



ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Public Hearing

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, March 11, 2019

Nantucket High School Cafeteria – 4:30 p.m.

Called to order at 4:39 p.m. and Announcements made.

Staff in attendance: Eleanor Antonietti, Zoning Administrator; Tucker Holland, Housing Specialist

Attending Members: Toole, Botticelli, McCarthy, Koseatac, Thayer, Mondani

Absent: O'Mara, Poor

Town Representatives: Ed Marchant, 40B Advisor; George Pucci, K&P Law, P.C.

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. None

II. OLD BUSINESS

20-18 Surfside Crossing, LLC Surfside Crossing 40B Freeman/Reade & Hanley

ORIGINAL APPLICATION: The Applicant is seeking a Comprehensive Permit in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 40B, pursuant to a project eligibility letter issued by MassHousing, in order to allow a multi-family project consisting of 156 for-sale dwelling units comprised of 60 stand-alone single-family cottages on fee simple lots and 96 condominium units in 6 multi-family buildings, with 25% (39 units, 15 cottages and 24 condominium units) designated as affordable units, with a total of 389 bedrooms. The existing lots will be subdivided into 60 fee simple lots, 4 open space lots, and a 3.6-acre condominium lot. Off-street parking will consist of 2 spaces per cottage and 148 spaces designated for the condominiums. Infrastructure and amenities will be provided; however, the proposed project is proposed to connect to municipal water and sewer infrastructure.

MODIFIED PROPOSAL under consideration: The Applicant is seeking a Comprehensive Permit in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 40B, pursuant to a project eligibility letter issued by MassHousing, in order to allow a multi-family project consisting of 100 for-sale dwelling units comprised of 40 stand-alone single-family cottages on fee simple lots and 60 condominium units in 5 multi-family buildings, with 25% (25 units, 10 cottages and 15 condominium units) designated as affordable units, with a total of 285 bedrooms. The existing lots will be subdivided into 40 fee simple lots, a 3.3-acre condominium lot, a 0.5-acre community lot, and 2.8 acres of open space lots. A total of 244 parking spaces will be provide consisting of 80 off-street parking spaces (2 per cottage), 124 spaces for the condominiums, 20 spaces for the recreational community building, and 20-overflow on street spaces. Infrastructure and amenities will be provided; however, the proposed project is designed to connect to municipal water and sewer infrastructure.

Voting Toole, Botticelli, McCarthy, Koseatac, Mondani

Alternates Poor, Thayer

Documentation Powerpoint® presentation and 40B Comprehensive Permit application documentation.

Representing Jamie Feeley, Cottage & Castle, Proponent

 Ryan Maxwell, Bracken Engineering, Inc.

 Chris Dallmus, Design Associates

 Peter Freeman, Freeman & Freeman Law, P.C.

Public Jacques Zimicki, 3 Wherowhero Lane

 Chris Skehel, 2 Keel Lane

 Campbell Sutton, 15 Appleton Road

 James Timmins, attorney for the Cabral Family at 8 South Shore Road

 Paul Derensis, attorney for Nantucket Tipping point and 285 Island homeowners

 Sean Perry, 14 South Shore Road

 Joan Stockman, 13 Wherowhero Lane

 Linda Derensis, 5 Gladlands Road

 Mickie Perry, 14 South Shore Road

 David Iverson, 21 Meadowview Road

 Dave Glowacki, 2 Waydale Road

 Stephen Welch, 13 Waydale Road

Discussion **Toole** – Stated he wants to start with a summary of the two work sessions:

Marchant – He acted as facilitator for the two design work sessions on February 4 and February 22. In his opinion, it was constructive and civil and led to improvements of the site plan. Cliff Boehmer, President of a firm that specializes in design

of mixed-income and affordable-housing developments; he came up with three sketches. There was discussion of pros and cons of those sketches. A consensus evolved for Sketch #3 because it was better at integrating the cottage (for-sale single-family dwelling units (SFDU)) and condominium multifamily buildings and introduced a continuous green space that was more attractive. Mr. Boehmer is interested in the creation of a sense of community; therefore, he wanted the condo units integrated better with the cottage units. He expressed concern about the functionality of the condo units: for plans and outdoor space and significant habitable space in lower the levels.

