

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: July 19, 2017

TIME: 6:01PM

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

BILLS: Staples.....\$98.96

ATTENDANCE: Bellante-Holand, Doble, Robinson, Seidman

MINUTES: As referred in the May 17, 2017 Meeting Agenda
17 May 2017 m/s/c 4/0/0
31 May 2017 m/s/c 4/0/0
14 June 2017 As amended m/s/c 4/0/0
16 June 2017 m/s/c 4/0/0
28 June 2017 m/s/c 4/0/0

APPOINTMENTS :

6:01 PM Dan Clemmey and Kristen Reimann (Landscape Architect) re: Boch Park, AP 09C02

D. Clemmey indicated that he represented E. Boch Jr. on this project and requested the appointment to present his client's proposal to develop a commercial parcel of land in the Waterfront Commercial District into a private park. He explained that he had met with the Conservation Committee once and was preparing for his second meeting. His interest in meeting with the Planning Board was to solicit their comments and recommendations before he met with the Conservation Commission.

Board members were invited to review Kristen Reimann's architectural plans, which included a site plan, and excavation plan, layout and materials plan, grading and drainage plan, planting plan, irrigation plan, lighting plan and plan for the deck, and wooden fence. The plans for Boch Park were dated 6/27/17 and rev. 7/7/17 (Plan Nos. L 1.0 – L 8.0)

K. Reimann inquired about the Planning Board's scope of address for the project and was advised that the proposal was a use that was permitted as a matter of right. It would have required Planning Board review if they were proposing extensive impervious surfaces. This was not the case for this proposal. K. Reimann explained that proposed park was comprised

of a combination of pervious and impervious surfaces, starting with the gray shaded area around the circular mound of lawn in the middle of the property. She explained that the darker gray hatching on the site plan represented a washed aggregate surface and the lighter gray hatching reflected their proposal for dry granite set. The overall percentage of impervious surface was very little.

B. Robinson indicated that the proposal was rather unique use for the commercial district, so that it was important to understand its function and potential impact. C. Doble thought storm water management, and drainage was an important aspect because it was such a challenge in the area. K. Reimann understood, and was aware that the property was subject to coastal storm flooding. She was also mindful of the fact that groundwater was only a couple feet below the surface. The landscape design was designed to collect the water in the four planted corners of the property. C. Doble inquired if the planted areas had detention capacity. K. Reimann replied in the negative and explained that they did not have anywhere to detain the surface drainage because of the groundwater's proximity to the surface.

B. Robinson inquired about the reference to a concrete slab in notes 3 & 4. K. Reimann replied that it made reference to the washed aggregate. The granite sets were pervious. B. Robinson inquired about the purpose for the concrete slab underneath the washed aggregate. K. Reimann noted that it is a process by which one washed the surface of the concrete to expose the gravel. C. Doble inquired if the planting materials did well in floods. K. Reimann replied in the affirmative and referred the Board to the spot grading plan to illustrate the planting sites. She notice that the lower points on the property were the four corners of the property. She noted that the lawn was crowned to shed the water to the planted corners. The plantings in the four corners were specifically selected to accommodate seasonably wet conditions. B. Robinson noted that the small plants could easily be replaced, but was curious about the trees, such as the London Plain Trees, Maple trees, Japanese Black Pine and cedars, and Beetle Bungs. K. Reimann replied that they would thrive. B. Robinson questioned the whether the maple trees did well in salt water. Board members counted three maple trees in various locations. K. Reimann added that they were also replenishing the dune grass because it had been destroyed by Gannon & Benjamin, who has been using the area to stage their boats. D. Clemmey interjected that he had spoken with the proprietors of G&B and made of aware of the damage.

B. Robinson inquired about the use of the park. D. Clemmey replied that it was going to be owned and maintained by the Boch family. It was going to be fenced in and locked for private use. They've met with the Board of Selectmen to explore the possibility of having a public park, but have postponed the discussions until they resolve the legalities of their liability. The Boch family was open to allowing public and civic entities (town, girl scouts) use the park at this time, but still working on a more definitive plan relative to its usage. B. Robinson noted that it would require some monitoring from the police and trash collection if it were ever to be opened for public use.

