

# 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:** February 15, 2017

**TIME:** 6:05 PM

**ATTENDANCE:** Robinson, Seidman, Stephenson  
Bellante-Holand arrived at 6:12 PM

**ABSENT:** Doble

**MINUTES:** As referred in the January 26, 2017 Meeting Agenda  
12/7/16 M/S/C 4/0/0  
01/11/17 M/S/C 4/0/0  
01/26/17 M/S/C 4/0/0  
02/1/17 M/S/C 4/0/0

**BILLS:** MV Times.....\$317.70  
Planning Board (Postage).....\$ 7.15  
Howard, Stein & Hudson Assoc.....\$8165.36

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

## APPOINTMENTS:

6:00 PM Public Hearing: Special Permit Application for Garde de le Mar, 09C08  
Attendance: L. Wild, property manager; H. Lee; D. Hodsdon

The continuation of the public hearing commenced in due form at 6:15 PM. Planning Board Chairman, D. Seidman began the discussion by re-introducing the Board of Health's meeting minutes dated 5/18/2010 and the former DPW Director's letter affirming their approval for an increase in seating capacity (80 seats). He entered P. Foley's email confirming that the MV Commission elected to remand the DRI referral because they did not find the proposal to be significant to warrant their review.

D. Seidman opened the discussion to the board members. H. Stephenson had a question for the applicant with regards to beach access along the beach. She noted that the Planning Board's regulation in s.06.09.05 allowed them to consider "visual and pedestrian access to the waterfront". L. Wild indicated that the marina's beach was open to the public, and explained that they constructed stairs that connected to the dock so that people could safely

traverse the beach. H. Stephenson submitted photographs of the dock to illustrate that the sign on the side ( private beach – no public access) discouraged people from traversing over the dock. If they climbed the dock, they faced an additional sign that limited the use of the dock to “Marina Guests Only”. The sign prohibited and prevented the establishment of a pedestrian access. L. Wild noted that the private beach was open to public, and that the sign at the gate was required by Homeland Security. The sign could not be removed. The staircase they constructed for the deck allowed the general public to climb onto the deck and walk down the beach. The staircase was normally removed for the winter. Pedestrians still had the ability to cross over the deck safely further up towards the building. Whereas she did not have an issue removing the sign, it prevented certain illegal activity. She noted that the police had documentation on file substantiate her claim. B. Robinson questioned that the signs were actually deterring the illegal activity relative to the legal enforcement. H. Stephenson noted that without the stairs, the deck was very high and difficult to climb. L. Wild reiterated that the recent storm required the removal of the stairs for safety reasons.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired if there was an acceptable compromise that could be negotiated to address H. Stephenson’s issue and to meet the establishment’s needs without preventing people from accessing the beach. B. Robinson thought they could change the signage to allow people to access the beach, but not loiter. D. Seidman felt they had to weigh in the rights of the private property owner. B. Robinson understood, but felt the Board had an obligation to promote the town’s policy as expressed in the zoning regulations to secure public access whenever possible. D. Seidman did not believe the regulations allowed the Board to permit the general public to use the private establishment’s amenities. B. Robinson concurred, and believed clear signage would resolve the issue. D. Seidman asked L. Wild if she was amenable to changing the text to allow the public to traverse the beach and giving the Board an opportunity to review the text. L. Wild replied in the affirmative.

B. Robinson recommended adding the request as a condition in the special permit. He also wanted to bring to the Board’s attention that there was an increase in parking requirements that had to be discussed. He understood that the applicant was providing additional parking spaces across the road, but thought it important to discuss how the applicant planned to accommodate their safe passage across the road. There being no comment, B. Robinson shared that the MassDOT were proposing a new crosswalk from Hinckley’s to the restaurant in the 75% plan for Beach Road.

H. Lee inquired if the Planning Board was recording the parking arrangements at the Hinckley site to prevent an overlap in the allotment of spaces between the applicant and R. Paradise (MV Film Society) and to verify the availability of spaces. B. Robinson clarified that Hinkleys issued a letter confirming the availability of spaces. H. Lee thought it was difficult to certify the availability of spaces at any given time, if a public record did not exist to account for their allocation, actual use or any change in use. A public account of the spaces would allow anyone thirty years down to road to keep on the top of the actual number of spaces that were available as opposed to relying on the integrity of the property owner (s), or memories.

D. Bellante-Holand understood that the MV Film Society was assigned a specific number of spaces at the Hinckley site and never exceeded the use of the spaces, so that the applicant had a reasonable expectation that the number of spaces offered by the property owner were in fact available for the use of their patrons. D. Seidman reported that they had a total of 31 parking spaces at Hinckleys.

B. Robinson noted that the arrangement also relied on neighborhood cooperation. If an issue with parking presented itself in the future, the Planning Board was obligated to address the issue. They had the ability to revoke the decision.

There being no further discussion, D. Seidman entertained a motion to close the public hearing and enter into deliberations. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0

6:40 PM        Deliberations: Special Permit Application for Garde de le Mer, 09C08

The deliberations were duly opened by the Planning Board Chairman at 6:40 PM. Board members were asked if they had any suggestions for the sign, they had discussed earlier during the public hearing. B. Robinson thought the sign had to clearly indicate that the public was welcomed to access the beach, but not allowed to linger on the property or to use the establishment's amenities. He felt the location of the sign was an important consideration, which should be approved by the Planning Board. The text for the sign was the property manager's responsibility and had to be submitted by L. Wild for Planning Board approval.

H. Stephenson raised a question about the lack of handicap accessibility for the new area. L. Wild spoke with the building inspector, who explained to her that the new section was exempted from the ADA requirement as long as she provided the same service on both floors. Additional discussions ensued, and the Board agreed that it was not a matter within the Planning Board's scope of address.

There being no further comment, D. Seidman entertained a motion on the application. B. Robinson moved to approve the applicant's request for an increase in the seating capacity (80 seats) with the aforementioned conditions and restrictions. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion. The motion carried. 4/0/0

The Board moved to continue the deliberations on 3/15/17 at 6PM to review the draft special permit. The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled meeting at 6:43PM.

6:30 PM        Public Hearing: Special Permit Application for Seven Hills Foundation, 08D11  
Attendance: E. Doucette, J. Guest, L. Perry, H. Lee, D. Hodsdon, P. Casey,  
J. Decesare, M. Loberg

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:45 PM. Planning Board Chairman informed the board members that the proposal was for the renovation and change of use of a 3600 sq. ft. structure within the BI District. The Seven Hills Foundation was proposing a non-structural

remodeling of a one-story cottage with a total gross area of 546 sq. ft. and the renovation of a two-story wood frame commercial structure with a total gross area of 3600 sq. ft. for use as an Adult Day Habilitation Center with support staff offices.

E. Doucette explained that they were currently operating a rehabilitation center at 5 Church Street with plans to relocate at 37 State Road. The new location was much more suited to the special needs of their clientele who required handicap accessible facilities. The Foundation wanted to convert the retail space in the first floor of the building into an “adult dayhab” facility with offices for staff. He did not expect more than eight clients and four staff members in the facility at any given time.

E. Doucette advised the Board that the clientele did not drive to the location and had to rely on a van service for transportation, so that the only cars on the premises would belong to the four staff members during the facility’s hours of operations (8AM to 4 PM). In comparison to previous retail use of the building, he believed there would be less vehicular activity on the property to have any impact on traffic.

D. Bellante-Holand noted that there were a total of nine parking spaces illustrated on the site plan, and inquired about the use of the three bedroom apartment upstairs on the second floor. E. Doucette replied that the apartment was intended for staff. D. Bellante-Holand inquired about the daytime activity. E. Doucette replied that it was vocational (OT and computers). D. Bellante-Holand inquired if they planned to have a kitchen to provide meals. E. Doucette answered that they would have a kitchenette to provide snacks, but that their clientele were essentially responsible for providing their own lunches.

B. Robinson inquired about the use of the back parking lot. J. Guest replied that they were leasing four parking spaces to the Mansion House. L. Perry added that they had four additional parking spaces on the side specifically for staff and five short term or transient spaces out front for visitors.

B. Robinson advised the Board that the applicant’s representative, J. Guest met with the Site Plan Review Board on a couple of occasions. At their last discussions on ??/?/16, the applicant scaled back the exterior renovations to power washing and staining the natural cedar shingles. E. Doucette confirmed that they did away with the vinyl siding, and were now proposing to use the horizontal pre-finished HardiPlank on the lower part of the building. B. Robinson inquired if the 2 ft. overhang over the side entrance was sufficient. J. Guest did not believe a 3 ft. overhang was necessary. It also detracted from the aesthetics of the front façade.

R. Casey, an abutter did not have any objections to the use of the structure. She favored the exterior revisions, because the architect of the building was so out of character with the abutting properties in the neighborhood. She advised the Board that a handful of buildings on the street were fortunate to have survived a devastating fire in Vineyard Haven. She thought the renovations were an improvement, but did not alter the structure’s appearance sufficiently to blend into the neighborhood. R. Casey asked the applicant if they would

replace the 1950 picture windows with four single windows and shutters up front on the second floor and use double hung windows to replace the picture windows. B. Robinson recalled the discussions at the Site Plan Review Board, and noted that a similar recommendation was raised. The issue was that the pitch of the roof did not lend itself to the more traditional style.

L. Perry advised E. Doucette that there was a cost factor to the proposed revisions that they had to consider. E. Doucette mentioned that they were replacing the windows on the second floor all the way around. L. Perry added that they were also adding a window to replace the front door that was being relocating to the side. B. Robinson asked L. Perry if they needed a significant amount of natural light for their activities. She replied that it was essential to have natural light in the first floor, given that it was the area where they held the activities for their clientele .

D. Seidman noted that it was a business. B. Robinson acknowledged but felt they had a responsibility to address the aesthetics of a historical building on a public road. R. Casey noted that the attorney's office building across the street changed the style of the windows to conform to the more traditional style of the abutting properties. E. Doucette thought they had to revisit the design and cost to determine if it was feasible. He asked R. Casey what upset her the most about the windows. She replied that she did not like the scale, layout or style of the windows. She felt they could improve the existing configuration and style of windows. L. Perry disagreed and referred R. Casey to the architectural plans reflecting the overhang with trim boards, etc. E. Doucette noted that the overhang reduced the picture window's impact. R. Casey insisted that the windows on the second floor should be traditional. B. Robinson thought it was possible, but that any change would require further study. The applicant's largest hurdle in the design was the low roofline, and based on the discussions the only issue appeared to be the two picture windows.

J. Guest explained that they were proposing to eliminate the two giant windows up front and adding two gang double hung windows on each side, a picture window and planking with another set of double hung windows. It was his impression that the building would never appear residential because it was constructed as a commercial structure. B. Robinson believed the issue was about blending in the structure. D. Seidman inquired if this was discussed at the Site Plan Review Board. B. Robinson indicated that they discussed the materials. D. Seidman thought it was important to have brought this up at the Site Plan Review Board so that the applicant could have addressed these issues prior to the public hearing. D. Hodsdon disclosed the fact that he was a member of the Site Plan Review Board and the William Street Historic District, but that the comments he planned on making were his own personal opinions. As a contractor, he had worked on several historic structures and found that there was a way of blending a structure into the neighborhood. The low roofline was not as uncommon or an unsurmountable challenge. He felt they could use a "6/6 window" which was typical of the traditional look on the island, and place a mullion over it on the outside and a muntin on the inside to give the window a traditional appearance.

D. Seidman inquired if wanted to continue the discussions to another date. B. Robinson asked E. Doucette for their construction schedule. E. Doucette advised the Board that they had a buyer for the building on Church Street, and did not want to jeopardize the sale. They did not realize that they were obligated to undergo the additional review process, and were well behind their construction schedule.

J. Guest asked R. Casey if she would approve of replacing the large picture window on the second floor with three large double hung windows with mullions. J. ?????, a contractor thought the recommendation for three 6/6 or 6/9 windows would address R. Casey's concern. E Doucette explained that their intent for the current proposal was to break up the monotony in a row of windows. R. Casey believed that the symmetry in a row of windows was an attractive attribute, so that she wondered if they would consider adding mullions and shutters to the windows on the second floor.

Additional discussions ensued, and D. Bellante-Holand asked the Board if there was anything they could do, within the scope of the hearing and their authority to move the process forward. L. Perry inquired if they could conclude the process with a condition on the style of the window.

E. Doucette noted that they also had a landscaping opportunity, and thought they could add plantings in the unused planter area and around the break by the front door to soften up the façade of the building.

H. Lee referred the Board to the title page (T1) of the architectural plans and inquired if the applicant was proposing a new parking layout. D. Seidman replied in the negative. H. Lee inquired if they were proposing to place planters along the front property line to delineate the front parking lot from the sidewalk, because the current configuration blurred the separation. E. Doucette noted that they were proposing planters along the front of the building. H Lee they could add plants and small trees on the side of the building along the edge of the parking lot facing the four side parking spaces. He also suggested adding a vegetative border (i.e. zebra grass) along the edge of the front property line to delineate the front sidewalk and egress. R. Casey believed H. Lee raised an important safety issue because of accidents, and the fact that the sidewalk was very narrow. H. Lee reiterated that he was suggesting that the applicant simply create a visual barrier (landscaping) or demarcation between parking lot and sidewalk. D. Seidman noted that the two means of egress were clearly defined as was the sidewalk.

Additional discussions ensued, and D. Seidman asked the Board if they had additional comments or questions for the applicant. There being none, he entertained a motion to close the hearing from the Board.

The administrative assistant requested a clarification regarding the board's address with regards to this application. D. Seidman replied that they were considering all of the windows on the second floor and the one picture window on the first floor. B. Robinson indicated that the applicant needed time to revise their proposal. D. Bellante-Holand was of the impression

that they were going to move forward on the approval and allow them to address the issues and incorporate the recommendations in the revised plans. R. Casey requested the opportunity to review the revisions. D. Bellante-Holand did not want to restrict the applicants from moving forward on their project. D. Seidman concurred.

Additional discussions ensued, and the L Perry indicated that they were moving forward on the revisions to the façade, and rethinking the configuration and style of the windows on the second floor. J. Guest noted that it would be difficult to accommodate the revisions R. Casey was recommending for the first floor because they needed the light. The recommendations for muntins and shutters on the first floor were excessive, and only made it “look too busy”.

There being no further discussion, B. Robinson moved to close the public hearing and enter into deliberations. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0

7:34 PM        Deliberations: Special Permit Application for Seven Hills Foundation, 08D11

The deliberations of the previously held public hearing were duly opened at 7:34 PM. D. Seidman, Planning Board Chairman opened the discussions and asked the Board for their comments.

D. Bellante-Holand moved to approve the proposal as presented with conditions and restrictions pertaining to the front elevations, as discussed. B. Robinson seconded the motion. The motion carried. 4/0/0

D. Bellante-Holand recommended continuing the deliberations on 3/22/17 at 6 PM. B. Robinson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0    The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled meeting at 7:36 PM

7:42 PM        Public Hearing: Tisbury’s 2017 Street List  
Attendance: H. Lee, D. Hodsdon, M. Loberg

The hearing commenced in due form at 7:42 PM. The Planning Board Chairman read the hearing notice into the minutes and acknowledged the members of the public before introducing the Board.

H. Stephenson inquired if the list was limited to public roads. The Administrative Assistant replied that the list included all public and private roads in town. H. Stephenson questioned the inclusion of Mayrand Way, given that that the road was being use as a private driveway and did not extend to Proprietor’s Way. Board members were advised that Mr. Mayrand had intentionally blocked the road with plantings and boulders to prevent anyone from traversing the road.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired about the purpose for the list. B. Robinson explained that it was a state requirement. It was an official document that listed the existence of a road.

B. Robinson moved to approve the Street List for 2017 as presented. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion. H. Stephenson recommended that they delete Mayrand Way from the list.

H. Lee recommended adding an explanatory paragraph on the proposed draft to identify the revisions to the list, or to inform the public that there were none. The recommendation was acknowledged. H. Lee noted that the Planning Board endorsed a Form A Plan acknowledging (Old Hedge Row) as a private way. A new title search and survey confirmed that 9 ft. of the 10 ft. wide access, Old Hedge Row belonged to him. The listing of the access road on the Street List concerned him, in that it appeared to legitimize the taking. He asked the Board if they could revise the list to describe the access road as a path. B. Robinson advised H. Lee that he'd have to pursue a legal remedy that the town would recognize to alter their records.

H. Lee thought they could avoid the situation if they asked the surveyor to verify that they've checked the last 50 years of the area's land area. He found that they did not comply with the requirement to save their clientele the additional cost.

H. Stephenson wanted to go on record to have Mayrand Way reopened from Midland Ave. to Main Street, and if it was not possible, to have the road removed from the list, if the property owner continued to use the road as a private driveway. D. Bellante-Holand recommended moving forward on the discussions if the Planning Board did not have the ability or jurisdiction to open the road to the public. She thought H. Stephenson raised a valid point, but felt that the subject should be referred to the appropriate authority or raised at the Vision Council's upcoming meeting on Complete Streets.

D. Seidman entertained a vote on B. Robinson's motion to approve the street list. The Board voted 4/0/0

D. Seidman moved to close the public hearing. B. Robinson seconded the motion. The motion carried. 4/0/0 The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled meeting at 7:54 PM

7:54 PM      Reid Silva re: Form A Application MV Land Bank, AP 16A22

R. Silva informed the Board that the property in question lie within the Oklahoma area and part of a very old subdivision plan, that were designed as pictures depicting the type of development they wanted for the property, but that was not adhered to by developers. It created an issue with the title of the properties in the area, so that any exchange or purchase of property warranted a perimeter survey.

He explained that the Tisbury Land Bank Advisory Board contacted him to do a perimeter survey of the Watson property because they were purchasing the property. During the survey they discovered that both abutters had been encroaching on the Watson property to some degree over the land that the property had title on.



The MV Land Bank wanted to resolve the conflicts with the abutters so that they could have a clean title to the Watson property. In the final agreement between the property owners, D. Dandridge gains the land area delineated as lot 2 in exchange for lot 3, which provides the Land Bank frontage on the pond. Lot 4 was being conveyed to Mr. Johnson so that he could meet the district's setback requirements for his dwelling.

H. Stephenson reported that the committee supported the purchase of the lot because it provided public access to lagoon point and a way of accessing the beach.

There being no further comment, B. Robinson moved to approve the plan of land for the MV Land Bank as presented. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried.

4/0/0

8:00 PM          Public Hearing: Proposed ZBL Amendment – Sec. 04.03.11(Mobile/Tiny Homes)  
Attendance: M. Loberg, H. Lee, D. Hodsdon

Hearing commenced in due form at 8:05 PM. Planning Board Chairman, D. Seidman read the notice into the minutes and explained that he had been working on building costs and methods to produce affordable housing for the last couple of years. In the course of his research he met with a developer in California who was managing 16,000 land lease lots in California (or mobile home park lots) and thinking about converting them to tiny homes.

The State of Vermont invested in a tiny home initiative in which a mobile home park was converted into a 30 bedroom housing development (e.g. McKnight Lane Affordable Housing Development) with self-contained modular units (Vermont Homes) boasting a zero net energy capability. He noted that development did not require any public financing, except for the acquisition of land and Brownfield remediation (fuel tanks). The overall cost per bedroom was \$122,000.00 as opposed to the average cost of \$250,000.00 - \$300,000.00 on island.

Composting toilets like urine-diversion units (Eco Johns) in solar powered modular homes were just some ideas that he wanted to share with the Board about the options that were available for producing cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally friendly homes.

Board members inquired about the relationship between the presentation and the proposed bylaw amendment D. Seidman was recommending. He explained that that the requirements in the bylaw were unrealistic and prohibitive in nature to render the regulation useless. He believed the regulation could be revised to facilitate housing developments similar to the McKnight Lane Affordable Housing Development. It was the purpose for reducing the land acre land area requirement to 3 acres, reducing the buffer from a public road from 200 ft. to 50 ft., reducing the buffer zone between homes from 60 ft. to fifty ft. and for reducing the perimeter boundaries from 100 ft. to 50 ft. D. Seidman indicated that he was recommending the removal of the text "the use of a mobile

home park for the storage or parking of mobile homes or trailers for sale thereof is forbidden”, and the addition of the following language:

**“No storage or parking of a mobile home/tiny home for storage or parking of unoccupied units”.**

D. Seidman indicated that the revisions allowed a developer to create a housing development “that an average person could buy or rent” as permitted in MGL Chapter 140, Sections 32-32L. The requirements listed in the aforementioned regulation were similar to a homeowners’ association’s covenants.

H. Stephenson thought the revisions were substantial in nature and supportive of private development, which did not translate into affordable housing. She did not see anything in the bylaw that encouraged the development of affordable units. She understood the concept for tiny homes, but the proposed revisions were geared for a specific group of people with a preference for a particular lifestyle, that did not accommodate families. The proposal essentially allowed the private development of tiny home parks throughout the town for the sole benefit of the private developer. Nothing in the bylaw prevented the wealthy developer from owning several units to rent for the summer season

D. Seidman disagreed with H. Stephenson and explained that 75% of the DCRHA’s wait list required an affordable unit for a family of one to two people. H. Stephenson observed that the language did not address the points of access, the road system, utilities, etc. D. Seidman explained that the reference to MGL Chapter 140, Sections 32-32L was included in the proposed bylaw because it addressed these issues. The Planning Board in addition had the ability to generate regulations to address all of the concerns and restrict the development, accordingly.

B. Robinson thought H. Stephenson raised a valid point about the summer rentals. D. Seidman reiterated that the development required a special permit, in which they could incorporate conditions and restrictions to prevent the potential abuse. B. Robinson noted that the language clearly allowed the use as a matter of right; it did not require a special permit. D. Seidman acknowledged the oversight, reiterating they could add language to require a special permit. B. Robinson asked the Planning Board Chairman to explain how they were going to monitor the affordability of the units and their year round occupation. D. Seidman replied that it would be in the form of a restriction.

H. Stephenson thought the regulation required further thought, and considered within the context of the HPP’s recommendations and the recodification of their zoning regulations. D. Seidman thought it was important to provide a way to produce affordable housing, if they were sincere and committed to addressing the need.

H. Lee believed D. Seidman’s affiliation on the Island Housing Trust (IHT) as a board member could be perceived as a conflict of interest, given that he made determinations on the construction of affordable housing complexes and developments. H. Lee questioned D.

Seidman's ability to conduct the hearing. D. Seidman did not believe his affiliation with the IHT prevented him from authoring or presenting the bylaw amendment.

H. Stephenson noted that the Planning Board never discussed or voted on the proposal prior to the scheduling of the public hearing. D. Seidman's departure from protocol robbed them of the time they needed to discuss the merits of proposal and its appropriateness.

H. Lee added that the HPP consultants in the first two workshops commented that the Towns of Oak Bluffs and Tisbury did not have an issue with affordable housing (85% AMI) as did the towns of Edgartown and West Tisbury. Tisbury had sufficient housing types that were affordable. The question they were being asked about pertained to the housing types they wanted to see in the future. He thought the bylaw amendment was premature given that the town officials and the community have not had the opportunity to discuss the HPP or to accept the plan and its recommendations. H. Lee thought the bylaw amendment had to correlate with the HPP recommendations, master plan policies etc. and evaluated against all other possible options.

D. Bellante-Holand was not prepared to comment on the new concept without further review. She needed time to see the physical layout of a development and the financial impacts. It was too early in the process to vote on the proposal, but felt that she could not support the bylaw amendment as it was written because it was inconsistent with the sentiments of the community, and it did not provide affordable housing.

B. Robinson inquired if there was a requirement for towns to develop a regulation for mobile home parks. D. Seidman replied in the negative, explaining that the regulation simply provided the town a mechanism by which to regulate the use. B. Robinson felt there was a definite monetary motivation to develop the tiny home park. If the houses were to remain affordable, they had to be restricted as affordable and monitored. D. Bellante-Holand agreed, and saw a potential for abuse by private investors. She asked D. Seidman about the intent for the bylaw amendment he was proposing. D. Seidman replied that he wanted to create a mechanism by which they could develop housing without any government subsidies. He wanted to provide decent homes at an affordable cost with zero-net energy.

H. Stephenson noted that it did not accommodate families. D. Seidman replied that it was intended for "starters" and "enders", the population in most need of housing according to the statistics. M. Loberg recommended looking at the whole picture and prioritizing their solutions. H. Lee believed they had sufficient units on island to address their housing needs. He thought could generate units by restricting or prohibiting the short term rental of the apartments and by converting existing housing stock into multi-unit buildings.

H. Lee was also of the impression that they did not have to meet the state's 10% subsidized housing inventory. B. Robinson clarified that communities within the Commonwealth had the option of complying with the state's minimum 10% requirement, or the HPP's recommendations to guard against unfriendly 40B developments. H. Lee inquired about the

18% raised at the presentations. B. Robinson replied that the 18% pertained to the percentage of units the whole island had to produce to meet the needs for affordable housing.

Additional discussions ensued and M. Loberg recommended looking at the solutions that were being recommended as a whole and prioritize them. H. Stephenson concurred.

Due to the late hour, D. Seidman moved to close the public hearing given that the Planning Board did not vote on the proposed bylaw amendment. B. Robinson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0 The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 9:05 PM. D. Bellante-Holand departed shortly after.

### **BOARD DISCUSSIONS:**

1. D. Seidman's report on Finance & Advisory Committee Mtg. on 2/8/17
  - A. Administrative Secretary, Assistant to the Planning Board
  - B. Budget

D. Seidman reported that the Finance & Advisory Committee approved the Planning Board's request for additional staff (e.g. Administrative Secretary), and J. Grande's recommendation to elevate P. Harris to MP2 level 4. In the course of the discussions, J. Kristal recommended cross-training the new hire to cover the Building Department in R. DeBettencourt's absences to improve the inter-departmental communication, and the workflow between the Planning Board and Building Department. He thought they could use the opportunity to re-configure the Town Hall Annex and relocate the Planning Board's Office into the space currently used by the ZBA for P. Harris and R. DeBettencourt. J. Kristal thought they could relocate the new hire into R. DeBettencourt's office, and move the ZBA/Conservation Commission into the Planning Board's current office. The Conservation Agent could be accommodated in the space that once accommodated the Shellfish Constable.

D. Seidman added that the Finance & Advisory Committee in addition reduced several line items in the budget for FY 2018. He reported that they had reduced the advertising line item by \$500.00, the mapping line item by \$300.00, the supplies line item by \$350.00, the office supplies line item by \$250.00, the equipment line item by \$500.00, the consulting line item by \$2,000.00 and all funds requested for seasonal help and overtime. In total the Planning Board's budget was reduced by \$16,185.00 to offset the increase in salaries.

Additional discussions ensued and B. Robinson noted that there was sufficient housing on island to house everyone year round, if they could become a market player and revenue stream.

D. Seidman moved to close the public hearing. B. Robinson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0 D. Bellante-Holand left the discussions at 9:05 PM

2. All Island Planning Board Meeting Agenda

3. Complete Street Policy

- A. Presentation on February 23, 2017 at 6:30 PM (Senor Center)

C. Doble informed the Board that the MassDOT did not accept the Complete Street policy that was submitted for the Town of Tisbury. She had reviewed their comments and revised the policy accordingly for resubmittal. C. Doble explained that she included a section on performance standards, and a minor edit to the implementation section. The revised policy was sent to the Board of Selectmen's office for their approval and resubmittal to MassDOT.

4. CPTC Conference

RE: March 18, 2017 (Sat.) at Holy Cross College – Confirmation of attendance

5. H. Lee

- A. Controlling individual Curb cuts or opening sizes,
- B. Commercial Parking in Residential or historical/residential lot, in R or B, without any permitting or supervising reviews and regulations in place,
- C. Un-recorded commercial parking and its tracking
- D. Parking Needs Study and Strategy (instead of expanding parking space numbers in town)

H. Lee asked the Planning Board to consider adopting a regulation that would allow them to review every facet of a property and not just the building because he was noticing a proliferation of pocket commercial parking lots within the B1 District's residential properties. He thought needed to address the various features of a property, such as open space, parking area, etc. to be thorough. B. Robinson advised H. Lee that the recently approved a regulation that allowed the Planning Board to review all of the property's features.

H. Lee was concerned that the Planning Board did not appreciate the significance of the oversight, and its impact on the business district. B. Robinson advised H. Lee that the Planning Board did not have jurisdiction over the B1 District, until recently, and under specific circumstances. He suggested bringing the issue to the Board of Selectmen's Parking Study Committee, who was currently studying the town's parking needs.

H. Lee believed the issue required a zoning regulation. Discussions ensued, and D. Seidman advised H. Lee that they could not continue the conversation due to the late hour. He was advised that the Parking Study Committee was addressing the issue he raised, and looking into solutions for the Board of Selectmen's consideration.

6. Committee Reports

7. 2016 Town Report

**CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:**

1. M. E. Lipke

RE: Accessory Apartments

The Planning Board acknowledged Ms. Lipke's letter.

2. MV Commission

- A. P. Foley re: Garde de le Mer, AP 09C08 and Santander Bank
- B. 10 February 2017 Extended Schedule
- C. 16 February 2017 Meeting Scheduled

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

**PRO FORM**

Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 9:17 P.M.  
m/s/c 4/0/0)  
Respectfully submitted;

---

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

**APPROVAL:**

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

---

Date

---

Daniel Seidman  
Chairman