

Andrew Vorce
Town of Nantucket
Planning Director
2 Fairgrounds Rd
Nantucket, MA 02554
USA

Dear Andrew:

We hope you have had a good and safe holiday. Thank you and Megan for forwarding the link to the planning board discussion of short term rental bylaw options.

After attending the Select Board Discussion and viewing the Planning Board Discussion for the Bylaw Amendment Options developed by the planning department, we thought it might be helpful to both boards to have our reactions to the November 30, 2021 version of the options :

Background

Our Nantucket home has its genesis to a childhood vacation in 'Sconset over sixty years ago. Like many of us on the island I was drawn to all its natural characteristics, freedoms and rural communal lifestyle. We were one of 'The summer people' in Quidnet for more than 20 years. We bought property in 1981, spent most of those 20 years paying for it, bit by bit. Then in 1998 began to build two homes on our property located near the Squam Farm.

Today, these homes are the focal point for our family to come together each year. That's twenty years now, drawing our children and theirs from as far away as Johannesburg and Sacramento. Last year there were 17 of us. As both we and our children have grown older, we are using the homes more frequently throughout the year. Our son and his family are now living on the island. We consider ourselves part of the Nantucket Community.

We rent both of those homes to defray the cost. Since Covid, one has been rented year round, the other continues to be rented as a short term rental. Prior to Covid, and perhaps as Covid subsides; we have and plan to rent both homes when not used by the family. In a good year the rental income meets our current expenses for owning and maintaining the property. As the homes are passing the 20 year mark, we need to be a bit more creative to attend to replacement and longer term expenses such as roofing, windows, siding and the like. About 80% of the income goes to town taxes and local workforce expenses, including carpentry, plumbing and other trades, plus cleaners, landscapers and supplies.

We are one of the 250 LUG 3 properties listed in the statistics presented by the planning department.

Our assessment of the impact of the 6 options presented

Option 1 : The maximum of one STR lease would not impact us currently, as we have one property currently rented year round. However we expect it would limit us significantly in the near term. Looking at our historical income, we would loose 40% of the annual income, forcing dramatic changes to our increasing use of the homes for our growing family. This might be ameliorated somewhat by attracting one or two longer term rentals. But that is yet to be seen.

Option 2 : This option would not affect us.

Option 3 : We understand that this option would not apply to us as we only have a maximum of two homes which could be rented.

Option 4 : This option would not apply to us as we understand it.

Option 5 : The maximum number of short term rental days we have experienced is 168 days. A more normal level has been 140 days. However with covid trends we are seeing a bit more demand in the shoulder and even one winter (MLK Weekend) rental. This option however would be less painful than option one.

Option 6 : This option would be burdensome for us and we believe more burdensome for the town. We just went through this type of change with the state. It resulted in higher rental expense for our renters and had the interesting side effect of putting more control in the hands of rental agencies like VRBO, AirBNB, and others. It also concerns us as these layers of oversight tend to grow and increase complexity for both us and the town over time

Our conclusions

Options 1 and 5 concern us as stated.

In Quidnet, noise has not been more than an incidental concern in the 46 years we have been there. The Quidnet Squam Association has not had to discuss it as an issue. We cannot speak for other neighborhoods on the island.

One unanswered question we have is: What role do the rentals being discussed here play in the economy of the island? It seems that at any given point in time these rentals provide 5-7000 rooms for visitors to the island. How does that compare with the Hotel and B&B capacity? What would the resulting impact be on service incomes and business incomes be of each of these options?

Our largest concern with the lead up to last year's warrant and some subsequent dialogue is the divisive nature of pitting those categorized as year round residents against those who are not. This can only retard the progress we can make as a united community. We face challenging issues of sustainability, affordable living and housing for all income levels, and the environment which most of us prize so dearly as members of the Nantucket Community.

Please call on us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Penny and Mike Herlihy
6 Salti Way, Nantucket, MA 02554. USA
mikeherlihy@mac.com
617-653-5829

Hillary Hedges Rayport
89 Main Street
Nantucket

January 31, 2022

Dear Planning Board:

Many residents believe that while seasonal cottage and room rental is a way of life on Nantucket, investor-funded, commercial-scale short term rentals are NOT a traditional way of life on Nantucket, are in fact harmful to the Nantucket way of life, and should not be written into the zoning code without restrictions. For this reason, I'm writing to ask for a motion to table or to commit Article 42 for further study and effective community engagement.

I'm very disappointed that the Planning Board cast aside a list of balanced ideas for managing STRs, which were developed under the leadership of the late Judith Wegner, in favor of this blanket zoning code amendment. You did this when the Select Board was unable to deliberate this issue on behalf of the public.

Article 42 does not meet our Master Plan goals and works against housing goals. Nantucket's 2009 Master Plan does not mention short-term vacation rentals in any way. Nantucket has extremely dense zoning and allows secondary dwellings by right in most residential areas expressly to increase the supply of year-round rentals. We must protect, as much as possible, these dwellings for year-round rental, as they were intended.

Members of the Planning Board have said people must "work this out at Town Meeting". The housing insecure, who are most adversely affected by Article 42 are the people LEAST likely to be able to present and vote their interest at Town meeting, due to inflexible and intense work commitments, language barriers, and caregiving. We have already seen how Town Meeting can become captive to motivated special interests who show up, vote their interest, and leave.

The Commonwealth has a definition of "investor-owned short-term rental" which, at the very least, Nantucket could adopt. Passing article 42 will limit Nantucket's options to restrict STRs in the future. **Please protect housing diversity by pulling or modifying article 42.** Further to this, please see below my email of November 23rd, regarding investor-owned short-term rentals.

Sincerely,
Hillary Hedges Rayport

enclosure: email to J. Wegner and J. Bridges, 11/23/21

From: Hillary Rayport <h_hedges@mac.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 at 12:17 PM
To: Judith Wegner <jwegner@nantucket-ma.gov>, "Jason M. Bridges" <jmbridges@nantucket-

ma.gov>

Cc: <jtrudel@nantucket-ma.gov>, David Iverson <d.m.iverson@comcast.net>, Fritz McClure <fpm1348@gmail.com>, Nat Lowell <natlowell@comcast.net>, Kristie Ferrantella <kferrantella@nantucket-ma.gov>, "Melissa B. Murphy" <mbmurphy@nantucket-ma.gov>, Dawn Hill Holdgate <dhillholdgate@nantucket-ma.gov>, Matt Fee <mfee@nantucket-ma.gov>, Libby Gibson <LGibson@nantucket-ma.gov>, Andrew Vorce <AVorce@nantucket-ma.gov>, Leslie Snell <LSnell@nantucket-ma.gov>, Erika Mooney <EMooney@nantucket-ma.gov>, Megan Trudel <mtrudel@nantucket-ma.gov>

Subject: Public Input on STRs

Dear Judith and Jason:

Good afternoon. I'm writing to offer public input about Short-Term Rentals and your Boards' ongoing individual and joint deliberations. At yesterday's ZBA hearing, several board members asked for policy development. I'd like to second some of the comments from that hearing, to share some info from a public meeting of the Historical Commission on Nov. 19th, and to request your consideration regarding policy.

I agree with Melissa Philbrick and others who questioned high frequency short term rentals as a new and different kind of use that is disrupting residential neighborhoods. A key aspect of these rentals is the short stay and lack of on-site supervision to enforce house and community rules. The short stay is more likely to disrupt the peace than the one- or two-week rental that has been typical of neighborhoods and a decades long practice.