D. Clemmey indicated that the property had power and water for their irrigation plan and low shade lighting on the boardwalk. K. Reimann referred the Board to plans L-7.0 and L-8.0 to

illustrate the deck, mounted lights and wooden fence that was to be erected along the perimeter of the property. K. Reimann indicated that they were proposing a opened picket fence (black aluminum) for the north (4 ft.) and south (6 ft.) borders and an 8 ft. high fence on the east and west boundaries to screen off an abutter's service area to the west. The 8 ft. high fence was designed to have 12" wide horizontal boards that tapered down to 4" (with spacing), so that they'd have a 6 ft. high fence heading towards the harbor. It would then connect with a 4 ft. high fence that faced the beach.

M. Loberg joined the Planning Board meeting at 6:10 PM

B. Robinson noted that there was a walking path in the middle of the property. K. Reimann was aware of the path, and noted that it was created by G& B for their coffee runs to the Black Dog. The path was not part of the new landscape design. D. Clemmey indicated that the Conservation Commission was glad to see the path closed off because it was over a coastal source dune.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired if the public was allowed to use the boardwalk and benches. K. Reimann replied in the affirmative. D. Bellante-Holand inquired about its boundaries. D. Clemmey noted that it was above the high water mark. C. Doble inquired if the public would be allowed to walk over the sandy beach. D. Clemmey replied in the affirmative. D. Seidman indicated that he would like to see the park open to the public a set number of hours in the future. D. Clemmey understood but felt it was important to have a management plan for the property in place before they operated a public park. B. Robinson agreed and understood that it may require a MOU with the Board of Selectmen that included policing.

C. Doble noted that the town was in the process of developing an open space, park and recreation plan for the town to manage and maintain their public spaces and parks. As they moved forward on the plan, she hoped that at some point in time they could initiate a discussion on some kind of partnership with the town. D. Clemmey welcomed the opportunity, but was intent on moving forward on the permitting process and its construction, which was projected in the fall. C. Doble hoped D. Clemmey was open to continuing communications with the town. D. Clemmey replied in the affirmative.

C. Doble asked D. Clemmey if they were considering the use of the park for evening events. It's an issue the town was grappling with the MV Museum. D. Bellante-Holand questioned the location of the trees, because she wondered if they blocked the views of the harbor. K. Reimann agreed and noted that she was relocating the trees to stop them from obstructing the views.

Kate Scott spoke in favor of the development of the property into a park and recommended looking into the arrangements for the privately owned pocket parks at the Rockefeller Center in Manhattan.

B. Robinson indicated that the Planning Board did not see any issues with the design of the park, and hoped that the use would in time become available for public use. D. Bellante-Holand inquired about the motivation for the park. D. Clemmey indicated that the family

wanted to develop the park in memory of Boch Sr. M. Loberg inquired about the park's management. D. Clemmey replied that the Boch family will have a property manager and landscaper to maintain the property. M. Loberg inquired if they had planned to lease the park for private functions e.g. weddings, business outings, etc. D. Clemmey replied in the negative. B. Robinson inquired if the lawn was designed for tent setup. K. Reidmann replied in the negative.

The Planning Board staff requested a full set of plans and color photos presented at the meeting. K. Reidmann indicated that they could also have a pdf. Board members requested a hard copy and a pdf file.

6:37 PM Public Hearing: Special Permit Application Re: Larkin Reeves, AP 09C01
Attendance: M. Loberg, K. Scott, ME Loberg, J. Feeney M. Lipke, Jeffrey
Katz, Allan & Karen Patterson

The continuation of the public hearing was duly opened at 6:37 PM. Planning Board Chairman, B. Robinson read the hearing notice into the record, and advised the Board that the applicant's agent, J. Lolley confirmed the applicant's request to continue the hearing.

B. Robinson reminded the Board that the hearing was continued because the applicant preferred having a five member board present for the discussions. He recommended continuing the hearing until August 16, 2017 at 6PM in the Town Hall Annex. There being no discussion, the board moved, seconded and carried the recommendation for August 16, 2016 at the time noted.

The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled meeting at 6:39 PM.

6:39 PM James Feeney re: Informal Discussion
Attendance: Jeffrey Katz, Allan & Karen Patterson

J. Feeney indicated that he had requested an appointment with the Planning Board to solicit information required for a Form C submittal. The property inquest was just left to the MV Campground on Edgartown Road. He had purchased the land in 2000 and initially divided the portion of land within the town of Oak Bluffs into two lots in May 2001. He then divided the parcel of land within the Town of Tisbury into three building lots under the Deep Lot Provision in December 2001. Recorded plans of the divisions were provided for the discussion, along with a set of minutes from the Oak Bluffs Planning Board, dated 02 May 2001 reflecting the Board's decision approving the subdivision with frontage on Great Rock Road and access off Edgartown Road. He explained that the plan at the time was to create the three additional lots and add the fourth lot e.g. Lot 1 in Plan No. MV 8791 – 05022001.

