

Aquinnah Planning Board Plan Review Committee Meeting – August 9, 2022

Present: Jim Wallen, Jim Newman, Sarah Thulin, Tom Murphy, Heidi Vanderhoop, Amera Ignacio

Not present: Berta Welch, Isaac Taylor

Also present: Chris Alley, Dan Doyle, Megan Ottens-Sargent, Brendan Hanley, Phil Regan, Weston, Halkyard, Greg Whiting, MHV, Carlos Montoya, Claudine Hanley, Mitzi Pratt, Tony Bene, Meg Bodnar, Mary Sage Napolitan, Liz Volchok, Vera Dello Russo, Derrill Bazzy

Meeting was held via videoconference on Zoom

Meeting opened at 6:36pm.

Minutes: Sarah motioned to approve the 6/28/22 minutes. Motion was seconded by Jim W. Committee voted 6-0, motion passed.

Public Meeting: Wallen of 7 East Pasture Shore Road Map 4 Lot 88 - Special Permit Amendment request to increase previously approved dwelling footprint from 1,740sf to 1,838sf. Committee agreed that the Zoning Administrator can review and approve the changes so long as the footprint change does not exceed the 170sf threshold. Sarah motioned to refer the request to the Zoning Administrator. Motion was seconded by Tom. Committee voted 5-0-1, motion passed. Jim W abstained.

Next meeting date: October 18th, 2022. Committee agreed to continue meetings via zoom.

Meeting of the Planning Board: Form A – James F Obrien Jr – Mpshup Trail Map 10 Lot 6 – Chris Alley noted that he refiled the plan after the last meeting on 6/28 and gave a brief outline and explanation behind the Form A request: difference between parcels (any piece of real estate with a defined perimeter) and lot (parcel that is developable and meet area and frontage of local zoning); Two ways land can be divided: Form A which is accompanied by an Approval Not Required plan and is not a subdivision and Form C is a subdivision where the lots are created such that new frontage must be generated. With a Form A the question that is placed before the Planning Board is whether the division of land shown is a subdivision in that new frontage is being created (plan does not rise to the level of a subdivision and is not attempting to create developable lots). O’Brian proposal is to divide one 64ft parcel into three parcels where no new frontage is being created. Committee and public briefly discussed the plan. Jim W motioned to endorse the Form A as presented. Motion was seconded by Jim N. Planning Board voted 4-0, motion passed.

Public Hearing: CCS Sanctuary, LLC of 4 Moshup Trail Map 12 Lot 87 (continued from 5/24 & 6/28/22) – Jim W noted that there are still issues surrounding the project are environmental and applicant is awaiting Con Comm review and approval.

Applicant presented revised plans: complete redesign of dwelling; pool has been removed (original notice included pool zoning bylaw that is not applicable now); garage has been removed; well will maintain in existing location as well as existing parking area; maintaining septic system in originally proposed location (no disruption to the bank sited to the north); current proposal does not include any new ground disturbance that hasn’t been previously disturbed; applicant still plans on habitat restoration of square footage on property that would potentially offset any new footprint; dwelling has been shifted north of existing dwelling (more concealed by dune with pine trees); adjusted roof and orientation of dwelling (three different ridge heights); highest proposed ridge height is 4ft7in below existing dwelling ridge (23ft10in above mean grade); closest ridge line to Moshup Trail is almost 6ft below height of existing dwelling and the cross ridge is almost 7ft below height of existing dwelling; existing total footprint on the lot is 1,672sf; revised footprint of dwelling is 1,940sf with 554sf of decking (2,494sf total); proposal presented at May meeting had a total footprint of 3,487sf (inclusive of garage and pool which has been removed);

Committee discussed the following: elements that pertain to zoning bylaws such as the pre-existing non-conforming bylaw that gives the Committee authority to alter a structure bearing in mind that the reconstruction and alteration bears a reasonable relationship to original size and nature of existing structure and isn't substantially more detrimental to neighborhood than existing structure; glazing element; appreciation of compromise between parties thus far (removal of pool and garage, reduction in height and size); waiting on Conservation Commission review and environmental issues prior to issuance of special permit; substantial reduction in ridge line and size of dwelling; concern about the mass of the structure; proposed footprint is still substantially more than existing.

Applicant presented the proposed glazing calculations: northeast 1st floor is 28% and 2nd floor is 27%, northwest 1st floor is 12% 2nd floor is 25%, southeast 1st floor is 8% 2nd floor is 45% (roof overhang will obstruct upper wall), and southwest 1st floor is 25% and 2nd floor is 26% (each façade total glazing is under the 50% wall to glass guideline); some windows didn't show divisions which will be required for the windows to be operable and will further reduce the percentages. Elevations were done for conceptual discussion; windows will be the size as presented but are not detailed in terms of divisions.

Jim W polled the Committee and members noted the following: lack of support with current configuration; appreciation of give and take but not prepared to vote in favor; based on effort in reduction in height and willingness to keep septic in existing location and subject to Con Comm comments in favor; moving in right direction but not there yet; no vote knowing and appreciating changes but need more compromise; great improvement but the environmental side is concerning and awaiting Con Comm. It was noted that out of the Committee discussion, there was still concern with the proposed sized.

Applicant felt that the request was reasonable in that they are reducing the visibility of the mass, that the dwelling footprint was in line with existing but that the proposed decks was what pushed the footprint over, however, the decks were key elements to the use of the property given the concern of and number of ticks in the area. Owner felt that they had addressed every issue/feedback expressed at the last meeting (significant reduction in height and reduced proposed footprint and reclaiming more land than increasing and is footprint reducing), noted that this is not raw land and that the alternative is renovate the house (not their intention). Owner noted that they appreciated everyone's sensitivity for the land and environmental consideration. Under the circumstances to the discussion, Jim W motioned to continue the hearing to October 18th, 2022, at 6:40pm. Motion was seconded by Jim N. PBPRC voted 6-0, motion passed.

Public Meeting: Dan Doyle, MVC, Transportation Engineering Services Update/Proposal – Since the previous meeting/discussion regarding the the proposed edge lane road concept, PBPRC had asked that the FY22 appropriation of the Transportation Engineering Services be used for community education and conversation. The engineer working with MVC developed a scope of work proposal that the Committee was satisfied with. However, the Committee felt that the Select Board should take the lead in approving and moving the proposal forward. Next steps: Dan will meet with the Select Board with the notion that PBPRC is in favor of the proposal for community education and conversation.

Public Meeting: Island Housing Trust Update on Aquinnah Affordable Rental Units Project - Island Housing Trust gave a brief presentation on the progress of the Town Hall Affordable Rental Units. Project will be reviewed by the Zoning Board of Appeals under Chapter 40B given the zoning variances needed for frontage and density.

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 8:16pm.

Respectfully submitted, Sophia Welch, Board Administrative Assistant