

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: August 9, 2017

TIME: 6:00PM

ATTENDANCE: Bellante-Holand, Doble, Robinson

M. Loberg, ME Larsen, M. Lipke, H. Lee, D. Hodsdon, R. Marks, C. McAndrews, V. Bachelor, J. Bachelor, J. Krystal

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

BILLS:

Thomson Reuters.....	\$ 7.84
Office Supply.....	\$1328.96
Gazette	\$ 232.20
MV Times.....	\$ 512.00

MINUTES: As referred in the July 19, 2017 Meeting Agenda

C. Doble recommended approving the minutes, pending review within 24 hours. B. Robinson seconded the motion.

12 July 2017 and 19 July 2017 m/s/c 3/0/0

APPOINTMENTS:

6:37 PM John Abrams and Ryan Bushey re: 248 Main Street Development

J. Abrams inquired if the Planning Board had the opportunity to read the summary he had prepared to describe the seven unit housing project he wanted to develop. He was particularly interested in learning from the Board if in their opinion section 04.04.02 of the zoning bylaw applied to the proposed housing development. C. Doble replied in the affirmative, but felt that the regulation's reference to the requirements of section 04.03.12, more specifically, the land area requirement complicated the situation. She felt the Board had to understand why the regulation (sec. 04.04.02) made reference to the earlier section (04.03.12) and if the purpose still pertained.

C. Doble believed the project warranted further discussion because there were other elements that had to be explored, such as the septic solution. J. Abrams did not think the septic presented an issue for the housing development as did the land area requirement.

C. Doble agreed, noting that the bylaw did not allow for the type of development (infill) the Planning Board supported and recommended. She further added that the Planning Board has had discussions about the regulation's inconsistency between the intent and intended outcome when they reviewed similar applications in the past.

J. Abrams asked the Board if they've considered addressing the inconsistencies. B. Robinson replied that the only remedy available to them was to consider a bylaw amendment(s). J. Abrams noted that the regulation essentially forced them to pursue the project as a Ch. 40B development. He would consider postponing the project, if the Planning Board pursued a bylaw amendment to remedy the inconsistency for town meeting. B. Robinson could not guarantee that the Planning Board would be prepared to recommend an alternative regulation in time for town meeting. C. Doble mentioned that there were several issues with the zoning regulations, which required their complete overhaul. This was brought to the attention by their consultants. She felt they had to recodify their regulations before they considered any amendment. J. Abrams inquired about the process for modifying the zoning regulations. He was advised that any board or town citizen could submit a zoning bylaw amendment to the Planning Board. J. Abrams inquired if he and the Planning Board could collaborate on the bylaw amendment. B. Robinson thought it was important for them to look at the language outside the scope of the project. J. Abrams understood, and inquired if there was anything he could do to inspire the Board to pursue the amendment. C. Doble explained that the Planning Board was aware of the issues with the regulation, and reiterated that they had issues with the entire bylaw that had to be resolved before they focused on a specific topic or section of the bylaw. She was concerned that the revision would contribute to the inconsistencies in the bylaw. J. Abrams understood, and stated that he would simply follow the Planning Board's progress.

J. Abrams wanted to discuss the setback requirement for the second structure. He explained that the existing barn was not suitable for renovations, so that he had to construct a new building for the moderate income units. He asked if he had to meet the setback requirements. B. Robinson replied in the affirmative.

J. Abrams asked B. Robinson if he could define what constituted the rear setback for 248 Main Street. B. Robinson replied that the setback was determined by the Building Inspector. R. Bushey inquired if the same applied to pieces of the renovation of the existing house that are outside the setback. B. Robinson did not think it would apply to the renovation provided it was within the existing footprint.

J. Abrams solicited the Planning Board's impressions about the development. B. Robinson thought the proposal met many of the goals specified in the town's housing production plan. It was in close proximity to the business district and library and a benefit to the town. Based on the discussions, B. Robinson thought the Planning Board was supportive of the development, understanding the limitations of the regulation.

D. Hodsdon inquired of the existing building had to be referred to the MV Commission because the building was constructed around 1900. B. Robinson recalled that they had changed the DRI list. He thought it could be referred to the MV Commission if it was constructed prior to 1900 and the structure was being demolished, and offered to review the DRI Checklist to determine if it included renovation.

D. Hodsdon noted that the report did not include any elevations, so that it was difficult to determine if the new structure in the rear was going to be two stories, and/ or visible from the street. J. Abrams believed the building was going to be visible to the abutting properties, and explained that he had not developed the proposal sufficiently to come prepared with building plans or elevations. D. Hodsdon noted that as a member of the Historic Commission and Site Plan Review Board, he is very interested in the scale of the structure relative to the abutting properties and to determine if the development complimented the neighborhood. J. Abrams indicated that he would solicit the town's recommendations throughout the review process to make sure that the development blended in with the community.

C. Doble inquired about the use of the driveway and the location of the property line. J. Abrams illustrated the property lines and noted that he and the abutter (church) were going to sharing the one driveway. C. Doble inquired if the church had plans for the vacant land in the rear. J. Abrams did not believe they had any plans for the immediate future, but that he understood that they wanted to expand the church to accommodate children's' programs and parking.

H. Lee indicated that it was important to review the use, the land, and building during the review process, and consider updating their regulations and/or guidelines to require a more comprehensive review of proposals proposing a 50% change in use. He noticed a flaw in the review process, when the Board spoke in favor of a development that their regulations prohibited. While the proposal appeared to be appropriate, it would require the approval of an exception, which may lead to a new standard, warranting further examination of the regulations. He questioned whether they had to time to review and amend the regulation in time for town meeting. He was also concerned about the address of the non-conformity to setback requirements. B. Robinson understood, but noted that the non-conformity pertained to the land area requirement. The issue he felt pertained to the increase in density and the neighbor's perception of the intensity of use, which could be addressed by a larger setback.

C. Doble noted that the community, during the review of the Housing Production Plan complained that affordable housing was thwarted by their zoning regulations and septic system requirements. J. Abrams was curious to learn how the Love House, Havenside and the Greenough House were allowed in the same district.

D. Hodsdon inquired about the existing dwelling's sq. footage. R. Bushey replied around 2000 sq. ft.

There being no further discussion, J. Abrams thanked the Board and looked forward to hearing from the Board members regarding their progress with the zoning regulations overhaul.

6:35 PM Adam Turner re: Recodifying the Tisbury Zoning Bylaws

At 8 PM B. Robinson contacted A. Turner to inform him that the Planning Board's discussions with the school building committee were in progress. A recommendation for a re-schedule of his appointment was accepted at a date and time to be discussed later.

BOARD DISCUSSIONS:

1. MV Land Bank

Re: Planning Board's appointee

B. Robinson asked C. Doble and D. Bellante-Holand if they were interested in representing the Planning Board on the MV Land Bank. C. Doble offered to serve until they filled H. Stephenson's vacancy on the Board to appoint their representative. D. Bellante-Holand supported the recommendation.

B. Robinson inquired if they knew the MV Land Bank's meeting schedule. C. Doble offered to contact the board's chairman and to inquire about their meeting schedule. B. Robinson agreed to postpone the discussions until next week.

2. Planning Board Draft Projects

A. Complete Streets

B. Owen Park

C. Zoning

D. Open Space Planning

E. Other projects

3. Tisbury Government Study Panel

Re: Planning Board's Appointment

B. Robinson inquired if the Board of Selectmen had solicited volunteers from the community to serve on the government study panel. M. Loberg replied in the negative, adding that they were waiting to see if there were any responses to the town moderator's invite, and learned that no one had responded. C. Doble indicated that the Planning Board interviewed two potential candidates, and wanted to communicate to them.

B. Robinson asked J. Kristal if the Finance & Advisory Committee had actively solicited potential candidates for the study panel. J. Kristal replied in the negative, noting that they were hoping to obtain recommendations from the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen. M. Loberg mentioned that E. Eugster had conveyed to her that she was not

completely certain about serving in the study panel, because of her concerns with the process.

C. Doble recommended inviting S. Zabloutny and E. Eugster to meet with the Planning Board to make sure they were still interested in serving on the study panel. B. Robinson thought they should contact D. Medders to inquire if she's obtained the four volunteers to serve on the study panel, and to inform her that they currently had two potential candidates, one of which they would gladly refer. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if the Finance & Advisory Board would need to interview the person they will refer. J. Kristal replied in the affirmative.

Additional discussions ensued with this regard, and C. Doble recommended having the board's staff contact E. Eugster to confirm her interest in serving on the study panel. Once appointed as the Planning Board's representative, the Board could refer and recommend S. Zabloutny to the Board of Selectmen, Finance & Advisory Committee and D. Medders. Board members agreed with the recommendation.

4. Tisbury Elementary School Building Project RE: Discretionary referral to MVC

Based on previous discussions, B. Robinson informed the Board that he met with A. Turner, the Exec. Dir. at the MV Commission and the DRI Coordinator, P. Foley to discuss the referral process, and the potential discretionary referral of the new school building with J. Goldstein and C. Barnes, the town's two representatives on the MV Commission. B. Robinson indicated that the two representatives did not express an issue with the school project's referral.

A. Turner and P. Foley mapped out the review process at different junctures of the school's planning phase, noting that the MV Commission would be reviewing the value of the existing school building, its demolition (and alternatives) if the project was referred. If the Planning Board opted to wait until the design was much more defined, the MV Commission's review would focus on the new construction. The final decision to accept a project for a discretionary referral remained in the MV Commission's hands. B. Robinson indicated that he was hesitant to refer the project, but was concerned that the community had little opportunity to comment on the project until town meeting, he wanted to solicit the Board's opinions on the matter.

Members of the School Building Committee present at the discussions were also invited to speak on the subject.

R. Marks and members of the School Building Committee stated that they had met with A. Turner and P. Foley and volunteered to participate in the MV Commission's review process. A. Turner and P. Foley wanted to meet with them as they developed the project. The first step in the review process was to have P. Foley meet with the landscape architect on site to look at drainage and other site related issues. B. Robinson inquired if

the project was undergoing a full Commission review or a staff review, and if the discussions included the school building committee. R. Marks replied that it was a staff review, and clarified that he and C. McAndrews accepted P. Foley offer for assistance. He mentioned that the school building committee was interested in participating in a cooperative process with the MV Commission staff to prevent any issues.

R. Marks mentioned that the Massachusetts Historic Commission did not have an issue with the demolition of the school building. He also wanted to note that the school building project did not meet any of the criteria listed in the DRI Checklist that warranted a referral. B. Robinson concurred and explained why the Board was considering a discretionary referral. R. Marks believed if the demolition was referred to the MV Commission it would halt the project, and cost the town \$190,000.00 a month. He also wanted to note for the record that the town's school children would not enjoy their new school on the targeted date of January 2021.

R. Marks spoke with the MSBA about the project's possible referral. They were not happy to hear the news, because it was an additional expenditure of taxpayer funds. He also added that the School Building Committee did not have any objection to working with the MV Commission's staff.

C. McAndrews inquired about the purpose for the Board's consideration of the discretionary referral. B. Robinson replied that a segment of the community was concerned about the direction of the project. They felt the review process did not allow them to look at the trade-offs for the renovation and addition of the school building, that was less expensive than a new construction. He was concerned that it was going to create a hurdle for the proposal for a new school. B. Robinson indicated that the Planning Board was intent on participating in the design of the building to make sure it was the best option for the town.

C. McAndrews noted that the town agreed to abide by the MSBA process, and that was not an option with the MSBA. B. Robinson disagreed and noted that the MSBA's regulations made a difference in the requirements for renovations and new structures. C. McAndrews mentioned that they held several phone conversations and meetings with the MSBA regarding their options, and were advised that the most important room in the building was the classroom. B. Robinson indicated that there were exceptions to the rules. C. McAndrews believed the school building should be constructed with what they believed was best for the students and the future of the school, and not the exceptions to the rules. C. McAndrews added that the school building committee complied with the MSBA's public review process and questioned the validity of the Planning Board's issues with the review process, because it appeared to her that the Planning Board Chairman, B. Robinson was trying to stop the project.

C. McAndrews was also upset that she was not informed of the discussions by the Planning Board, and would have appreciated some communication with regards to the meeting, when the school building committee included two members of the Planning

Board. She expressed concern and disappointment in the lack of communication, and felt they “were going behind her back”. B. Robinson reminded C. McAndrews that the Planning Board had raised the subject at the last two Planning Board meetings she attended. He approached the MV Commission to inquire about the review process, and was reporting his discussions to solicit the Board’s impressions. He believed the Planning Board was entitled to an opinion regarding the public process, especially when the school building committee appeared to dismiss a number of criticisms.

C. Doble believed the magnitude of the project warranted a review of the process, because of its potential impact on other municipal projects. She felt the committee was not given sufficient information to make informed decisions. At the OPM’s recommendation, the Planning Board read the MSBA’s guidelines and learned that they favored renovations and additions, but that the presentation to the school building committee did not disclose this information. It made her realize that the public process was flawed. If they were to move forward, they had to do a better job at providing the information. C. Doble noted that the Planning Board was interested in moving forward on the project, but wanted to make sure that the project was the best option for the town. They wanted a good building design for the students that complemented the neighborhood and community. They did not want to present a proposal that was going to fail at town meeting. The issues the Planning Board had been presenting to the school building committee included those being voiced by a segment of the community that felt they were not being heard in the process.

R. Marks offered to work with the architect to frame arguments in a way that reflected the pros and cons of the proposals at the upcoming meetings on August 28th, September 11th and September 25th. He understood what the Board was asking of him, and agreed that the committee had to be well informed to have the understanding to make decisions. He wanted to inform the Board that the Facilities Assessment Subcommittee thought their proposal was excellent as presented, and was prepared to commit the fourteen million dollars to the project. Both the Executive Director and Assistant Director of the MSBA were upset at the latest news regarding the possible referral to the MVC and reiterated his question about the need for the referral. He believed they’ve made every effort to be transparent in their review process, and offered a commitment to meet voluntarily with town boards to make sure everyone has an opportunity to comment on the proposal. He advised the Board that he conveyed to the MSBA that they might need additional time (two months) to complete the schematic design, because of the concerns that B. Robinson and H. Lee raised at the last meeting.

R. Marks did not think a discretionary referral was necessary when there were a number of local boards that were quite capable of reviewing the project. He did not believe the MV Commission needed to be involved. It would delay the project and cost the town additional funds (\$190,000.00 more a month).

B. Robinson indicated that he had reviewed the school building committee’s last submittal to the MSBA and noted that none of the Planning Board’s letters were included.

It concerned him because it did not provide the MSBA an accurate picture of the town's perspective. Additional discussions ensued and D. Bellante-Holand felt people were talking at cross purposes so that it wasn't clear to her what the Planning Board was asking of the school building committee. She inquired if the Planning Board was stating that the community had expressed a concern about not obtaining information for the renovation/addition of the existing building, because the assumption was that the option was less expensive. She asked if they were also requesting the information so that it became part of the discussion. She further questioned whether the information would have any relevance at this juncture, because of its impact on the design.

D. Bellante-Holand believed it was inaccurate to state that the MSBA was on board with the OPM's submittal. Based on previous discussion, C. Doble mentioned that not all of the information presented at the meetings was being submitted to the MSBA, so that the MSBA was essentially on board with only what had submitted. Based on her understanding, D. Bellante-Holand felt that the issue was that the process did not include or give people an option of considering an alternative renovation addition proposal at a lower budget.

C. Doble noted that it was a part of the issue. It troubled her that the information on the screen at the public meetings was difficult to see or read. The topics (options) were not presented in an even manner, and based on her observations; she questioned whether people were grasping the concepts to make informed decisions.

C. McAndrews acknowledged the complexities of the subject matter, but noted that she had made every effort to reach out to the school building committee members to encourage them to contact her with any questions. At no time, did any of the nineteen members of the committee contact her. C. Doble recommended providing the school building committee member's sufficient time to review the materials and to generate their questions well in advance of the meetings. It allowed for an in-depth discussion on the subject. She felt that they were not provided with an opportunity to look at the multiple renovation and addition plans, because the focus of the discussions and presentations were on new construction. It prevented them from exploring whatever options they might have had in the flexibility of the design, the preservation of the existing building, cost, etc.

D. Bellante-Holand did not understand what was still possible at this time. R. Marks replied that they were going to start working on the development of a schematic design for the next three to five months. During this phase of the project they school building committee had to continue meeting to solicit public input, etc.

B. Robinson asked R. Marks why he believed the referral of the school project to the MV Commission would "kill the project". R. Marks clarified that he misspoke; and stated that he believed the MV Commission would fully support the project. The referral, in his opinion only delayed the process. R. Marks felt the town was quite capable of reviewing the project without further regional oversight. C. McAndrews indicated that it also had

the potential of impacting the project negatively. She was curious to understand what the Planning Board's goal(s) was for the referral and to learn if she may have missed something in process.

B. Robinson indicated that the Planning Board listed the topic on the meeting agenda because a solid group of community's residents indicated that they've already decided to vote against the proposal. The Planning Board has expressed a difference of opinion, but they were supporting the school building committee and committed to helping them with the design to make sure they recommended the best option. B. Robinson also had to balance his obligation to respond to the constituents' concerns, many of which he agreed with.

V. Bachelor, school building committee member inquired if the people of whom B. Robinson referred to had children in the school and attended their meetings. B. Robinson replied that some did, and most did not attend a meeting. V. Bachelor thought if they attended the meetings they would have understood the process, the state and federal requirements and space needs. Parents with children in the school were very supportive of the proposal. B. Robinson understood, but explained that it was also a capital expenditure that impacted everyone in town, and future town projects. They had to appreciate the fact that this was investment that was going to impact the community for a long term.

V. Bachelor noted that the teachers were all initially supportive of the Manter site. When the site was eliminated from consideration, they accepted the decision and moved on to the existing site. It was a compromise. She thought other town boards should follow their example and demonstrate the project was a cooperative effort, instead of engaging in "back stabbing". If there were issues, all they had to do was to convey this to the school building committee.

C. Doble indicated that the Planning Board had conveyed their issues through their correspondence, and held public discussion on the subject, as noted on the posted meeting agendas. B. Robinson apologized if they felt they were not appropriately notified of their discussions, and would make sure that they were informed in the future.

C. McAndrews believed the Board had been open about their opposition; it was the decision to consider a referral that concerned her. She understood that there was going to be opposition to the proposal, but they had to continue to plough through the process and work on generating support if they are going to complete the project.

B. Robinson reiterated that the Planning Board was worried that the project could fail at town meeting, but were also required to make sure that they were supporting a project that best suited the needs of the town.

J. Krystal understood that the MV Commission did not typically insert itself in the political disagreements of a town. He asked the Planning Board not to refer the project under the discretionary checklist item. He also questioned whether the community did in

fact have a strong sentimental attachment for the school building as many inferred. J. Krystal indicated that for some children, the school did not provide them with positive or memorable experiences (e.g. bullying, custodial care), so that it was “stupid to state that the school building raised fond memories. It represented a lot of problems for a lot of families”.

J. Krystal also thought that they should have anticipated that there would be opposition to the project. All potentially controversial subjects, similar to the beer and wine vote were going to generate opposition. In his opinion, the discussions they were holding should occur at town meeting, not among the three Planning Board members who were going to refer the project to the MV Commission. He did not care whether the project failed or passed, as long as the discussions occurred at town meeting.

M. Loberg, reflected on the discussions at a meeting with the MSBA, and understood that they expected or hoped that they were going to receive a verification of the town’s consensus from the school building committee. The lack of consensus presented a problem. It did not appear that they’ve done enough to drive the consensus. She felt that they had to take note of the objections that have been raised, because they could lead to the project’s failure. B. Robinson also felt that they could have the school building committee address the alternatives. V. Bachelor inquired if that was his goal. B. Robinson admitted that he was of the impression that the alternative (renovation and addition) would save the town money and save some of their history. He would have also liked to know what the tradeoffs were to save money.

D. Bellante-Holand did not fully understand what B. Robinson was requesting of the school building committee. B. Robinson explained that the school building committee presented a proposal for the renovation and addition of the school that met the MSBA standards, but did not take into account that they could have also presented a similar proposal without meeting all of the standards. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if she understood B. Robinson correctly, that another renovation and addition with a different budget (dollar amount) could have benefited the process because it would have provided the town with a less expensive option. B. Robinson clarified that they were never given the opportunity to look at how the educational program could have been adjusted to work within the existing facilities to reduce the cost or, use the existing building within the new construction to preserve some of their history.

D. Bellante-Holand asked the R. Marks and C. McAndrews to explain why they omitted the option. R. Marks explained that it was presented to the committee on more than one occasion but that it was voted down. Several members of the community were present at the discussions. D. Bellante-Holand did not understand what the Board was expecting from the discussions, given that the school building committee had engaged in a long public process. B. Robinson replied that they were continuing with the decision that had already been made e.g. new construction.

C. McAndrews explained that she was uncomfortable moving forward with the 11-5 vote,

when the Board of Selectmen, Planning Board and Town Administrator voted in opposition. It was the reason she decided to schedule a second meeting (for a potential re-vote). After the meeting, the Board of Selectmen, the Finance & Advisory Committee and Town Administrator have come on board to support the project. She hoped the Planning Board would do the same.

B. Robinson noted that the Planning Board supported the school building committee, but were weighing their options with the MV Commission. They were also very interested in helping with the design of the new structure.

J. Bachelor did not understand why the one segment of the community had not asked these questions of the school building committee a long time ago. B. Robinson replied that the Planning Board had been asking these questions of the school building committee. Additional discussions ensued and R. Marks clarified that every question was answered at the public meetings, and totally disagreed with B. Robinson. The appropriate venue to have questions answered was at the public meetings.

C. McAndrews acknowledged that the school building committee did not entertain the renovation and addition option with the “cutback” because it did not meet the MSBAs requirements. B. Robinson noted that it was “the issue” he had with the committee. After reading the MSBAs regulations, as R. Marks recommended, he learned that this was in fact an acceptable practice and a viable option. C. McAndrews acknowledged.

J. Bachelor asked the Planning Board to explain why they were referring the project to the MV Commission. The Town of Edgartown pursued a new construction to replace the old school building (1927) without referring it to the Commission. They held similar discussions that finally resulted in its demolition. He felt they should abide by the school building committee’s vote to demolish the existing building and to construct a new school.

B. Robinson was concerned that the proposal was going to be rejected at town meeting, and wanted to stand up at town meeting in support of a proposal, provided that the proposal was the best option for the town.

D. Bellante-Holand felt that by not having the alternative sketched out, there was a potential to undermine the entire process. She asked if it was possible to put the information together. R. Marks and C. McAndrews replied in the negative. Both stated that it was too late. V. Bachelor believed that if they opted on the renovation they could not increase the size of the rooms. B. Robinson corrected V. Bachelor and explained that they were allowed to increase the classroom. They were not obligated to meet the recommended size. V. Bachelor noted that the recommendations in the proposal were based on the educational program. B. Robinson mentioned that the educational program was never open to the public process. R. Marks thought it important to state that the educational program was developed by the Superintendent of Schools, the principal, the teachers, 35 parents and volunteers, students and an educational planner hired by the

MSBA. He did not understand B. Robinson's comment, when the program was available for the past six months.

M. Loberg believed the Planning Board was trying to convey to them that they were concerned about the cost, and the possibility that they may not be able to afford the "Cadillac dream plan", because their share of the cost was steep. R. Marks understood and tried to look into ways that they could reduce a couple of spaces. He recently contacted the architect to delete the 600 sq. ft. outdated computer lab. C. McAndrews thought they had to reach out to the community to inform them that they were not proposing the "Cadillac dream plan", because the only addition to the educational program was the one pre-K class.

H. Lee did not find the school building committee members open to any dissenting comment, based on his observation and experience. When he expressed concern at the scale of the building design, the school building committee advised him that it was premature. "They were dealing with it at a later time". He felt he was dismissed. It concerned him that the committee was not grasping the importance and complexities of a design that warranted discussions now. And he did understand how a committee member could in all conscious participate in an important vote when he only attended the last two meetings. He did not think this should have been allowed. And contrary to R. Marks comment, many of his questions were not answered at the meetings he attended.

H. Lee wanted to clarify for the record that he did not oppose or support the renovation/addition or the proposal for a new construction. But he questioned the school building committee member's interest and commitment in the review process. In his opinion, the school building committee members did not appear to be invested in researching, or exploring the options sufficiently to flush out the best alternative(s). Comments and questions about important issues were dismissed. It made him and others question the validity of the decisions, and final recommendation. R. Marks understood and made note of similar complaints mentioned in the meeting, so that they would be addressed.

There being no further comment, B. Robinson asked the Board members if they had additional questions or comments on the subject. After both replied in the negative, B. Robinson inquired if they felt they were prepared to vote whether or not to refer the proposal to the MV Commission. C. Doble had abstained from the previous Planning Board decision, because she did not feel it was appropriate to vote on a project she was involved in as a member of the school building committee.

C. Doble thanked the members of the school building committee in attendance for discussing the issues that have been of great concern for the Planning Board. She reiterated that the Planning Board's comments and discussions were not held for the purpose of obstructing the project, but to bring to the surface the importance of moving the process forward in a serious and thorough manner. It was important for her to know that the committee would be provided with the necessary information to make informed decisions. She was also disappointed that they did not explore the renovation and addition

alternatives thoroughly, and emphasized that she did not want to see the new construction impact the neighborhood adversely. In her opinion they had to scale down the building, and R. Marks agreed.

C. Doble did not know if they could change anything or look into an alternative at this juncture of the process, other than to halt the process altogether. She felt they had to be much more diligent from this point forward to provide the town with the best possible option.

Additional discussions ensued with regards to the Planning Board member's impressions about the conduct of the meetings as members of the school building committee. M. Loberg observed and felt a sense of win-lose among committee members at their last session. It also explained why some committee members and people may have been reticent about speaking publicly at meetings.

R. Marks asked the Planning Board if they were receptive to another meeting with him, C. McAndrews, P. Torowski on September 13 or September 20, 2017 to discuss the process, improving and vetting the information, and an update. He advised the Planning Board that he obtained a two month extension for the schematic design, which would still give the MSBA the time to vote on the project in mid-February for a vote at town meeting. This would give the Selectmen and Finance & Advisory Committee time to weigh in their thoughts on the project before town meeting.

There being no further discussion, B. Robinson assumed D. Bellante-Holand needed more information before voting on a possible referral. D. Bellante-Holand was not sure what the MV Commission could impart on a process at this juncture. B. Robinson confirmed that the Planning Board was not voting on the referral this evening. He promised to contact them if the topic came back up again.

