due form at 7:20 PM. B. Robinson, Planning Board Chairman read the public hearing notice into the minutes and introduced the Board members. Board members were advised that the applicants were proposing to add 30 sq. ft. in the southwest corner of the first floor, and a second floor addition (720 sq. ft.) within the existing footprint.

B. Robinson advised the Board that the applicant was referred to the MV Commission because it was the subject of a previous DRI. At the LUPC meeting, the committee decided that they were not recommending a concurrence vote. They did however express a concern about the tree on Beach Road. Board members were advised that they received an email from Maura Valley, the Tisbury Health Agent stating that that the second floor addition did not trigger a request for an increase in flow for the building, but that it may have to be revisited if the applicant increased the number of employees. B. Robinson inquired if the applicant intended to hire additional staff. D. Reubens replied in the negative. He explained that the additional area was strictly for office space and storage.

D. Reubens noted that the project received the Conservation Commission's approval, and that of the Site Plan Review. B. Robinson requested a copy of the minutes. D. Reubens referred the Board to the architectural plans he had submitted with the application to illustrate the location of the small addition in the office on the first floor. It was to accommodate the staircase leading to the new second floor addition (720 sq. ft) for

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 14, 2017

additional storage and office space. Board members reviewed the 3D rendering of the addition from the street view. H. Stephenson inquired if the addition would impact the existing footprint. B. Robinson replied that the applicant was expanding the footprint in the southeast corner. D. Reubens explained that they were still meeting the 4 ft. side yard requirement with the addition.

The job details for the first floor addition required the replacement of the existing foundation with footings to support a slab (on grade). P. Breese confirmed that it was new construction from the ground up, but that the modifications were within the existing footprint. D. Reubens reported that the MV Commission's comments have been favorable. They felt the two story addition added dimension to an otherwise flat form, and reduced the length of the building. Board members concurred. D. Reubens noted that the Commissioners at the LUPC did express some concern about the fate of the locust tree. D. Reubens spoke with the applicant about the tree and noted that they essentially had two options. The first was to prune the tree and the second was to replace it with a more attractive tree. The applicant favored the latter. D. Reubens provided copies of a maple tree that graced his office, and thought it was a beautiful solution to the locust tree.

B. Robinson was of the impression that the tree was slated to be removed as part of the Beach Road improvements. D. Reubens reviewed the MassDOT's 75% design plan to find that both locust trees were being protected during the reconstruction of Beach Road. C. Doble inquired about the applicant's preference. P. Breese replied that locust trees were less desirable because of their maintenance. B. Robinson added that they did not do well in that location. D. Bellante-Holand asked what the issue(s) were for this particular type of tree. D. Reubens replied that they dropped leaves year round and created a maintenance issue for the roof. P. Breese noted that the canopy of the maple tree in front of their office was much more contained. B. Robinson noted that it was also a very young tree. Once it grew, the branches would spread out. D. Reubens requested recommendations from the Planning Board. C. Doble thought they could provide the applicant with a list of potential trees for the sight. B. Robinson thought they could send the MV Commission a letter indicating that they were addressing the tree. P. Breese asked D. Reubens if the MV Commission was looking to the Planning Board for their input on the matter. B. Robinson clarified for the record that the Planning Board could not make a determination on the application until after the MV Commission voted on their referral. They could issue the Commission a letter advising them that they were considering several options by which to address their concerns about the locust tree.

B. Robinson recommended moving on to the Site Plan Review Board's comments and suggestions. He noted that they had some issues with the width of the upper windows. They were narrower than the existing windows. They also had a question regarding the location of the corner windows. The Site Plan Review Board suggested having three wider windows at the far left instead of the group of five, and pulling in the corner windows in the side elevations. They did not make any recommendations for the rear of the building because they never received a plan.

P. Breese explained that the configuration was based on proportion and dimension. He wanted to address the stretched out horizontal proportion of building, and decided on a more slender unit. The corner windows allowed for a more three dimensional effect similar to the cupola. They also had to understand that the roof of the existing building did not allow for a window at the same sill height unless it was fairly close to the corner. B. Robinson noted that the corner boards looked like the casing for the corner windows. P. Breese mentioned that he continued the detailing of the existing building to include the corner boards in both sides of the addition.

D. Reubens mentioned that the MV Commission thought the addition enhanced the existing structure. P. Breese thought the design was respectful of the existing building. D. Bellante-Holand respected the architect's comments and did not feel there was a reason to make any alterations to the proposal. She liked the position of the windows, and imagined that from the interior one would enjoy a panoramic view of the harbor.

P. Breese noted that the structure behind the addition was a taller two-story gable building that exceeded the height of the addition.

B. Robinson inquired if there was an alternate location for the new tree, if they decided to replace the locust tree. Any tree in the current location would detract from the views out to the harbor from the second floor. P. Breese preferred doing the project properly by removing both trees and planting them at the entrance. He thought it would connect the landscape with the architecture. He wanted to find a species that will not flow in its canopy over the roof. B. Robinson thought it would be helpful to know what the applicant is willing to spend on the trees relative to caliper size. It was important to know the species and size for the continuation of the discussions. He also thought they could just leave the locust trees in place during the construction, and then have them replaced. D. Reubens agreed with B. Robinson's recommendation. It made sense to prune the trees for the present until the construction of the road was completed in 2019.

There being no further comment, B Robinson recommended continuing the public hearing on June 28, 2017, at which time he expected the MV Commission would make a determination on their referral.

C. Doble moved to continue the hearing on June 28, 2017 at 6:30 PM. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0 The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled meeting at 8:10 PM.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSIONS:**

1. Karen Burke, Reynolds, Rappaport, Kaplan & Hackney, LLC (or George Sourati)  
RE: Alternate access on 55 Church Street (curb cut)

2. Tisbury Planning Board

A. Committee Reports – None provided



## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 14, 2017

B. FY 2018 Projects – Bylaw Amendments,

C. Tisbury Government Study Panel (Board's Representative)

M. Loberg reported that the Study Panel was co-authored by Lynne Fraker and Deborah Medders via petition for the purpose of evaluating the executive branch of town government. L. Fraker and other town residents felt that the communication, sharing of information and decision making process was limited to a small number of persons, that did not reflect the overall town residents' interests in the local government's operations or management.

B. Robinson noted that the town moderator was responsible for selecting four of the seven members composing the study panel. The Board of Selectmen, the Planning Board and the Finance & Advisory Committee were each allowed to select a representative from the community. He asked M. Loberg if the Board of Selectmen were going to solicit volunteers from the community, and if the town residents responding to the ad were available to the Planning Board and Finance & Advisory Committee. M. Loberg did not see an issue passing along potential candidates. D. Bellante-Holand thought it more advantageous to use the one advertisement, due to the cost.

The Planning Board Assistant inquired if there was any information about the study panel's scope of address, meeting schedule, and time frame to provide interested parties. M. Loberg replied that there was a one page document that was submitted with the petition that the Town Administrator was given by the town moderator.

C. Doble was concerned that L. Fraker did not provide the town voters with a more structured presentation of the idea. M. Loberg advised the Board that the study panel was plagued with other issues, in addition to the lack of funds for a budget, and clerical support.

Other discussions ensued and it was suggested that the Planning Board could place an ad in the local papers to solicit a volunteer from the community. D. Bellante-Holand reiterated that ads were expensive. Unless there was a reason why they couldn't pursue a group ad, it did not make sense to her to have several ads. C. Doble thought she could approach the Vision Council. D. Bellante-Holand supported the recommendation. B. Robinson agreed and entertained a motion. C. Doble moved to solicit the Planning Board's representative on the study panel from the Vision Council. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion. C. Doble requested a copy of the study panel's mission statement to develop the ad.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired if there was a timeframe by which the Planning Board was required to appoint their candidate. M. Loberg did not know.

3. Tisbury Elementary School Building Committee

RE: Letter

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 14, 2017

B. Robinson reported that he was advised to send all correspondence regarding this project to the project manager and not the MSBA. C. Doble recommended adding the architects. B. Robinson did not have an issue sending the letter to all of the individuals that are involved in the project. The most important note on the subject was that the school committee voted to eliminate the Manter Well site from further consideration. M. Loberg and Henry Stephenson heard that some of the committee members were reconsidering their vote.

M. Loberg inquired about the school building committee's meeting schedule and received a text message from C. McAndrews confirming that they had scheduled a meeting on June 19, 2017 and did not anticipate the need for another meeting in the month of June, unless they did not vote on the schematic design. C. McAndrews was of the impression that the school building committee was prepared to make a decision. M. Loberg questioned their ability to accomplish this in one evening. B. Robinson thought it was premature, and demonstrative of the school building committee's failure to engage in a more deliberative process on reviewing their options.

Henry Stephenson agreed with the Board. It concerned him that the architects were discussing the possibilities for a renovation and addition and the construction of a building in the eastern corner of the site. He drew a schematic of a new building in the eastern corner, and discovered that it was disastrous. The prime location was at the crest of the hill on site, where the existing school building was situated. The one option however required them to tear down the existing school building, which the school building committee members did not want, because of the inconvenience to the teachers. Henry Stephenson reviewed the diagrams, and thought they needed to be much more comprehensive to qualify as schematics. He felt the school building committee members and consultants should be engaging in some dialogue with other town departments, such as the Planning Board, before they formally present their proposals and make any decision on their plans.

C. Doble observed that many of the members of the school building committee did not know what to ask. They often failed to raise any questions or hold in-depth discussions with the consultants, except to express their preference for a specific site or option. The consultants contributed to the problem by failing to explain the ideas that guided their designs or initiating any discussions about the relationship of the building to the surrounding context, site analysis, etc.

H. Stephenson inquired if anyone knew whether D. Seidman would be available to attend the school building committee's meeting on June 19<sup>th</sup>. If he was unable to make the meeting she recommended having B. Robinson represent the Planning Board. It was her impression that the committee would benefit from having an architect on board. It was suggested that the topic could be addressed at a future meeting.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired if C. Doble thought they should synthesize their conversation and present the fact that they were concerned at this stage of the process,

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 14, 2017

that they've not vetted out the details required to produce a design. M. Loberg thought they could mention the fact that the timeframe for the review process had been so condensed that they've not been given much time to explore their options. She also felt they needed a committee with experience in design, architecture, and construction to converse with the consultants so that the town's interests were factored into the project.

Additional discussions ensued, and B Robinson asked the Board if they wanted to communicate with the school building. Board members replied in the affirmative. B. Robinson thought they should clearly specify their concerns with the committee's ability to function properly. D. Bellante-Holand thought they could write the letter in a more positive tone, such as a recommendation for the next step. H. Stephenson thought they should let them know that their timeframe may not be realistic. It did not allow them sufficient time to review the plans to make a determination. Other discussions ensued, and D. Bellante-Holand recommended that they focus on the topic. She asked the Board if they were interested in sending the school building committee letter, and if so, she offered to draft a letter for the Planning Board.

B. Robinson was willing to entertain a motion to have two Planning Board members collaborate on a draft letter, and asked for volunteers. C. Doble offered to work with D. Bellante-Holand. D. Bellante-Holand noted that she was available to work with C. Doble this Thursday and Friday. B. Robinson believed the Board had to endorse the letter, and recommended continuing their meeting on Friday, 16 June 2017 at 2 PM to review the draft letter for an endorsement. H. Stephenson seconded the motion. The Board moved the motion. 4/0/0 B. Robinson asked that C. Doble send a copy of the draft to the members prior to the meeting.

## 4. IHT collaboration

RE: Discussion

B. Robinson advised the Board that he wanted an opportunity to speak with P. Jordi about IHT's mission relative to Tisbury's affordable housing needs. He wanted to know more about IHT's parameters in the development of private property. C. Doble noted that IHT has been working on new structures until recently when he asked for assistance on a parcel of land that was already developed. She thought it was important to explore how the town could collaborate on projects with IHT that were of mutual interest.

B. Robinson wanted to schedule a meeting with P. Jordin within a month, because it was possible that the discussions may include potential bylaw amendments that they need to begin addressing.

## 5. Infrastructure Steering Committee

RE: Coordinating the implementation of projects, complete streets, CPC funding etc.

B. Robinson felt that the town had to create an administrative structure that was going to be responsible for implementing the recommendations of the Parking Committee and

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 14, 2017

following through on the Complete Street program to make sure that they applied for the funds before they were no longer available.

B. Robinson explained that he wanted to feel comfortable that the town will be able to complete the projects. C. Doble did not believe the Planning Board was in the position to guide implementation. She felt town staff should be held responsible for the procurement, and implementation of the projects. M. Loberg agreed. B. Robinson felt they had to have a process in place, whereby staff is informed about upcoming projects, funding, time limits, etc.

M. Loberg recommended contacting the Town Administrator to ask that he invite a member from the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board to an infrastructure meeting, where they can discuss and develop a mechanism by which they could delegate the responsibility of the projects from the subcommittees to the departments.

B. Robinson offered to discuss the topic with the town administrator for the purpose of scripting out some process that the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board can review for implementation.

**CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:**

1. John Grande, Town Administrator

RE: Taxation of Marijuana Task Force (Board representative)

The Planning Board Assistant provided the Board with a copy of the Town Administrator's email asking for a board representative on the new task force. Questions about the task force's mandate, time frame, meeting schedule, composition, etc. were not addressed in the email.

A request for a volunteer from the board was not answered. B. Robinson recommended revisiting the request at their next meeting to give the board members an opportunity to reconsider.

2. Tisbury Board of Appeals

A. Special Permit #2283 – Whit Hanschka & Nancy Tutco, AP 04B03 expansion of pre-existing, non-conforming shed)

B. Special Permit #2284 – Paul D. Adler, AP 24A24.2 (12 ft. high fence)

3. MV Commission

A. 09 June 2017 Extended Schedule

B. DRI 665- MV Museum at Marine Hospital

4. Oak Bluffs Planning Board

RE: Hearing Notice – Gary Harcourt, AP 26-5 (Petition to reconsider conditions)

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

**PRO FORM**

Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 9:25P.M.  
(m/s/c 4/0/0)  
Respectfully submitted;

---

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

**APPROVAL:**

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

---

Date

---

Benjamin Robinson  
Chairman