B. Robinson read the second entry in the Oak Bluffs Planning Board's minutes of 05/02/01 and asked for a clarification. J. Feeney replied that the access for the fourth lot was intended to be off Edgartown Road, because at the time he was submitting the Deep Lot Division of Land to the Tisbury Planning Board. The idea was to extend the access to the fourth lot in

Oak Bluffs. B. Robinson found the note to be vague and confusing. He understood that the Oak Bluffs Planning Board had the ability to grant an additional access, but their authority did not extend across town borders, which did not allow them to burden the access easement created in the Deep Lot division of land. B. Robinson also felt that when the Oak Bluffs Planning Board declared Great Rock Road as their frontage, they were essentially stated that it was their only means of access by their bylaws. J. Feeney was not sure when the bylaw was adopted. He asked about it but was still waiting for an answer from the Oak Bluffs Planning Board. If they considered a site visit, they would understand that Megan's Way offered a more direct route to the property, rather than accessing the property through Sea Glenn.

J. Feeney indicated that he was exploring his options when he was advised by G. Harcourt that the Oak Bluffs Planning Board had approved the second means of access provided the fire chiefs in both towns approved of the access and they complied with the Tisbury Planning Board's requirements for a subdivision. He was willing to consider the subdivision of land, pending his finances, and asked for this appointment to solicit from the Board information about the requirements.

D. Seidman thought it was important for D. Feeney to address the concerns of the two immediate abutters most impacted by the proposal, because they had submitted letters in opposition of the subdivision, and becoming members of a Homeowners Association. J. Feeney was not aware of the letters. He mentioned that he had prepared an access easement for the middle lot, which included a provision for maintenance costs of Megan's Way.

B. Robinson noted that the Planning Board received three letters on the matter. Two were from the immediate abutters, D. Katz and Allan & Karen Patterson, both of whom opposed the development of a subdivision road and participation in a homeowners' association. The third letter was from Barton Kent Jr, 24 Jesse's Way, another abutter who did not object to the subdivision, provided the improvements to the road were limited to avoid its use as a thoroughway. B. Robinson inquired if the Board members read the letters so that he could just reference them for the record, or if they preferred he read them in their entirety. The Board indicated that they read the letters.

J. Katz indicated that he wrote in opposition to the subdivision and its potential use for other lots. J. Feeney noted that it was inaccurate. The subdivision was only serving four lots. J. Katz reiterated that he did not want to see the road extended to provide access to an additional lot in the Town of Oak Bluffs. A. Patterson indicated that he did not want to be a part of a homeowners association. G. Harcourt advised the Planning Board that the Oak Bluffs Planning Board's decision was being reviewed because of the legality of one of the conditions. During the hearing the Oak Bluffs Planning Board indicated that they wanted to hear from the Town of Tisbury regarding their requirements for a subdivision road. B. Robinson replied that they would have to create a road lot within a form C process, which could be 30 ft wide with a travel surface of a certain dimension and construction. The latter was a topic of discussion during the public hearing process. G. Harcourt inquired if they could create a homeowners association with only two lots, since the abutters did not want to

be a part of the association. B. Robinson believed they had to address whether they had the legal ability to create the road without the support of the Katz and Pattersons. They would have to be part of the homeowners' association because each property owner will have a ¼ interest in the road, and responsibility to maintain it. This led to questions regarding to the application of the 1987 amendments of the local subdivision control law pertaining to the homeowners' association. J. Katz questioned the rationale for making him financially responsible for maintaining the road beyond the agreed terms for the access easement. Board members understood, and noted that it was a question for their counsel to answer.

K. Patterson inquired about the Harcourt's request for the alternate means access if they already had legal access for the property in question on Great Rock Road. B. Robinson replied that the Town of Oak Bluffs did not address the adequacy of the frontage when they granted the property owners access on Great Rock Road, which is inadequate for this purpose. Great Rock Road was essentially a walking path for the residents in the area. Improvements to the road would destroy the walking path.

