

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 ~~

Friday, February 22, 2019

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

Called to order at 1:35 p.m. and Announcements made Ed Toole

Staff in attendance: Eleanor Antonietti, Zoning Administrator; John Hedden, Land Use Specialist; 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 (HDC)
- Jason Bridges, Chair Select Board
- Tucker Holland, Affordable Housing Specialist
- 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** – This is a follow up to February 4 meeting. Our goal here is to come up with a plan that satisfies everyone.
- Boehmer** – On February 7, he met with the development team and talked about a more seamless integration of the types of housing on the site; he suggested the developer be able to have more tangible metrics to discuss density. Reviewed his concerns with the original layout that had the condos clumped at the rear of the site in a way whereby the rest of the neighborhood would not interact with condo residents.
- Site Plan 1** – This also clusters the condos; but with one-way circulation, everyone experiences the full scope of the site making it more inviting with a walkable, coherent setting where it is starting to look like a neighborhood. He and the development team talked about taking advantage of the easement to be used for outdoor community space. However, he thinks the scale of the buildings along the street should be regularized. The developer should look at options for breaking up the “condo zone” as well as breaking up the size of the condos. If this works for the developer, the next level is 3D modeling of the buildings to see how the streetscape appears.
- Posner** – The modules that are stacked are 1 bedroom (BR) over a 3 BR or a studio over a 2 BR. We have tried to work with the topography and used basement bedrooms to keep the height down.
- Dallmus** – The tallest cottage is 28 feet. The condos are taller.
- Bridges** – He's here for Dawn Hill Holdgate, who was representing the Select Board. Ms. Hill Holdgate says the layout is moving in the right direction with the enlarged buffer, more greenspace, and interior parking; however, she would prefer smaller condo buildings.

Welch – The circulation model creates a focal point in terms of everyday service and use as well as aesthetics; there should be a focus on the aesthetics and functionality of the green space. These types of subdivisions typically have issues with parking and noise. Thinks referring to the condos as “condos” is a disservice as it is a form of ownership; these are multi-family dwelling units. “Condo” is not descriptive of these buildings. If every bedroom has a parking space, you’re short; there is parking on the street. The success of secondary and tertiary roads is lower density. The duplexes impact the esthetic as well as parking. There needs to be a common vocabulary among the buildings.

Sutton – Her main concern is the regulated lots; they are all at 5,000 square feet (SF). For a 5-BR house, there isn’t enough space. When the emphasis is on year-round population, you need to think about people’s sense of space and independence from the neighbors; that closeness isn’t an issue for summer rentals. Cited Park Circle as an example of small lots for duplexes with no yard space for children to play and family use.

Perry – Looking at the numbers, we’ve gone up in the number of residences from 100 to 104. This set shows 56 multi-residential and 8 duplexes. He’s disappointed to see no increase in the buffer status.

Holland – He’s sensitive to the intensity of use. He’s most focused on the social integration of the site and agrees with Ms. Sutton to some degree. This still feels segregated when it should feel integrated.

Botticelli – Agrees with Mr. Holland; she was disappointed with the schematics of clustering the multi-residential structures. There isn’t enough integration. Likes Mr. Boehmer’s suggestion of having smaller structures along the roadway. She’s also sensitive about the four townhouses lined up together looking like cookie-cutter residences. Asked if the easement can be paved.

Feeley – He got a letter from their consultant who said they are allowed to pave the easement.

Toole – He’s encouraged by the new housing types in the duplex area; however, the multi-family is still not well integrated. He thinks those buildings have to change radically. He’s also taken aback that there are more units rather than less.

Botticelli – Asked about the idea of varying the lot sizes. A preliminary HDC comment was that it looked like a development that was created overnight rather than one that grew organically over time.

Toole – Asked why they insist the 5-BR houses are integral.

Feeley – The 5 BR are more marketable. Without those, we are targeting a narrower part of the market.

Toole – The 5 BR should be on large lots with fewer of them.

Feeley – His first home was a 4 BR on 5,000 SF; he found it had adequate space.

Posner – This development is not getting subsidized; it functions within the economics of the *pro forma*. We are counting on making this work by selling 27 single-family dwelling for more than \$2M. He doesn’t think the lot area is crucial to the marketability of the house. Most of 4- and 5-BR units would be owned by couples with most of the bedrooms empty most of the year.

Feeley – The numbers we are projecting carry the notion that they are restricted to year-round residents. We could sell them as summer units at a much higher price.

Toole – He would prefer a smaller bite of the apple and without having to worry about enforcement actions. Residents are going to rent rooms even though the pro forma doesn’t allow it.

