



Housing Committee

Town of Chilmark

MEETING NOTES - FINAL

March 17, 2022 (via ZOOM)

Present for the Housing Committee and attending the Zoom meeting were Bill Rossi, Ann Wallace, Allison Cameron Parry, Nettie Kent Ruel and Alison Kisselgof - Administrator. Peter Cook, Richard (Rich) Osness and Jessica Roddy were also in attendance.

Jim Feiner & Andrew (Andy) Goldman were not in attendance.

The meeting came to order at 9:03 AM.

ACCESSORY APARTMENT / GUESTHOUSE SIZE DISCUSSION: Rich started the discussion by mentioning the lack of regulations for the size of a detached bedroom and pool houses, which commonly include kitchens and could potentially be used as living space. In contrast, accessory apartments and guesthouses, which could help with housing issues, are limited in size. Rich went on to say that total living area (TLA) is determined by size of the lot so why can't apartments and guesthouses be allowed to use the remainder of TLA. In his experience, 800 square feet does not allow for much space to live.

Bill offered that the detached bedrooms are limited to 400 square feet (reference by-law Article 2). He recounted issues at the Zoia house regarding a large detached bedroom that contributed to the limit being instituted. Bill said that accessory apartments should be limited to family, caregivers and affordable housing to prevent them from being used as apartments. He felt this limitation would be received better by residents in order to change the by-law.

Peter mentioned that he re-read the by-laws on accessory apartments and guesthouses and noted that both are allowed on the same property. He wondered why this was so clearly stated in the by-law and what the implications are.

Rich suggested that the Housing Committee request the Planning Board review the by-law on the accessory apartments and guesthouses. Bill made a motion that the Housing Committee formally request the Planning Board evaluate the size limitation of the accessory apartment and guesthouses. Allison seconded the motion and passed by vote of four in favor.

PEAKED HILL PASTURES UPDATE: Ann said that Peaked Hill Pastures (PHP) is on the spring town meeting warrant. Bill added that warrant article is only about conceptual design before issuing the RFP and not financial requirements. Peter offered that until the RFP is issued, the financial requirements could not be determined.

Rich mentioned that the town would need to find funding for PHP which could be constrained due to cost of the Fire House – EMS project.

HOUSING BANK DISCUSSION: Ann asked this topic be included on the agenda. She wanted to clarify that the upcoming votes for the Housing Bank is the first of two votes. The first vote just sets up the regional agreement which 4 out of 6 towns need to pass. If passed, the next step would be sending the proposal to the Legislature. The Legislature may change some wording and would then send it back to the island towns for a second vote. Laura Silber of the Housing Bank is hoping there won't be amendments on the floor in any of towns for the first vote because then towns would be then voting on a different proposal.

Peter was concerned that the question on the town ballot is quite long and the town moderator may only read a portion of the warrant. He offered that it was important for the town to prepare the public for how it will be presented.

Ann said that Jonah Maidoff is the outreach coordinator for Chilmark from the Housing Bank. Rich asked if town boards should write letters of support for the Housing Bank so residents will see the support of the town. Ann thought that this may have already been done but would follow up with Jonah about it.

HOMESITE SALE PRICE & SETBACK REQUIREMENTS CONTINUED DISCUSSION: Alison had distributed some information used for Nab's Corner showing the expected costs of infrastructure installation. She and Ann had done some other research regarding the current cost of infrastructure for Homesite and found the amount to be close to \$40,000, which is the current sale price maximum. Ann added that the \$40,000 was being evaluated as an incentive and whether it would encourage a landowner to carve off a Homesite lot.

Bill said that raising the maximum sale price to \$100,000 may encourage more landowners to create Homesite lots. He didn't feel that all Homesite lots would be created for altruistic reasons and that a higher sale price would be another way to motivate landowners to create housing. Bill also mentioned that Nab's Corner was town-owned property and that residents do not own the land so a comparison of costs with this project would not be parallel with private Homesites.

Ann suggested that landowners could submit Homesite creation proposals with sale prices up to \$100,000 to the Housing Committee and the Committee would approve or deny the proposal. Bill wondered if the \$100,000 could be on top of the cost of infrastructure. He added that any proposal should be accompanied by infrastructure designs.

Ann reminded that the town is in the process of updating the by-laws to allow for less than an acre for a Homesite lot and to change the setback requirements which should also help landowners with Homesite creation.

Allison supports the cost of infrastructure being separated from the sale price of the Homesite lot. She wondered how much could be built on less than an acre. Bill offered an example of his family property that is a 0.5 acre lot which has a 6-bedroom septic, well which meets minimum separation from septic & ~3000 square foot house on it. He said that the size of what could be built was dependent on factors like quality of soil. Bill offered that it may be necessary to limit the size of the house on a Homesite lot.

Peter said that he supports a sliding scale cost for Homesite sale because the infrastructure costs are varied.

Ann suggests the topic be continued at the next Housing Committee meeting as well as have the Planning Board discuss it as a meeting. Rich agreed that the Planning Board should discuss the topic and would have it added to their agenda.

MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING CONTINUED DISCUSSION: The Committee decided to hold this topic until the next meeting so that Jim could be included in the discussion.

TOPICS NOT ANTICIPATED: Ann reminded the Committee that there is a special town meeting on March 26th to vote on an additional funds for the Fire House – EMS project. Bill offered some details regarding why the money is needed and the results if the funds are approved.

Rich brought up the tiny house project in San Francisco that was recently opened. He was pleased to see this unique solution come to fruition.

Alison mentioned that she would be on vacation from 4/18-4/22/22 and asked if the next Housing Committee meeting could be a week earlier on April 14th. Members of the Committee were fine with this schedule.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: Since Bill had not read the minutes, it was decided that these minutes would be voted on at the next meeting.

DOCUMENTS:

Draft minutes from the 2/17/22 Housing Committee meeting
Nab's Corner spreadsheet of infrastructure costs

NEXT POSSIBLE MEETING: April 14, 2022 @ 9:00 AM via Zoom.

With no further business to conduct the meeting adjourned at 9:49 AM.

Respectfully submitted by Alison Kisselgof, board administrator.