



Proposed Minutes for May 19, 2009
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
37 Washington Street
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
Telephone: 508.228.7231 Fax: 508.325.7572
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Dirk Roggeveen (Chair), Valerie Norton (Secretary), John McLaughlin, Linda Williams, David Barham
Associate Commissioners: Diane Coombs, John Wagley, Dawn Hill Holdgate **Staff:** Mark Voigt, James Grieder, Terry Norton, Ann Medina

~~ MINUTES ~~
May 19, 2009 – OLD BUSINESS
Cyrus Peirce Middle School Cafeteria – 5:00 pm

Called to order at 5:04 p.m. Staff in attendance M. Voigt & T. Norton

I. CONSENT	ADDRESS	PROPOSED WORK	M& P	AGENT
1. Mooney, Robert – 53767	171 Orange Street	Hanging sign	55-176.4	P. McCarthy
2. NIR – White Elephant – 53768	19 North Water St - HSAB	Private parking sign	42.4.2.-3	BPC
3. Hayford, Susan – 53769	41&43 Madaket Road	Apron	41-413&414	Self
4. Linda Loring Foundation – 53770	110 Eel Point Road	Gate	32-33	V. Laux
5. Anderson, Duncan – 53771	31 Okorwaw Avenue	Window replacement	79-153	NAG
6. O'Neill, John – 53772	16 Paul Jones Road	Rev. COA 53593 – move stair	41-97.1	Structures Ultd
7. Glowacki, Walter – 53773	24 Evergreen Way	Move shed on lot	68-711	Self
8. Smith, William – 53774	2 Oak Hollow Lane	Bluestone patio	56-74	Emeritus
9. Smith, William – 53775	2 Oak Hollow Lane	Rev. COA 53514 – add window	56-74	Emeritus
10. Mack, Jerome – 53776	2 Newtown Road	Replace garage door	55-203	Self
11. Savel Nominee Trust – 53777	47 Pocomo Road	Outdoor shower cabana	15-19	Botticelli & Pohl
12. Savel Nominee Trust – 53778	47 Pocomo Road	Outdoor shower guest house	15-19	Botticelli & Pohl
13. Seaman, Nancy - 53779	9 Hallowell Lane	Rev. COA 53488 Δ window	30-14	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs			
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Approve			
Vote	4-0, McLaughlin abstain			
		Certificate #	53767 to 53779	

II. OLD BUSINESS	ADDRESS	PROPOSED WORK	M&P	AGENT
1. Nantucket Land Bank	1 Fair Street – HSAB	Park - Discussion	42.3.1-152.1	D. Bartsch
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs ((Wagley arrived 5:08))			
Representing	David Bartsch – Talked about the Main St walls being more urban. “Exhibit A” stone, upon which the entire Main Street wall was based in the approval, only tells half the story. The Course Ashlar criteria for the Main Street wall was stated throughout. It was intended to be a Victorian Era park, which has no precedence on this island, to reflect a time when parks were popular in the main-land US. The desire to give it a more urban look was along Main Street. Each stone was 9 inches high, by 18 inches long. This makes it a better stone to run along the curb face.			
	No where in the approval did the HDC require a stone size. I would recommend that if HDC does not feel right about the size of the stones, we can alter the length (18, 24, & 36) but keep the height at 9 inch.			
	Fountain wall won’t have a cap, but be a flat wall comfortable to sit on.			
	Eric Savetski			
	Leslie Johnson – how did the color go from the grey in the photo to shiny silvery finish.			
Concerns	(5:05)(5:14) Roggeveen –The problem is that the stone being used, does not look like anything that was submitted in the application. The cap was approved as 6” caps or 1/3 the depth of the stone, what is on site is ½ the depth of the stone. Stone size was referenced in that it should match the foundation of the bank. The applicant put an interpretation on what was said. In retrospect, HDC should have required a drawing instead of caving to being rushed, and allowing the use of photographs. The motion referenced plans and photos that were supposed to represent the park. Course Ashlar had to do with the finish on the stone, so we can not use it to over ride the specifications on the size of the blocks. This commission should not even think about addressing the modification without a detailed drawing. At the May 14 meeting, the applicant was asked to provide such for this meeting. Once again we are asked to know what the applicant is thinking without visual details. The cap overwhelms the short block.			
	A drawing with 15” stones was submitted for review. Photographs are an attachment to clarify, not to replace the details of a drawing, especially with stone walls since final stones won’t look like those drawn. Bring photos of similar walls built around the island.			
Decision	To come back to another set of drawings of blocks at another depth in addition to the 15” drawing submitted 5/19. Staff to provide photos of existing work at beginning May 26 meeting			
2. Richardson, Julie	22 Hussey Street – HSAB	Retaining wall	42.3.4-97	L. Thornewill
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	Luke Thornewill			
Concerns	(5:45)			
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff with stonework approval via committee of Barham & Williams (staff)			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #	53780	