Upon reaching a consensus on Sketch 3, the applicant was asked to consider developing a revised plan. Between the two work sessions, Mr. Boehmer met with the applicant and their design architect, Chris Dallmus. The applicant complied with the request to distribute its revised plans based upon Sketch 3 at the second session.

One surprise was that the number of units went up to 104 from 100. The bedroom count decreased slightly. It incorporated the green space and curvilinear roads. There were duplexes positioned on South Shore Road; the design received favorable comments. Placing parking on inside of the lot rather than along the exterior was better. Someone liked the asymmetrical nature. There was a preference for better integration of condos and continued concerns about the size of the multifamily buildings and a common vocabulary among the buildings. Density was still too high. One person asked that the lot size vary.

There was a follow up meeting between Mr. Boehmer and the applicant's representative, which led to submission of the current design. That meeting led to the plans to be reviewed.

Explained he has worked on 160 40Bs; the majority has been representing ZBAs but he has also worked for some developers. Site plan and building design are critical issues on 40Bs; they are related to density. Boards are not supposed to talk about density; it is clear in 40B and HAC history that density by itself is meaningless. We should also take into consideration design factors and open space. The applicant initially came in with 156-unit shock-and-awe plan. It went to down to 100 and now is 104 units. There comes a time when a Board has to say, "Here is what we like and could get behind." Rather than work in an adversarial relationship, it's always good to work things out. One way to do that is for Board to establish objective design measures with objective standards – i.e. frontage, setbacks, minimum lot size but that is less critical, street width, sidewalks, parking ratio; those are the standards. We can make progress if those standards are laid out.

Zimicki – At the end of the second session, two sketches were generated which he thought were to be reviewed at this meeting. He understood more people were interested in an idea sketched at the table by Stephen Welch; asked what happened to that.

Marchant – There was a charrette that the applicant could mark up and use; Mr. Zimicki's question is one for the applicant.

Toole – There were multiple ideas generated. Asked if there were any specific questions for Mr. Marchant about the work session. (none) Asked the applicant for their presentation.

Dallmus – Gives presentation – PowerPoint®. Goes over the 3 site plans created by Mr. Boehmer; It was thought that Sketch 3 had a more beneficial streetscape. Reviewed their concept plans which still concentrate the condominiums but have centralized public green space. Reviewed the concept floor plans for the 4-module buildings at 30 feet tall.

Skehel – Asks if references to "lower level" is a basement.

Dallmus – The lower level is below grade.

Toole – It is a basement.

Marchant – A smaller module is a 4-unit building with 2 modules. There are 8 units located in 4 2-unit duplex buildings. There are 44 SFDUs and 40 multifamily condos.

Dallmus – The 30-foot-tall, 4-unit buildings – The storage for studio, 1-bedroom and townhouse units is either immediately adjacent or accessible by an areaway. The second floor is either 1-bedroom or studio apartments. We have tried to give everyone in the multifamily units a sense of their own entry, so there are entry points all the way around the perimeter of the buildings rather than five or more doors on one façade. Outdoor spaces will be created for each unit. The 32-foot tall buildings – the lower level units are a half-flight down and have their own terrace entrances and their own storage; these are true townhouses. Have studied the massing of the front elevation and with gable massing can bring the height down to 30 feet without compromising interior living space. We have consciously addressed providing outdoor living space for each individual, multi-family unit. The 27-foot-tall foot building – these have 4 units in two modules with the same configuration as the 30-foot building and again separate entry points for each unit and individual outdoor space. We have not yet drawn all four elevations of the buildings. On multifamily units the roof material will be architectural asphalt. All cottages will have wood roof.

Botticelli – Asked if the duplexes will be architectural.

Dallmus – The duplexes will have wood roofs. The Duplex building is essentially a townhouse with storage and mechanical space at the lower level and no living space on lower levels.

Botticelli – How long is right elevation ridge line of the duplex. It's hard to get sense of scale from the sketches

Dallmus – The module length is 42 feet.

Botticelli – It would be good to have dimensions.

Dallmus – Summarizes chart of bedrooms for the units on Page 59 of the packet.

Toole – There is a *pro rata* distribution of bedrooms; we need assurance that affordables won't all be one bedroom. There are 70 bedrooms in multifamily units and 24 on the duplexes totaling 94. Asks Mr. Feeley if the duplexes are part of year-round.

Feeley – No. They will be market rate.

