



HULL PLANNING BOARD

253 Atlantic Avenue, 2nd floor
Hull, MA 02045

Phone: 781-925-2117

Fax: 781-925-8509

October 10, 2012

Members Present: Joseph Duffy, Chair, Timothy Reynolds, Jeanne Paquin, Vernon Wood, Kelly Phelan, Nate Peyton

Members Not Present: Stephen Flynn

Staff Present: Robert Fultz, Community Development & Planning Director
Ellen Barone, Administrative Assistant

7:30pm J. Duffy called the meeting to order and welcomed members from other Boards and Committees (The meeting was also taped by Hull Cable TV)

Attendees:

Angela Insinger, MAPC
Barry Keppard, MAPC
David Ray, Zoning By-law Committee
Bartley Kelly, Hull Redevelopment Authority (HRA)
Spencer O'Loughlin, HRA
Jacqueline Chase, HRA
Phylliss Aucoin, HRA
James Tobin, HRA
Jan Scullane
Susan Aborn
Greg Cove (not signed in)

After a motion by T. Reynolds, 2nd by J. Paquin and a vote of 6/0/0, the Board took a ten minute recess at 6:37, reconvening at 6:47 to allow the HRA to arrive from its meeting elsewhere in the building.

R. Fultz provided a powerpoint presentation outlining Hull's needs for rezoning in the Nantasket Beach area from Phipps Street to Rockland House Road to allow for development and commercial growth. MR. Fultz stated that the Town's Commercial Tax Base is 4% and that capital improvements within the Town are impossible to achieve without commercial growth. Re-zoning this area is necessary to allow for development that would be sustainable year round. The process for re-zoning will be achieved through receiving comments and suggestions from many public meetings and with the technical guidance from MAPC. Deliverables from MAPC are posted on the Town's website. MR. Fultz stated that he welcomes the comments and/or suggestions from residents or business owners at anytime regarding this initiative.

Ms. Angela Insinger of MAPC reviewed her Memorandum of September 26, 2012 along with two maps that outlined Hull's current zoning and current land use for the Nantasket Focus Area. This information makes up the deliverable for Task 1 that illustrates the issues and options for rezoning this area. Ms. Insinger reviewed the MAPC document dated October 10, 2012 titled Overview of Approaches, Issues and Options. This document provides an overview or summary of the previous memo submitted in Task 1.

Ms. Insinger explained that there were two options to rezoning the Nantasket Focus Area: (a) by amending zoning in existing districts to include mixed-use, or (b) by creating an overlay district or overlay districts where mixed-uses would be allowed, either by right or by special permit.

Comments & Discussion:

R. Fultz -Main problem is that there is not a true mixed-use district in this area. An overlay district would add uses that would serve a need in the community as well as provide for market viability.

B. Kelly– Overlay District zoning is the best approach as it would be an easier process to have changes made at Town Meeting. Existing zoning would still be in place. An overlay district would open up multiple uses and allow for more requirements to be met, such as parking. Would like to see overlay district include all DCR properties from Atlantic Hill to Phipps Street.

B. Kelly- A provision should be added stating that if a use were allowed by right in a specific district then a special permit would not be required. If using the overlay district for zoning, then the special permit process would kick in.

S. O’Laughlin - Preference would be to keep height no greater than the Hotel in the area of the HRA property (40 feet plus the cupola).

R. Fultz – Previous workshops indicated a desire to have the first floor be an open market area and then allow up to four stories of usable space. Consideration must be given to the fact that this area is located in a flood zone. Objections were made to seeing large masses of walls from buildings.

B. Kelly – If a special permit using the overlay district were required, preference would be that the Planning Board (PB) be the granting authority over the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). PB is an elected board, where a majority makes a decision, ZBA is 3 people weighing in and the decision must be unanimous.

R. Fultz-Consideration must be given to allow mixed use in a district and a specific building. Should it be by right or special permit?

J. Duffy – In the focus area use should be by special permit so that the Town could retain some control. People would have an opportunity to speak out re the proposed use at a public meeting.

P. Aucoin- Would not like to see another hotel in this area.

B. Kelly – Does not see why we would not want another hotel. An investor would make that decision. Business brings business.

D. Ray – Agrees with B. Kelly about hotel. Developers make the decision to invest. The permitting process cannot be so cumbersome. We are over designing parking requirements, would like to see more shared parking. As far as the special permit process, most of the development would go through site plan review. Special Permits could be considered at the same time as Site Plan Review.

J. Paquin-Cannot get bogged down with wanting or not wanting specific types of business development such as restaurants or hotels. We should look more generally. The place that we have or the zoning that we have may be more palatable to a developer coming in. We should provide developers with guidelines. Let them get a clear message of what we want and what we expect however let the public have the input and through the special permit process.

A. Insinger-Thought should also be given to uses allowing multi family residential, currently not allowed in the business district. If business area is extended, do you want to allow multi-family or keep the use exclusive?

D. Ray -Would like to see business grow in this area. However we cannot limit developers to only making business development when there is very little business to start with. We need to be flexible to give them any opportunity to get a payback on the money they will invest.

T. Reynolds – The property at 301 Nantasket Ave. is a great example of a development as to the scale and size and attractiveness.

R. Fultz – Another pre existing non -conforming structure that has been redeveloped is 10 Malta. Addressing guidelines on the size can be a way of control.

N. Peyton – Would like to see mixed use in the business district with a balance that will allow for a walkable streetscape that would have businesses and multi-family residences. Does not think we should have an exclusive multi-family area. Would like to see the area currently strictly multi-family added to the overlay area to allow for mixed -use as well. (Park, Berkley, Atherton)

J. Duffy - Would like to look at eliminating the 10' setback in the business zone.

J. Scullane – Brought attention to the number of failed businesses in the area.

R. Fultz -Explained that failed or closed businesses or blighted properties are exactly what are being addressed. Provide more opportunities for developers so that there are less constraints to allow them to design their project so that it is market viable.

G. Cove - Multi-family residences equal traffic; transportation issues should be solved prior to zoning. What is DCR going to do with their parking lot? Are they going to share it? What is their part in all of this?

R. Fultz - We have a planning initiative that includes a study of the transportation corridor and we also have a MassWorks grant application in that we hope will provide an easier way out that will eliminate part of the corner by Anastos Corner that will be truly two lanes out of that area.

B. Kelly – The existing zoning heights are Commercial Rec A can be as high as 70' under Flexible Plan Development with a special permit as long as you give back open space, Single Family is 35, Multi-Family is 40'. The only Commercial Recreation A area is the HRA parcel.

The next public meeting will be on November 7, 2012 and will be publicized and a mailing will be sent out.

9:25pm Upon a **motion** by T. Reynolds and **2nd** by N. Peyton a **vote** of 6/0/0;
It was **voted** to: Adjourn