1. DESCRIPTION

1.1 Applicant: Sam Dunn
1.2 Owner: Santander Bank
1.3 Project Location: 75 Main Street, Tisbury, Map 7-D, Lot 7
1.4 Proposal: Renovate two existing buildings and construct five new buildings, with a total of 11 condo units and four commercial units, and reduce parking spots from 35 to 19. Includes pedestrian pathways, a courtyard, and a pocket park.
1.5 Zoning: Business 1 (B1)
1.6 Local Permits: Tisbury Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals
1.7 Surrounding Land Uses: Business 1 (B1), Business 2 (B2), and Waterfront Commercial zoning districts; surrounding uses include an existing residence with access from Main Street, the Steamship Authority Terminal, Vineyard Transit Authority transportation hub, a town-owned parking lot, Stop and Shop, and businesses along Main, Union, and Water streets.
1.8 Project History: The Old Stone Bank building on Main Street was designed by architect J. Williams Beal in 1905 and constructed by local stonemason James Norton using local field stones. Businessman and Tisbury resident William Barry Owen had purchased a controlling share in the property in 1904. The building is a notable example of the Romanesque and Bungalow styles. DRI 674 involved the removal and replacement of terra cotta tiles on the building. The tiles had already been removed and replaced with asphalt shingles when the project was referred to the Commission in 2016. The Commission voted in 2017 to deny the application and require that the asphalt shingles be replaced with ceramic tiles consistent with the historic character of the building. Santander Bank closed the bank branch in 2017 and put the property up for sale. The tiles were replaced in 2019. The project was referred as a modification, but would also have triggered the checklist on its own.

Project Summary: The project involves renovating two existing buildings and constructing five new buildings, with a total of 11 condo units and four commercial units. (See figures 1 and 2 below.) The existing Stone Bank and annex (A) and a separate drive-through building (C) would be renovated to include a total of four condos; one existing building would be demolished and replaced with another building (B) to include two condos; and four other new buildings (D1, D2, E, and F) would be constructed to include a total of five condos.

As proposed, buildings A, C, E, and F would have commercial uses on the first floors totaling 5,650 ft², not including 700 ft² of existing storage space in Building C. The proposed uses are retail and office space, although the applicant has stated that future uses may include a restaurant and welcome center. The first floor of the Stone Bank fronting Main Street would remain in commercial use.
The buildings would be accessible via pathways from the town parking lot, Main Street, and Union Street, while building D2 to the east would stand above an existing parking lot just north of the town lot. The pathways would also lead to a pocket park between buildings C and E.

Parking spots would be reduced from 35 to 19 to make room for a proposed courtyard between buildings A, B, and C. Buildings D1 and D2 would be raised above the floodplain level, with vehicle access and/or parking underneath. The abutting Stam property would maintain a driveway that is accessible via the gravel lot.

*Figure 1: Proposed buildings, footprints, units, retail area, and bedrooms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Footprint (ft²)</th>
<th>Retail units</th>
<th>Retail area (ft²)</th>
<th>Res. units</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (existing)</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>R1 R2 R3</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (rebuild)</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R4 R5</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (existing)</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1,400 (+700 storage)</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 (new)</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 (new)</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (new)</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>R9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (new)</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>R10 R11</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,540</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Site plan*
2. **ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY**

2.1 **DRI Referral:** Tisbury Building Inspector

2.2 **DRI Trigger:** 1.2 (Modification to a previous DRI)

2.3 **LUPC:** December 7, 2020, February 22, 2021

2.4 **Public Hearing:** Not yet scheduled

3. **PLANNING CONCERNS**

3.1 **Some Key Issues**

The plans have gone through several changes since November 2020. The applicant is also working with the town Planning Board to finalize the application. Planning concerns focus on vulnerability to storms and flooding, town zoning regulations, traffic and parking, and the impact of potential future phases on wastewater and traffic.

3.2 **Historic Character:** The Stone Bank is listed in the MA Cultural Resource Information System, and the Tisbury Historical Commission has called it “arguably one of the most important buildings on Martha’s Vineyard.” The MVC had previously given the building a score of 15 out of 20 for historic significance. The Tisbury Historical Commission has formally endorsed the project, praising the discreet nature of the proposed courtyard, and stating among other things that the proposed buildings are appropriately diverse and in keeping with the scale of neighboring areas. As proposed, buildings B, D1, D2, E, and F would have wood shingles and clapboards, in contrast to the stone construction and terra cotta tiles of buildings A and C.

3.3 **Wastewater:** The property was previously allowed to generate 904 gallons per day (GPD) of wastewater, and has received two approvals from the Town Sewer Advisory Board to increase that amount. The first approval (October 2020) was for an additional 1,076 GPD, and the second approval (February 2021) was for an additional 330 GPD, bringing the total to 2,310 GPD for the property. The second approval was good for one year, after which the applicant would need to apply for renewal. It was not clear if the first approval also had a one-year limit. The proposed 16 bedrooms on the site would require a total allocation of 1,760 GPD, leaving 550 GPD for the proposed 6,500 ft² of retail and office space, which would require a total of about 315 GPD.

3.4 **Stormwater:** There are no stormwater facilities on the property, but the applicant has stated that the area of existing asphalt will be reduced by about 9,650 ft², with about two thirds of that area replaced with grass and the rest with gravel. About 75% of the site would consist of pervious surfaces, including the gravel areas underneath buildings D1 and D2. The property slopes downhill from Main Street toward the harbor, causing rain runoff to flow into the harbor. The rainwater would pick up pollutants as it makes its way downhill, potentially degrading the recreational and economic benefits of the beach and harbor. Runoff from the buildings could contribute additional pollution, and during significant storms, not all of the stormwater in the parking area would be absorbed by the pervious surfaces. Vegetated swales or other green infrastructure could be used to mitigate these impacts.

3.5 **Climate Change Resilience:** The project lies within the 100-year floodplain, with beach frontage on Vineyard Haven Harbor. The eastern part of the property lies within the FEMA AE zone, which FEMA defines has having a 1% chance of annual flooding, or a 26% chance over the life of a 30-
year mortgage. Buildings C, D1, and D2 (and a portion of B) would be located within the AE zone. All of the units would be constructed 1–3 feet above the base flood elevation. However, the FEMA flood maps are based on historical data and do not take into account sea level rise and the resulting increase in storm surge and flooding. Flooding events on the low-lying portion of this site are increasing as the 100-year flood occurs with greater frequency. The applicant has not provided a projection of actual flooding at the site, or how it would affect traffic and parking. The applicant has stated that hazard insurance would be included in the condominium fee.

3.6 **Energy:** The applicant has stated that the buildings will have electric heating and cooling (mini-splits), electric clothes drying, and propane for cooking. The energy source for hot water has not yet been determined.

3.7 **Housing:** The project would add 11 units to the Island housing stock, and Building B would be deed restricted to include one affordable housing unit, with an income restriction of no more than 80% AMI. The applicant has stated that the target population for the condos in general are elder Island residents looking to downsize. The applicant has also stated that full compliance with Universal Design standards would not be practical, since the required widths and configurations would conflict with other design goals.

MVC staff has calculated the monetary mitigation for the proposed retail uses, and provided the following recommendations for the project in regard to affordable housing:

- 6,350 ft² X 4 (Retail Use) X $8 = $203,200
- The affordable housing unit shall be exempt from all condominium and homeowner association fees
- The affordable housing unit shall comply with all affirmative fair housing laws
- The homebuyer income eligibility shall be set at 80% or less of the Area Median Income (AMI)
- The recipient should be income certified by Dukes County Regional Housing Authority, with all DCRHA administration costs paid by the applicant
- Clarify how homeowner’s insurance coverage and other insurance costs will impact the overall affordability for the Affordable Housing recipient and what guarantees will be made by the applicant to ensure affordability?
- Clarify whether the affordable unit will be lotteried by a state-certified affordable housing entity

3.8 **Economic Development:**

- The proposed residential units will have a beneficial impact on surrounding businesses, particularly retail shops and restaurants.
- The future commercial uses in buildings A, C, E, and F are still unknown, although the applicant has indicated that they will most likely be retail/office space.
- The anticipated number of new jobs created, and the hours of operation, for the four commercial units are still unknown.
The proposed project will not have a significant impact on town services such as police and fire, since it is located in a densely developed mixed-use/commercial area.

The project will generate new additional commercial and residential property taxes for the town of Tisbury.

The project will create a small number of new temporary jobs in the professional services and construction industries.

The FY 2020 Assessed Value for the properties are as follows:
- 75 Main Street: $1,875,000
- 16 Union Street: $1,167,600

The FY 2020 Property Tax Revenue for the properties are as follows:
- 75 Main Street: $22,711
- 16 Union Street: $12,415

### 3.9 Zoning and Land Use:

Tisbury Zoning Bylaw 05.12 (uses requiring a special permit in the B1 district) states that private dwellings and apartments are allowed by special permit in business structures, but may not occupy the first floor of any structure where such use did not exist in the preceding two years. The proposal for 74 Main Street includes demolishing one existing commercial building and replacing it with condos (Building B), and constructing two other buildings (D1 and D2) with condos on the first floors. (There is some disagreement about whether the units in D1 and D2 are in fact on the first floors, since those buildings are raised above the ground; and how to categorize the two stories of the Stone Bank annex, which extends out from the existing basement, but at grade.) The town Planning Board has not yet determined whether any of the buildings may have residential uses, or whether buildings B, D1, and D2 will be considered business structures and therefore subject to the first-floor restriction. An opinion by Town Counsel states that new structures in the B1 district could potentially have residential use on the first floors, but a final decision is up to the Planning Board.

### 3.10 Traffic and Parking:

Parking spots will be reduced from 35 to 19, or about a 46% reduction. The 19 spots would be for residents and guests only. The proposed commercial uses would likely increase demand for public parking in the immediate area, but it is unclear how much, since the commercial uses have not been specified. The neighboring town lot is for public parking.

### 3.11 Landscape and Lighting:

A preliminary landscape plan shows five existing trees to remain, and a mix of new and existing shrubs/vegetation throughout the property. According to the site plan, lighting would be LED landscape lighting beneath trees and shrubs, along with downlighting on each of the condo porches. No additional lighting is shown on Main Street.