- Dallmus** – The proposal has 202 parking spaces total: 46 adjacent to multifamily, 50 street parking spots, 18 at the recreation building, and 88 for SFDU. We have not developed parking for the duplexes; parking will be on the lot.
- Botticelli** – There are 46 spaces for 40 multifamily units.
- Dallmus** – Plus the 50 street parking spaces.
- Botticelli** – They are not going to park on other side of street.
- Toole** – Those street-parking spaces should be counted as guest parking, not multifamily parking. It was meant for overflow, not to be active all-day, every-day parking.
- Botticelli** – There is one parking space per unit around the loop.
- McCarthy** – The 10 lots in back of the duplexes are part of multifamily parking; 70 bedrooms get 46 parking spaces.
- Toole** – There needs to be more parking.
- Dallmus** – Not in the packet is the square footage calculations and bedroom dimensions.
- Toole** – Asked for a summary of the sizes of the bedrooms.
- Dallmus** – The smallest bedroom we allow is 10x10 bedroom; they increase from there: 10x13, 10x13½, 10x12, 14x12, etc.
- Toole** – Asked if the 10x10 includes the closet space.
- Dallmus** – No. We are talking about space that can be allocated for furnishing a bedroom. We should get you area calculations for the bedrooms.
- Toole** – Not sure we are on same page in terms of unit and bedroom count.
- Zimicki** – Asked if the public can ask a few questions.
- Toole** – He doesn't want to get bogged down.
- Sutton** – On the 32-foot building, you had a sketch showing outdoor space for each of the units. Asked how the outdoor space was accessed.
- Toole** – He does not want to get into specifics of the architecture. He would prefer to continue with site plan and give applicant guidance on what we are willing to support.
- P.DeRensis** – Asked for clarification of the number of units and bedrooms.
- Toole** – That is a legitimate question. Asked what number the applicant is submitting in terms of bedroom count.
- Feeley** – 70 + 24 + 186 = 280 bedrooms.
- Toole** – So the bedroom count is basically the same. He appreciates many of changes; the site plan is beginning to show promise in terms of streetscape and breaking up larger buildings. The building designs that we have seen show promise. There are still some issues. He'd like to talk in terms of Mr. Marchant's point of trying to frame the question in ways that give the developer guidance on the next iteration. For him frontage is a big issue; the lots should be wider. We have been very consistent about saying we don't like 5-bedrooms SFDUs while the applicant has not only insisted upon keeping them but increasing the number of 5-bedroom SFDUs. There has to be a *quid pro quo* to even consider them, that means making the lots bigger.
- Botticelli** – Without seeing how parking is going to work, it's hard to understand if it will fit. It looks tight; these are the minimum lot size allowed in Town on Nantucket. Wants some lots bigger to give more breathing room and increase the frontage.
- Toole** – Some of lots, due to curvilinear road, will have houses at the lot line. Asks to see the slide on Page 32 with the site plan; pointed out problematic lots that don't have room for parking. There is promise; the board needs to give the applicant more guidance on where we want to see this go.
- Botticelli** – The placement of buildings around multifamily buildings seems odd, indicated the top-left corner of the site plan. Asked about the landscape plan around that building; where do they enter; what is it going to look like around those buildings. There could be more development to make it more pleasing.
- Dallmus** – After discussion with Mr. Boehmer, the buildings are set to follow the curving roadway. We did not want to have it aligned with street.
- Botticelli** – But there are multiple points of entry; no true front door. Not all have pathways to get people to front doors. She agrees with Mr. Boehmer that houses facing the street makes sense. Right now, some of front doors are facing into each other with duplexes.
- Dallmus** – There is one side and one front entry on the duplexes.
- Botticelli** – Part of developing a landscaping plan would be paths to the front doors.
- Dallmus** – The intent of the plan was to show the development of open space, more than an open green. Mr. Boehmer stressed importance of developing public space.
- Botticelli** – She would rather have sense of entry for the buildings; the different doors is architecturally unusual. Maybe you can show us how it will work with a landscaping plan.
- Toole** – Asks Ms. Botticelli if it would work better if there were fewer units and buildings.
- Botticelli** – Yes. It would also be easier if you had fewer and smaller buildings that relate to the streetscape. That was the option Mr. Welch drew with smaller buildings. Maybe there is an in between, a 3-module unit.
- Toole** – It might help to make the 4-module buildings 2-modules and eliminate two so there is a total of 10 modules that can be spread out better with more parking space. Doing that would get more end units and less interior units and reduces the strain on infrastructure. Everything improves.
- If we need to cut to the chase, we need to come up with a number. Asks Mr. Pucci if that is kosher.
- Pucci** – The Board needs to see parking on the plan.
- Toole** – Let's talk about frontage on the lots: a Minimum of 60 feet.

Thayer – He doesn't think you necessarily need 60 on every lot, but corner lots are too tight.

Botticelli – Asked how many parking spaces are going to be required for each cottage.

Toole – An advantage to more frontage is you get more space between each driveway. There is no additional street parking in beginning pod of the development; there is no overflow parking. There's still issues. Setbacks of 5 feet is the minimum and 10 feet between buildings is tight.

McCarthy – Would prefer they follow the setback guidelines for R5, 10 feet each side.

Pucci – They have to treat affordables equally with the market rate. You cannot be talking numbers until you know if the affordables are mixed in and you can't have easily accessible parking for the SFDUs but not the multifamily units.

Botticelli – We can't address major issues until we have a plan that shows where the affordables are and accurate parking.

McCarthy – If we say frontage must be minimum of 50 feet and setbacks have to be X feet in the back and 10&10 on the side, they will have to make that work. That means decreasing the number of units. We need to give them parameters. They may have to make a smaller house to make it work. In Naushop, we have 5 feet on one side and 10 feet on the other and there is tandem parking in some places and side by side in others and on-street parking on one side.

S.Perry – Pointed out that Naushop has dramatically less bedrooms and no full basements with bedrooms in them.

McCarthy – Naushop is not a 40B and it does have 5-bedroom houses and the minimum lot size is 5,000 square feet.

Mondani – In reviewing the minutes from the February 22 work session, the developer mentioned that they need 281 bedrooms to make this work. He wants to talk about the number of bedrooms.

Feeley – If there were an easy way to reduce the bedrooms relative to business plan, we would do it. One way to reduce density is to have more cottages, but that does not address the middle-income piece of the plan, which is why we want the condos to be part of this plan. Going from the 100-unit plan to this plan, we really liked the 100-unit plan because 70% of the units would be restricted to year-round. By reducing the condos, we have gone to 52 year-round units out of 92. Year-round occupancy has dropped to 56.5% from 70%. Hearing talk about reducing frontage is disheartening because we had a linear plan with all 50-foot frontage. We were told to go to a more organic direction. There is nothing arbitrary about the program and economics behind it to hit a minimum bar.

Toole – This development is proposing over 20 bedrooms per acre; Rugged Scott was 14 bedrooms per acre and Sachems Path was 10 bedrooms per acre. Ticcoma is a totally different issue: it was zoned for workforce housing and it all counts toward the Subsidized Housing Inventory (SHI).

Feeley – Beach Plum Village is 25% affordable. We have 56% year-round residency.

McCarthy – Affordable and year-round are two different things. She likes the idea behind the year-round restriction but doesn't know how enforceable it will be.

Marchant – The only units that will count toward the SHI are the affordable units.

Mondani – If you reduce the number of bedrooms or units, you make it up with the price. You're focused on the year-round thing but have affordable and not affordable.

Feeley – The condos are an ownership product developed to a specific price point, \$450,000 to \$750,000 to help our year-round professionals so they can afford to be able to stay here. That does not really exist on the Island.

Toole – Asked if the condos are a loss leader, are you selling them at cost, or are they for profit.

Feeley – They are for profit but there is risk.

Stockman – Question one is has anyone determined whether or not it is legal to restrict the year-round houses; question two is who will police that; question three is who will oversee it. She looked at the price per square foot for the condos; it was \$1100+ per square foot, which is astronomical.

Toole – At the last meeting, Mr. Posner mentioned a letter from Krokidas & Bluestein. Asked if we have that.

Freeman – We do not at this moment, but he will provide that. That firm's analysis is comfortable that what is being proposed is permissible under the law. Theoretically someone could question it.

Mondani – He has a problem with the year-round thing, but he likes the mid-level aspect. He would like the applicant to try to figure out how we can get to less units.

Marchant – He is familiar with the firm Krokidas & Bluestein; they are one of leading law firms in terms of affordable housing. That decision should be presented to DHCD to get feedback on that opinion along with Town Counsel.

Toole – If you are making the case that the year-round piece is critical to whole puzzle, we should have the letter. We have been asking for months. If it turns out to be not valid, we have been wasting our time.

Feeley – We have enough feedback to feel comfortable to continue down this path. You will have the letter before you make a decision.

Toole – We have asked repeatedly for months to show us how the basic year-round plan is kosher. You are asking us to take your word for it.

Freeman – It's not just us, our comfort is based upon the review of that firm. It is "kosher." We will get it to you. Asked what it is about the number of bedrooms that concerns the ZBA.

McCarthy – She's concerned about the number of bedrooms because it will over-tax, over-stress what this site can handle as far as cars, people, parking, traffic, and the pool. There is no playground structure for the children. The number of bedrooms informs the rest of it. We are asking for a lot of information - the letter, landscaping, driveways, parking - which is very slow in coming as the deadline creeps up on us. She doesn't understand why we don't have that information.

Feeley – We have a highly developed 100-unit version of this plan; you've seen it. We decided in late January that we were not finding common ground, so we have spent last month working on a new design, which he thought embraced the preferred design. If the Board says they are behind this plan, they will submit all that information.

Botticelli – It's hard to get behind the plan without all that information. We have to see that. Looking at the plan from the last session, there were five houses on one stretch of road and now there are six. Some of the lots on the February 22 plan have had SFUDUs added.

McCarthy – Something has to give; just because you take from one doesn't mean you push on the other.

Botticelli – You have 70 bedrooms in the multifamily units, so you would want at least 100 parking spaces.

Feeley – Everyone in the affordable units will have assigned parking for the 46 spaces; but there are 96 spaces between that and the on-street parking. There is room for more parking on this plan. We can address a lot of these things on this specific plan as part of another submission if that will help reach a decision. To Ms. Stockman's comment and her numbers, between the 3-bedroom condos you're looking at square footage between 1162 and 1368 going for \$750,000 and every 4th one is going to be an affordable unit.

Marchant – Ms. Stockman might have been looking at original PEL application. In that those units were very small. The square footage has increased.

Stockman – She based the numbers on more recent submissions but it's hard to tell since the submissions are incomplete.

McCarthy – Wants to go back to the discussion about frontage, parking, setbacks, sidewalks, etc.

Botticelli – Every unit should have adequate parking but there should also be green space; if there are less units, there might be a happy medium.

Mondani – That's why he brought up bedrooms; Mr. Posner stated a specific number that you needed to make the economics work.

Feeley – He did not have a specific number. He thinks Mr. Posner asked if the Board had a specific number.

Mondani – Reads from minutes of February 22 workshop. Asked if the Board is being told we can't go less than 280 bedrooms.

Marchant – We could talk forever about this. The Board just has to say what you want.

Zimicki – At the Design Review, it was suggested that the north road going to the condos be 2-way from the entrance.

Feeley – It's not two-way inside the property. Demonstrates proposed traffic flow

Toole – That is another parameter where we can give some guidance.

P.DeRensis – At several points he has talked about how the economics don't work for him, and in the minutes of the workshop there is continued reference to the economics of the project; the economics are being used as a limiting factor. In his opinion, the Board should ask for financial data to verify what's being said.

Pucci – You can ask for anything, but at this point you are not talking about a condition or a denial. It goes to the issue Mr. Mondani had mentioned about a red herring – the year-round housing. They are an eligible applicant because they are talking about affordable housing that qualifies under the SHI. If a particular design requires a certain number of bedrooms for year-round housing, this is subject to the 40B and is relevant to the ZBA's design concerns. While I don't think you are at the point where you can demand the *pro forma* on project economics, the developer is not making a compelling argument why they need the year-round housing, aside from the issue of legality; that doesn't give them jurisdiction to seek relaxation of zoning and to have a number of bedrooms that may overburden the site. They cannot come back and say that a certain parameter would preclude them from meeting their year-round housing goal because that is not relevant to why they are an eligible 40B applicant before the ZBA.

L.DeRensis – In cottages, you had originally said there would be sheds or maybe even spas; that will make a lot even tighter once the driveway is installed. Asked Mr. Feeley if they are still planning on sheds and spas. Sheds are shown.

Feeley – This plan does show sheds; we had submitted a couple of landscape plans back when it was a 100-unit design. They would be happy to provide the same details for this plan.

Toole – Keeping Mr. Pucci's comments in mind, the year-round thing is not a driving force for us unless we feel like there should be some extra weight given to it. We can give them some parameters that we can get behind; it would ultimately have conditions.

Thayer – Appreciates attempt to create more affordable housing. He's not sure the neighbors support the plan; he's not sure site supports the kind of units they are proposing; and he's not sure it is our responsibility to solve the island's affordable housing problem on one piece of property in one neighborhood.

Toole – He agrees with Mr. Thayer. It interests him that there has been almost no public support for the affordable housing portion of this.

Feeley – He feels the negative response created a toxic environment early on. He wishes there were more people willing to speak out on the issue; we all know people who have had to move off Island.

Timmins – Things have become unnecessarily skewed here because the board is working hard to come up with something. The applicant should look at what is proposed and decide what does or does not fit. We started at 156 units and are trying to bring that number down without looking at the reasons why it should come down. This plan has two dead end streets; we don't know how wide the roads are; the State fire code says the 1-way road have to be at least 20' wide without parking on either side. You have an obligation to work with them, not an obligation to tell them what you want. Ms. McCarthy said that the board wants to vote on something, but they aren't getting the information. If the Fire Chief looks at the plan as is, it will get skewed. It has to be an internally safe site; right now, this is not. The Board doesn't know how wide the roads are; some are parking lots with pathways down the middle. Walk around the plan and say how many units work and what does not work. We are not going to solve the housing issues on this island with this development. The abutters along South

Shore Road should not be burdened with the issues of 40B, which the Island faces. This part of the Island is getting “walloped” by housing due to access and bus routes.

Toole – It is not helpful at this point to talk about 40B. Appreciates the comments about details on the plan. He feels the Board and applicant are still very far apart. He likes Mr. Pucci’s comments on the year-round thing; if you want to restrict them all to true affordability, he’s willing to talk about that.

Botticelli – She appreciates the goal; the number of units and bedrooms and people are the issue. The size of the buildings is inappropriate on Nantucket and particularly given the area. The loop-road plan is a good one but would still prefer the multifamily buildings broken up into smaller units that address the street better. We don’t know from the plan what roads are 2-way and which are 1-way. She would like the lots to have more frontage.

P.DeRensis – The Board has stated numerous times that they don’t have enough information to make a decision. A circle is developing where they do some work, the ZBA looks at it... it’s a waste of everyone’s time. Get the information you need and evaluate that.

Freeman – We hear the ZBA; we had hoped we would meet more of a consensus and maybe we are too far apart. My client will take comments to heart and respond to concerns. We know you need to have actual dimensions and details. If it’s still too far apart, so be it.

Marchant – The 40Bs are always negotiated, especially controversial 40Bs. They’ve said what they would like to do. Now you have given them direction in terms of frontage, parking, setbacks, and on the additional tier of affordability without income limits, which weakens that argument, you have stated how you value that and that it does not trump a reasonable or functional design.

Botticelli – Asked if it would make sense to have this plan evaluated by the Fire Chief before the next meeting to ensure it meets State requirements.

Thayer – An engineer should not design a roadway system that doesn’t meet the State codes.

Marchant – Bracken Engineering is very familiar with Nantucket and the State code; he would not worry about that.

Toole – Would be disappointed if the “tongue” design, which came out of the design review, turns out to be unworkable from an engineering standpoint.

Maxwell – We will come up with a finalized design that works within Fire Department code

Feeley – Don Bracken did change the radius at the end to accommodate fire truck.

Toole – He doesn’t feel the Board has stated all of our parameters.

Mondani – Based on Sachems Path, if we put a ratio to it, parking should be at least 1 space per unit

Antonietti – Points out that LUG 2 requires 2 spaces per dwelling unit. In R-5, it’s 1 per dwelling unit; and for duplex is 1 space per bedroom.

McCarthy – They are going to have to have overflow parking on the street.

Botticelli – Wants to be careful about having so much parking that you lose green space. That’s 192 spaces not including on-street parking.

M.Perry – If these parking spaces will be hard surface, you’re taking green space away to have hardscape that causes run off.

Iverson – He applauds the call for more parking; everyone lacks parking. The 1 space per bedroom for duplexes should be extended to condos.

Mondani – Asked if there was planning-board representation at the February workshops.

Welch – Parking is a primary concern; the densities discussed are correct. There’s no overflow parking for this neighborhood.

Antonietti – An option for the condos is 0.75 spaces per bedroom as is case with apartment buildings

Holland – For the Ticcoma Green project, parking is one bedroom; there are 80 places on site with adjacent overflow.

Mondani – He’d prefer to see the number of units decreased rather than building bigger parking areas.

Toole – Let’s talk about frontage. It should be more than 50 feet in an area where it’s 2-acre zoning.

Antonietti – Frontage in 2-acre zoning is 150 feet.

Toole – Thinks 60 feet is appropriate; some of the 5-bedroom houses would become 4-bedroom.

Mondani – All this is within the concept of this plan.

Toole – It is unclear what is before us. Asks Mr. Freeman if the 156-unit plan is officially before us.

Freeman – It has not gone by the wayside. We have come up with the recent design based on the workshops and feedback; we now know what the ZBA is looking for and believe we can come up a plan upon which a decision can be made. The peer review was done for a larger plan. If we don’t reach something that is agreed upon by both sides, we have reserved the right to go back to 156. We know we need to give you more detail on one of the later iterations.

Feeley – As the ZBA roll out acceptable ideas, there may or may not be another plan.

P.DeRensis – There are at least 6 fatal defects with this proposal. Could write a letter outlining the flaws, which should cause you to deny the project

Toole – Yes, write a letter and we will have someone look at it. If we agree with you, we might go that route.

Pucci – It would be helpful to have something in writing on issues that are outstanding with this project. I know we are talking about limited extension. There should be at least 2 further public hearing sessions, not just an extension to accommodate one. If developer came back with new plan more in line with your input, there are still a lot of issues to address in the public hearing process: sewer, water, anything else abutters have. That’s assuming productive hearing time. But even at the most productive level, this is worth at least 2 more public hearing sessions.

Toole – He agrees with Mr. Pucci and appreciates the optimism it will only take 2 hearings.

McCarthy – Asked if there is the final decision on parking.

Botticelli – 70 bedrooms times 0.75 is 52 parking spaces.

Toole – We're interested in the ratio, not the number; let's make it one parking space per bedroom.

Freeman – He agrees with getting guidance; but if you say across the board, 1 space per bedroom, there are a lot of units with 2 or more bedrooms.

Toole – 2 parking spaces per house; 1 per bedroom for multifamily, and some percentage for additional bedrooms.

Marchant – Doesn't make sense to have 1 per bedroom with duplex. They are 3 bedrooms units and have only 2 spaces for the cottages; that is inconsistent.

McCarthy – It is consistent with our zoning bylaws.

Toole – Suggests 0.75 per parking spaces per bedroom works; a 4-bedroom house would need 3 spaces and a 5-bedroom house would get 4. Frontage is a minimum of 60 feet. Setbacks are 5 feet on one side, 10 feet on the other, and a minimum of 10 feet in the front.

Marchant – Want to talk about side-by-side parking versus tandem spaces.

Botticelli – She thinks it should be varied and it would look nicer.

McCarthy – Suggested the rear setback be 5 feet. Suggested ground cover maximum be 40%.

Toole – Suggested groundcover ratio at 30%. There is no waiver request for the street width.

Botticelli – Some should be 2-way; currently all the roads look too narrow to be 2-way.

Toole – Some of the plans showed bedrooms in the basement and no bathrooms. At one point it was sidewalks both sides of the street; he could see not having them encroaching on the center green space.

McCarthy – She would like to see sidewalks on both sides.

Glowacki – Just around green area, would be okay to have sidewalks on one side only.

McCarthy – So sidewalks on both sides aside from around green space. Building height, keep it at 30 feet or less

Toole – He would like to see the 4-module buildings go away and have more 2-module buildings.

Botticelli – She's not a fan of the raised garden structure.

Welch – Asked them to speak on hearing time for architectural review. These are new buildings and won't go before Historic District Commission (HDC). The multifamily and duplex buildings are very large. Past precedent of the HDC has had applicants in four to five times to come up with appropriate designs.

Toole – He doesn't think we're there yet.

Botticelli – Once we have a site plan that works, we will get architectural plans for the buildings; we aren't approving sketches. We only have the cottages, not the larger buildings. We want CAD drawings showing all 4 elevations.

Toole – A full set of architectural plans for all structures is a requirement.

Marchant – A 40B is based upon preliminary plans.

Toole – Asks how you would make architectural decisions if you don't have the proper drawings.

Marchant – If you reach agreement on the plan, you will get CAD plans.

Pucci – That will be an ultimate condition.

Toole – Askes if they want to talk about the ratio of bedrooms to acres.

Marchant – He doesn't think so.

Pucci – If you think if it is overburdening the site.

Toole – Keep in mind the ratio of what has been done out here before.

L.DeRensis – You need an updated waiver list.

Toole – We will ultimately go over the waiver list.

Botticelli – We had asked for topography and height calculations.

Antonietti – Asks if they want 3D renderings.

Toole – Not yet; how about an extension.

Feeley – We will extend to April 4th.

Toole – This is not going to be finished by April 4th. We have to meet again to either close or extend on the 4th. Asked if they could have a new plan in two weeks.

Feeley – His partner is not here; there's a lot to go through with him. He'd like to extend to April 4th; it sounds like March 26 works for next meeting.

Toole – For the record, we have no interest in dragging this on; he hopes to reach a resolution.

Thayer – We have no interest in dragging this out, but we do have an interest in coming up with a plan that works, and we need time do that. Holding an end date over our heads is not helpful.

Toole – Asked if push comes to shove, can the ZBA close the hearing at the March 26 meeting.

Marchant – Your obligation is to evaluate the original application; if you must, you would base your decision on the 156-unit plan.

Pucci – It may be a problem that he doesn't have Mr. Posner here, but we need to see a show of good faith. You still need to address the conditions of the project; April 4th is unrealistic.

Freeman – You could schedule both March 26 and April 4; at least that gives certainty of two hearings.

Toole – It is up to the applicant to provide the requested information; if they don't, we're in the same place.

P.DeRensis – If they don't give you an extension, we will give you a letter providing reasons to deny the project.

Motion to Accept an extension to April 4th. (made by: Botticelli) (seconded by: Mondani)

- Vote Carried unanimously
Toole – The next meeting: March 26, all locations are available. Let’s go back to the Public Safety Facility; he doesn’t think it will be overcrowded.
- Motion **Motion to Continue the public hearing to March 26 at 4:30 in the Public Safety Facility at 4 Fairgrounds Road.**
(made by: Botticelli) (seconded by: Mondani)
- Vote Carried unanimously
McCarthy – On the next proposal plan, wants to see how trash for the multifamily buildings will be handled. Wants to see a playground for kids; she’s not a huge fan of impervious basketball courts. She would prefer green space such as a Bocci court and playground. All mail for all units will be delivered into recreation building.
Toole – The recreation building is another discussion. We have to get off the site plan; we need at least general number of buildings on the site plan.
McCarthy – Currently there are 4 duplexes; suggested increasing to 8 duplexes and decrease the condos to 6 buildings with 4 units each. You go from 70 condos to 24 condos with bedrooms going from 280 to 259. Condos go from 70 bedrooms to 42 bedrooms. This is way to find more room and still have rooms. Could go from 44 cottages to 40 cottages totaling 169 bedrooms. Whole project would drop from 280 to 259 bedrooms. Get down from 104 units to 88. Maybe this is feasible. This decreases condo building size and increases number of duplexes.
Toole – Good suggestion but there are innumerable ways to look at this mathematically. Plan has to work for the site for Nantucket and ultimately for the developer and us. Ms. McCarthy’s number is not necessarily the number; there are a number of ways to get to different numbers. Another thing he wants to say; the cost goes down if you can create less parking; conversely you don’t have to sprinkle the cottages, so that cost would decrease.
Mondani – He wants input from the Planning Board.
Antonietti – We have that.
Koseatac – He wants input from the Fire Department.
Toole – We’re still far apart on the site plan and number of buildings. Mr. Chessia would have to review the storm drain plan. Once we get into the nitty-gritty, it will take more than two meetings.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

1. None

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to Adjourn at 7:25 p.m. (made by: Botticelli) (seconded by: Mondani) Carried unanimously

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton