

Planning Board Subcommittee Minutes 02/27/17

APPROVED

Chilmark Planning Board Subcommittee Meeting

Monday, February 27, 2017

Present: Janet Weidner, Chair, Joan Malkin, Peter Cook

Not Present: John Eisner, Jennifer L. Christy

Public:

Staff:

Meeting called to order at 3:00PM:

- **Menemsha Master Plan Summary:**

- The subcommittee reviewed the summary and discussed the readability, particularly.
- There was discussion about “non-negotiables”, noted on a draft of minutes from the meeting on Feb. 13, 2017. It was not known to what this referred and the members decided to inquire with Ms. Christy on her return.
- Discussion occurred regarding the low barrier to direct pedestrians/traffic outside of the fish markets.
 - Discussion occurred about how the barrier may be received by the public and by business owners. There was also discussion about how the barrier may impact the turning ability of VTA buses in the event that the buses make a turn at this location in order to exit Menemsha.
 - It was decided to identify the area as one of concern for pedestrians, but that the MVC may want to determine what the impact will be on traffic, particularly of the VTA buses.
 - More discussion occurred about the placement of a barrier for the purpose of pedestrian safety and how to “shepherd” pedestrians as they move from the beach area toward the fish markets. Signage to work in concert with a barrier was also discussed for the area .

- **Review of the Menemsha Master Plan Public Safety spreadsheet of issues & survey development:**

- Ms. Weidner gave an update of the large spreadsheet of Menemsha issues (a collection of all the input received) and she reported that she is working to eliminate redundant items and add in missing items. Ms. Weidner listed the sections other than the public safety section. The Board of Health input is not included yet either. Ms. Weidner listed the 5 “bins” (with the 6th as Public Safety that she has organized the input into).
 - Vision
 - Two general sections
 - Commercial Non-fishing
 - Working Waterfront
 - Comfort Station (which may not need to be its own “bin”
- Ms. Weidner stated she wants to use this spreadsheet to try to organize the survey questions.
- Ms. Weidner stated the spreadsheet could direct the subcommittee in what we want to find out using a survey.
- Mr. Cook noted that a lot of the questions in the example surveys, sent out by Ms. Christy for brainstorming purposes, were boilerplate questions. He noted there seemed to be many questions that ask for confirmation of things that are hard for anyone to disagree with. He suggested a survey with a first section that gave a statement of facts, that all agree with, and stated that the conversations with stakeholders showed there are certain things that are held in general agreement and those things are listed. Mr. Cook noted these examples:

- Character of Menemsha should be preserved
 - The Fishing industry, whatever its future and volume of production is an integral feature of Menemsha and needs to be nurtured and taken into account
 - A free and public beach at Menemsha is essential
 - Public safety is a primary concern
- Mr. Cook continued and noted that there could be 6 or 7 of these statements of fact and have people respond as to whether they generally agree or do not agree, etc...
 - Then, he stated further that the survey could have a subsequent section(s) that asks the responder to consider “trade-offs”.
 - Discussion occurred about this survey model. The subcommittee discussed the importance of letting responders know what the subcommittee heard, overwhelmingly, in its input sessions throughout 2016. Mr. Cook suggested that an “Agree” and “Disagree” button may be placed next to each statement of fact and a comment area should be provided.
 - Mr. Cook suggested a section, after the opening section that asks for a stance on more specific questions. He noted these examples:
 - The wetlands should be preserved at all costs.
 - Business in Menemsha should continue to be limited to...
- Mr. Cook noted that these more specific questions would allow the responder to not only agree or disagree but also to reveal a level of intensity of agreement or disagreement.
 - Mr. Cook stated he is working on a draft of a survey format and a set of survey questions.
 - Ms. Weidner stated that it will be important to ask questions that the Town can do something with and take positive action on. Mr. Cook reiterated that the task before the committee is possibly not to ask questions but to gather information on how the public feels about certain apparent facts about Menemsha. Ms. Weidner noted the question regarding wetlands and wondered what positive action could result if responders stated overwhelmingly their disagreement that the wetlands should be preserved at all costs. Mr. Cook stated the questions could be designed to state fact and simply ask for position rather than stated in a way that results in a yes or no. Further discussion occurred about the possibility of outcomes to specific and more pointed questions. Mr. Cook suggested a preamble to sections that ask more pointed questions that state any changes to regulations and bylaws and procedures would need town review or other official review.
 - Further discussion occurred regarding how to design questions.
 - Further discussion occurred about the usefulness of the format of affirmative questions with responses of agreement.
 - It was suggested that a specific question could be posed and directly underneath the main arguments could be framed so that the responder has reasoning behind their response. And, it was further noted that questions with background will provide responses that may be understood as agreement or disagreement with a particular stance on the question.
 - Mr. Cook agreed to continue working to develop draft questions and a survey format.
 - The subcommittee members reviewed the Menemsha Master Plan input spreadsheet and brainstormed the amount and variety of questions that may appear on the survey. They also identified areas of input that would not be useful for the survey.
 - Streetsweeping and eliminating the telephone poles were discussed as possible areas that could be suggested to the BOS, but not included in the survey.
 - Discussion occurred regarding livery vans and whether a question would be useful that addresses the pros and cons of these seasonal vans.
 - It was discussed that an economic section is worthwhile.
 - It was noted that a lot of the work of the committee, aside from the development of a survey, will be to develop the sections of a Master Plan and group together “like” topics from the input and put them together in a recommended proposal for the Board of Selectmen. An area of grouping may have to do with trash, for example.
 - Ms. Malkin noted that the subcommittee must begin to consider the ramifications of climate change and make suggestions to the Board of Selectmen in this area. Ms. Malkin suggested further that the Board of Selectmen should be asked to appoint a steering committee to address climate change in Chilmark.

- **Next Steps in Master Plan Work:**

- Mr. Cook stated he planned to have a first draft of a survey for the next meeting on March 6, 2017.
- Ms. Malkin noted that the input items need to be separated into “bins” or areas for action. She noted some items will be placed in the section for recommendation for action by the Board of Selectmen. Some items may be placed in the section for inclusion in the survey.
- Ms. Weidner stated she will work to organize the input into these areas by the next meeting.

- **Next Meetings:**

- March 6, 2017, 3PM
- March 13, 2017, 3PM

- **Correspondence:**

- **Minutes:**

- The minutes of December 6, 2016 were reviewed: Approved as written.
- The minutes of December 7, 2016 were reviewed: Approved as written.
 - Ms. Malkin noted that the photo maps in the Menemsha Master Plan Summary need to be redone so that the readability is improved.
- The minutes of January 18, 2017 were reviewed: Approved as written.
 - Ms. Malkin asked Ms. Christy to place on the March 6 agenda to discuss the meeting for all Chilmarkers in April.
- The minutes of January 23, 2017 were reviewed: Approved as written.
 - Ms. Malkin asked Ms. Christy to note on the March 6th agenda that there is an open item from the Jan. 23rd minutes that Tim Carroll was going to look into the reduction of speed during the summer on Basin Road.
 - Ms. Malkin also noted the open item of why there is a 5 hour parking sign and could Ms. Christy to ask why there is 5 hour parking in some places.
- The minutes of February 13, 2017 were reviewed: Approved
 - Ms. Malkin asked for Ms. Christy to place as an open item at March 6 who is to prepare the list of 10 key items as noted in the Feb. 13th minutes (1st page, 4th bullet from the bottom).
 - Ms. Malkin asked if Janet has incorporated the Beach Committee’s comments into the Menemsha Master Plan chart.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jennifer L. Christy