

TOWN AREA PLAN WORK GROUP
Meeting Of July 5, 2022
DRAFT MINUTES FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Attending: Mary Anne Easley, Marsha Fader, Regen Horchow, Alison King, Mary Longacre, Mickey Rowland, Lee Saperstein, and Henry Terry.

Attendance was verified by a roll call; there was a quorum at all times. The meeting was recorded and can be viewed at “Meeting Recording:”

Meeting Recording:

https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/TP_xepTDCovoNSodEVE6f4oJADGO3AVWp2ITaZjOJLYtIL37xd3HBZQAQC0omKff.g3S-p9akA5E7zxb8

Chair Henry Terry called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. Mary Longacre read the script about remote-attendance meetings and said also that this meeting would be recorded.

Agenda Approval.

Henry Terry then asked for approval of the agenda and was given unanimous consent for approval.

Minutes Approval.

The next order of business was approval of the draft minutes for the meeting of May 20, 2022; it was noted that the meeting of June 7, 2022, was canceled for the lack of a quorum, hence there were no minutes for that meeting. Approval was granted also unanimously.

New Business.

Mary Longacre suggested that the Work Group members would like to know about the Town’s planning for future meeting and suggested that there be a copy of the e-mail from Erika Mooney included in these minutes.

“As you hopefully remember, the state provision allowing remote participation ends July 15. The AG’s newsletter on Friday stated:

On February 15, 2022, Governor Baker signed into law a new session law, Chapter 22 of the Acts of 2022, which extends certain COVID-19 related measures including provisions regarding holding remote meetings and remote public access to meetings. This extension expires on July 15, 2022.

The Senate budget bill includes a provision that would extend the July 15, 2022, expiration to December 15, 2023. The Senate budget amendment is under consideration by the Budget Conference Committee. In addition, the Legislature’s Joint Committee on State Administration is considering bills that would make permanent changes to the Open Meeting Law. If the Legislature does not enact any changes or extensions, then beginning

on July 15 meetings of public bodies will need to resume taking place in person at locations that are open and accessible to the public with at least a quorum of the public body physically present.

The Division of Open Government will provide additional updates as soon as they are available.

I wrote to you back on May 31 that the trailer at 131 Pleasant St would be coming online, and it is now available for use. Please let me know ASAP if you want me to schedule in the trailer for your committee, as I will need to start populating the trailer room calendar.”

Old Business.

Henry Terry then suggested that the key item of business for this meeting is to address newly posed, potential questions for the residents’ survey. He asked Mary Longacre to discuss the proposed questions that she and Lee Saperstein developed for subcommittee 8, Circulation. Lee Saperstein related that these questions began as a dialog between the two of them that he then converted into questions; Mary Longacre edited his draft and it is this version that is under consideration today. She said that she was concerned that the questions be non-leading and valid in a survey sense. She opened a copy of the survey questions using the “Share Screen” function of Zoom. When Henry Terry asked if there were questions, Lee Saperstein reached in to say that the one-to-five ratings should be applied so that all five values are used and each one only once. He then said that there is a significant issue before us because Nantucket has a history of parking on one sidewalk on narrow streets such as Gay, Hussey, India, Lily, and York. Mickey Rowland agreed and said that this issue should be posed as a separate question, perhaps in terms of improved pedestrian access and safety. In effect, the issue is cars versus people. Mary Longacre then inserted a third question in part 1, “Circulation,” “What measures do you favor to improve pedestrian sidewalk access?” Regen Horchow said that this section needs a preamble to help respondents understand the issue. Marsha Fader said that pedestrian safety is as important as access. Mary Longacre asked the group if this question should be moved down to “Transportation”, to which Lee Saperstein said, with apologies to his co-author, that “no” this issue belongs in the circulation section. Regen Horchow implicitly agreed by saying that the issue of cars versus people should be at the top.

Mary Longacre noted that we are dealing with a sensitive question: What are the trade-offs among cars, bikes, and pedestrians using the streets? Mary Anne Easley added that the number of cars on Island has grown as has their size. Is there any way, she asked that the Town can control either the number or the size or both? Henry Terry wondered if weight restrictions could be imposed. Marsha Fader asked if it is illegal to drive up and over a curb on narrow streets. No one had an answer to that and it was suggested that we ask Chief Pittman by e-mail for an opinion. [Chief Pittman responded quickly and completely; driving on the sidewalk is illegal.] Attached to these minutes is an edited version of the Circulation questions that includes a new question 3. under Circulation and a reference to the regulation forbidding parking on sidewalks: 700CMR5.401(5).

In response to Henry Terry's question of anything else to consider, Alison King reviewed, by reading and commenting on them, the questions on Economic Development. These, also, are attached.