3.	MacLeod, Judith	56 Orange Street – HSAB	Addition	55.4.1-80	LPA
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Scott Hutton – saving Mulberry and Orange Streets windows in entirety. Trying to create the feeling of a glass porch. Submitted a context map of roofwalks along Orange Street.				
	Judith MacLeod				
Concerns	(5:50) HSAB comments read. Plans of addition were not clouded to help the changes stand out. Norton – concerned about the size of addition and the replacement of historical windows, pane size of new windows should match original. Long windows are not appropriate to age of house. Rear elevation the long tall windows, and 9/9s, ell off East elevation appears in the 1800s and plans do not detail how much historic fabric will be removed. Roofwalk is not historic to this building. Existing chimney in rear ell must be historically documented. Williams – agrees with Norton. ganged windows. Barham – West elevation size of addition, ganged dormer inappropriate and oversized, concern about how much is being added and loss of garden visible from street in a neighborhood where houses begin to diminish in size. Three-bay bump out is awkward upsetting the simple, plain design of the original building. Dormers, ganged windows, square bumpout on right side of West elevation. Roofwalk does not appear in any historic pictures so has no precedence. Back is totally visible from street and is a wall of glass, ganged windows, multiple sizes, loss of chimney in ell, proportion of ell which is bumped out lopsidedly, bump out coming off the back of that. What it is becoming is unsympathetic to original house. McLaughlin – West elevation meeting rails do not align. Six lights on the second floor of the addition should be double hung. Agree with Barham. Doors should be left natural to weather or white like the rest of the house. Dormer dropped off ridge Roggeveen – Don’t agree about the doors. Bumpout toward South elevation should be flush, any additive mass should be the size to contain a room. Ell as old as this should preserve original line with the ell distinctly different – broken back and/or corner board. I would go with a simpler, smaller roofwalk not dying into a dormer. Houses with roofwalks had very high chimneys and this house has a very low chimney.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and clouded drawings to include reduced set (Williams)				
Vote	5-0				Certificate #
4.	MacLeod, Judith	56 Orange Street – HSAB	New Garage	55.4.1-80	LPA
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing					
Concerns					
Motion	Motion to Hold for main house				
Vote	5-0				Certificate #
5.	MacLeod, Judith	56 Orange Street – HSAB	Demo existing garage	55.4.1-80	LPA
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing					
Concerns					
Motion	Motion to Hold for main house				
Vote	5-0				Certificate #

Proposed Minutes for May 19, 2009

6.	Auerbach, Herbert	18 Long Pond Dr. – MAB	New garage-studio	59-20	D. Holcomb
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	David Holcomb - dropped height down to 22'6", added shed roof toward Long Pond Rd, removed windows from each elevation, added lattice work for climbing roses, garage doors are natural. Went with 12/12 to go with design, not main house. Pulled away from lot line to preserve natural screen.				
Concerns	Fay Gilfoy – Still concerned about the number of windows and presence of decks. This is not a simple garage. (6:19) MAB comments read. Williams – too many windows, Main house is simple and this is not, three eight-foot doors, cross bucks, triple ganged on West elevation, deck is too tall and to large for an ancillary structure. Should not be 12/12, could match main house 8/8. Complicated roofline is not additive massing. East elevation gable inappropriate. Norton – Agree on need for simplification. This building personifies a house trying to have every aspect of architecture included making it over massed and complex. Barham – Agree on need for simplification. Road-facing elevation has 13 roof slopes. Agree on windows. In the context of design, the garage door windows don't look to fit, should be 5 light rather than 4. Cross bucks. Still seems to be very tall and competes with the main house. McLaughlin – cross bucks are not typical.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions (Williams)				
Vote	5-0		Certificate #		
7.	29 Baxter Road N.T.	29 Baxter Road – SAB	Outdoor shower	49.2.3-9	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli – client wants the dip in the shower so can see over top				
Concerns	(6:31) Standard height of shower enclosure is 6 feet.				
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff with East elevation of the shower at 6 feet max with a dip going to 5 feet. (Norton)				
Vote	3 -2, McLaughlin & Barham		Certificate # 53781		
8.	Prospect Hill Cemetery	Hummock Pond Road	Retaining wall	56-276	J. Morash
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, Williams, Barham, Coombs				
Alternates	Wagley/McLaughlin recused				
Representing	Jeff Morash – artist rendering of the finished product. Stones 6 to 10 feet. The type titled Concord matches most closely what is existing. Dual Macintyre				
Concerns	(6:35) Coombs – want the stone size specified on the plans. In existing stone, is the granite lighter than Concord? Barham – Seen from street, these are long runs of granite and should be dark and recessive. Concerned about the galvanized 1½ inch handrails, should be a more traditional design. Roggeveen – PVC pipes are buried with plaques covering made of bronze.				
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff with concord grey North, the thermal finish stone face, block dimensions 12 inch depth, 15 to 18 inches high, 6 to 10 feet long, metal railing to be determined by subcommittee and submission of shop drawing.				
Vote	5-0		Certificate # 53782		
9.	Schmidt, John & Wendy	28 Bosworth Road	Fence, oven, trellis	92.4-121	S. Payne
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs				
Alternates	Roggeveen & Williams recused				
Representing	Mike Foster – Oven is small 5X6, fence curved to hide oven, pool equipment will be behind fence, out of sight, pergola small and aligned with pool, shower and bench align with tennis court. Not visible and fire structure enclosed in concrete with wood separated.				
Concerns	(6:52) Norton - the fence looks like it just stops, plans do not indicate fence encompasses the property. Existing and new should be delineated on the plans for clarification. McLaughlin – no problems. Barham – approvable due to lack of visibility. Coombs – no comment. Wagley –no comment				
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff with a correct plot plan showing the full extent of property fencing based on lack of visibility (Barham)				
Vote	4-0		Certificate # 53783		

Wagley depart 7:28 p.m.

10. Merson, John	71 Baxter Road – SAB	Move on site & renovate	49-26.1	J. Merson
Sitting	Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	J. Merson – windows extend from foundation wall to the first-floor wall.			
Concerns	(6:59) (Must have ¼ scale drawings. Orientation must be cardinal points. Roof plan must be correct. S elevation should show angled windows. Solar panels not labeled.) Williams – Only have two issues left, still have sunken thing in the front with mini-skylights that project beyond front face of house West elevation. The California roof on 2 nd floor, would rather it have the height of a standard hipped roof. Coombs – hard to see how far ground windows tilt out. Barham – roof plan is incorrect. A201 to 103 hipped roof on left side is missing. West elevation (201&203) plan makes it look like slanting windows extend beyond the plane of the chimney. Drawings are not consistent between elevation & floor/roof plans. Use window wells all across with the tops of windows aligning to emphasize the horizontal line of the building. Agree about the hipped roof on 2 nd floor element. Placement of solar panels needs to coincide with design of house, present configuration forces the roof to overhang unnaturally. South elevation should show angled windows.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions (Barham)			
Vote	3-0	Certificate #		
11. Merson, John	71 Baxter Road – SAB	Move/demo existing garage	49-26.1	J. Merson
Sitting	Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	J. Merson			
Concerns	(6:59)			
Motion	Motion to Hold f or main house (Barham)			
Vote	3-0	Certificate #		
Break 7:30 to 7:40 p.m.				
12. Paddock House Trust	18 India Street – HSAB	Condenser location	42.3.1-59	NAG
Sitting	Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	Steve Theroux – fence will cover front and side. Condenser sits 107 feet from India Street. Roda Weinman – will look like fence/table on the deck and will not be visible from the street. Charity Benz for Carol Cross, abutter – would like to see condenser fully enclosed			
Concerns	(7:40) Barham - West elevation makes it look like the condenser as full visible, that is the side to the tree. It would be nice if it were screened to the neighbor, but HDC has no jurisdiction over that.			
Motion	Motion to Approve (Coombs)			
Vote	3-0	Certificate #	53784	
13. Rubinstein, Phyllis	28 Chuck Hollow Road	Deck addition	75-71	T. Wilson
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs			
Representing	Tori Wilson			
Concerns	(7:46) Williams – not visible. McLaughlin – no comment. Barham – objectionable and some change of screening will make it visible. Norton – agree with Barham, too big.			
Motion	Motion to Approve due to lack of visibility			
Vote	3-2, Norton & Barham	Certificate #	53785	
14. Irwin, Richard	115 Cliff Road	Addition	41-07	Permits Plus
Sitting	Norton, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	Mark Poor – prior concerns were on an element that has been removed in favor of a single cohesive form.			
Concerns	(7:50) No concerns			
Motion	Motion to Approve (Norton)			
Vote	4-0	Certificate #	53786	

Proposed Minutes for May 19, 2009

15. Sobel, Tom	45 Vestal Street Extension	Shed	41-591	Permits Plus
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs			
Representing	Mark Poor – changed design to proportional standard shed.			
Concerns	(7:53)			
Motion	Motion to Approve (Norton)			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #	53787	
16. Humphrey, Lia	124 Surfside Road	Pergola	80-298.1	Permits Plus
Sitting	Roggeveen, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	Mark Poor – ridge changed, arch forms reminiscent of shingle style homes, lattice portrayed as inboard.			
Concerns	(7:55) McLaughlin – no comment. Coombs – no objection. Barham – if we allow the arch to the lintel, will have a lot of applications coming back if this is approved as drawn. I'm Ok with a flair to the column, but a flat lintel to the bay. William – round elements are horrendous and it is completely utterly visible. Totally inappropriate.			
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff with squared bays (lintel & columns) (Williams)			
Vote	4-1 Williams	Certificate #	53788	
17. Brooks, Shelly	11A Mary Ann Drive	New duplex	68-983	V. Oliver
Sitting	Roggeveen, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates				
Representing	Shelly Brooks Shannon Cronan			
Concerns	Val Oliver – reduced size of forward building, shifted on lot, changed dormer. Residential/commercial street. (8:01) McLaughlin – No problem. Barham – Discrepancies between elevations and floor plans. Door needs to be centered between porch posts, porch post runs down in front of window. Window wells on street elevation and those don't show up on plans. West elevation suspended balcony should go away and be replaced by window. North elevation porch should go to corner of house. Too much building on property. Williams – South elevation windows that cross changes in plane need to shifted out of there.			
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff West elevation corrected drawings so that windows on right back in, porch to end of building on right, side of centre post & window wells, North elevation get rid of centre post and run porch left to end of building. East elevation no change. Unit One South elevation windows on main mass on left move left to be equi-distance form center line, windows on right side move left away from corner post. Unit Two South elevation both top & bottom windows need to clear corner post, windows centered on gable.			
Vote	3-1, Barham	Certificate #	53789	
18. Ericksen, Michael	26 Orange Street – HSAB	Renovation & partial demo	42.3.2-135	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Roggeveen, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates	Norton recused			
Representing	Ana Ericksen			
Concerns	Lisa Botticelli – believe dormer is an appropriate way to add room to this house. Shutters remain on main mass of original house and come off flat-roof additions. Lisa Botticelli thinks the deck on the North elevation is inappropriate. (8:18) Williams – no comment. Coombs – feel strongly about the red roof, which has been noted for a long time, an house stay white. McLaughlin – “A” are more typical for dormers. Barham – opposed to dormers in the rear, especially white on red. Wise idea to take shutters off street face, but attractive on North elevation. Removal of balustrade across East elevation 2 nd floor in favor of the first floor gable, looks to mid 1950s suburban sun room addition. South elevation move window to the left. Roggeveen - white shingles, keep roof red, A dormer ok in white and red color combo. Uniformity on the red roof and white painted shingles on all sides. Board split on dormers.			
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff with “Exhibit A” shed dormers on rear, red roof maintained & white painted shingles on all sides maintained and South elevation 2 nd floor shifted six inches left. (Williams)			
Vote	4-1 Barham	Certificate #	53790	