D. Bellante-Holand thought it important to address J. Fenney's question about the extension of the road. She inquired if J. Fenney could improve the road through the Deep Lot Provision. B. Robinson replied that he would have to pursue a Form C division with the abutters' blessings. If J. Fenney wanted to pursue the division of land without the abutter's support, the applicant would have to address the legal concerns they discussed and weigh in the abutters concerns.

G. Harcourt referred the Board to J. Katz's deed (Bk 1120 Pg 809) which stated "Subject to the obligation to equally share with the owner of Lot 3 all expenses to maintain the integrity and appearance of the said 30 foot Access Easement ... in the event that others are subsequently granted easements over the .. equally share the ... Lots 2 and 3". J. Fenney indicated that it had always been his intent to add on the fourth lot when he first divided the lot in 2001. G. Harcourt indicated that he was interested in purchasing the abutting lot in Oak Bluffs and was approved access from Megan's Way because it was the most logical route and it would avoid destroying a walking path. J. Katz indicated he had issues with the language of the access easement, and with J. Fenney regarding the interpretation of the access easement, that ultimately resulted in paying for all of the improvements to the road because the road was impassable.

B. Robinson inquired if the Planning Board addressed J. Fenney's questions. He clarified that he wanted to know the Board's requirements for the subdivision. D. Seidman, B. Robinson and D. Bellante-Holand replied that he had to submit an application with the consent of the abutters. D. Bellante-Holand thought the latter part was a civil matter he'd have to address with the assistance of an attorney.

J. Katz inquired if the construction of the road was permitted if they were just in the exploratory phase. B. Robinson replied that they could not prevent a property owner from improving their lots, but that if the improvements continued to allow traffic, they should contact the town,

7:20 PM Tisbury Government Study Panel Interviews – Steve Zablotny and Elaine Eugster

B. Robinson noted that the Planning Board solicited candidates for the Government Study Panel that was approved at town meeting. The article creating the study panel indicated that the Planning Board, Finance & Advisory Committee and Board of Selectmen were each granted one appointee to the study pane, while the town moderator was granted four appointees.

Although the Planning Board was grateful and happy to have received letters of interest from two citizens, they were only allowed to make the one appointment. B. Robinson assured the two applicants that their letters would be shared with the other boards, if they were not appointed by the Planning Board.

B. Robinson read S. Zablotny's letter to the Board and opened the discussions to the candidate. S. Zablotny believed the study panel's goal was for a more cohesive and accountable government through diverse representation. He felt they had to know what the current status was. They had to look at the process on a step by step basis. They had to evaluate it from the end users perspective to resolve how the process could be more effective. He understood the goal was much more of a communication issue. He was not sure if study included a tactical aspect with recommendations.

The journey mapping and user centered design referenced in his letter of interest was a way to make sure that the people they are trying to help are represented. B. Robinson thought it was going to be up to the panel to generate their direction and findings. S. Zablotny believed it would avoid issue driven discussions. D. Bellante-Holand did not see how they could quantify diverse representation. S. Zablotny replied that they had to define the problem before they could solve it. The document did not clarify the problem. He also felt that every organization had to be examined periodically if they were to work more efficiently. They had to explore the organization's strengths, weaknesses, challenges and opportunities before they can make recommendations

C. Doble was concerned about the study panel's process because it identified the issues to be addressed before they began their investigation. It limited the scope of their address. D. Seidman thought it pre-determined the outcome. D. Bellante-Holand suggested that the scope of address appeared to be a way for someone to achieve an agenda. S. Zablotny agreed, but felt the way the study panel was structured was critical to the outcome. He agreed that there appeared to be a predetermined outcome for the set of goals that were listed.

Additional discussions ensued with regards to the recommendations and all were in agreement that they were premature

B. Robinson introduced E. Eugster to the Board and read her letter of interest for the record of the minutes. E. Eugster noted that she has been a very faithful attendee of town meeting,

but could not attend this year's meeting due to illness. She thought it was important to motivate the community to attend town meeting and to support their participation in the process so that they had a voice in the decisions. In the letter of interest, she indicated that she was interesting in streamlining the town meetings so that they were concluded in one night. B. Robinson thought shorter meetings were possible with smaller warrants or informed citizens. E. Eugster thought there were other ways to streamlining town meeting. She recommended "consent agendas" in which payment of outstanding bills did not have to be discussed on a line item basis. It was a mandatory obligation. Unless it was required by state law, she did not see the necessity to bring this up for a discussion and vote. She felt the same policy could be applied to the allocation of the SSA funds. Unless there was an issue or question on a particular line item, she did not see why they could not vote on the allocation of funds the way they voted on the budget, with the exception of the controversial items.

