

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Surfside Crossing 40B

Design Workshop

2 Fairgrounds Road

Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Ed Toole (Chair), Lisa Botticelli (Vice chair), Susan McCarthy (Clerk), Michael J. O'Mara, Kerim Koseatac

Alternates: Mark Poor, Geoff Thayer, Jim Mondani

~~ MINUTES ~~

Monday February 4, 2019

Public Safety Facility, Training Room – 1:30 p.m.

Called to order at 1:30 p.m. and Announcements made.

Staff in attendance: Eleanor Antonietti, Zoning Administrator; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent

I. DESIGN REVIEW

20-18 SURFSIDE CROSSING, LLC – a/k/a SURFSIDE CROSSING 40B

The application and supporting materials are available for public review at the Zoning Board of Appeals office at 2 Fairgrounds Road between the hours of 7:30 A.M. and 4:30 P.M., Monday through Friday. The Locus is situated at 3, 5, 7 and 9 South Shore Road and is shown on Assessor's Map 67 as Parcels 336, 336.9, 336.8, and 336.7 and is shown as Lots 4, 3, 2, and 1 on Plan Book 25, Page 50 as recorded at the Nantucket Registry of Deeds. The total lot area of the combined parcels is approximately 13.5 acres. Evidence of owner's title is recorded in Book 1612, Page 62 at the Nantucket Registry of Deeds. The property is located in a Limited Use General 2 (LUG-2) and within the Public Wellhead Recharge District

Attendees

- Ed Marchant, ZBA 40B Consultant, facilitator
- Cliff Boehmer, ZBA Design Advisor
- Ed Toole, ZBA
- Lisa Botticelli, ZBA
- Jamie Feeley, Cottage & Castle, principal
- Josh Posner, principal
- Don Bracken, Bracken Engineering, Inc.
- Chris Dallmus, Design Associates
- Cormac Collier, Executive Director Nantucket Land Council
- Stephen Welch, Historic District Commission
- Dawn Hill Holdgate, Select Board
- Tucker Holland Affordable Housing Advocate
- Campbell Sutton, 15 Appleton Road
- Shawn Cabral, 8 South Shore Road
- Sean Perry, Nantucket Tipping Point
- Jacques Zimicki, Nantucket Tipping Point

Documentation Site plans; slide presentation.

Discussion **Marchant** – Overview of the purpose of the workshop. Today is focused on the two facets of design: site plan and building. Non-design issues are not up for discussion. Introduced Mr. Boehmer and explained his qualifications; he was asked to look at site plans and building development to identify issues

Boehmer – His most important charge was to look at the sketches. Once he realized the amount of work done on building and site design, he turned his attention to the site organization.

Bracken – Reviewed the last official submitted site plan: condo buildings in the back, cottages toward the front, parking on the perimeter, recreation building with pool, and buffers.

Dallmus – Explained the preferred site plan for condo layout and moving some parking forward.

Boehmer – Felt the site is abruptly bifurcated with one type of development in the front and an entirely different type in the back. It isn't just different types of buildings but also a contrast in the very different ways people would live on the site. Looked at a way to have a more integrated texture throughout the site.

SITE SKETCH 1

Boehmer – This sketch concentrates access around the perimeter and creates a more uniform texture across the site with townhouse condos; this affords some simple attributes such as private backyard space. Other goals include: 1-way road circulation, utility easement space used as outdoor space, size of the lots. The Condos could be gridded into lots of similar sizes as other lots.

SITE SKETCH 2

Boehmer – This might be too urban in regards to the streetscape; it creates a simple circulation path throughout with no visible parking from the outside. This breaks up the lot sizes so that condo townhouses could be scattered among the single-family dwellings. The roads are wide enough for 2-way traffic and parking on both sides with a planting area. This makes beautiful, well-treed streets. The community building is toward the front. He put the year-round residents toward the front of the site. The single-family dwellings on Nantucket tend to be simple designs. This also takes advantage of the easement. You want the development to be an inviting place; if that isn't done, there is no invitation for the residents to integrate with the community.

SKETCH 3

Boehmer – This organizes the development around a natural element such as a rain garden; it integrates green space and passive recreation. He puts sidewalks on one side. This provides more space at the north side for condo units on cul de sacs with parking in their own "sub district". On this he put parking on top of the easement.

His studies all resulted in a lower density than proposed, partially because he upped the size of the single-family dwelling lots to ensure sufficient parking. His buildings are all smaller than on the proposed plans.

Marchant – Opened the floor to questions to be followed by comments.

Zimicki – It sounded like you were talking about the neighborhood surrounding this or just this development. All the neighbors have 2-acre zoning.

Boehmer – He was talking about the impact on the immediate neighbors. If this were a 40A development, he'd look at the LUG-2 zoning.

Marchant – Obviously the developer could develop within the zoning but that wouldn't be a 40B development. All 40Bs are built at a higher density than would be allowed if it were built under residential zoning.

Zimicki – It seems this density is onerous; it is very packed; this third plan with 88 units is about 200 to 220 bedrooms. That's a lot for 13.5 acres on Nantucket.

Toole – Thinks the original was 285 bedrooms.

Perry – Asked about the road width

Marchant – They can ask for exceptions. They aren't asking for a road-width waiver.

Bracken – They aren't asking for a waiver to the 40-foot street width.

Marchant – A developer has the right to ask for waivers; that's not a guarantee. The Fire Department trumps any waiver request. ZBAs have a difficult job on 40Bs; there are no clear rules and regulations and must make the best decision possible. The ZBA decides what width of the road is necessary.

Hill-Holdgate – Asked if it's okay to pave over the easement.

Bracken – We're allowed to pave over the easement as long as nothing jeopardizes the integrity of the easement. The Island has several roads that are paved over an easement.

Marchant – He will review a copy of the easement to understand any limitations to activities over it.

Toole – The plan with two-way roads and parking on both sides and sidewalks would have to be a 40-foot width.

Boehmer – Streets have to meet the code for emergency vehicle access, whether or not it is a 40B.

Marchant – You can only ask for waivers from local rules, not state rules.

Zimicki – The force main is currently about 4 feet down; once the topsoil comes off, that leaves only about 3 feet. David Gray was concerned about the roads crossing the easement. Asked if it could be left a pervious material.

Bracken – Yes, we could look at that.

Hill-Holdgate – The 4-unit building, asked the square footage.

Boehmer – He was using a module planning tool which has each module about 18X30 feet.

Perry – Asked if the groundcover was about the same.

Boehmer – The original plan is very dense, so you'd want multiple parking spaces that aren't tandem; therefore, he widened the lots to 60 and 65. A multi-bedroom home should have space for parking more than one car.

Holland – Asked if he's seen each of these concepts in practice and which might work best.

Boehmer – He doesn't have any comparable. Neither does he have an idea about the issues brought up. His conclusion was that this project would benefit from a more integrated feel across the entire site. After doing the three concepts, he found putting the condos on the back two lots wasn't reasonable. His plans were not reviewed by an engineer for stormwater management.

Sutton – The second sketch has no encroachment on the sewer easement. She likes the flow of this; it feels more like a pocket neighborhood. Asked for an explanation on the central section.

Boehmer – That was to ensure physical integration across the site: raised walkways, traffic calming crosswalks. It makes sense to him to have it toward the front.

Sutton – On Sketch 3, asked about the greenspace. There are issues with other developments with inadequate parking and no on-street parking.

Boehmer – The lot near the community building lot could be a rain garden. Some plots might have to be eliminated to make room for more stormwater management. Tick marks showing parking spaces were just a thought and no statement of the amount parking. It is incumbent upon the development to make a realistic projection on the parking requirements.

Cabral – Asked what was taken into consideration when addressing density. South Shore Road has one of the largest year-round populations; this will overwhelm the neighborhood. People are already talking about putting their homes on the market. Asked if the impact on the current residents was taken into account.

Marchant – The traffic analysis study has been reviewed by a peer consultant. Mr. Boehmer isn't a traffic analyst. The ZBA, in creating its decision, has to take into consideration all local concerns and weigh that against the regional need for housing. No municipality wants this to go to the HAC since a strong majority rule in favor of the developer; you want to work out the best plan.

Sutton – Asked how many of those towns are on an Island. With our emergency issues, to add people complicates matters.

Marchant – What works against Nantucket is that 2% of housing is listed on the subsidized housing inventory (SHI). There is a lot of proposed action.

Hill-Holdgate – Asked to stay focused on the design review; we're not doing that.

Toole – He's partial to Sketch 2 with single lots with different sized buildings on them and doesn't have the contrasting development. He doubts some of the corners work and it would have to be tweaked. It seems more of a neighborhood that is appropriate for Nantucket.

Botticelli – What she likes about Sketch 3 is it feels more natural with varying lot sizes; Sketch 2 is too regimented.

Toole – That's a win since you can build the condos as you go as opposed to building 5 large buildings with outlook that you will presell. This seems more user friendly.

Collier – We have a goal and objective that works. You're constricted with a lot count unfavorable to ¾ of the people in the room; all three are too dense. If there is flexibility to reduce the lots, there is room for discussion. They are too dense with insufficient buffers and lack ecological considerations with lack of open space.

Boehmer – You want to talk about density in the number of bedrooms. About the buildings, there are a lot of types proposed in the packet he received; a couple of building ideas that trouble him is bedrooms in basements. That is very strange with new construction and would reduce bedroom density if those are eliminated. Also encourages enhanced accessibility for the homes; it is possible to meet current code for accessibility with a few tweaks. Suggested the developer look beyond what's required; aging population would appreciate not having to deal with steps into the home.

Zimicki – Sketch 3, likes the way the road curves around the rain garden; that is probably the best plan for stormwater management. Sketch 1, has no chance of meeting stormwater standards and Sketch 2 maybe.

Botticelli – Asked Mr. Zimicki's how he feels about the parking on the plans.

Zimicki – He does not want parking on the outside; he's talked to people on the other side with the same concern. That would also cause stormwater to run onto the adjacent lots. He supports on-lot parking rather than large lots; that creates large impervious surfaces as well as lighting.

Collier – Agrees Sketch 3 is more organic but again regarding density, the south lots were reduced and reconfigured to a more horizontal shape to improve the buffer and open space.

HH – She appreciates Sketch 3 with the multi-use sidewalks and significant greenspace. She'd like the condo buildings to be broken up into duplexes. Appreciates SFD being the first seen coming in off SSR. She is concerned about paving over the easement.

Botticelli – What she likes about Sketch 2 is integrating the condos around the neighborhood with every building on its own lot.

Toole – You could do that on Sketch 3. However, the sidewalk is across the street from the houses.

Botticelli – That creates a more park-like area.

Holland – He likes the organic shape of Sketch 3 and there is positive feedback to Sketch 2, which captures the principal of integrating the housing throughout. He'd like to see the impact of imposing the Sketch 2 integration on the flow of Sketch 3. What is a density number that would be acceptable?

Toole – The number of bedrooms is a function of the design element; sidewalks and rain gardens take up space.

Botticelli – If we give the developer direction on layout and design, the numbers will fall into place. On Sketch 3, asked if there is concern about a one-way road in regards to evacuation and safety.

Boehmer – His first stop would be check with the fire department. Two reasons for Sketch 3: you need difference between SFD and condo spaces and slowing traffic and making it safer.

Sutton – On the addition of cul de sacs, asked if that increases paved way. She likes the organic flow of 3 but the integration on 2. On Sketch 2 there would have to be catch basins in the center section. Sketch 3 as laid out still segregates the housing.

Marchant – The smaller lots could be pervious; the smaller the module, the more flexibility. The large parking on Sketch 3 would have to be impervious surface. A good idea to him is using the easement for public space. Consensus seems to be centered around: integration, no perimeter roads, green space,

Zimicki – He has concern in regards to the size of the condo buildings and the density it represents. On Sketch 3, it's a good solution if you use shell.

Bracken – You have to be able to collect any potential pollutants in rain water. Gravel or shell is susceptible to pollutants going straight into the ground.

Zimicki – He thinks the north side condos in Sketch 3 should be separated. He wants to talk about the larger buildings proposed for condos.

Botticelli – These plans are bringing the large condo buildings down to duplexes or quadraplexes. Doesn't think the ZBA supports 37-foot tall buildings. Mr. Marchant brought up a good point about the aging populations.

Sutton – Asked the density at Park Circle; they seem tight.

Boehmer – Using this kind of module makes it easy to privatize space and they can be kept from looking like urban townhouses. Townhouse units are popular for aging-in-place populations.

Cabral – The most tolerable one to him is Sketch 3.

Toole – Sketch 3 with reworking of the condo lots; he thinks they can be redesigned in a more appropriate manner.

Perry – Mr. Boehmer did a good job of getting all these lots into a small area. Asked if the developer would look at less density with larger buffers.

Marchant – Mr. Boehmer's job is to generate ideas and get feedback. The ball then goes into the developer's court.

Toole – He's hearing from the peer review that the original didn't quite work, and options were provided. Asked for the developer's input.

Posner – Appreciates the tone and desire to find something the neighbors like. This gives us some ideas to work with. He has some appreciation for the idea that we need a pro forma that works; we need numbers that work. He would like the opportunity to bounce ideas off Mr. Boehmer.

Toole – Thinks the developer should do some sketching and come back before the workshop.

Antonietti – There is a February 14 meeting to continue the hearing. March 11 looks like the most viable hearing date.

Discussion about the next work session date, Friday February 22 at 1:30 p.m. in the 4 Fairgrounds Road Training Room.

Toole – The idea would be to circulate the site plans ahead of the workshop date so everyone can review them.

Welch – Suggested that there be a deadline for the revised plans to be sent to the members of the workgroup prior to the next session.

Toole – The plans should be to Ms. Antonietti by mid-day February 20; she will forward them to the group members.

II. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned=[at 3:35 p.m. by unanimous consent.

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton