

From: [Hugh Taylor](#)
To: [Alex Elvin](#)
Subject: Addressing commissioners' questions...
Date: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 10:40:45 AM

MVC questions before 2/2/23 hearing..

Greetings Alex. Please accept these responses to your commissioners' questions and get back with anything unfulfilled...

#1....The awning we aspire to have will be the corrugated steel arches that are the lightest aesthetic with the most strength. We do not anticipate painting the galvanized upper surface until some time in the future when a protective coating may be required. We only anticipate that a reflective color would be applied in that distant future. It will likely be painted on the interior surface at some later date and any steel under structure, that is not hot dipped galvanized, will be coated during installation. Know that the weather surface of this awning is not in any significant public view, being shadowed from the public by the existing building.

#2 & 3 .. We consider conditional approval a necessary component. We simply can't afford the expense of engineering this project with the absence of approval. A return to LUPC to seek approval for engineering seems to be the most prudent pathway.

Without the engineering efforts, an assessment of the costs to reach our desired wind survival loads is also premature. The commissioners should know, however, that we require this structure to endure, without concern, the normal winds at our location, which often exceed 90 mph on any given northwesterly winter wind and that we will ask the engineer to make the awning capable of withstanding 100 mph winds.

We would ask the commissioners to allow us a conditional approval, subject to engineered plans to these limits, put, upon their production, back before the LUPC.

#4 The number of permitted seats doesn't address the number of guests or the number of car spaces that those guests might bring to the property. If we serve, on a normal evening, 120 people, they may all come in their own cars, but more likely, they will arrive in parties of two per car...at a minimum.

If we serve 2 1/2 seatings per night (first seating 5 pm, then through 9 pm) , we know from experience that the first 40 seats (20 cars) will be off the property as the next 40 seats (20 cars) might arrive. The overlap often results in as many as 40 cars on the property at a time, mostly at the time of sunset when, if it's is a dynamic event, the patrons tend to overlap their time on premises with a common interest, not dinner service, but the spectacle of sunset. Employee parking is a component of these questions also, but have a different logistic. Our resident employees' cars are layered behind the service staff who can "fence in" those residents who won't be moving their cars after service. We put two and three cars in that block of employee cars in a manner that minimizes the area they take up. Everyone knows where to park, behind who , etc. to best consolidate that space with a nod to which staff leaves first or, sequentially, after.

Addressing event parking, we have years of experience with the parking requirements. When we are required to handle more cars, parking attendants are on site to maximize the space on the acres of property available. Our normal operating parking requirements don't need attendants to direct positioning, but when we need to make the most of the acreage for parking, attendants do so as one might think of a valet scenario in a more confined space. Frankly though, in fifty years of these larger events, we have never had a problem with

parking. Of the many events, mostly weddings, that we have hosted, very few, maybe 6, have been of island families where they might be more apt to drive themselves to the site. The vast majority are people whose coordinators orchestrate shuttle and taxi conveyance to and from the participants lodging. I ask for the number of cars to be considered at 120 to satisfy the remote and/or rare occasion, that an event might require accommodating that many. We have acres of areas on which to park cars if the need were to arise.

#5 Before approval of the change of use that our planning board referred us to the MVC as a DRI, we had about ten employees. After the 1991 approvals by the town and MVC to open to the public, we increased the employment to something near 18. Annually that increased as the business grew and our model demanded a larger service staff. When outside dining became part of the Covid mandate, our service staff increased with the demands of a more spread out service area.

#6 & 7 Presently, and for the last two seasons (May through October), we have had 8 rooms available for staff. Those rooms have the capability of housing 2 per room in the title five septic umbrella we operate under. We have the capacity to house 16 under that code but only had 10 individuals in those accommodations last season.

Going forward, it seems unlikely that the business dynamic would allow us to return to accommodating inn guests. The housing we were able to secure, off premises, prior to Covid, is no longer available or attainable. We have a tenuous hold on adequate service staff drawn from the resident island pool, but there is no way to cast a net wide enough to enlist qualified kitchen staff without offering acceptable housing.

We hesitate to close the door on our original business model of overnight guests and the ability to host this touring public. So, for that reason, we would not want this review of our processes to shut the door on that part of our business. Presently it is out of reach, but we would not want to condemn that dynamic as a result of some decision that this petition might require. We would rather keep that option open when, where and if, staff housing outside the building becomes more realistic or attainable.

Hugh

Sent from my iPad

1/24/23

DRI 336-M Outermost Inn Modification

Commissioner questions during public hearing

1. What color(s) will the awning be?
2. An engineered plan for the awning should be submitted before the hearing closes. Alternatively, the commission may decide to condition the project so that an engineered plan comes back for approval by the LUPC prior to receipt of a building permit.
3. What is the wind rating of the proposed awning? (Please reference the MA Building Code 9th Edition; this would indicate that structures in southeastern MA should be designed to withstand at least 90 MPH winds as measured 30 feet above the ground, but other factors may also apply. A wind rating could potentially be included as part of the engineered plan mentioned above.)
4. The proposal is for 67 seats and 57 parking spaces, and for events with up to 350 people and 120 cars. What is the plan for parking when there is an event where attendance is more than 67? Please show on the site plan where will the additional cars would park. Is there also an option for shuttle service from offsite?
5. Clarify the number of employees when the Outermost Inn was first considered a DRI in 1991.
6. Provide the number and location of all employee housing units that are currently provided, and the number of employees that occupied the housing last year.
7. Please clarify the proposed arrangement for employee housing going forward, including the number and location of units, and the maximum tenancy. Will the eight inn rooms continue to serve as employee housing? If so, this could be included in the proposal, or submitted as an offer.