The other new use is purely commercial and funded by investors. The attached exhibit is a project from Heirloom, a company focused on **large-group travel STRs**. Heirloom proposes to create a full-time vacation rental at 3 Beaver St. The property, currently with 2,627 sq. ft of existing living area on a lot smaller than a 5,000 sq ft., **becomes a 10-bedroom, 7-bathroom full-time vacation rental with a hot tub and outdoor kitchen.**

- This is not a mom-and-pop operation – it's a professional, commercial concern, **a new use and a new operating model.** These well-financed investor-driven projects maximize "stays." In our attractive historic areas, these projects will build over open space in already congested neighborhoods, and gut historic interiors in order to maximize bedrooms and bathrooms.
- **Imagine the impact this renovation and others like it have on Nantucket's electrical grid, sewer, landfill, public safety staff, and neighborhood quality of life. House prices are also affected, as modest personal residences are priced to a commercial use.** Our zoning code says that small second dwellings are accessory to principal residences and meant to provide affordable year-round rental. But units are absorbed as resort rental compounds.

To me, this project exemplifies where an unregulated free market for STRs will take us.

Select Board members are asking "what problem are we trying to solve" and seem to want more data about whether extractive and undesirable uses really are proliferating. **Please, we cannot wait any longer on this. It's just not fair to residents who are not STR investors.**

When Nantucket passed a bylaw to prohibit cruise ship facilities in Nantucket harbor, we didn't wait for the cruise ships to set up shop in order to know they would change Nantucket for the worse.

The Massachusetts courts and legislature has established what municipalities can do about STRs, and how they can fund the extra cost of regulating them. The work in other communities started in 2015 - nearly seven years ago. Nantucket does not need to reinvent the wheel.

- Please consider adopting the accepted definition of “investor” owned STRs, **and ban investor STRs across Nantucket County**. Importantly, the Commonwealth’s definition **allows for ownership of investment properties and second home rentals – just not at scale and not in an absentee fashion**. Banning investor owned STRs protects housing, Town infrastructure, and residential neighborhoods’ right to remain residential.
- It’s also worth considering limits on extra short (less than one week) stays in rental homes where the owner is non-resident on Nantucket. **The short stay without supervision is a new and unwelcome use** – these guests should stay in guest houses, hotels, and rental homes where the owner lives on the property or nearby.

I hope our voters will have something to act on at 2022 Town Meeting. People who are not “investors” in STRs need your help!

Thank you for your consideration! I hope my public input is helpful.

Best Regards,
Hillary

From: [James Simpson](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: 42 and 43 Feb 7th
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 4:44:57 PM

Dear Ms Trudel,

Please include the following if you would in the notes for the meeting on February 7th regarding articles 42 and 43.

I have been coming to Nantucket seasonally since 1971. 50 years ago my family rented a small cottage down on Walsh Street (Scuttlebutt) for a couple of weeks each summer. It was what my parents could afford at the time and these memories from a different time on the island are seared into my memory. Since then we have owned a few houses on Dukes, then Orange behind the old town garage and my mother now has a place on Milk Street where she spends half the year. I just recently purchased the old Candlehouse on Starbuck Court for my own family and am gently restoring the house while trying to preserve as much of the original character as possible.

Rentals are necessary on Nantucket and in many ways they enrich the character of the island and the revenue derived allows for owners an income that helps not only them but, the island itself. It is very clear though that the world has changed and having zero restrictions on short term rentals will quickly and forever change the landscape of this special place in the world. It is imperative that those who rent have a vested interest in the island as residents rather than just their corporate pocketbook. I do not support Article 42 as written as it provides no reasonable protections to the island or its future. Article 43 is thoughtful and measured while still allowing for full time and part time residents a rental income. These funds are generally rolled back into the local economy and community.

I hope that due consideration will be given to passing article 43 for the sake of not only the present but the future of Nantucket.

Respectfully,

James Simpson
7 Starbuck Court

Sent from my iPad

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Thomas Kruskal](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Article 42 and 43
Date: Sunday, February 6, 2022 4:04:55 PM

Gentlemen - we own a house on Angola st and my wife has been coming to Nantucket since 1947. We bought our first Nantucket house in 1974 and would not have been able to afford it without doing some rentals. When we sold that house we built a house on Angola st and continue to need rentals
To afford the high costs of ownership. We are good neighbors in our community.

The town's article 42 seems like a good first step to address the issues at hand that I don't need to go into.
Article 43 is a big mistake - trying to solve a problem which is ill defined with a sledgehammer.

Please approve article 42 and not 43

Sincerely, Tom & Deborah Kruskal
6 Angola St.

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Bill Liddle](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Article 42 and Article 43
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 1:41:08 PM

Dear Megan,

Please add my comments regarding zoning warrant article 42.

Thanks so much,

Bill Liddle
7 Mill Street, Nantucket 02554
508-221-0888 (cell)

The Nantucket short term vacation rental market has changed dramatically over the past thirty years. The tradition of renting a home for a portion of the summer was not uncommon and the underlying and practical motive was to help offset expenses and to ease the cost of maintaining a home. It was a symbiotic relationship. Ownership was a little less burdensome for people lucky enough to own on the island and summer visitors who were coming to sleepy Nantucket could find accommodations other than hotels and inns.

But over the years (blame it on the popularization of Nantucket as a destination, technology platforms, lifestyle habits, low interest rates and/or tax incentives for investment properties) the tradition of renting one's home to offset expenses has turned into a big business. Indeed, this business is important for the island's economy. But the question is, how much unrestrained short term rental growth can the island handle? It should be alarming for all of us that there are now over 2,000 registered short term rental homes in the midst of a profound housing crisis for year round residents. And if unchecked, neighborhoods will continue the slow rotation from homes to vacation rentals. And there are other considerations. Amenity laden vacation rentals soak up more energy requiring a greater electricity source for the island; peak ferry demand will require more boat capacity for the island, and most importantly, the displacement and loss of the community will continue. Unfortunately, Article 42 does not account for these changes.

We cannot pull the rug out from the many people who have depended on short term rentals. But unchecked, it's reasonable to assume that the Nantucket vacation rental market will continue to erode the island's quality of life. And what would the island look like if, in another thirty years, there are 4,000 vacation rentals - and even fewer year round homes? Do we wait and let future generations try and fix the problems we are creating today? Many other communities are actively tackling the issue of STR's and Nantucket would be wise to do the same. Article 43 is a fine example of balancing property rights, sustainable business, and allowing the tradition of short term rentals on the island while providing guardrails to discourage investment ownership that has already taken root on the island.

From: [Sam Baker](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Article 42/43
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 4:59:38 PM

Dear Ms Trudel,

As a resident living at the end of Hussey St, I am fortunate that all my neighbors are year-round and committed to Nantucket.

Unfortunately, the middle part of Hussey St has turned into a short-term rental zone that changes over weekly and/or on the weekends. Often, when I walk my dog in the morning, I see liquor bottles and plastic cups strewn in yards and in the gutter. When I walk my dog in the afternoon, I see boisterous strangers perched on porches - people who have no stake in our community; people who have no stake in our island.

The last Town Meeting was devastating. Warring tribes split the community along socioeconomic lines and left wounds that risk becoming permanent if we, as a community, do not find a balance between economic stability and conservation of Nantucket.

Nantucket is a model for innovation in conservation in America. Short-term rentals threaten to destroy all that hard work and to disrupt the very fabric of the island.

There is an obvious solution and that is to digitize the rental market so that short-term rentals are constrained, regulated and taxed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sam Baker
Hussey Street

Sent from my iPhone

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Eric Savetsky](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Article 43 - SRT Regulation
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 3:56:10 PM

Dear Planning Board Members,

I urge you to consider making a positive recommendation on Article 43 to adopt reasonable regulations for SRT's in residential zoning districts. The commercial rental use of a residential property should be accessory to its primary residential use which is the goal of this article. Many resort communities have already adopted regulations similar to this.

The quality of life on Nantucket (the reason many of us choose to make it our home) is already at a tipping point and the overburdening effects of SRT's are a large part of this. In addition, regulating SRT's will help Nantucket's strained workforce housing supply.

I thank you for your consideration and for your public service.

Sincerely,
Eric Savetsky
12B Oak Hollow Lane
Nantucket, MA 02554

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [William Brenizer](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Article 43 vs Town Sponsored Article
Date: Sunday, January 30, 2022 6:37:51 PM

My family has been in Polpis since 1925. My wife and I have owned the house at 275 Polpis Road since 1990.

I am strongly opposed to the Town-sponsored short-term-rental article, which I view as extremely short-sighted and driven entirely by economic interests, particularly on the part of the real estate practitioners on the island.

ACKnow has proposed a very reasonable Article (#43) that seeks to balance the interests of year-round residents who want to rent their properties and the interests of all other Nantucket residents and workers.

I urgently appeal to all Nantucket voters to vote in the long-term interest of the island to adopt Article 43 and reject the Town's ill-considered article.

Bill Brenizer

Sent from my iPhone

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [chuck davis](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Articles 42 and 43
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 11:25:20 AM

Dear Ms. Trudel,

Below are our comments on Articles 42 and 43 for the Planning Board Meeting on February 7.

Proposed Article 42 (Short Term Rentals) permanently opens the floodgates to those pursuing financial gain through investment in Short Term Rental properties on Nantucket. Its proponents apparently brush away the legitimate concerns related to the cost of housing, impacts on this island's fragile ecology, limited infrastructure and families who cherish their neighborhoods. To the extent Article 42 is passed as it is currently drafted, we will not have a chance to “rewind the clock”. Please either amend the proposed Article 42 so as to limit the ability of commercial businesses to continue with their destruction of this very special place or support Article 43 as a reasonable compromise.

Charles Davis

Anne L. Davis

15 Mill Street

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Sharon Lefevre](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Cc: [Sharon Lefevre](#)
Subject: Articles 42/43
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 1:59:56 PM

Dear Meghan,

In the past five or six years, there have been a number of NYTimes articles detailing the sad impact of investment rentals in the residential areas of popular towns and cities. A long magazine feature on the demise of Barcelona and another about Venice were both particularly disheartening. In these beautiful cities, long-time residents no longer know their neighbors because, slowly but surely, investment groups buy up properties and neighbors are replaced by a turnstile of anonymous tourists. In just a few years, the character of these places, defined in no small part by the routines of residents who tend and care for them, is erased. The more charming the place, the greater the vulnerability. And we know how charming Nantucket is!

Article 42 turns a blind eye to the impact of turning homes into commercial properties in everything but name. It's short-sighted in not recognizing the long-term effect of diminishing the quality of life on the island. I strongly **Oppose article 42.**

Article 43 will keep the healthy mix of vacation rentals and proud personal ownership that has characterized Nantucket for more than 100 years. This mix is what has given the island it very unique (if not idiosyncratic) charm. Please count me among the home owners who **Support Article 43.**

Best wishes,
Sherry Lefevre
30 Pine Street

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [TRISTRAM DAMMIN](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#); afmdewez@gmail.com
Subject: Articles
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 9:49:05 AM

I have had a Copley Group rental next door and barely weathered it's negative aspects. I would not vote for an article that allows for year round non rentals any where on the Island.

Tris Dammin 12 New Mill St

John T Dammin MD

Instructor
Boston University School of Medicine
Department of Emergency Medicine

1 Boston Medical Center Place
Dowling 1 South
Boston, MA 02118

T:617543 3863

www.bmc.org

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Anne Troutman](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Cc: [Anne Troutman](#)
Subject: Comment_Zoning Warrant Articles 42 and 43 on Short-Term Rentals, Public Hearing February 7
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 12:25:15 PM
Importance: High

Good morning, Meghan -

Please include my comments (below) on Articles 42 and 43 re short-term rentals in the Feb 7, 2022 Planning Board Meeting. Thank you, Anne Troutman

To: Town of Nantucket Planning Board

Re: Comment on Articles 42 & 43

As a year round island resident and homeowner, I am writing in support of the Citizen's Article 43.

Article 43 sustains the time-honored tradition of rentals by residents while keeping corporate and absentee investors from ruining our neighborhoods.

Article 43 is a reasonable zoning bylaw which protects resident's ability to continue to short-term rent their homes, thus sustaining the tourism industry while preserving the character and peaceful enjoyment of our residential neighborhoods.

Article 42, legalizing unrestricted islandwide short-term rentals without regard to their negative impact in every regard is guaranteed to damage the island and our community on all levels.

We are at a critical juncture.

Regulating short term rentals is essential to preserving Nantucket as a fully functioning community. Keep corporate and absentee investor-owners out of our residential neighborhoods. Article 42 guarantees the degradation of our island and sense of community.

Please reject Article 42 and support Article 43.

Respectfully,

Anne Troutman
41 Fair St.

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Aleks Istanbulu](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Comment_Zoning Warrant Articles 42 and 43 on Short-Term Rentals, Public Hearing February 7
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 12:57:07 PM
Importance: High

Good morning, Meghan -

Please include my comments (below) on Articles 42 and 43 re short-term rentals in the Feb 7, 2022 Planning Board Meeting. Thank you, Aleks Istanbulu

To: Town of Nantucket Planning Board
Re: Comment on Articles 42 & 43

As a year round island resident and homeowner, I am writing in support of the Citizen's Article 43.

Article 43 sustains the time-honored tradition of rentals by residents while keeping corporate and absentee investors from ruining our neighborhoods.

Article 43 is a reasonable zoning bylaw which protects resident's ability to continue to short-term rent their homes, thus sustaining the tourism industry while preserving the character and peaceful enjoyment of our residential neighborhoods.

Article 42, legalizing unrestricted islandwide short-term rentals without regard to their negative impact in every regard is guaranteed to damage the island and our community on all levels.

We are at a critical juncture.

Regulating short term rentals is essential to preserving Nantucket as a fully functioning community. Keep corporate and absentee investor-owners out of our residential neighborhoods. Article 42 guarantees the degradation of our island and sense of community.

Please reject Article 42 and support Article 43.

Respectfully,

Aleks Istanbulu
41 Fair St.

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [howard dickler](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Comments on Article 42
Date: Saturday, January 29, 2022 12:44:55 PM

In my view the newly proposed Article 42 in its current form is a frightening open door to the rampant commercialization of residential housing that will further decimate year round housing and destroy what is left of our year round neighborhoods.

Short term rental of residential properties is a long standing practice on the island. But a court decision elsewhere in the state has caused our town leadership to worry that the practice might not be legal. Yet there is no way around the fact that such rentals are a BUSINESS using property specifically zoned for residential rather than business use. Every property owner who does such rentals identifies the costs and income as a business on their tax return.

So to insure that such rentals are legal, the town has proposed the current Article 42 which declares it legal by making it an unrestricted RIGHT for almost every single piece of residential property on the island. But conferring this as a right would foreclose any possibility of limiting that right and accelerate the decline of year round housing. Is that what we really want?

There is an alternative path. Instead, establish short-term rentals as a non-conforming use for which an exemption can be granted. Then let the community reach a consensus on what the parameters for such exemptions should be. That would give the island control over its destiny.

We are at a crossroads. One path leads to more, more, more. The other leads to sustainability. The island found a way to protect itself from rampant development and preserve open space. Should we not find a way to protect ourselves from the rampant commercialization of year round housing? It is up to us to decide what kind of island we wish to be.

Howard B Dickler MD

From: [Bruce Mandel](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Comments re: consideration of STRs
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 3:30:18 PM

Dear Ms. Merkel

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a few comments about the proposed Warrant Articles addressing short term rentals for the record. Please share this with the members of the Board and advisors

Many of our community's residents live here year round, others seasonally and specifically cherish their rural, quiet, low key, charming neighborhoods. In recent years we have experienced houses being purchased by investors concealed by the veil of LLC and anonymous "trust" names who tear down purchased houses in order to maximize ground cover to provide the investors with what has become for the neighborhoods trouble plagued, unresponsive STR businesses prone to creating noise, litter, parking abuses and the like – stealing the ability of others to enjoy the quiet, peaceful use of their property.

Rather than discussing these and other issues pertaining to the proposed universal, one size fits all community application of a new type of STR use to apply to all neighborhoods during the ATM I suggest there ought to be a more nuanced and inclusive discussion before going to an ATM or STM. Just the prospect of placing enforcement of the proposed regulations on the Board of Health deserves careful review. The Board of Health is already charged with enforcement of various regulations while being hampered by not having enough specifically dedicated enforcement officers with work hours compatible with problematic the times of complaints.

Other resort-based communities across our Southeast Massachusetts area are seeking to find ways to deal with destructive types of commercialized STRs in order to preserve their ability to continue to attract the needed kind of tourism that supports their economies.

Addressing these articles at ATM without prior community input paves a way to further the loss of our island's culture and neighborhood freedoms under existing, protective zoning. We can lose our neighborhoods one small bite at a time unless we stand together.

We ought to not be making important decisions that affect every community in the confines of the time constrained format of the ATM. Our community needs to find a balance that protects residential short-term rentals meant to make ends meet as opposed to commercialized STRs extracting more than just revenue from neighborhoods. There is much to be civilly discussed.

We need an open forum and a community-based workgroup to explore our best ideas for achieving a balance between:

- preserving neighborhood integrity and allowing year-round residents to shore up their ability to continue to afford to live here by providing an STR revenue source; and
- a way for investors, some of whom hide behind the veil of LLCs as they buy properties with the sole intention of creating businesses using media outlet driven rentals in residential neighborhoods, to fit compatibly in designated areas.

We recognize that TON seeks to tap into a revenue source by regulating both types of uses. This is a balance we need time to discuss and try to resolve as best as possible. This is more nuanced than just providing a mechanism for investors to create buildings in our communities that are designed to maximize STR rental versus having buildings that fit into the context of the neighborhood as it exists.

It would be better for our island if we held open workshops to try to achieve our mutual objective:

- Protecting the unique and individual character of different neighborhoods;
- Providing relief from the growing proliferation of investor owned, commercial STRs that change neighborhood qualities and characteristics;
- Maintaining residential districts as stable quiet areas where neighbors can enjoy the use of their property peacefully;
- Providing specific areas where commercially driven STRs might proliferate without changing the nature of residential communities;
- Recognizing that the residential short-term rentals by year-round residents trying to make ends meet on our increasingly costly island is different from commercial uses by investors. These two objectives are different:

Zoning, we believe, is about enacting regulations / laws addressing how owners should use and enjoy their property. Restrictions and protective regulations ought to serve to ensure the wellbeing of quiet, village style communities and ability of individuals who decided to live there in that kind of environment to be better informed before having commercial STRs thrust upon them.

Thank you for the opportunity to place these thoughts on the record for consideration by the Boards and other TON committees working with the residents to preserve our island's culture.

Bruce Mandel

From: [Lucinda Ballard](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Corrected letter re Articles 43/42/please read this one!
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 4:43:19 PM

Dear Ms. Trudel,

I am writing to urge the Town to reject the Town-sponsored Article 42 as written and endorse Citizen-sponsored Article 43.

Three generations of my family have been seasonal homeowners on Nantucket since 1910; we have cherished the island's character, culture, and community. In recent years I have watched, with horror, these very things threatened by off-island corporations, developers, and investors whose primary commitment is not to the community but to making a buck.

Article 42 will open the door wide to these often absentee business entities, and in the process corrode the character of many neighborhoods. Unrestricted short term rentals will draw renters who are indifferent to the sense of community and quiet charm of in-town neighborhoods. They will add to noise pollution, parking problems, and the unsettling sense that neighboring homes have a revolving door of unvetted strangers coming and going. I do not want to lose my neighborhood to transient renters who have no commitment to the community.

Article 43 preserves the right of year-round or seasonal home-owners to rent their properties as they have done in the past. The ability to do so is often imperative in order to afford keeping their homes. I know a number of long-time homeowners who rent their homes so they can pay their taxes. They are keenly aware of who is renting their property, and very often it is the same family year after year who cherish the character of the island, have become part of the community, know and are known by their neighbors. This is certainly the case in my neighborhood.

You have been entrusted with protecting the well-being of the Nantucket community. I trust that you will do the right thing by rejecting Article 42 which will hurt the community and by embracing Article 43 which will support it.

Respectfully submitted,
Lucinda Ballard
7 Darling Street
Nantucket, MA 02554

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Lisa Botticelli](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: FW: STR articles
Date: Wednesday, February 2, 2022 10:44:13 AM

Planning Board
Town of Nantucket
Vial email

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am writing regarding the STR articles that are under consideration tonight. I don't think that I will be able to attend the public hearing as I have a class this evening so I wanted to put some thoughts in writing. In full disclosure I do sit on the advisory board for ACKnow.

STRs and how they have contributed to the affordable housing crisis is a worldwide problem and one that Nantucket is not immune to. Many other communities around the country and world have put restrictions in place to protect the year-round housing stock in their communities so that they can retain their unique character while providing housing for those individuals required to support economies based primarily on tourism. As such, I must say I am highly opposed to Article 42 which would permit STRs as a "use" in all residential zoning districts on the island and frankly confused as to why the planning board would put an article like this forward. What is already clearly a problem would be made far worse by the endorsement of an article that has clearly been penned by special interests.

I do, however, believe that Article 43 or some modified version of it is a big step in the right direction. Please understand: it is not proposing to eliminate STRs completely and allows year-round and seasonal home owners (within some reasonable, sensible parameters) the ability to utilize their properties as short-term rentals. Our goal is to discourage the purchase of viable housing stock that under normal circumstances would have been available to local workers and families by developers who have the financial firepower to carry the properties and utilize them for commercial gain. Very significantly, unlike many other communities on the mainland, Nantucketers do not have the ability to live further down the road and drive a little further to get to work. If housing is unavailable here they move to the cape. And Nantucket loses its support population as a result. In this case, we should all be very much focused on long-term benefit to the many as opposed to the short-term lucre for the few.

Ray and I feel very fortunate to have moved to Nantucket when we did and that were able to

buy a house and raise our family here and become part of this special place. This path has now become untenable for not only our young residents, but even to doctors, teachers, and other professionals. This is not only short-sighted, but a tragedy. The town is working diligently to provide “affordable” housing, but it is a slow process and the issue goes beyond affordable housing; we need housing for those year-rounders who fall into that gray area between meeting the qualifications for “affordable” housing and simply being able to get together the down payment on a house where the median house price is in excess of 2 million dollars. Reining in STRs can only help move us closer to that goal.

My hope is that the Town will discourage STRs and find a way to encourage people with rental properties, through incentives, to rent to our year round population who is in desperate need of housing. Unstable housing is a clear contributor to mental health instability which is another crises that this island is facing.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Botticelli

--

Lisa Botticelli

BOTTICELLI & POHL

11 Old South Road

Nantucket, MA 02554

508.228.5455 w

508.325.2148 c

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [claudia.kilvert](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Fwd: Zoning letter 1-31-22
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 5:05:28 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Graham Kilvert <graham.kilvert@rocklandtrust.com>
Date: January 31, 2022 at 10:48:59 AM EST
To: "Claudia Kilvert (cmk4272@gmail.com)" <cmk4272@gmail.com>
Subject: **Zoning letter 1-31-22**

From: Graham & Claudia Kilvert 30, 2022 at 6:12:32 PM EST
To: Megan Trudel mtrudel@nantucket-ma.gov.
Subject: **Support of zoning Article 43**
Date: **January 31, 2022**

Dear Megan,

We are writing in support of Article 43. We have owned a home on Nantucket since 1985, and prior to that my family has owned property on Nantucket since 1920. Over the past years we have witnessed a major change in the overall residential development on the Island. Not only has the pace of construction gotten out of control, but the driving force behind the development is now directed by off Island developers who are building homes with the primary goal of short term rentals. Their motivation is purely profit driven with little interest in the long term impact on both neighborhoods and the year round working population that must complete for housing. We are **adamantly against the town-sponsored zoning article**, making unrestricted short-term rentals island-wide permanent. This approach of legalizing unrestricted island-wide short-term rentals without regard to impacts on residents, neighborhoods and housing is ill-advised, is damaging for the Island and has pushed the need for “affordable“ housing to

unprecedented levels.

We **support the citizen-sponsored zoning article (Article 43)**. It's a Reasonable zoning bylaw proposal for residential neighborhoods and districts.

-It protects seasonal and year-round residents' ability to continue to rent their home on a short term basis.

-It will discourage purely commercial short-term rentals in residential

Neighborhoods.

-It sustains the tourism industry and preserves the character of residential

Neighborhoods

-It will help stabilize home prices for year-round residents like teachers,

Nurses, and firefighters

Short term rentals benefits off-island interests, while diminishing the community of Nantucket. Detrimental effects include:

- driving up cost of affordable housing
- making it economically unfeasible for working people who sustain the island's businesses to live on Nantucket
- creating a loss of community and local businesses who care about and support the island

We are at a critical juncture. Regulating short term rentals now is essential to preserving Nantucket as a functioning community.

Regards,
Graham & Claudia Kilvert
47 Skyline Drive
Nantucket MA 02554

To the Planning Board:

I live at 17 Mill St. with my husband, David Poor. We oppose the Town's Article 42 as it encourages uncontrolled rentals by off-island entities who are interested in profits and not in enriching or respecting the island and its unique neighborhoods.

We support Citizens' Article 43, which offers a sensible approach to sustaining the time-honored tradition of rentals by local islanders and long time summer residents, while affording them the opportunity to keep homes within a family for generations to come, thereby strengthening the threads of this tapestry called Nantucket. Additionally, we support Citizens' Article 43 as it prevents corporate and absentee investors from renting with rapacious indifference, forever altering the Faraway Island.

Please support Article 43 (the Citizens' Article for Sensible Short-Term Rentals) and reject the Town's Article 42 as written.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Beilman
David B. Poor

From: [Dammin, Beverly](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Cc: [TRISTRAM DAMMIN](#); [Beverly Dammin](#)
Subject: Letter to Megan Trudel in support of Nantucket Article 43
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 11:51:03 AM

Dear Ms. Trudel,

As owners of 12 New Mill Street, we have contested the Copley Group's profiteering of the house next door at 14 New Mill Street. The "unreachable" owners show beautiful interior photos on their website of the renovated house with extravagant fees for a week's stay. We and neighbors on our block of New Mill Street slowly realized that the weekly stays brought a relentless activity of arrivals, cars, partygoers, landscapers, trash removal, deliveries, barking dogs and an attitude unknown in the past. None of us contemplated that ownership quietly changing from a single owner to a corporate entity would create such havoc in the historic district. The short term renters pay significant fees that entitle them to get their money's worth - whether it means bringing additional guests to help pay the rent, to indulge in self gratification and arrive with a "devil may care" attitude.

Let us clarify our annoyance with short term rentals – It is only against corporate, non island ownership that is so detrimental to the island. Absentees owners face No consequences nor lose sleep living next to these short term rentals. As well, it is unclear why the zoning for commercial ownership allows these corporate entities to pay residential fees rather than commercial zoning fees – a bonus which would only benefit the town.

All Residents of Nantucket should be entitled to rent their properties – it is only Nantucket residential owners who can be responsible and accountable for their tenants.

We strongly support Article 43 The Citizens' Article for Sensible Short Term Rentals.

We reject Article 42.

Thank you.

Beverly and Tristram Dammin
12 New Mill Street
Nantucket

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Ryan Craig](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#); [Andrew Vorce](#)
Subject: Planning meeting 2-7-22 - comments
Date: Sunday, February 6, 2022 3:24:42 PM

This message was sent securely using Zix®

Forgive me in advance if this email is outside of the comment period allowed for tomorrow's meeting. As a fairly recent homeowner, I'm still getting the hang of staying in the loop from afar. I fully plan on attending the meeting, but wanted to tell our family's story as the STR issues directly impact us.

Our family of three came all the way from Texas to find this beautiful place in the summer of 2011 when our youngest daughter was just 9 months old. We fell in love and immediately starting bringing back family & friends year after year. First at 4.5 Gay St., then in different STRs every year until we were fortunate enough to purchase a piece of this island in the fall of 2020. The only way our family could purchase the home was based on the expectation of STR income to offset the debt that was incurred. While many of the neighbors we met over the years of renting would tell us fascinating stories of their parents and grandparents owning a home that was now handed down to them, that was not the case for us. However, with the ability to have income from our property as an STR, we might one day be the parents & grandparents so fondly spoken of—decades from now.

We are fortunate enough to enjoy our property the entire month of June. We then rent the property from July 4th to Labor Day and possibly a couple weeks in September. Then, we allow friends & family from Texas to enjoy the property for free the remaining weeks of the year. Last year we had 6 different groups of family and friends who enjoyed the property from September through November—as well as our family again for a week in October. We love the idea of our friends and family coming to patronize our favorite shops & restaurants to provide support to them when we can't be there due to our school aged children and living primarily thousands of miles away.

Our property is by no means a business. We are not real estate investors looking to capitalize on anything. Because of when we purchased our property, I'm fully aware that the value of our property might drop in the future. That is not why we purchased it. We purchased this property to be able to create a pile of incredible memories so big that it permeates generations to come. Our oldest daughter who wants to be a school teacher in Nantucket, may one day be a full-time resident of the island. If that were to happen, I would hope she has the perspective of gratitude toward visitors who were once like her and her family. These visitors aren't there to take resources from others, but just looking to experience something one magical summer that could potentially change the course of a family forever. It sure did for us and I hate the idea of limiting this potential through burdensome rules & regulations. It is incredibly rare when these rules & regulations are beneficial for the majority of a society.

The Craig Family
28 Pleasant

This message was secured by [Zix](#)[®].

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [George Spencer](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Please include in packet for Feb 7 meeting
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 12:01:46 PM

Planning Board:

I write to you as a 58 year old summer resident whose family has been summering in Nantucket since the 1860s. This perspective may provide a somewhat longer-term view than many others, and one which I hope will be considered.

I'm writing to encourage you to carefully consider several articles related to short-term rentals on Nantucket that have been proposed for consideration by the 2022 Town Meeting. Over the past decade, we have seen an explosion in the number of short-term rentals on the Island, as well as skyrocketing housing costs, displacement of year-round residents, and damaging impacts on local neighborhoods.

While it's true that vacation rentals have long been part of the Island's seasonal economy, many of today's short-term rentals are of an entirely different character than those of only a decade or so ago. Too many are large, commercial enterprises, often operated in residential neighborhoods, owned by off-island corporate investors with little or no connection to our Nantucket communities, marketed worldwide over the internet, and in effect "mini-hotels" supported by centralized booking systems, concierges, and too often minimum-wage staff providing cleaning, laundry, and gardening. Essentially, much of the short-term rental industry on Nantucket today amounts to thousands of unregulated hotel rooms operated in residential neighborhoods and at the expense of our year-round housing, workforce, and communities.

Over the past 20 years, an ever-increasing amount of Nantucket's housing stock has been lost to commercial STR enterprises. What once was a cottage industry in which rooms and houses were rented on an ad hoc basis -- often to the same families year after year -- has transformed into a well-organized and corporate investor-funded industry that essentially serves as an unregulated hotel sector that has caused real damage to our neighborhoods, economy, and housing.

The saddest thing about this is that the real wealth from this new industry is being transferred off-island to mostly corporate real estate investors who are profiting from Nantucket's island character and traditions, but who often have no connection or incentive to help preserve our communities or neighborhoods.

I support the citizens proposal (currently Article 43) providing reasonable zoning protections for short-term rentals by year-round and seasonal residents in residential zoning districts. It allows year-round and seasonal residents to continue to supplement their incomes by renting their homes. At the same time, it restricts the conversion of neighborhood homes to purely commercial STR enterprises in residential districts. It will also encourage returning to our year-round housing stock many of the homes lost to commercial STRs in recent years.

The town's proposed by-law which would legalize unrestricted short-term rentals island-

wide without any regard for residential zoning districts or neighborhoods would be a terrible mistake for our island, and I urge you to oppose it. This approach would essentially ensure the permanent unfettered and unregulated expansion of commercial STR enterprises in our neighborhoods, which would further stress our economy, reduce our already dwindling supply of year-round housing, and harm our ability to maintain a thriving, sustainable year-round economy and community on this island that we all love so much.

George Spencer III
3 Sherburne Way

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Criss Troast](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: proposed article 42
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 5:02:13 PM

Dear Megan, Planning Board of Nantucket, and fellow Nantucket residents,

As evidenced by the storm this weekend, we as an island have the most incredible sense of community; we take care of and support each other no matter what it takes. The history of Nantucketers renting their houses out to help cover their mortgages has been a wonderful reality for many of us. As a community member who cares deeply about protecting those aspects of Nantucket we all hold dear, I am very concerned about the commercial enterprises and off island entities who are purchasing residences on the island as investments. This practice not only removes homes from the pool of potential housing options for locals, but it leads to increases in property values which prices properties out of reach for most locals. With property taxes extremely low on the island, and the demand for weekly summer rentals high, the investors can afford to pay significantly higher prices for properties which in turn makes properties unobtainable for more and more locals.

Living and working on Nantucket and being a member of this community has been a gift. I worry that with the shift to properties becoming commercial enterprises (used for STR) and the enormous demand of and therefore transition to STR for profit, the younger generation will no longer have the opportunity to own their homes and as a result will leave the island to find a community in which they can be successful. In our family business we employ an average of 45 people annually. While many of these amazing people have been searching for homes, only one employee out of the 45 is fortunate enough to own their own property. This is a tragedy for our island. Article 42, which would codify forever all properties on island for use as a STR, regardless if the property is owned by a local resident or an off island investment entity, is a bad idea. Article 42 would give all commercial enterprises carte blanche on island and would set a terrible, permanent precedent. If we do not find a way to help local island residents own their own homes, by protecting their rights to rent their properties, while preventing off island commercial enterprises from gobbling up our housing stock to be used for profit and STR, our island community will be changed forever. I support the citizens article (currently Article 43) as a viable and sensible path forward.

Sincerely,

Criss Troast

From: [Robert Kargman](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Fwd: Article 43: Citizen Sponsored Article on Short Term Rentals
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 11:13:05 AM

Megan

Please use this email as my comments on Article 43 instead of my prior emails.

Please confirm.

Thank you

Bob Kargman

>

> Dear Ms. Trudel

> Please enter these supporting comments on the Citizen Supported Article (Article 43) regarding Short Term Rentals.

>

> Nantucket has become world famous for its long term success in preserving and protecting the unique character of its Old Historic District in the downtown area.

>

> This area is well known for its charming narrow, yet quiet residential streets of beautifully maintained, historic homes on compact lots—separated only by low fences and hedges and window boxes for privacy.

> In the past few years, business entities have discovered that they can make extraordinary amounts of money by using certain Nantucket zoning ambiguities to convert these charming single family homes of permanent or seasonal residents into mini hotels offering short term rentals at premium hotel rental rates.

> Needless to say, the transient, non-related vacationers who rent out bedrooms in this quiet neighborhood of single family homes are now threatening the essential character of the Old Historic District, with their to-be-expected late night revelry causing light and noise pollution.

> The Citizen Sponsored By Law proposal regulating Short Term Rentals (Article 43) is narrowly crafted to prohibit only these commercial business entities from continuing their invasion and the complete ruination of the Old Historic District-Nantucket's most precious asset.

> Sincerely,

> Bob and Marjie Kargman

> 8 Mill Street

Sincerely

>

>

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Janet Bailey](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: RENTALS
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 7:32:57 AM

Dear Megan, My husband, Sam, and I TOTALLY and WHOLE HEARTILY SUPPORT the letters written by our neighbors, Anne Dewez, Bob Kargman and Gerilyn Brewer regarding rentals.

They have expressed exactly the way we ADAMANTLY feel. I can't improve on what they have each written.

THANK YOU very much for your time.

Janet and Sam Bailey

11 Mill Street

Cell 860 944 8883

Sent from my iPhone

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Roman, Neil](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Short-term rentals
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 7:04:46 AM

Dear Megan Trudel:

I am AGAINST Article 42 because it would permit unrestricted short-term rentals everywhere, destroy values, and change the character of Nantucket.

I am FOR Article 43 because it would protect short-term rentals by year-round and seasonal residents and discourage commercial businesses in residential neighborhoods.

Neil K. Roman
6 Berkeley Avenue
Nantucket, MA 02554

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Cathy Lepore](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Short term rentals on Nantucket
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 4:15:49 PM

I believe that homeowners on Nantucket should be able to rent their homes for short periods of time to help defray their mortgage expenses. However, my question to you is how is this new development and the building of houses, whose primary purpose is for wedding venues and the like, is helping our community? Certainly we are experiencing a housing crisis but these types of new building projects are not designed to address this issue. As a community we need to work together to help members of our work force who will contribute to and benefit all of us who cherish this island!

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [melissa druley](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Short term rentals
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 11:03:49 AM

Good day, Ms. Trudel,

I am writing today as a new home owner and resident of Nantucket. We have rented (short term rental) for years and finally found a home on Candle House Lane in the fall of 2020. I am writing to give supporting comments on the Citizen Supported Article (Article 43) regarding Short Term Rentals. "The purpose of this article is to protect Nantucket homeowners, while also seeking to protect our neighborhoods and housing. We can do that by helping to manage and sustain economic growth and honor our tourism tradition by preserving our community's character."

Absentee landlords (e.g. corporations, investors) who have recently started to participate in the rental market on Nantucket are threatening the fabric of our neighborhoods.

Thank you for your time. We need to protect Nantucket.

Be well,

Missy Druley
10 Candle House Lane
817-874-5807

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

MedTech Analytics, LLC

www.medtechanalytics.com

1/29/22

To the Planning Board, the Town of Nantucket:

Regarding the short-term rental (STR) zoning articles.

As a summer Emergency department physician, I started coming to this Island in 1980; Purchased my property from Frank Silvia in 1985; Finished my home with Red Hamilton in 1989; And have been living here ever since, retiring in 2015. I never thought much about short-term summer rentals. They were always a way of life. A way folks could make ends meet and enjoy Nantucket's daily life.

Times have magnified the challenges. What was once an issue of available summer housing has morphed into the subject of affordable year-round housing. What was once the issue of short-term summer rentals has transformed into the subject of long-term seasonal rentals.

So, it is time for the Town to step-up; To bring forward positive changes to its zoning articles to maintain the spirit of Nantucket's past, while addressing Nantucket's future.

In all honesty, there is really little to debate.

The Town-sponsored zoning article that allows unrestricted short-term rentals island-wide on a permanent, legal basis is NEITHER in the spirit of the past NOR the way to maintain the high-quality of Nantucket's daily life that we cherish and love.

To be clear, the Citizen-sponsored zoning article (Article 43) is a reasonable zoning bylaw proposal for residential neighborhoods and districts.

Specifically,

1. It protects seasonal and year-round residents' ability to continue to short-term rent their homes, (E.g., My neighbors).
2. It discourages purely commercial short-term rentals in residential neighborhoods, (E.g., The booming noise caroming from up the street).
3. It sustains the tourism industry and preserves the character of residential neighborhoods, (E.g., A compromise for all).

As this is an important conversation for our community, I hope that voters review and support the Citizens' Article 43 for Sensible Short-Term Rentals in residential zoning districts.

Thanks much.

Take care and stay well.

Sincerely,

Eric Silfen, MD



January 31, 2022

To Whom It May Concern:

1. We are writing to register our **strong support of Article 43**, the citizen sponsored article regarding Short Term Rentals on Nantucket.
2. We **strongly oppose the Town-sponsored article** which allows flexible short-term rentals on a permanent basis, Island-wide. This will be disastrous for Nantucket, in our opinion.

Both of our families have been property owners and longtime summer, off-season, and/or full-time residents on the Island since the 1920's and the 1940's, respectively. Marcia & I have owned 14 Pine St since the 1980's, we were married here, our family has celebrated most of our important milestones here, and Jim was baptized here. We call Nantucket home.

All of us who know and love Nantucket have felt the dramatic social shift of the past several years. The overcrowding is hard to miss, and the dramatic decline in civility on the Island is powerfully felt by all, especially those in the service businesses. The Island's fragile social and physical infrastructure is being asked to carry an unsustainable load. We can't hire or house enough Police, Fire Fighters, and other Public Safety personnel. There has emerged a sort of "*Me First*" attitude that has never been part of our Island community's culture. For the few lucky enough to find to find a Steamship Authority reservation, they arrive and then wonder why they can't move in the traffic.

Something has to give

The proliferation of unregulated STR's has contributed to the emergence of the "Disneyland" effect. There is a growing number of "hit-and-run" visitors who do nothing to contribute to the community. Many of these "visitors" overuse the Island's resources and services and only support the very few investors who run residential houses in residential neighborhoods as remote, high-volume hospitality businesses.

To wit: we live in a small neighborhood in very close proximity to our neighbors. We know most of them as people, not as Private Equity Funds, or investment entities. When we had a break in our water line a few years ago, it was not an "investment entity" who called us to tell us about the problem, it was my neighbor across the street.

We have also been forced to involuntarily witness numerous weddings and subsequent parties in the backyard of our next-door neighbor, a new group each time.....their backyard is 15 feet away through a privet hedge!

Enough is enough! **Please pass Article 43.**

Respectfully submitted,

Jim & Marcia Hooper
14 Pine Street, Nantucket

From: [James Chapman](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Cc: [Pamela Chapman](#); [Pamela Chapman](#)
Subject: Support for Article 43 - short term rentals
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 7:16:37 AM

Megan,

I am writing to express my wife, Pamela's and my support for the Citizens' Article 43 which is under consideration this week.

As way of background, Pamela and I purchased a single family home on Angola Street a few year's back. We have spent the last three summers on the Island and aspire to retire on Island in a few years. As things go, we purchased a building lot directly across the street from our Angola home, as we have been stunned at the development ongoing on the Island.

To that end, we have reached out in the recent past to voice our concern related to what seems to be out-of-control developers who do not share the values and sentiments about what makes Nantucket truly special. In their search for ever greater profits, the situation is rapidly becoming untenable, as there appears to be an increasing presence of absentee-owner rental properties, aimed solely at maximizing profit for investors. This has become all too common place on Wall Street as enormous pools of capital have been raised to pursue these "investment" opportunities.

To be abundantly clear, these absentee owners are operating "ghost hotels" with little to no vested interest in Nantucket short of their profit motivations ("quick flip" or otherwise), and do not contribute to the long term well-being of Nantucket. In fact, as per our prior emails related to ongoing efforts near our Angola home, these developers are degrading Nantucket by destroying neighborhoods, whether it be in the historic district or beyond.

Pamela and I understand that there are two zoning proposals pending to address the issue of Short-Term Rentals. The Town's Article 42 opens the whole island to new, corporate owners with no restrictions whatsoever. The Citizens' Article 43 offers a sensible approach to sustaining the time-honored tradition of rentals by residents while keeping corporate and absentee investors out of our residential neighborhoods.

Back to our Angola home, Pamela and I are very fortunate that we do not have to rent our home to meet financial obligations. We have been blessed to have the financial wherewithal to purchase the building lot directly across the street from our Angola home which we intend to "clean up" and leave undeveloped. However, we are mindful that is not the case for many families on the Island. As such, we submit the emphasis on any rental property proposal should be on "the families" and not on some amorphous financial enterprise backed by a private equity or hedge fund seeking solely to maximize returns for their investors with little to no consideration whatsoever on what makes Nantucket truly special.

Pamela and I hope that "common sense" will prevail on any short term rental proposal to preserve the flexibility for families' to rent their homes, while protecting the neighborhoods throughout Nantucket from being turned into yet another investment asset class.

In short, Pamela and I fully support and endorse Article 43 (the Citizens' Article for Sensible Short-Term Rentals) and reject Article 42 as presently written.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela & Jim Chapman
7 Angola Street
Nantucket
203-249-6780 (M)

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Gerilyn Brewer](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Cc: [Henry Mueller](#)
Subject: Support of zoning Article 43
Date: Sunday, January 30, 2022 5:29:34 PM

My husband and I own a home on Nantucket. Our home has been in my husband's family since 1967.

- We are **adamantly against the town-sponsored zoning article**, making unrestricted short-term rentals islandwide permanent. This approach of legalizing unrestricted islandwide short-term rentals without regard to impacts on residents, neighborhoods and housing is ill-advised and damaging for the Island.
- We **support the citizen-sponsored zoning article (Article 43). It's a reasonable** zoning bylaw proposal for residential neighborhoods and districts.
 - It protects seasonal and year-round residents' ability to continue to short-term rent their homes.
 - It will discourage purely commercial short-term rentals in residential neighborhoods.
 - It sustains the tourism industry and preserves the character of residential neighborhoods
 - It will help stabilize home prices for year-round residents like teachers, nurses, and firefighters

Unrestricted short term rentals benefits off-island interests, while diminishing the community of Nantucket. Detrimental effects include:

- driving up cost of affordable housing
- making it economically unfeasible for working people who sustain the island's businesses to live on Nantucket
- creating a loss of community and local businesses who care about and support the island

We are at a critical juncture. Regulating short term rentals now is essential to preserving Nantucket as a functioning community.

Regards,
Gerilyn Brewer & Henry Mueller
11 North Mill St
Nantucket MA 02554

917-751-8339
917-679-4151

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Lindsley Matthews](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Support of Zoning Article 43
Date: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 2:04:51 PM

Megan,
Hope this works. Thanks for your help.
Lindsley

I have been coming to Nantucket since the 1960's. My parents were homeowners for several decades, and I have been on and off the island as both a summer and a year-round Nantucket resident my entire adult life. Throughout the years I have owned different homes and was ecstatic to eventually build the house that I would live in, full-time, forever. Less than five years later I was forced to move due to the expanding short-term rentals in the neighborhood. The revolving door of large rental groups, events and parties made for a highly disruptive neighborhood. The noise and lack of care or concern for the people who lived there was intolerable. The neighborhood fabric and the community's soul of Nantucket is very much being threatened and must be addressed legislatively.

I am in support of the citizen-sponsored article (Article 43). This article is a reasonable zoning bylaw proposal for residential neighborhoods and districts.

- It protects seasonal and year-round resident's ability to continue to short term rent their homes.
- It will discourage purely commercial short-term rentals in residential neighborhoods.
- It sustains the tourism industry and preserves the character of the residential neighborhoods.
- It will help stabilize home prices for year-round residents like teachers, nurses and firefighters.

I adamantly oppose the town-sponsored zoning article making the island-wide unrestricted short-term rentals permanent.

Legalizing unrestricted islandwide short-term rentals significantly impacts residents and neighborhoods, and would be ill-advised and damaging for the island.

Purely commercial short-term rentals by off-island corporations have no place in our community. Unrestricted short-term rentals benefits off-island interests and diminishes our community. Affordable housing is unattainable for many who are the fabric of this island. Without it we lose our community and the people that make Nantucket such a special place.

We can all acknowledge Nantucket is a place for rentals (short-term rentals) by island residents to welcome visitors year after year. But we, as an island, need a balanced approach, not an unrestricted approach like the current version of the town's zoning proposal. I am encouraged by the town's proposal to create a registry, but that will not solve the issue.

Nantucket is at a crossroads and it is essential to regulate short-term rentals in order to preserve the community we all love.

The Citizen's Article is one for sensible short-term rentals. The voters should strongly consider it in the coming months.

Lindsley Matthews

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

To the Planning Board:

I am writing to express to you my concerns about Article 42. The intent of the combination of Articles 39 and 42 is clearly:

- 1) To amend the existing zoning bylaw to define the practice of short-term rentals as an allowable use in residentially zoned districts (Article 42) with no limitation and,
- 2) To establish a framework that could potentially limit STRs at a later date via a set of as yet undetermined regulations. It is unclear to me whether those regulations could be written to protect the rights of year-round residents who MUST STR in order to afford a home on Nantucket.

My concerns are:

- 1) That the highly charged real estate market which has driven prices out of reach for our year-round community is fueled in part by the business model of STRs. This is not the same market that started the practice of STRs in generations past. The practice began with people who owned homes and spent time here on a seasonal basis renting their homes part of the season to help defray the costs of ownership. We see an increasing number of investors whose primary (or only) interest in their Nantucket property is STR income. Their personal use is a secondary interest at best and for many of no interest at all.
- 2) If we pass a blanket codification of all STRs with no limitations on the investor-only model, we will never be able to rein in the practice. Once permission is granted by right, it is unlikely to be rolled back.
- 3) Rushing this decision at this Town meeting before you have all really evaluated what this codification will mean for the future of Nantucket has me worried for all those who are trying to make a life here and will never be able to access a market dominated by buyers who can make any property in any neighborhood a profit center.
- 4) At some point the balance of the number of beds for visitors will so outstrip the number of beds for the folks who provide needed services for those visitors will negatively impact the very economy that the proponents of blanket codification argue they want to protect.
- 5) As an advocate for year-round and affordable housing, our efforts to build housing units that are deed-restricted to year-rounders is offset by the transition of homes that have been occupied year-round to the investor portfolios. If we don't TRY to stem that tide now, I see the challenges of housing our workers getting exponentially worse.

Questions/Suggestions:

- 1) Postpone all the STR articles to a special Town Meeting in the fall give the community the opportunity to review the potential negative consequences of a blanket codification of all STRs.
- 2) Evaluate more thoroughly the proposal in Article 43 that seeks to protect the rights of those who need or choose to do STRs to make it financially viable to support their primary personal use (whether as full time or seasonal residents).

Respectfully submitted,

Brooke Mohr
2 Henderson's Drive

From: [Anne Dewez](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Zoning Warrant Articles 42 and 43 on Short-Term Rentals, Public Hearing February 7
Date: Sunday, January 30, 2022 5:04:25 PM

Good morning Megan,

Below are my comments on Articles 42 and 43 for the Planning Board Meeting on February 7.

Thanks very much, Anne

Short-Term Rentals – a time-honored tradition on Nantucket

My parents bought a house on Nantucket in 1961 and we came for the first time in 1962 when I was 11. For the first several years, we had the great luxury of spending the whole summer on island, from the first week of June until Labor Day. Then my father went through a bad patch financially. The only way we could keep our house was to rent it for a month. Thank goodness that was an option.

Renting is a lifeline for many owner-occupiers of houses on Nantucket, whether full-time or seasonal residents, and the availability of houses, apartments and rooms for people to rent is critical to our all-important tourism industry. On that I think we can all agree. However, our island's popularity and the evolution in ways to rent have converged into an untenable situation that requires us to formalize an until-now informal arrangement.

The untenable situation of which I speak is the increasing presence of absentee-owner rental properties – “ghost hotels” – aimed at maximizing profit for their investors, which are often pools of money or corporations. These owners typically have no vested interest in Nantucket, *per se*, and do not contribute to the well-being of Nantucket as a whole. In fact, they are contributing to the degradation of Nantucket by destroying neighborhoods and what makes Nantucket so special – the sense of community in these neighborhoods.

There are two zoning proposals to address the issue of Short-Term Rentals. The Town's Article 42 opens the whole island to new, corporate owners with no restrictions whatsoever. The Citizens' Article 43 offers a sensible approach to sustaining the time-honored tradition of rentals by residents while keeping corporate and absentee investors out of our residential neighborhoods.

The Planning Board has time to modify Article 42 and it may do so based on feedback from voters. In its present form, it cannot help but to accelerate the pace at which Nantucket loses its community, character, charm and perhaps even its historic designation. Once the cat is let out of the bag, there is no clawing back sensible restrictions based on “data” derived from the experience of a free-for-all rental market. Town Counsel, when asked about this by a member of the Planning Board, more or less admitted that it would be difficult. Given the money behind those who would challenge any such restrictions, they'd be dead in the water.

Let's start this journey with a sensible, carefully thought-out approach that keeps gives us the flexibility to maintain our time-honored rental tradition while protecting our neighborhoods and our island from being turned into an investment asset class. Support Article 43 (the Citizens' Article for Sensible Short-Term Rentals), reject Article 42 as written.

Respectfully submitted,
Anne Dewez, 5 Mill Street

Anne F M Dewez | 5 Mill Street, Nantucket, MA 02554, USA | Cell: +1(203) 685-5361 |
[Email: afmdewez@gmail.com](mailto:afmdewez@gmail.com)

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Doug Rose](#)
To: [Megan Trudel](#)
Subject: Zoning Warrant Articles 42 and 43 on Short-Term Rentals, Public Hearing February 7
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 1:02:41 PM

Megan,

Regarding Articles 42 & 43 for the Planning Board Meeting on February 7, attached are my thoughts.

When the issue of short term rentals is debated, the refrain we often hear is “what is the problem we’re trying to solve?” If it’s nuisances like rowdy frat house behavior, the argument goes, then we should just pass stricter noise ordinances, rather than impose limits on property owners’ right to generate rental income. But that’s like putting a bandaid on a disease.

Case in point: There are now three properties in my immediate neighborhood owned by the Copley Group -- a corporate real estate development firm based in Boston. My concern with these corporate rental properties is not just the common nuisances that can come with some short term renters (noise, traffic, etc). My deeper concern is the insidious effect that absentee ownership has on the character of my neighborhood. As the number of properties owned by non-residents increases, the number of neighbors with a vested interest in the welfare of my street declines.

Example: Would the residents of these three properties bother to pick up the Bud Lite cans littering my street, like I do? No... because they don’t live here. The renters won’t be here next week, and the landlords have never lived here. They have no emotional investment in my street; their only concern is for the ROI of that property. With each new absentee landlord, the fabric of my neighborhood is weakened. That’s a disease that can’t be solved with bandaids.

Thank you for your consideration on this important issue, and for your service to the community.

Best,
Doug Rose
22 Fair Street
Non-voting taxpayer

This email was scanned by Bitdefender