Marchant – Spoke with Margaux LeClair, attorney and fair-housing expert at DHDC, about whether or not a year-round occupancy restriction is acceptable to the State. She said we need to check with Town Counsel; her argument is there could be a resident in Nantucket who spends half the year here and half the year in Florida and wants to downsize and would appeal the restriction. You don’t talk about density for density’s sake. Design is paramount. Given the proposed density of 104 units, whether or not we can achieve the design objective we are looking for, 40B is a tradeoff; there is no guarantee a 40B developer will make money; you have to come up with a plan that’s acceptable. Looking at the square foot prices on the multi-family buildings, he can see why they want to build them. It’s a combination of good intentions and profit margin.

Welch – On the integration, we didn’t talk about massing in relation to the lot sizes. Cited Park Circle, Sachems Path, and Nashaquisset as examples of massing to lot size. His question is how use relates to massing. Explained how they might break up the multi-use buildings and sell condos in single-family dwelling to make up the economic difference.

Marchant – Middle income is great, but there are no income limitations here but there are no safeguards as to what the price must be.

Posner – We do have a legal opinion.

Marchant – Asked Mr. Posner to send it in.

Posner – He thinks Nantucket will want to get into multi-family condos more. He believes the restrictions on the house being sold to a year-round resident will keep the prices down.

Sutton – She’s taking time off to be part of a design group and this conversation is going off on the economics between the ZBA and the developer. We are here to work with the developer’s goals for an acceptable plan.

Feeley – They studied the viability of condo sales.

Zimicki – The density is still too high though he likes the flow of the plan. If six houses are dropped out, the site becomes more spacious. The two condos that face the road could be swapped with two front duplexes; that would address the streetscape concerns. The one-way flow of traffic, the condos are dumping out and circling around; thinks the road should be two-way up to the first condo entrance. Lots 1-9 are appropriately sized for the buildings on them.

Collier – It seems we’ve taken a step back and comments from the last meeting haven’t been taken to heart. When talking about Naushop or some of the other 5,000-SF subdivisions, those work because they reflect the zoning of the area and they

blend in. Zoning along South Shore Road is 2 acres; you can't justify comparing this to those subdivisions. There are opportunities for larger lots, which would be more appealing to the surrounding neighborhood.

Sutton – On the parking at the community building, that is being counted as viable parking and they have double use for overflow parking and parking for the community building and pool.

Posner – He expects people to walk to the pool and community building; they consider it to be guest parking. Discussion about adequate parking to provide guest over-flow parking.

Toole – He's uncomfortable with the intensity of use in the 4- and 5-BR houses when "the family" arrives.

Feeley – We envision the property manager as the enforcer in regards to the parking and use.

Posner – You are asking us to break up the condos; we have put them in smaller footprints. We would be happy to move things around. We haven't heard anything meaningful about what you would be comfortable approving.

Marchant – We've tried to explain the design objectives; we've said how to make this look like a single texture along the road and how many multi-family buildings can fit behind them. He has expressed his opinion on basement units and the 30-foot modules.

Botticelli – Everyone's concern is that the multi-family buildings don't seamlessly integrate.

Toole – He doesn't see how buildings of that scale can be integrated.

Posner – His concern with integration is the possibility of destroying the value of the single-family dwellings, which will pay for this subdivision.

Marchant – He heard Mr. Posner say they will look into duplexes and triplexes along the road in place of the two large buildings.

Discussion about the possibility of integrating the multi-family structures without impacting market value of the single-family market-rate dwellings.

Welch – Presented a plan to increase the duplexes resulting in 188 bedrooms total. That's less than the 281 Mr. Posner said he needs.

Botticelli – For her it isn't about the number of buildings, it's the character of the architecture and scale of the structures.

Marchant – He thinks the design objectives have been clearly stated as to what would be more palatable to everyone here. Asked if the developer is willing to come up with another plan and is another work session merited.

Posner – He doesn't think they are interested in a plan radically different from the program they proposed. He thinks they can make adjustments that address the streetscape and scale along the streetscape, but he doesn't think those changes will bring the bedroom numbers down.

Sutton – She feels resistance from Mr. Posner against even trying. When we left last time, we expected 90 to 100 units with a good site plan base.

Collier – Feels no effort is being made to meet the concerns of participants; the conversation seems to be between the ZBA and the developer.

Discussion about the apparent lack of forward momentum.

Marchant – If there is no effort at flexibility on the participants' part, this is a futile effort. It's still worth the effort to see if they can come up with a plan that is mutually acceptable.

Posner – He thinks it's worth trying to see what they can do. Suggested Mr. Boehmer and Mr. Dallmus work together to address the streetscape. They have a cost structure and a program that's been carefully worked out. They will look at other layouts.

Marchant – Suggested a meeting with the architect with plans submitted to Ms. Antonietti for dissemination prior to the next public hearing.

Boehmer – In order to get to a point that makes everyone happy, some units will be lost. Retaining the value of all the homes is assured through a seamless distribution of structures.

Toole – The next 40B public hearing is March 11.

II. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 3:52 p.m. by unanimous consent.

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton