

# 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 28, 2017

**TIME:** 5:23 PM

**PLACE:** 55 Church Street, Vineyard Haven, MA and  
Town Hall Annex, 66 High Point Lane, Tisbury, MA

**BILLS:** Lilian Robinson.....\$100.00

**ATTENDANCE:** D. Bellante-Holand, C. Doble, B. Robinson, H. Stephenson and D. Seidman

**MINUTES:** As referred in the June 14, 2017 Meeting Agenda  
17 May 2017 Deferred  
31 May 2017 Deferred  
14 June 2017 Deferred

### APPOINTMENTS:

5:23 PM Site Visit, 55 Church Street, Vineyard Haven MA (request for curb cut)  
Attendance: George Sourati, Russell Burrows (abutter), and Lee Wainwright (abutter), Ray Tattersall, DPW Dir.

Board members, H. Stephenson, C. Doble and B. Robinson met with G. Sourati and a couple abutters at 55 Church Street for a site inspection. They were advised that G. Sourati had revised the site plan to address the Planning Board's concerns pertaining to the removal of the lilac hedge, the parking area's visual impact on the property and abutting parcel; and the location of the curb cut.

G. Sourati noted that his clients had agreed to remove 26.5" from the side porch, the handicap ramp and steps to widen the parking area, so that they could save the lilac hedge. The additional land area allowed for a deeper parking space, so that the property owner could back up far enough to align the frontend of the car with the edge of the front porch to screen the car. The front lawn was going to be replaced with reinforced turf to hold up to the vehicular traffic, and the existing curb cut was going to be moved and widened.

JUNE 28, 2017

B. Robinson noted that the manhole appeared to be within the turning radius. G. Sourati confirmed that it was, and could not say for certain if he was going to move it further back or reinforce it with a concrete vault and metal cover. B. Robinson inquired about the surface material for the driveway. G. Sourati replied gravel. B. Robinson advised the Board that the applicant had to replace the sidewalk when they remove the existing handicap ramp. G. Sourati noted that he was given the town's specifications for the sidewalk by the DPW Dir.

H. Stephenson inquired about the zoning district's frontage requirement. B. Robinson replied 80 ft. H. Stephenson noted that the property only had 49 ft. of frontage. She felt the parcel was too narrow to accommodate a parking space. She did not understand why they would entertain the curb cut, if the property owner already had sufficient parking area in the back yard. D. Bellante-Holand arrived at 5:25 PM and was brought up to speed on the applicant's revised proposal.

B. Robinson inquired if they planned to trim the hedge. He thought if they trimmed the hedge a bit they could gain a foot or more of space for the parking area. G. Sourati replied in the affirmative.

Board members inquired about the width of the curb cut. G. Sourati replied fifteen ft. from the street. R. Tattersall recommended hiring PNP Masonry for the sidewalk since they constructed the majority of the sidewalks in town. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if the abutters had the ability to comment on the proposal or share their concerns. R. Burrows was concerned about the driveway's use as a drive-thru. He also wanted to know where they planned to move the utility pole. G. Sourati noted that the potential buyers planned to abandon the use of Howland Lane and fence off the back yard. The location of the septic system on the property prevented anyone from using the side yard as a drive through.

There being no further comment, B. Robinson recommended recessing the meeting for fifteen minutes to give the board members time to reconvene at the Town Hall Annex for the continuation of these discussions. C. Doble so moved. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 4/0/0 The time was 5:30 PM

The Board members reconvened their regularly scheduled meeting at the Town Hall Annex at 5:45 PM to continue the discussions on an application for a curb cut at 55 Church Street. D. Seidman, Planning Board Chairman joined the Board. K. Burke, the applicant's attorney was also present at the Annex for the discussion.

B. Robinson informed D. Seidman of the applicant's revised plan and of the discussions at the site visit. He added that the abutters were concerned about the driveway's use as a drive-through, but was advised by the engineer, G. Sourati that the potential property owners were fencing off the backyard.

C. Doble's only concern was that the property owners over time would abandon the turn around to back out on the road due to the convenience. Nothing prevented them from cutting back the hedge to give them the sight distance they needed to see oncoming traffic.

D. Seidman noted that very few lots in the immediate area had parking spaces up front, but that they had sufficient frontage to accommodate them. It concerned him that they were proposing to introduce a curb cut on a very narrow lot. H. Stephenson agreed. She felt the lot was non-conforming in a very relevant way. It explained why they had the existing parking area in the back yard. G. Sourati commented that R. Tattersall, the DPW Dir. believed the revised proposal was functional and safe. The revisions he implemented addressed the Board's request to save the lilac hedge, to reduce the view of the car from the street and to preserve the front lawn. The applicants were able to accomplish this by reducing the size of their side porch. B. Robinson thought the plan he presented was a good solution to get a curb cut on the street, but felt they should debate the merit of allowing a curb cut on a substandard lot. He agreed that the lot was rather small, but that it was in a historic district where similar lots existed and had curb cuts. H. Bellante-Holand noted that the Vineyard Playhouse lot was an example. H. Stephenson mentioned that the applicant's already had access and parking from Howland Lane. G. Sourati reminded the Board that they were removing the existing handicap curb cut on Church Street and simply relocating it.

Additional discussions ensued, and B. Robinson asked the Board if they believed they had sufficient information to make a recommendation to the DPW Director. There being no further discussion, B. Robinson entertained a motion. C. Doble recommended that the changes that had been made addressed the primary issues held by the Planning Board so that they were prepared to make a favorable recommendation on the application for the curb cut, with the understanding that it was not going to be developed as a drive-through. H. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried. 3/2/0

5:58 PM Michael Thomkins VLS&E Re: Form A Application for Vineyard House Inc.,  
AP 22A06

M. Thomkins submitted a revised Form A Plan of Land creating a 2.54 non-building lot for the purpose of conveying the land area to the abutter, the Goodale Construction Company that originally sold the applicant the land to accommodate a septic system. B. Robinson advised the Board that the applicant was referred to the MV Commission for their review for being a previous DRI.

P. Foley, the DRI Coordinator at the MV Commission wrote the Planning Board that the Commissioners did not find proposal to represent a significant change to warrant a full Commission review as a DRI. Said letter is part of the applicant's application to the Board. B. Robinson informed the Board that they received a second letter from Brian Mackey, the President of the Vineyard House's Board of Directors, dated 12 June 2017 confirming that the drainage system that was designed and approved for the housing project was installed by DRE Excavation.

P. Harris informed the Board that they had to render two determinations. The first pertained to the Form A division of land, and the second pertained to the need to amend their special permit, because the decision hinged on the acreage. The Groundwater Protection District

JUNE 28, 2017

bylaw requires a groundwater recharge system that protects the groundwater quality for any use the renders land impervious by more than 15% or 2500 sq. ft. M. Thomkins agreed that the proposal changed the acreage, but that it no bearing on the storm water management system for the residential use. The storm water is controlled on the site the Vineyard House occupies. The additional land that is under consideration was specifically for the septic system. The applicant no longer needed the land because they were connected to the town's sewer system.

D. Seidman inquired about the land, the applicant was returning to Goodales. M. Thomkins replied that they were severing 1.89 acres from the existing 4.43 acres. D. Seidman and D. Bellante-Holand calculated that change in the lot coverage of impervious surfaces with the reduction in the land area. B. Robinson reported that the lot coverage of impermeable surfaces was closer to 5% when they eliminated the parking spaces, sidewalks and the square footage for Short Hill Road, because none of them were paved as originally proposed. He further noted that since the storm water management system was not impacted by the land the applicant was parceling off, he did not believe the applicant was required to amend their special permit.

There being no further discussion, B. Robinson entertained a motion. D. Seidman moved to endorse the Form A Plan of Land as presented. C. Doble seconded the motion, which motion carried. 5/0/0

M. Thomkins did not provide the Planning Board four hard copies of the plan, and was asked to submit four signed copies for the Board's records.

6:08 PM Holly Stephenson re: Resignation

H. Stephenson informed the Board that she had decided to resign from her post as Planning Board members as of this evening. She offered to remain on Board to conclude any business, which required her vote, but did not want to participate on new projects.

B. Robinson inquired if she would reconsider her decision. H. Stephenson replied in the negative. Board members bade her farewell.

6:09 PM Public Hearing: Special Permit Application Re: Larkin Reeves, AP 09C01  
Attendance: John Lolley, Robert Sawyer, and ???

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:09 PM. Planning Board Chairman, B. Robinson informed the applicants and their representative of H. Holly's recent resignation and the unavailability of a five member board. They were advised of their options. They could open the hearing process with the four members, understanding that the approval would require a unanimous consent (4/0/0). If they did not want to proceed with four members, their option was to postpone the process until they acquired a fifth member. The Planning Board indicated that they planned to advertise the vacancy on the board as soon as possible.

JUNE 28, 2017

J. Lolley recommended that they proceed with the four members. R. Sawyer requested a clarification. B. Robinson explained that all four members had to be present for all of the discussions. If this was not feasible they'd have to continue the hearing until all four were present. The fifth member would allow them to continue the process even if one of the members missed a session. D. Seidman clarified that they had to solicit a volunteer from the community to replace H. Stephenson, and they could not predict how long it would take for someone to come forward.

J. Lolley inquired if they could resubmit the application with revisions, if their proposal was denied. D. Seidman believed they could not resubmit the proposal to the board if it was denied before a two year period. J. Lolley noted that they were before the MV Commission. He inquired if they could proceed with the Commission's review process separately from the Planning Board's permitting process. B. Robinson replied in the affirmative, and explained that they could review the application, but were unable to render a determination until the MV Commission voted on their proposal.

D. Seidman recommended postponing the review process until they had a five member board present. Additional discussions ensued and R. Sawyer advised the Board that he preferred waiting to review the application with a five member board.

B. Robinson recommended continuing the public hearing on August 2, 2017. C. Doble advised the board that she was not going to be available on August 2<sup>nd</sup>. B. Robinson recommended continuing the hearing on July 19, 2017 at 6:30 PM. If the applicant's review process was still on-going, they will continue the hearing. The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 6:16 PM.

6:33 PM        Darren Reubens and Peter Breese (Breese Architects): Public Hearing (Cont.) -  
Special Permit Application: The Net Result, AP 09B19.1-.3 (Second floor  
addition/office & storage)  
Attendance: ME Larsen, M. Loberg

The continuation of the public hearing commenced in due form at 6:33 PM. B. Robinson, Planning Board Chairman read the MV Commission's letter dated 27 June 2017 remanding the applicant's referral to the Planning Board because the proposal to renovate unit 1 of Building A to add a 720 sq. ft. addition for office and storage space did not warrant a public hearing review as a DRI. He added that the Planning Board received a revised site plan (with landscape), dated 21 June 2017 (Plan Nos. AO.1 & AO.2) for tonight's discussions, reflecting the removal of the one locust tree and the addition of two red maple trees.

D. Seidman and B. Robinson referred to the MassDOT's 75% Design plan for Beach Road and confirmed that the two locust trees were on the Tisbury Marketplace's property and earmarked for protection during the construction of the road improvements to Beach Road.

D. Reubens explained that the tree canopy of the locust tree on the northeast boundary line extended to the abutting building's roof. To control the damage to the roof, and its maintenance,

JUNE 28, 2017

they had to prune the tree. Due to the size of the tree, they had to prune the tree substantially, which would throw it off balance. That was when they decided that it was best to replace the species altogether in favor of a maple tree. In order to maintain the symmetry in the urban landscape they had to add two trees and decided to bring them in closer to the center of the property to draw the attention to the storefront's entrance.

H. Stephenson inquired if the applicant was considering a specific caliper, because she did not think a young tree would be adequate. D. Reubens concurred, and noted that the applicant intimated that he was willing to invest in mature trees. B. Robinson noted that maples did well in fresh water. He was curious to know if they would survive and thrive in a saltwater environment. D. Reubens did not find anything in the literature on the tree to state that it did not. B. Robinson recommended obtaining a second opinion from an arborist, because he struggled to find any maple trees on the island along the shore line. D. Reubens inquired if the Planning Board would consider recommending an alternative type of tree, if the maple tree was found not to be an alternative. B. Robinson further noted that the state was adding locust trees to the streetscape down the road along Winds Up as part of their road improvement, for consistency. He liked the idea that they were proposing two trees.

C. Doble did not have an issue with the choice in trees because they appeared more like a marker or gateway to the front entrance that was different from the streetscape. Her concern was concerned about the flooding in the area and its impact on the maple trees. It could explain the state's reason for preferring locust trees. They were a very tough species. B. Robinson noted that maple trees also grew big, so that they would reproduce the situation. D. Seidman inquired about the canopy. D. Reubens replied that the tree canopy had grown approximately fifteen feet into the building. C. Doble thought they could prune the tree down a bit, and keep it in place during the Beach Road construction, then replace the tree, if it was necessary. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if she understood the Board correctly to state that they favored pruning as the initial step, but were open to replacement trees with a species that was hardy enough to withstand saltwater intrusion.

B. Robinson asked the Board if they wanted the applicant to provide additional information on the viability of a red maple or list it as a condition. D. Bellante-Holand questioned the need, if in pruning the trees; they negated the need for two new trees. B. Robinson believed they could address this in the form of a condition during deliberations. D. Reubens assured the Board that the applicant was committed to addressing the situation by complying with the Board's preference, because the property owner was interested in improving the aesthetics. B. Robinson thought pruning the tree could be the first option, and waiting to see how the tree survives the road construction before determining whether they will need to replace the tree.

There being no further discussion, B. Robinson entertained a motion to close the public hearing and enter into deliberations. C. Doble so moved. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/1 D. Seidman abstained from the vote not having participated in the first hearing.

6:47 PM      Deliberations - Special Permit Application: The Net Result, AP 09B19.1-.3

The deliberation of the previously closed public hearing was duly opened at 6:47 PM. B. Robinson inquired if the Board had any impressions on the overall proposal. He asked the Board if they were prepared to vote on the proposal.

D. Bellante-Holand moved to approve the issuance of a special permit for the two story addition to the Net Result as presented at the previous hearing with conditions and restrictions. C. Doble seconded the motion. 4/0/0

B. Robinson referred the board to the draft outline for the decision the board's staff prepared for tonight's discussions, and added a finding regarding the locust trees. He recommended adding text stating that "The MassDOT plans on removing but replacing and adding locust trees for a continuity of the streetscape". He noted that the new trees were not going to be as mature as the trees that were going to be replaced.

B. Robinson did not have an issue with the project, but wanted to recommend to the applicant that he prune the trees during the construction of the addition. If the applicant opted to replace the locust tree he had to return to the Planning Board for the approval of the modification. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if they was a set of criteria the applicant had to meet. C. Doble agreed. She recommended adding language that qualified the modification, such as documentation of the species selection, based on the water (and soil) conditions of the site, the space available, etc.

B. Robinson inquired if the Board received a copy of the site plan illustrating the setbacks. He noted that the addition created non-conformity by inches. D. Bellante-Holand referred the Board to the second finding, which noted the existing non-conformity. D. Reubens verified that the new construction was conforming to the side yard setback. The addition was slightly angled relative to the property line. It was going to be slightly off-kiltered to satisfy dimensional requirement.

B. Robinson recommended amending Finding No. 2 to state that the addition will meet the sideyard setback requirement for the zoning district, and adding a condition clarifying that the two story addition will not increase the non-conformity of the existing building.

B. Robinson entertained a motion for the draft decision. C. Doble moved the revised decision which was to include a finding on the trees and a condition for the trees and conformity of the addition. D. Bellanted-Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0

C. Doble moved to close the deliberations, and D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion. The motion carried. 4/0/0 The Planning Board closed the deliberations at 7:05 PM

7:37 PM Marni Lipke Re: Accessory Apartments

M. Lipke indicated that she wanted to follow up on the last discussions and to periodically check in with the Board to keep abreast of any issues or concerns they may have with the

JUNE 28, 2017

proposal she submitted. B. Robinson understood, and explained that the Planning Board had discussed the development of a working group that would help move forward on the bylaw amendments. He mentioned speaking with L. Anthony Peak, a former Planning Board Chairman to inquire if he might have any interest in serving on the committee.

C. Doble believed the Planning Board should hire a consultant to help them with the process. She felt the consultant would be able to review their regulations, find the inconsistencies, and to lay out the framework they needed to shape their bylaw into a usable document they could subsequently amend. M. Lipke was concerned that the process would take years, which would force her to move off-island. C. Doble understood and did not foresee the process taking too long if they acquired the MV Commission's assistance.

M. Lipke was still interested in pursuing her proposal as part of the amendments into the zoning bylaw. B. Robinson understood, and explained that they had to recodify their regulations, before they could amend the bylaws. In regards to her proposed bylaw amendment, the Planning Board did not have sufficient time to address a couple of issues with her proposal before town meeting. The Planning Board could not decide whether the apartment should be deed restricted, registered as an affordable use or permitted as a matter of right if the apartment stayed within the existing footprint.

M. Lipke indicated that she understood that the apartment had to be overseen by the Duke County Regional Housing Authority to maintain its status as an affordable unit. The requirement ended when she submitted a physician's note attesting to the need of a caretaker. B. Robinson noted that the Planning Board could not write zoning to address a particular situation. They had to write it broad enough to create opportunities for "year round" affordable units.

B. Robinson thought they should invite Tony Peak and Adam Turner to their meeting on July 19<sup>th</sup> to discuss how the MV Commission could assist them with the services of a consultant. He also thought they should draft a list of the issues they want to address with them. He recommended preparing the list a week in advance of the meeting to give A. Turner and T. Peak the opportunity to prepare for the discussions. Board members agreed.

C. Doble noted that their ordinances were very prescriptive, and though they should explore what other communities have been incorporating into their regulations e.g. performance space zoning.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSIONS:**

1. Tisbury Planning Board
  - A. Committee reports
  - B. July Meeting Schedule – The Planning Board agreed to revise their meeting schedule for the month of July and decided not to meet on July 5, 2017.
  - C. Planning Board Draft Project List
  
2. Tisbury Government Study Panel

JUNE 28, 2017

RE: Planning Board Representative

H. Stephenson advised the Board that N. Orleans had resigned from the Parking Committee so that he could join the Government Study Panel. C. Doble understood that he had contacted the Planning Board's office to express an interest in serving on the study panel.

C. Doble indicated that she was preparing an advertisement to solicit interest from the Vision Council and N. Orleans was on the mailing list. She wanted the Board's feedback before she emailed the ad.

3. John Grande, Town Administrator

RE: Taxation of Marijuana Task Force (Board representative)

D. Seidman volunteered to represent the Planning Board on the task force if no one else was interested. B. Robinson solicited volunteers from the board, and there being none, other than D. Seidman, B. Robinson entertained a motion. C. Doble moved to appoint D. Seidman as the Planning Board's representative on the task force. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion. 5/0/0

H. Stephenson reminded the Board that there was a vacancy on the MV Land Bank Advisory Committee that needs to be filled.

4. Infrastructure Steering Committee

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

B. Robinson informed the Board that he, C. Doble and R. Tattersall were meeting with the town administrator on Monday, 03 July 2017 to discuss how they were going to move forward on infrastructure projects that have been funded. He felt they had to assign the projects to their professional staff to complete. R. Tattersall in previous informal discussions has indicated that he wanted to disband his advisory board and rely on the Planning Board's advisory opinion for certain planning projects, and curb cuts.

H. Stephenson thought it was wise to consult with the Planning Board about their parks. C. Doble has been working sporadically on an open space plan, but finds that she needs assistance. B. Robinson thought the Planning Board could be instrumental in developing a parks plan, and a maintenance program beyond the day to day maintenance. C. Doble agreed. H. Stephenson thought it was important to have a policy in place for the development, management and maintenance of their parks.

H. Stephenson also cautioned the Board against taking on additional projects that will create more work for their one staff member. They had to take their limitations into consideration before they make a commitment. It would not be fair to their department and staff. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if their opinions carried any consequences. B.

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JUNE 28, 2017

Robinson noted that their opinions were advisory, so that the responsibility for the final determination rested on the referring authority.

## 5. Tisbury Elementary School Building Committee

RE: Update

B. Robinson informed the Board that the Tisbury School Building Committee voted in favor of a new building on the school property. He understood that the Board of Selectmen had to certify the vote at an upcoming meet. D. Seidman asked M. Loberg if the Board of Selectmen had the ability not to certify the school committee's decision. M. Loberg did not believe they would vote against it.

B. Robinson recalled that the Tisbury School Building Committee (TSBC hereinafter) solicited \$500,000.00 from the Town in 2015 and has spent approximately \$200,000.00 for the feasibility study. He learned that the TSBC decided to go into recess until September 2017, at which time they will reconvene to discuss and design a final building plan for submittal in November 2017. B. Robinson thought the meeting schedule was extremely tight. He asked the Board if they thought it was worth investing in a special town meeting to solicit the public's opinion on the proposal before they went forward on the project and spent another \$200,000.00 of the town's funds. B. Robinson indicated that they can launch a citizen's petition which would require 200 signatures or ask the Board of Selectmen.

B. Robinson felt it was difficult to invest the time and energy to build a good school, if they did not know what the town was willing to support before town meeting. If he knew the town was supportive of demolishing the existing school building and constructing a new structure, he would approach the project differently. D. Seidman preferred not tearing the building down.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired about the TSBC's options if the Town voted against the demolition of the existing building. M. Loberg did not know. B. Robinson recalled when the school principal, John Custer was soliciting funds for the study; he mentioned that the town would be presented with two options. On reviewing the town meeting taped session, town voters voted with the belief that they were going to have choices, not just the one proposal.

B. Robinson was also concerned about the tight schedule the TSBC was giving itself to come up with a final design for the school. It was too short a period to come up with a good design. D. Bellante-Holand understood B. Robinson was recommending a special town meeting. She asked the Board if they were considering a petition or asking the Board of Selectmen. B. Robinson reiterated that he wanted a better sense from the community whether they are going to support the proposal to invest the time and effort the project demanded. D. Seidman recommended the citizen's petition.

JUNE 28, 2017

D. Bellante-Holand inquired about the petition, and asked for a clarification about what they were asking from the town residents and proposing to move forward on the project. She also inquired about the ramifications if the town residents opted against the current proposal. M. Loberg understood that the MSBA gave the TSBC 120 days to revote, but she questioned whether they could revamp the plans for a renovation/addition.

M. Lipke, at the Planning Board Chairman's request advised the Board that the architects were working on the design plans during the summer and part of the fall. It was her additional understanding that the architects were very interested in retaining parts of the old building. They understood the town's affection for the building, and were trying to incorporate the existing building's design into the new. They were not an insensitive firm.

Other discussions ensued, and M. Loberg recommended that the Planning Board invite the OPM, the architect and members of the TSBC to clarify the minimum standards, the process for variances, etc.

D. Bellante-Holand asked B. Robinson to clarify what he was asking of the Planning Board. B. Robinson replied that the TSBC stopped the town from commenting on the school design until September. C. Doble thought of writing the TSBC a letter expressing her concerns with the TSBC's recent vote allowing the architects to move forward on a design for two months without any communication with the TSBC. D. Bellante-Holand recommended addressing the two key issues (the construction of a new building without town input, and the thirty-five million budget) in the petition. M. Loberg supported the petition, because she felt it would persuade the Board of Selectmen to consider holding a special town meeting. M. Loberg advised the Board that the MSBA Board was meeting in August 2017. B. Robinson inquired if the Board of Selectmen had to certify the TSBC's vote. M. Loberg recommended attending the Board of Selectmen's meeting and making the inquiry.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired if they were stopping the entire process or simply stopping the TSBC from spending the remaining \$200,000.00. M. Loberg believed the latter. H. Stephenson asked the Planning Board if they could recommend to the Board of Selectmen that they not certify the TSBC's vote and call for a special town meeting. B. Robinson replied in the affirmation, and recommended that she enter a motion to that effect.

H. Stephenson moved to have B. Robinson represent the Planning Board at the Board of Selectmen's meeting to state their case about soliciting the town input on the viability of the TSBC's proposal for a new construction at the existing site. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried. m/s/c 3/0/2 C. Doble and D. Seidman abstained from the vote. Following these discussions, D. Seidman and M. Loberg left the meeting at 7:37 PM.

**CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:**

1. Brian Mackey, President (Board of Directors) – Vineyard House Inc.

RE: Drainage system installed by DRE Excavation as designed on 10/15/14

2. Oak Bluffs Planning Board

RE: Public Hearing Notice – Gary & Kathryn Harcourt, 10 Great Rock Road, OB

3. Tisbury Board of Appeals

A. Case #2287 – Anne M Eddy AP 07F21 (outside display in B1)

B. Case #2288 – Christine Flynn AP 04H05 (Accessory Apartment)

4. MV Commission

RE: 23 June 2017 Extended Schedule

5. Thomson Reuters

RE: Zoning Bulletin, 10 June 2017

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

**PRO FORM**

Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 8:07 P.M.  
(m/s/c 4/0/0)  
Respectfully submitted;

---

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

**APPROVAL:**

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

---

Date

---

Benjamin Robinson  
Chairman