E. Eugster was interested in exploring the benefits in changing the number of selectmen serving on the board, limiting the number of terms they could serve and on governance as a whole. B. Robinson explained the purpose for his inquiry, since she was specific about the issues she wanted to address. E. Eugster understood, and noted that they were the issues she felt most strongly about. C. Doble inquired if she was still interested in serving on panel since the focus was much broader than town meeting. Apart from the commitment, D. Bellante-Holand noted that it could also be politically charged. E. Eugster replied that she was still very interested in serving on the panel. D. Bellante-Holand believed the primary concern was communication, or lack thereof that is leading people to feel that they are not being represented.

E. Eugster noted that she was concerned that the town did not have enough candidates running for town offices, which had an impact on the governing boards. It was an issue they should review and address. D. Bellante-Holand asked the candidate how she'd address the issue. E. Eugster replied that the process would require research, and survey/polls to reach out to the community.

S. Zablotny inquired if there was a deliverable or end date. M. Loberg replied that the end date was next town meeting. C. Doble thought the study could be a real benefit to the town, but only if the study panel if the group looks into the broader picture.

ME Larsen use to do quality improvement for the local hospital utilizing a systems approach. Government in general was difficult, but she felt that it was complicated by the lack of information between departments.

H. Lee thought that the issues with town government stems from the leadership. It was important to know their qualifications, and levels of experience were in the operation of a governmental organization. More importantly the town's leaders should know the skills of their workforce and their ability to function in the positions they were hired to fill i.e. managers.

K. Scott thought they should conduct a series of surveys of people within town government and the public to generate information about the problems within town government. S. Zablotny thought the decision was the committee's to make. They had to consider if it was a viable method of collecting information. B. Robinson concurred, and concluded the discussions noting the Planning Board was fortunate to have two viable candidates for the study panel.

He advised the candidates that the Planning Board would contact as soon as they made their determination. B. Robinson in addition wanted to contact the appointing boards to inquire about the status of their appointments, so that they could forward E. Eugster's or S. Zablotny's Letter of Interest, once they selected their candidate.

D. Seidman excused himself from the meeting and left at 7:55 PM.

BOARD DISCUSSIONS:

1. Tisbury School Building Project

RE: Update

B. Robinson reported that the Tisbury School Building Committee (TSBC) met on July 17, 2017 to consider a re-vote of an earlier vote to construct a new three story building on the current site which would require the eventual demolition of the existing building. The TSBC decided that a re-vote was not necessary, and agreed to move forward on their application to the MSBA for the new three story construction.

D. Bellante-Holand called a few School Building Committee members about her reactions to their decision, and was struck by the variation in information (lack of concrete and detailed data) she was given by the members. In a conversation with J. Krystal, she expressed her concerns with the impact the loss of the façade of the school would have on the community. She attempted to explain that there was a certain symbolism attached to the structure that the community related to and identified with. His response was that he thought the committee was trying to re-create the façade with the new structure. Whereas she understood that the new structure made fiscal sense, it was important for the Planning Board to make sure that they did in fact re-create the façade. She wanted to know at what point during the design phase is the community allowed to interject their preferences, so that it is not left in the hands of the architects. She wanted to prevent the architects from going into default settings because they did not have the opportunity to address the constraints.

B. Robinson inquired if she was questioning the committee's ability to design the new building. D. Bellante-Holand replied in the affirmative. She felt they should communicate to the committee their concerns about the budgetary constraints, the design parameters, the construction's impact on the school's activities and their preference for a less massive structure.

