

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: January 11, 2017

TIME: 6:00 PM

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

PLACE: Town Hall Annex, 66 High Point Lane

BILLS:

Office Depot.....	\$ 42.98
Comcast.....	\$ 27.17
Postage.....	\$ 7.36
Howard/Stein & Hudson Assoc.....	\$192.18
Howard/Stein & Hudson Assoc.....	\$5872.54

At the Town Administrator's request, B. Robinson moved to authorize the Planning Board Chairman, D. Seidman to sign the Complete Street Prioritization Project consultants' (Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates) bills for the remainder of the contract, on their behalf. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 5/0/0

MINUTES: As referred in the December 21, 2016 Meeting Agenda

18 May 2016	m/s/c	5/0/0
25 May 2016	m/s/c	5/0/0
21 September 2016	m/s/c	5/0/0
28 September 2016	m/s/c	5/0/0
05 October 2016	m/s/c	5/0/0
19 October 2016	m/s/c	5/0/0
21 December 2016	m/s/c	5/0/0

APPOINTMENTS:

6:00 PM Jon Snyder, Tax Collector re: Average Residential and Commercial Tax Rate

B. Robinson advised the Board that the 30 year account of the average commercial & residential tax rate and the avg. value per parcel (FY 2016) provided him with a better understanding of the tax base's distribution by district and the makeup of each district in term of the number of lots, acreage and values. He thought it interesting that the average value of a parcel in the BII District was \$880,000.00 compared to the BI District. The 78 lots in the BI District were valued at an average of one million dollars.

B. Robinson thought the information raised important questions about the type of commercial model they should encourage because of its value to the town. Based on the information J. Snyder provided, he noticed that 88% of the town's revenue came from the residential districts. It did not correlate with the concern expressed over the years to protect the downtown and commercial districts.

B. Robinson felt the Board should understand the financial impact a zoning bylaw may have on the values of the parcels. A consideration they could not ignore for the BII District which has experienced substantial development (light industry) and with the least amount of planning. His concern applied to Waterfront Commercial District which contained a substantial amount of unused or underutilized land. D. Seidman inquired about the values, and asked J. Snyder if the figures included both building and land. J. Snyder replied in the affirmative. D. Seidman noted that the information may not reflect the total picture, because he suspected that the values for the properties in the Waterfront Commercial District were predominantly just for land.

B. Robinson was surprised to see that the R25 average property values exceed the values listed for the R50, R3A and Waterfront districts. R3A and R50 however had the most value. R10 had the highest percentage of year round residents on the island. D. Seidman inquired if J. Snyder could separate the values of the house and the land per parcel. It would give them a glimpse of the properties that could be targeted for development.

B. Robinson reiterated that the two areas likely to experience more development were the Waterfront Commercial and BII Districts, which will need planning. C. Doble was curious to know how Tisbury's commercial or business districts compared with Oak Bluffs and Edgartown. B. Robinson noted that the MV Commission reported that the Town of Tisbury had the most businesses on island that numbered around 1600-1800 businesses.

Additional discussions ensued in this regard, and B. Robinson asked the Board if they thought it would benefit the town to increase the tax revenue generated by the commercial businesses by dividing the BII District into 78 parcels that were valued at one million dollars each as oppose to having the 107 parcels spread over 125 acres. D. Seidman noted that the BI District was closer to the harbor, and offered different types of business. B. Robinson understood that there were additional variables such as the layout. C. Doble though that the area also provided them with an opportunity for other parking solutions i.e. shared parking spaces to improve the walkability, and to connect the two business communities. B. Robinson thought they had to determine what type of business would be supported. Main Street offered boutiques, restaurants, services and the BII District offered light industrial businesses.

D. Bellante-Holand asked J. Snyder if there was anything he would recommend to the Planning Board. J. Snyder did not believe any effort to change to the commercial or business districts to increase their contribution to the tax base would benefit the town since 88% of the revenue is generated by the residential districts. M. Loberg acknowledged that the success of business did not translate into additional revenue for a town.

B. Robinson thought the town in general had a tendency of focusing on the financial health of the commercial districts, when their tax base was supported by the residential districts. He noted that 71% of the residents in the R10 District lived on island year round (according to the HPP). H. Stephenson thought it important to understand that the retail stores, restaurants and services offered by business community were important to the residents. D. Seidman added that they also employed island residents. C. Doble felt that the Board had to improve walkability into town, and the overall quality of life.

D. Bellante-Holand thought it was important to consider zoning changes in terms of maintaining what most people valued about living in town and improving the quality of life. She agreed with C. Doble that they should include the walkability of the town, the expansion of the Park-N-Ride and bus service.

Other discussions ensued, and J. Snyder departed at 6:25 PM to attend a meeting held by the Finance & Advisory Committee.

6:30 PM Public Hearing: Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment - Site Plan Review Board
Attendance: Refer to signature sheet

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:33 PM. D. Seidman, Planning Board Chairman read the public hearing notice into the record of the public hearing listing all of the amendments to applicable sections of the bylaws to eliminate the requirement of a Site Plan Review for pools, demolitions and repairs in the Waterfront Commercial District, Coastal and Island Road Districts provided they did not involve any changes in structure, design, texture or material. The sections of the bylaw under consideration were 02.73, 06.07.00 and 10.06.01.

C. Doble inquired about the source of the bylaw amendment and the inclusion of demolitions for structures that may hold some value for the town. B. Robinson replied that the revision eliminated the minor repairs, and the proposals in which applicants were not making any modifications to the structure, materials, or color. The review process did not benefit the town or applicant and occasionally postponed urgent repairs. B. Robinson thought they could use the on time and energy spent processing these applications on more important projects. C. Doble expressed concern about eliminating a regulation that allowed the some oversight over historical homes. D. Seidman clarified that the town did not have regulations in place to regulate historical homes. They were regulated by the MV Commission. He also questioned whether the town could evaluate the structure's worth or value, because it was very subjective concept.

C. Doble clarified that she did not have an issue with the revisions, but was interested in understanding why they were recommending the removal of the demolition. The board secretary explained that application was strictly for the demolition and replacement of the structure. The Site Plan Review Board's standard and regulations were limited to the aesthetics of a building. A recommendation on a demolition served no purpose.

C. Doble inquired about the purpose for removing pools from the Site Plan Review Board's oversight, given that it was important to have some oversight over the locations of the pools in environmental sensitive areas. B. Robinson noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals and Conservation Commission was typically the special permit granting authority for these applications, and responsible for the use's environmental impact.

D. Seidman asked the Board if they had any questions regarding the removal of the text in sec. 06.07.00 pertaining to the elimination of proposals to raze a structure. C. Doble did not have any objections.

Board members were asked if they had any issues with the revision in 10.06.01 deleting the residency requirement for the architect, landscape architect or designer, and the paragraph pertaining to the exclusions that was previously discussed under section 02.73. Board members were advised that the residency requirement was too restrictive and limiting. It discouraged viable volunteers from joining the committee.

There being no further comment, D. Seidman entertained a motion to approve the proposed bylaw amendments to sections 02.73, 06.07.00 and 10.06.01 as listed in the hearing notices for a recommendation at town meeting. B. Robins on so moved. C. Doble seconded the motion, which motion carried. 5/0/0

D. Seidman entertained a motion to close the hearing. B. Robinson so moved. H. Stephenson seconded the motion. The motion carried. 5/0/0 The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 6:44 PM

6:45 PM Public Hearing: Application for a Special Permit re: Garde de le Mer, AP 09C08
Attendance: Refer to Signature Sheet

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:45 PM. Planning Board Chairman, D. Seidman introduced the applicant's property manager, E. Wild to the Board and read the public hearing notice into the record for the minutes explaining that the property owner was interested in increasing the seating capacity of his restaurant from 50 to 80 seats. Also entered into the record was Paul Foley's, DRI Coordinator for the MV Commission email dated 1/10/17 recommending the application's referral for a concurrence review under DRI Checklist item 3.1.i.

Discussions ensued, and the Board was advised that they had the right to discuss the application before it was referred to the MV Commission, as long as they did not render a determination. Board members postponed a vote on the referral and D. Seidman continued the discussions. The Planning Board Chairman read the letter of application, dated 12/5/16 which made reference to the approvals for the increase in seating capacity from the DPW and the Board of Health. A copy of the Board of Health's minutes dated 5/18/2010 confirm the Health Commissioner's favorable vote A separate letter from Fred LaPiana, the DPW Director dated 5/18/10 confirmed a similar favorable advisory opinion from the Sewer Committee.

D. Seidman recalled that there was a question about the handicap accessibility of the upper deck during the pre-application discussion. L. Wild spoke with the Building Inspector about the expansion of the seating capacity on the upper deck of the marina and explained that the seats were in the outdoor on the deck, and accessed from the catwalk that connected the two buildings on the property. The Building Inspector informed her that the handicap accessible accommodations would not be necessary if the amenities were the same on both floors. Their clientele would have the same water views from both buildings and both floors. D. Seidman asked the Board if they believed the amenities were equal when sitting outside in the open air as opposed to sitting within a screened area. C. Doble noted that the clientele were currently being offered the same options. The additional seats did not alter it.

H. Stephenson inquired if the building where they were proposing to expand the food service was handicap accessible. L. Wild replied in the negative. D. Bellante-Holand did not find the dining experience to be the same between sitting outside and sitting behind a screen. D. Seidman agreed and did not believe the amenities were the same.

B. Robinson and H. Stephenson inquired if the regulations required that a percentage of seats had to be handicap accessible. H. Stephenson inquired about the existing seating capacities for the first and second floors of the restaurant. L. Wild was not aware of a percentage and did not have the floor plan to illustrate the seating arrangements.

C. Doble recalled in a previous application to extend the restaurant's hours of operation there was concern about the noise level from the chatter, and was concerned about the noise level with the additional thirty seats in the upper deck. L. Wild advised her that while they had the approval to open until 11PM, they normally closed at 10 PM.

L. Wild indicated that she polled her employees about the number of dinghies they helped tie up per night and learned that for the months of July and August they averaged 3-4, each carrying 4-6 people. They usually arrived around 5-5:30PM for an early dinner because their dinghies did not have night lights.

She informed the Board that she hired an engineer to help her create a parking plan for Hinkley's property and their property, next door. She was going to implement the suggestions he made to make parking easier for the patrons. The applicant and property was also looking into purchasing an abutting parcel of land to secure employee housing and additional parking arrangements.

C. Doble noted that they were sharing Hinkley's parking lot with the MV Film center, which could present an issue. L. Wild noted that the MV Film Center used Hinkley's parking lot for events. He held only two during the summer. She found that they had to let go of the parking attendant because they never had more than three or four cars park at Hinkley's at night. The MV Film Center was also required to have an attendant available whenever they used the lot.

B. Robinson inquired if there was a restroom in the building upstairs. . L. Wild replied in the negative. He inquired about the second means of egress. L. Wild replied that they had a staircase that led outside to the walkway. He asked about the extent of the marina's operations. L. Wild replied that the downstairs was for the sole use of the marina's guests, which included the covered deck.

D. Seidman asked if the Board was prepared to move forward on the decision to refer the application to the MV Commission. B. Robinson moved to refer the application to the MV Commission for a concurrence vote as suggested by P. Folley along with a letter recommending that they remand the application. C. Doble seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 5/0/0

H. Stephenson thought the Planning Board should consider discussing a provision against adding a new public barrier. B. Robinson indicated that the Planning Board had the ability to condition their determination to include such restriction, and thought it was a subject that should be discussed at a later time.

There being no further comment, D. Seidman entertained a motion to continue the public hearing until 2/15/17 at 6PM to give the MV Commission sufficient time address their referral. C. Doble seconded the motion. And the motion carried 5/0/0

The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled meeting at 7:17 PM. M. Loberg departed to attend the Finance & Advisory Committee meeting.

7:17 PM Public Hearing: Application for a Special Permit re: Samuel Denbo, Tr. AP 07G06
Attendance: Refer to Signature Sheet

Hearing commenced in due form at 7:17 PM. Planning Board Chairman, D. Seidman read the public hearing notice into the record of the minutes, explaining that the applicant was proposing to construct a flat, insulated, water proof wooden deck over an exposed brick foundation that once supported a two level "bump out" in a structure with a living area of 5969 sq. ft. within the B1 District.

J. Lolley, the applicant's engineer and representative explained that he was called in for an emergency repair of a collapsed two-story addition (bump-out) in the rear of a mixed use, commercial structure.

He explained that the two story addition was constructed on top of the existing roof of a single-story, light-framed "bump out" structure to provide additional bedrooms for the second and third floor apartments. The substandard construction of the "bump out" led to the large buckle in the building's second level exterior framing wall, where it attached to the main building's north wall. The undersized, knotty studs used for the frame of the exterior wall snapped from the stress of the weight load, causing the exterior wall to buckle.