Proposed Minutes for May 19, 2009

19.	51 Baxter Road LLC	51 Baxter Road – SAB	New foundation	49-16	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Roggeveen, Williams, Barham				
Alternates					
Representing	Lisa Botticelli				
Concerns	(8:42) Barham -				
Motion	Motion to Approve (Williams)				
Vote	3-0		Certificate #	53791	
20.	51 Baxter Road LLC	51 Baxter Road - SAB	New cottage	49-16	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli – tried to make to look like a garage turned into a house				
Concerns	(8:45) SAB comments read. Exceeds height restriction of 22 feet. Williams – most ancillary buildings out there are very small and right on the street; this is set back with a second floor.				
Motion	Motion to View with six stakes at each corner without comment. (Williams)				
Vote	5-0		Certificate #		
21.	Foregger, Doug	Tuckernuck – TAB	Addition – Humane House	94-24	M. Rowland
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs				
Alternates	Williams recused				
Representing	Ben Normand – would rather enlarge shed than shrink gable to get more room in building.				
Concerns	(8:50) Norton – maintain original ratio relationship between old shed and new gable to make shed stand out. Barham – give 9 inches on gable an pull back shed 9 inches to restore gap that existed earlier.				
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff with give 9 inches on gable an pull back shed 9 inches				
Vote	5-0		Certificate #	53792	
22.	Presta, Barbara	53 Orange Street – HSAB	Window revisions	42.3.2-153	D. Wiley
Sitting	Norton, Williams, Barham, Coombs				
Alternates					
Representing	David Wiley – Have plenty of old bricks to use for window wells.				
Concerns	(8:57) Norton – on historic homes windows went right up to the sills which is where these need to be (needs to be drawn onto the plan). North elevation egress window well, on floor plan, is visible from street and should be at rear of building but does not show on elevation. Barham – South elevation basement windows six light sash same size as 12 light sash right above. North elevation basement window visible from street. North elevation window well too close to corner to be screened by planting. Williams – North elevation exposed foundation does not match the East elevation.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions with corrected drawings and floor plans (Norton)				
Vote	4-0		Certificate #		
23.	Reinig, James	15 Milk Street – HSAB	New foundation	42.3.3-88	L. Thornewill
Sitting	Roggeveen, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs				
Alternates					
Representing	Luke Thornewill – reduced length of dormer East elevation. Taking all windows off the table. Chimney proposing to remove was built in the 1980s.				
Concerns	(9:10) Barham – East elevation concerned about composition, specifically shed extension & exterior chimney & dormer windows on upper level. House beginning to lose cohesion. Coombs – no concerns. Roggeveen – design feeds that sort of rambling feeling				
Motion	Motion to Approve (Williams)				
Vote	4-1, Barham		Certificate #	53793	
24.	Madison, John	17 Ipswich Street	Sheds	76.4.1-94	Structures Ultd
Sitting	Roggeveen, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs				
Alternates					
Representing	Nancy Drazhal				
Concerns	(9:18) Everyone has visibility issues				
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff with lattice on the Devon Street side				
Vote	4-1, McLaughlin		Certificate #	53794	

25. Crane, James 5 Salt Marsh Road Window change 55-297 Botticelli & Pohl
 Sitting Roggeveen, Williams, Barham, Coombs
 Alternates
 Representing Lisa Botticelli
 Steven Cohen
 Concerns (9:23) Williams – option A. Barham – doesn’t like any. Option A if the rake boards are lower. Coombs – prefers original approval.
 Motion Motion to Hold for revisions to option A
 Vote 4-0 **Certificate #**

26. Savel Nominee Trust 47 Pocomo Road Tennis Court & retaining wall 15-19 Botticelli & Pohl
 Sitting Roggeveen, Williams, Barham, Coombs
 Alternates
 Representing Lisa Botticelli
 Concerns (9:28)
 Motion Motion to **Approve** (Barham)
 Vote 4-0 **Certificate # 53795**

III.HDC BUSINESS	
Review Minutes -	May 12 and 14
Approve Minutes -	May 5 and 7 held for further review by commission
60 Day Denials -	N/A
Other Business -	Mitchells Book Corner – signed off but mason used wrong mortar for putting back bricks around lintels Airport – visible generator will be screened. Work in back can’t continue until temporary structures are gone. 4 Pleasant Street, Toland – Unpermitted work going on, removed screening and fencing between properties, put up unapproved fence, no change on the unpermitted curbcut & paving. 47 Centre Street – sent a letter of violation. Took a picture and must check more closely to ensure work done 21 Long Pond – plastic gate fence found when doing View of 18 Long Pond White Elephant Easton Street – unapproved fence Bricks on Main St – staff talked to Mohamed Nabulsi about coordinating between departments. Still to talk to J. Willett
Commission Comments	

Adjourned 9:45 p.m.

HSAB – Historic Structures Advisory Board SAB – ‘Sconset Advisory Board
 TAB – Tuckernuck Advisory Board MAB – Madaket Advisory Board