H. Lee was concerned about the project's referral to the MV Commission because he questioned if they would invest the time and staff to research the project and provide the town with the best option. If the Planning Board were committed and engaging in the discussions of the design, he was going to participate in the process to make sure that the necessary questions were being asked.

R. Marks invited the Planning Board to join the school building committee on a tour of a newly constructed school in New Bedford, MA the architect designed on September 30th. He explained that the building has some nice similarities (400 students, 79,000 sq. ft.) that could help them with the schematic design. Board members agreed and thanked R. Marks for the invitation.

B. Robinson offered to explain the MV Commission's review process, or to join D. Bellante-Holand in a discussion with MV Staff about the review process. D. Bellante-Holand did not understand the point for going to the Commission at this juncture of the review process. Up until this point, she did not see any indication that it would be

different at the MV Commission or of any benefit for the town. Additional discussions ensued with this regard, and B. Robinson noted that the Commission had jurisdictional powers that exceeded those afforded to the local boards, that could be implemented to project the towns. He reiterated that both town representatives supported the project's referral, which would be noted by the full Commission in their decision.

Additional discussions ensued and D. Bellante-Holand thought the aforementioned discussed spoke to the issue that people without the necessary experience were making decisions that required some experience. She noted that the three Planning Board members were the most qualified. Although they've been involved in the process, they were not making a connection with the committee. Tonight's discussions exemplified the issue, in which they engaged in conversation without making any decisions

B. Robinson believed the Planning Board had to decide whether they felt comfortable with the decisions that have been made in the past and move forward, or not. This was the only opportunity they had to weigh in the project. D. Bellante-Holand indicated that she was relying on D. Seidman, C. Doble and B. Robinson for a recommendation.

M. Lipke interrupted the discussions to express her concerns with the Planning Board's, more specifically B. Robinson's distrust of the committee and state process. B. Robinson clarified that he trusted the state process. M. Lipke mentioned that she attended all of the meetings, and has heard the same conversation. Additional comments were made, and M. Lipke expressed her frustration with the Planning Board's failure to address the bylaw amendment she submitted.

Board members discussed protocol and procedures for staying on the agenda schedule and attending to their appointments.

5. Planning Board (Vacancies)

RE: Letters of Interest – Elaine Miller and Paul Munafo

B. Robinson recommended scheduling their interviews as soon as possible.

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:

1. Nover-Armstrong Associates Inc.

Re: ENF - Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (Beach Road)

2. Tisbury Conservation Commission

A. Public Hearing Notice – Tisbury Harbormaster, AP 37A1.2 (dredging, pier, floating ramp, dinghy docks)

B. Public Hearing Notice - Gerard & Beth Ann du Toit, AP 58C1 (demo & recon of dwelling)

C. Public Hearing Notice – Melinda Farrelly, Tr., AP 66A09 (new garage/roof over deck)

D. Public Hearing Notice – Jonathan Albert, Tr., AP 5F1.3 (construction/addition)

E. Public Hearing Notice – Robert Schmetterer, AP 59A02 (upgrading septic system)

3. James Feeney

A. Homeowner's Association – Road Maintenance

B. Jeffrey Katz' Quitclaim Deed

C. cc: letter to Allan and Karen Patterson

D. cc: J. Katz' letter to the Oak Bluffs Planning Board

E. cc: A. Patterson's letter to the Oak Bluffs Planning Board

4. MV Commission

A. DRI Decision #674 – Santander Bank (order to remove the asphalt shingles and to replace ceramic tiles)

B. DRI Decision #675 – Franklin Westman - Historic District (approved)

C. 4 August 2017 Extended Meeting Schedule

5. IHT's Newsletter

Re: Goal of developing 100 new affordable rental and ownership homes by end of 2020

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

PRO FORM

Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 9:35P.M.
(m/s/c 3/0/0)

Respectfully submitted;

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

APPROVAL:

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

Date

Benjamin Robinson
Chairman