The applicant wanted to finish and re-shingle the rear exterior wall and to construct a water proof wooden deck over the existing brick foundation to protect the music store's storage space and to prevent the exposed water pipes from freezing. Mr. Lolley submitted a letter breaking down the net loss in floor area from removing the bump outs. The letter indicated that the floor area was reduced by 512 sq. ft.

D. Seidman requested a clarification regarding the special permit requirement for an emergency repair. He was informed that the building's sq. footage triggered the review.

D. Seidman referred to the Board members for any questions. J. Lolley informed the Board that the proposal was reviewed by the Site Plan Review Board.

There being no further comment, D. Seidman entertained a motion to close the hearing and enter into deliberations at the conclusion of the discussions. B. Robinson so moved. C. Doble seconded the motion, which motion carried. 5/0/0 The Planning Board returned to open session at 7:25 PM and immediately entered into deliberations.

7:25 PM Deliberations: Application for a Special Permit re: Samuel Denbo, Tr. AP 07G06

B. Robinson inquired if they intended to use EPDM to water proof the deck. J. Lolley replied in the affirmative. B Robinson noted that the pressure treated wood eroded the EPDM. J. Lolley indicated that the EPDM would not contact the pressure treated wood.

C. Doble moved to approve the application for a special permit for the repair of the exterior wall and the construction of the water proof deck as presented. B. Robinson seconded the motion. And the motion carried. 5/0/0

D. Seidman noted that they had to continue the deliberations on 1/26/17 at 5:30 PM to review a draft decision. B. Robinson so moved. Said motion was seconded and carried. 5/0/0

The Planning Board resumed their regular session at 7:27 PM and agreed to meet at an earlier time on 1/26/17 to accommodate their appointments.

7:30 PM Public Hearing (Cont.): Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment – Sec. 2, Definitions
Attendance: Christine Flynn, MV Commission

Hearing commenced in due form at 7:30 PM. D. Seidman, Planning Board Chairman read the public hearing notice containing the definitions for Area Median Income (AMI), Affordable Housing, Community Housing, and Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan and Resident Selection Guidelines. Also entered into the record of the minutes were emailed comments from P. Temple, Planning Board Chairman from the Town of Aquinnah indicating that they had not met to vote on the definitions. P. Temple also questioned the appropriateness of the use of the term "community

housing” for affordable housing, preferring the approved income levels to delineate the housing options. He felt the terms gave affordable housing a very negative connotation. H. Stephenson thought it was a misuse of the language and a slur to the affordable housing residents. It was her opinion that the term community housing had nothing to do with affordable housing, and more to do with communal housing and co-housing.

D. Seidman wanted to add to the record that the Town of Edgartown was meeting on January 17 to discuss the definitions, the Town of Chilmark did not act on the definitions as of yet, the Town of Oak Bluffs was waiting on the Town of Edgartown , and West Tisbury had voted to accept the definitions. He added that all of the towns shared the same legal counsel, and were advised that the terms could have a potential conflict with their existing bylaws.

C. Doble understood that the terms were recommended by the state. C. Flynn replied that it was partially true in that they used state and federal income indexes for the AMI at 80%, but relied on the state’s guidelines to encourage the towns to enact permanent restrictions and to abide by the Affirmative Fair Housing practices. The term “Community Housing” was suggested at the time they developed the Island Plan because they did not know how to define the income thresholds that were being raised up to 150%. It came up when the Community Preservation Act was allowed to fund affordable housing for those earning up to 100% of AMI. In 2004 the state allowed the Dukes and Nantucket Counties to place deed restrictions up to 150% of the AMI without providing a technical definition for that threshold. And the term does not exist in the rest of the Commonwealth.

She’s noticed that the federal government and Commonwealth have concentrated on workforce housing, without providing a definition for “workforce housing”. In recent research, she’s found that the common income thresholds being used to fund ‘workforce housing’ varied between 50% - 120%. Her objective for the definitions was to clarify the income thresholds, the permanent restrictions and to clarify the fair housing marketing.

H. Stephenson did not think “Community Housing” was correct, and recommended “indexed affordable housing “or “extended affordable housing” when it expanded the affordable housing regulation. She did not understand why they wanted to avoid the use of the term “affordable within the definition, if it described an affordable housing option. C. Flynn explained that the term “affordable” was restricted by specific state and federal guidelines, so that they could not use the term. H. Stephenson understood and reiterated that the term community housing was a misuse of the language, and separated the affordable out of the community, which she could not support.

Additional discussions ensued. D. Bellante-Holand asked C. Flynn if there was a term she could recommend other than “community housing” that addressed H. Stephenson’s concern. C. Flynn replied in the negative. B. Robinson thought they were discussing semantics, and agreed that the term “community housing” was too vague. He recommended reaching out to the other towns for their opinions and to move forward on the other definitions. C. Doble concurred.

D. Bellante-Holand thought H. Stephenson raised a valid point, but felt they spent sufficient time discussing the subject. Unless H. Stephenson offered a sound recommendation, she suggested that

they move on to conclude the discussions. C. Doble understood that they could not incorporate the term “affordable” because it was tied to the state’s and federal’s qualifications i.e. 80% AMI.

Board members recommended “affordable plus housing, community supported housing or supported housing and moderate income housing”. B. Robinson reiterated his recommendation to solicit feedback from the other towns. C. Doble thought they could discuss it at the All Island Planning Board Meeting in February, if the objective was to be consistent. D. Bellante-Holand did not favor creating additional work for a committee to address the one term, when it appeared much time, research and effort had already been expended on the definition. D. Bellante-Holand asked H. Stephenson if she had an alternative. H. Stephenson replied “extended affordable housing”. D. Seidman reiterated that they could not incorporate the term “affordable” because it was confusing. D. Bellante-Holand recommended “Affordex” or “B-ffordable”.

Additional discussions ensued and D. Seidman recommended moving forward and voting on the definitions. D. Seidman asked the Board if they would recommend a motion. C. Doble moved to approve the definitions and to recommend their adoption at town meeting. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion. The motion carried: 4/1/0 H. Stephenson voting in opposition.

There being no further comment, D. Seidman entertained a motion to close the public hearing. B. Robinson so moved. C. Doble seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 5/0/0 The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 8:18 PM

BOARD DISCUSSIONS:

1. Planning Board

A. Warrant Articles

B. Annual Town Report (Due 01/15/17)

C. Planning Board Administrative Secretary position

D. Complete Streets – Howard, Stein & Hudson Associates

Warrant Articles

B. Robinson recommended the submittal of a warrant article for the \$400,000.00. D. Seidman advised the Board that they could draft a “place holder” to meet the deadline, and ask the town administrator or legal counsel for more appropriate language.

C. Doble recommended language preventing them from exceeding the limits of the MassDOT’s grant and reimbursement policy.

Annual Town Report

C. Doble offered to write the report for 2016.

Planning Board Administrative Secretary

Board members were provided with a job description for the new Administrative Secretary position and the Administrative Assistant. Accompanying the job descriptions was a table itemizing the job details performed by the Administrative Assistant. The highlighted text was to be delegated to the new position. Copies of the Board of Health’s and Building Department’s Administrative Secretarial positions were also provided for the purpose of comparison.

C. Doble indicated that she requested the table to formulate a better sense of the work load and the time normally required to complete each task. She wanted to know if the work load warranted a part time or full time employee. The Planning Board Assistant advised the Board that the requirements of the department have exceeded the scope of the existing position's responsibilities for the past couple of years. The volume of work has multiplied with the Site Plan Review Board's administrative responsibilities, and temporary ancillary committees the Planning Board created or occasionally assisted. The volume frequently exceeded the limits of a 40 hour position and has created a stressful work environment.

D. Seidman noted that the extra position would add approximately \$100,000.00 to the town's budget. The Town's Tax Collector estimated the total for wages and benefits at \$67,000.00 for a full time position, and an additional \$17.00 in real estate taxes for homes valued at \$879,000.00. D. Seidman did not believe the \$67,000.00 reflected the true cost because it did not include the pension benefits that residents also contributed towards. B. Robinson inquired if the person could be shared with other departments, so that they could provide clerical support to some of the committees that have had a difficult time hiring staff. The Administrative Assistant believed they had sufficient work to justify a full time position and was concerned about meeting the needs of the department before they committed much needed help elsewhere.

D. Seidman advised the Board that the new position required the submittal of a warrant article by the January 17, 2017 deadline. The Administrative Assistance submitted a draft article for the Board's review. H. Stephenson understood that the school was not requesting any funds this year, and thought the timing would work in their favor. D. Seidman agreed. H. Stephenson commented that the Board had some responsibility to address the staff's request for assistance. Given that the Board was proposing to embark on a few new projects, they should support the new position.

Additional discussions ensued with this regard, and D. Seidman asked the Administrative Assistant for information about the process. She advised the Board that they had to agree and vote on the additional position, and to move forward with a warrant article that established the position and salary.

D. Bellante-Holand found it difficult to ascertain the need for an additional position without knowing if the workload that was being assigned to the one staff member resulted in actual benefit to the town. She noticed that majority of time spent at meetings was on lengthy discussions with little to no action. She questioned the value in having a paid staff person at the discussions in absence of some tangible benefit, and asked if they should evaluate the actual benefits in holding Vision Council meetings or subcommittee meetings to maximize the benefits to the town. Without quantifying the value in providing a service, it was difficult to justify the expenditure or investment. B. Robinson thought D. Bellante-Holand raised an important question. D. Bellante-Holand indicated that she did not have an issue supporting the Administrative Secretarial position if in their opinion, they believed the increase in capacity correlated with an increase in efficacy.

D. Seidman understood, but did not believe the comparison between a municipal office and private enterprise was fair, in that a governmental agency was designed to provide a public service without any consideration for profit. B. Robinson further noted that the breakdown clearly demonstrated that the majority of the workload was adjudicatory in nature and a service required by local or state regulation to assist residents through the regulatory processes.

H. Stephenson noticed that the Planning Board has committed to address a few town issues, and to embark on new projects such as the Open Space and Recreation Plan which was going to increase the Administrative Assistant's workload.

Board members agreed to move forward on the Administrative Assistant's recommendation for an additional staff person, and H. Stephenson moved to establish a full-time position of Planning Board Administrative Secretary (and salary) and to submit the warrant article as written. C. Doble seconded the motion, which motion carried. 5/0/0

2. J. Grande, Town Administrator

A. Zoning Bylaw Amendments (Protection and Preservation of Public Shade Trees during Construction and Scenic Roads)

C. Doble did not understand what the town administrator was asking of the Planning Board, given that the regulations were not zoning regulations. She offered to meet with Ray Tattersall to inquire about the purpose for the language, given that he had jurisdiction over public shade trees.

B. Harbor & Waterways Planning Committee Appointee (Planning Board's representative)

Benjamin Robinson volunteered to serve on the committee. D. Seidman moved to appoint B. Robinson as their representative to the committee. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 5/0/0

3. Special Ways

RE: Red Coat Hill Road Boundaries for designation

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:

1. Policies for Refreshments

- A. City of Sequim, WA
- B. City of Olympia, WA
- C. City of Mukilteo, WA
- D. City of Bellingham, WA
- E. City of Ashland, OR
- F. J. Grande's proposal

2. John Lolley, PE

RE: Withdrawal of application for a special permit Larkin B. Reeves, Tr. (AP 09C01)

The Planning Board accepted Mr. Lolley's letter, dated 12/30/16 to withdraw an application for a special permit on behalf Larkin B. Reeves, Tr. for the above listed property without prejudice. m/s/c 5/0/0

3. Tisbury Conservation Commission

- A. Public Hearing Notice – Andrew Dimmick, AP 11A59 (deck)
- B. Public Hearing Notice – Tisbury Harbormaster, AP 37B1.2 (maintenance dredging)

4. Tisbury Board of Appeals

- A. Public Hearing Notice – William Westman, AP 7H8 (pre-existing, non-conforming structure)
- B. Public Hearing Notice – John Meleney, AP 5H5 (Modification of height in coastal district)
- C. Public Hearing Notice – Frederick Rundlet, AP 8D1 (Accessory Apartment)
- D. Public Hearing Notice – Andrew Dimmick, AP 11A59 (addition to structure within shore zone)
- E. Permit #2257 – Raymond & Mary Gosselin, AP 22a13.1 (outside storage of boats)
- F. Permit #2571– Tony Godfrey & Virginia Litle, AP 30A8 (swimming pool in shore zone)
- G. Permit #2574 – Bethany Scanlon, AP 22A22 (Expansion of pre-existing, non-conforming bldg.)

5. Thomson Reuters
RE: Zoning Bulletin, 10 December 2016

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

PRO FORM Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 9:50 P.M.(m/s/c 5/0/0)
Respectfully submitted;

Patricia V. Harris, Administrative Assistant

APPROVAL: Approved and accepted as official minutes;

Date

Benjamin Robinson
Chairman Pro Tem