C. Doble participated on the committee and noted that she did not find fellow committee members particularly active in their research, and in the discussion of the different perspectives. She felt discouraged by their dismissal of the Planning Board's letters and by the process which felt like a fait accompli. B. Robinson learned that the two letters the Planning Board wrote to the committee were not included in the application submittal to the MSBA. C. Doble questioned the value in writing another letter, but strongly felt the need to reach out to the committee to express their concerns with the new building. S. Zablotny inquired if any of the immediate abutters expressed any comment on the new design or its impact on the neighborhood. K. Scott mentioned that she sat next to an abutter, who was horrified by the proposal, but remained silent throughout the entire meeting on Monday night. K. Scott informed the Board that she had received a series of emails from the school committee members, and there appeared to be some confusion among them about what they voted. She felt the project was being driven by a C. McAndrews and the team. She also informed the Board of her conversation with P. Foley at the MV Commission, in which he advised her that C. McAndrews and R. Marks presented a very detailed idea of a new structure. When he inquired about a plan for the renovation/addition of the school, they mentioned that they had the plan, but opted for the new construction because the cost for the latter was three million dollars more. Although they promised to send him the plan for the renovation and addition, they never did. In a subsequent phone conversation with P. Foley, he informed her of a conversation he had with C. McAndrew in March 2017, in which he advised her that the Manter Well and Tashmoo Well sites could not be considered as potential building sites because they were in two watersheds (nitrogen sensitive areas). K. Scott inquired if this was ever related to the school building committee members. C. Doble replied in the negative. K. Scott noted that P. Foley advised her that if the town was concerned about the school project, they had the option of referring the project to the MV Commission as a discretionary DRI. His only other recommendation was that they include a letter with the referral that explained why they believed the project required DRI review.

D. Bellante-Holand asked the Board how they should move forward. B. Robinson thought they had four potential paths. The first was to continue working with the MSBA and the school building committee to achieve a well done new building. The second path was to wait until Town Meeting to vote on the school building committee's proposal. The third path was to refer the proposal to the MV Commission for a discretionary review, and the fourth path was to go to town meeting with an alternative (renovation at a reduced cost).

D. Bellante-Holand was confident that the consultants were going to design a functional school, but what concerned her most from a planning perspective was that the community was going to have to live with the impact of a bad decision regarding the site, the structure's exterior, etc. for a very long time. She felt the town was making bad decisions that were going to have an impact on property values, tax rates. It was important that the school building committee did not make a similar mistake, as they made decisions on the school project.

M. Loberg thought there was another strategy available to the town, and has been pursuing the idea. Understanding that the committee members may not have the expertise to guide a design process, she has actively solicited volunteers in the design field to help the committee, since C. McAndrews indicated that they could add members to the committee. She thought if they could have a few volunteers on board they could work as a subcommittee for the purpose of working on the design.

H. Lee did not think a subcommittee was going to accomplish much, because the school building committee already set the parameters for the new structure, based on the program requirements. It also concerned him that the composition of the school building committee was not diversified to represent the community. The vast majority of members were either employed by the school, or affiliated with the school. He expressed additional concern at previous review process, in which it appeared that the presentations of the proposals were not so much to give the town an option but to solicit support for their particular project.

He asked if they could contact the MSBA directly to present a proposal for a smaller (mid-size construction) or a renovation and addition. He did not understand why they could not pursue a project similar to Springfield's that appeared more appropriate for their community. B. Robinson spoke with the MSBA and understood that they were understaffed, and as a result completely relied on the school districts and consultants to do the brunt of the work. If they wanted to pursue an alternative, it would have to occur outside the MSBA process. K. Scott thought it was too late to be ready by town meeting. B. Robinson felt the real issue was that they were constrained by the budgeted cost estimate for the project, which left them little to no "wobble room". Unless they agreed to shrink the 80,000 sq. ft. structure, they could not reduce the cost.

D. Bellante-Holand thought the Planning Board had to decide how they were going to impact the process. She felt the Board's discussions have not moved beyond the identification of the issues. They had to redirect the process or understand the parameters in which they have to work. If they were to have an impact or change the process they had to begin a discussion on how they intended to make a difference, or create a way to have their voices heard and acted on.

C. Doble thought they had two options. They could continue to work on the committee, press them to change the composition of the committee, and continue meeting without the OPM to begin discussing and addressing their concerns. The only other option, as far as she was concerned was to refer the project to the MV Commission.

B. Robinson thought if the concern with the new construction was its design, M. Loberg's recommendation for a subcommittee would address their concerns. If the construction costs and demolition of the school was an issue, they could refer the proposal to the MV Commission for the oversight. The third option was to present an alternative proposal at town meeting. C. Doble questioned whether they had the time and funds to pursue the

third option. D. Bellante-Holand felt they had to respect the work that the school building committee that they've done.