At this point, Mary Longacre asked how many of the subcommittees had submitted draft questions. Lee Saperstein said that he would check (6 of 7) and put it in the minutes, which has been done. The question was then asked of how to identify potential respondents. Lee Saperstein replied that everyone living within the boundaries of the Town should be asked. He noted that this would include those who reside in the Downtown Commercial Core. Henry Terry said that experience with the spa survey showed that it was not difficult to send each resident a post card with a unique code for entry to the survey. This action prevents multiple responses and also allows the survey analysts to identify the location of a response.

Next, Mickey Rowland said that his and Marsha Fader's questions on housing had been submitted; nonetheless, he thought that it would be a good idea for him to read them to see if Work Group members had comments or questions. The full subcommittee report, also, is attached. Regen Horchow asked, with respect to Question 1. on page 1., "What is meant or implied by the word assistance?" Mickey Rowland replied that it could be various forms of advice and consultation. Lee Saperstein pointed out that it could imply either consultation or financial grants or both. Mary Longacre suggested a few changes to obtain more information from respondents. She asked also if we needed a preface. Marsha Fader added strongly that our intention is the revitalization of the Town. The edited questions are attached.

With no further comments forthcoming, Henry Terry asked if we should adjourn. Consent was offered unanimously.

Adjournment. 4:53 pm

The next scheduled meeting is Friday, July 15, 2022, at 4:00 pm. Please review the attached draft questions.

For reference: Subcommittee composition and Survey Question Status.

2. Land Use: Liz Almodobar and Mary Anne Easley	02/19/2022
3. Housing: Marsha Fader and Mickey Rowland	12/07/2021
4. Economic Development: Alison King and Mary Longacre	05/20/2021
5. Natural and Cultural Resources: Liz Almodobar and Marsha Fader	12/07/2021
6. Open Space and Recreation Plan: Mary Anne Easley and Henry Terry	
7. Services and Facilities: Regen Horchow and Mickey Rowland	12/07/2021
8. Circulation; Mary Longacre and Lee Saperstein	07/05/2021

Lee W. Saperstein, Secretary, saperste@mst.edu

Subcommittee 8: Circulation and Transportation

Draft of July 5, 2022

Preface: These survey questions are posed to learn Nantucketers' attitude toward the tradeoffs that should be made among cars, bikes, and pedestrians for a safe use of streets

CIRCULATION: *(this question could be presented as a grid to fill in or we could re-list the options under each intersection.)*

For each of the high-volume intersections listed below, please indicate by rating 1-5 what you think are the most appropriate actions, where 1 is strongly recommended and 5 is least recommended.

-5 corners (Pleasant, West York, Atlantic)

-6 corners (Atlantic, Prospect, Vesper, Surfside, Sparks, Williams)

-Monument Square (Main, Gardner, Milk)

-Caton Circle (Main, Quaker, Madaket)

-Prospect, Milk, Milk St Ext, Quaker Lane

-“OTHER” LINE TO ADD YOUR OWN INTERSECTION

CHOICES (for each intersection, assign a rating for each choice and use any rating value only once) :

-preserve the intersections as they are now

-perform maintenance to enhance safety but do not reconfigure the intersection (for instance trimming vegetation to improve sightlines, adding signage, freshening street markings, repairing sidewalks)

-make small modifications to improve traffic flow but do not substantially change the intersection (for instance adjusting curbing, easing corners, marking no parking zones near the intersection)

-modify the intersection to improve pedestrian and bicycle access and safety but not to change automobile throughput (for instance adding or widening sidewalks & bike lanes, adding stop & yield signs)

-reconfigure the intersection to improve throughput for pedestrians, bicycles, and automobiles (for instance moving monuments, adding or formalizing roundabouts, major layout changes)

PARKING:

1) If Paid Parking is implemented in the Downtown Commercial Core short term parking area, (which is not part of this plan's area,) how do you think that will affect parking in the area covered by this plan?

CHOICES:

- no impact in the plan area
- paid short term parking in the Downtown Core will improve parking availability in the plan area because more parking will be available in the Downtown Core and people won't have to find spaces outside the Downtown core
- paid short term parking in the Downtown Core will reduce parking availability in the plan area because people will look for free parking outside the Downtown Core
- other _____

2) What measures are you in favor of to improve parking availability in the plan area (outside the Downtown Core/short-term parking area)

CHOICES: YES / NO / NO OPINION

- no changes needed
- greater enforcement of existing parking regulations
- increase parking ticket fines
- expand the 2-hour residential parking district
- create more on-street spaces
- make more streets one-way to allow for a parking lane
- add parking lots in the area covered by the plan
- add multi-level parking structures
- add park-and-ride lots outside the area covered by the Town Area Plan
- increase public transportation routes and/or frequency
- limit the amount of vehicles allowed to enter the plan area by using a permit system or congestion fee for access

3) Should the Town enforce the existing Massachusetts regulation not to park on the sidewalk?

What measures are you in favor of to limit parking in order to improve pedestrian sidewalk access?
 At present, Massachusetts regulation is not to park on the sidewalk. This regulation is not enforced on Nantucket.

“700CMR5.401(5). No person shall stop or park a vehicle so as to obstruct a road, driveway, parkway, intersection, sidewalk or pedestrian crossing or on a hill or curve where it would be a hazard or obstruction for other traffic. When stopping or parking a vehicle off of the traveled portion of the road, the front of the vehicle should be facing the direction in which traffic in the nearest traffic lane is flowing, and the vehicle should be stopped or parked parallel and within 12 inches of the curb; but in no case should any vehicle stop or park within 20 feet of any intersection nor within ten feet of a fire hydrant.”

How to improve pedestrian access?

TRANSPORTATION

What can the Town do to improve travel conditions for each of these modes of transportation in the area covered by this plan? (fill in the blank)

- Pedestrians _____
- Cyclists _____
- Public Transportation _____
- Cars _____
- Delivery Trucks _____

**SURVEY QUESTIONS FROM THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE,
ALISON KING AND MARY LONGACRE.**

Survey question 1: Are you well served by the businesses within the area? Please explain if there are additional businesses that would be beneficial.

Survey question 2: In the last three years what percentage of your dining/shopping is done in the following districts:

- a. Residential Old Historic District (our district)
- b. Downtown Core
- c. Brandt Point neighborhood
- d. Mid-Island Commercial District
- e. Cisco
- f. Old South Road Corridor
- g. 'Sconset
- h. Other (Wauwinet, Madaket, etc.)

Survey question 3: Please explain if and how you are affected, positively or negatively, by our proximity to the Downtown Core (outside of parking and traffic).

Survey question 4: if you own or operate a business (home-based business or public facing businesses), what would help you to become more successful?

Report of Subcommittee 3. Housing

Including suggestions from the meeting of July 5, 2022.

Preface: Much of the Nantucket Town local area is only occupied seasonally. The following questions ask how best to encourage year-round habitation; to revitalize the Town; and to address housing shortage

NOTE: An underlying basis for these questions was derived from an abundance of unused, seasonal housing.

Have you ever...

1. To town seasonal OR year-round residents:

Would you consider renting out a private guest room in your house to long term or seasonal tenants to help create worker housing and provide you with some income?

What assistance would you need to be able to do that?

2. If you are a seasonal town resident, what might attract you to live here year-round?

If you are a year-round town resident, what will you need in the future to enable/support/encourage you to stay in your home?

3. Are there quality of life needs or concerns that affect your desire to live in town year-round?

Such as: sidewalk conditions, street lighting, traffic, parking, noise, personal safety, etc.
Concerns & Questions

The following concerns and questions were discussed at several in-person meetings:

1. How will this Town Area Plan function to be meaningful? The implementation sections for other area plans do not propose actions or appear to be connected to specific island improvements. We wish to create a plan that will be actively used.
2. In the preservation & management of our historic district, what is the intention: to restrict or enable additional housing?
3. Quality of Life is a consistent benchmark from which all of our discussions were derived.
4. To better understand Housing, we need to study our area + analyze the following information:
 - How was our area zoned and when? Is the rationale for its zoning still relevant?
 - Statistics: quantity of houses, year-round houses, secondary dwellings, commercial buildings, etc.

Housing Issues

1. Empty, Seasonal Houses

Ideas: a. provide tax incentives/Land Bank transfer fee exemption + encouragement for the use + sale of existing homes to businesses + organizations for year-round, executive level, professional housing.

Example: NHA's Liberty Street house for their director; b. Aging in Place: provide tax

reductions for year- round senior citizens.

- 2. Preservation of Historic Houses:** historic interiors at risk, historically-inappropriate side/lateral + deck expansions together with loss of open-space + historic streetscapes context; no architectural historian HDC staff review of ROH applications

Ideas: a. promote/showcase historic interiors; b. land conservation easements; c. zoning bylaws restricting lateral expansion; d. create a transitional design zone between the ROH and rural outskirts of the town for HDC use; e. require professional HDC staff to review ROH applications

- 3. Quality of Life challenges:** noise (landscapers, HVAC, helicopters); lack of sidewalk maintenance; ineffective street signage; swimming pools + spas; short term rentals; good, walkable, livable neighborhoods attract + keep year-round residents

- 4. Loss of Mixed-Use Zoning**

Idea: encourage the re-use of existing commercial uses such as Marden/Main Street, Lighting/North Liberty

- 5. Short Term Rentals:** extends the Commercial Downtown/CDT imperceptibly into the ROH

- 6. Zoning Relevance:** review historic properties to incorporate within the Residential Old Historic District + streetscapes where the demarcation is down the middle of a street (exs: Upper Main Street, Cliff Road, Liberty + N Liberty Streets have one side in the district and one side out. The Zoning follows suit, splitting down the street with one side in and the other side out.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
ELEMENTS OF M.G. L. 41-
81D

Housing: identifies and analyzes existing and forecasted housing needs and objectives including programs for the preservation, improvement and development of housing. This element shall identify policies and strategies to provide a balance of local ho