H. Lee recalled that Flansburgh Architect's presented the school committee three options in 2012. He thought they should contact them to run the estimated construction costs for all three proposals for a comparison. B. Robinson indicated that the projected costs were the same.

M. Loberg felt the Planning Board narrowed down their options to work with the committee or separate from the school building committee on an altogether different course and proposal. Although the school building committee voted to stand firm on their original vote for the construction of a new school building, the Planning Board appeared to resist moving forward with the committee. S. Zablotny believed they would achieve more progress, if they acknowledged the work of the committee to address the educational concerns, but also clarify the need that still remains to address the concerns with traffic, neighbors, community context, etc. The educational component of the committee does not have the experience or qualification to address the physical reality. M. Loberg's recommendation for a subcommittee provided the expertise the school building committee lacked.

C. Doble thought they had to restructure the committee. They needed a committee to guide the design and construction of the building. More importantly they had to be critical in the review process. In absence of a critical review process, the project should be referred to the MV Commission. M.E. Larsen favored a restructured committee, and the project's referral to the MV Commission. B. Robinson believed that they would have to accept the cost, the proposed site and the current design. K. Scott favored the project's referral to the MV Commission. H. Lee questioned the MV Commission's staff ability to review architectural or construction plans, and felt it could be done locally by the Planning Board.

H. Lee thought they had the option of working independently of the school building committee with the MSBA or re-organize the committee to review all of their options. ME Larsen spoke with a committee member, V. Bachellor and informed her that any proposal to demolish the existing school would not be approved. She further noted that she was not impressed with the design or cost.

Additional discussions ensued, and D. Bellante-Holand believed the Planning Board had to move forward and figure out a strategy to enact some change. She asked that they clarify the change (s) they wanted to see happen in the existing process. B. Robinson felt that as elected officials they had to try to make the best decisions for the town, even if they did not solicit public support. D. Bellante-Holand thought they should request a meeting with the school building committee, not the consultants. The meeting with the consultants did not give them an opportunity to address their concerns. She also felt the Planning Board was partially responsible for not addressing their concerns. There were so many points that were in question, that it detracted from their objective. If they believed

they had to change the composition of the committee with people who had the knowledge and expertise to understand designs, they had the ability and responsibility to solicit the MV Commission's assistance. B. Robinson reiterated that there were four potential paths to follow. Z. Zablotny disagreed and felt the first option was the most desirable and difficult, so that it was just as ineffective as sitting on one's hands. He felt they basically had on two choices, which was to work with them and steer them in the right direction or try to stop the project. K. Scott agreed that the make-up of the committee had to change because it was driven by two individuals (Chairman and OPM).

C. Doble believed they had to have a conversation with C. McAndrews to advise her that the Planning Board had submitted correspondence to the committee to express their concerns, and to solicit answers to their questions. Additional discussions ensued, and B. Robinson indicated that he was hesitant to refer the project to the MV Commission, but offered to speak with P. Foley at the MV Commission about the school project, and to report his findings.

M. Lipke was given the opportunity to comment on the subject, and noted that she was not unsympathetic to their concerns. She also noted that she did not have much faith in the town's ability to design or manage large capital projects (EMS, Police). M. Lipke did however feel it was disingenuous of the Board to say that the school building committee did not take their concerns or letters seriously, because it appeared to her that the Planning Board was essentially doing the same thing, not taking the teachers concerns seriously. People have been very passionate about this project because of their attachment to the school building. She felt the primary issue was that people were not being objective or listening to each other.

2. Tisbury Zoning Bylaw Amendments

RE: Codifying existing regulations and potential amendments

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:

1. Holly Stephenson

RE: Letter of resignation

B. Robinson read H. Stephenson's letter to the board. Board members wanted to invite H. Stephenson to a future meeting to personally thank her for her contributions on the board during her tenure.

2. Tisbury Government Study Panel

A. Applicants (Steve Zablotny and Elaine Eugster)

3. James Feeney re Meagan's Way, Vineyard Haven, MA

A. Jeffrey Katz

B. Karen & Allan Patterson

C. Barton Kent, Jr.

July 19, 2017

4. MV Commission

RE: 14 July 2017 Extended Schedule

5. Thomson Reuters

RE: Zoning Bulletin, 25 June 2017

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

PRO FORM

Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 9:15 P.M.

(m/s/c 4/0/0)

Respectfully submitted;

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

APPROVAL:

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

Date

Benjamin Robinson
Chairman