



Proposed Minutes for May 26, 2009  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

37 Washington Street  
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554  
Telephone: 508.228.7231 Fax: 508.325.7572  
[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://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 26, 2009 – NEW BUSINESS

Cyrus Peirce Middle School Cafeteria – 5:00 pm

Meeting called to order at 5:04pm.

Linda Williams, Valerie Norton and Dawn Hill Holdgate absent.

Staff in attendance: Mark Voigt and James Grieder

I. CONSENT	ADDRESS	PROPOSED WORK	MAP-PARCEL	AGENT
1. Barbara's Skin Care – <b>53795</b>	35C Old South Road	New sign: projecting sign	68-6.2	B. Daniels
2. Marine Home Center – <b>53796</b>	5 Bayberry Court	Add door	55-705	D. Van Lieu
3. Belanger, Dean – <b>53797</b>	5A Pine Tree Road	Shed	68-227	Structures Unltd.
4. Westmoor Club LLC – <b>53798</b>	10 Westmoor Lane	Rev: COA #52162	41-91	JGG Architects
5. NIR (JC House) – <b>53799</b>	29 Broad Street – HSAB	New sign: temporary sign	42.4.2-38	J. Evans
6. Fifield, Randy – <b>53800</b>	5 Fair Street – HSAB	Fence revisions	42.3.1-100	CWA
7. Montalbano, Michael - <b>53801</b>	140 Main Street – HSAB	New fence	41-520	Self

Sitting Roggeveen, McLaughlin, Barham, Wagley, Coombs

Alternates

Representing

Concerns

Motion Motion to **Approve.** (Wagley)

Vote 4-0 (McLaughlin abstained)

Certificate # **53795 to 53801**

Valerie Norton arrived after "I. Consent".

Williams arrived at 5:20pm.

**Proposed Minutes for May 26, 2009**

<b>II. OTHER BUSINESS</b>	<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>PROPOSED WORK</b>	<b>MAP-PARCEL</b>	<b>AGENT</b>
1. Nantucket Land Bank	1 Fair Street – HSAB	Proposed stonework revisions	42.3.1-152.1	D. Bartsch

Sitting Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham  
 Alternates Coombs, Wagley  
 Representing David Bartsch

Concerns **Roggeveen:** Board requested a block-by-block detail on larger blocks at last meeting – looking to see the results of intermingling the existing stone with 9-inch (height) stones of varying lengths. Square (acute angle) on corner might be an option if the rounded corners have to be eliminated due to price constraints. The Fair Street wall begins with a 15-inch block that spans the entire distance from cap to grade and continues with full blocks along the top; around the corner on Main Street the wall follows the grade with the wedge-shaped stones appearing on the top of the wall rather than the bottom. (Bartsch: the wall along Main Street follows the slope of the grade; the top of the blocks could be cut at an angle if the board required it). Trying to use the same configuration as the Fair Street wall would lead to an arrangement where the cap overwhelms the stone of the wall, as it does now. The random lengths of the stones may be problematic; the top course of stones should be preserved. Acutely angled corner would be alright if the applicant needed to reduce costs. The color and material of the blocks is acceptable. Use the same stone in a bigger block size. If they have to purchase new stone for the wall then they will have to buy a new cap as well. On the inside wall, it would look better if at least some of the stones in the top course spanned the entire width.

**Norton:** Did not sit on the project initially, and asked if the wall follows the slope of Main Street (it does). The larger stones do seem more appropriate, especially given the size of the cap, and does not reflect what the commission had intended. Would like both size and color addressed, but size is most important. The stone looks too gauged. Material for wall is not fieldstone, and should have a granite cap per the previous approval. On the inner wall, the blocks are too “chinked” and are unacceptable. Also, the material chosen for the wall is not fieldstone as the board directed. The wall should have a cap as per the HDC approval.

**McLaughlin:** The plans are mislabeled – the West elevation should read North. The use of smooth stone is completely inappropriate. The project as it now stands looks like a cemetery or memorial. The block size should be larger, close to the size of the blocks on the bank across the street. All of the stones should be a standard 36” in length. The color is too light and inappropriate. On the inner wall, the stone and cut are inappropriate. The entire project should be redone.

**Williams:** After reviewing the other foundations used as an example, there is not as much variation in length as the park wall and the latter should be more regular in size. If the applicant had to change the color and material of the wall, then the cap would also have to be changed. Not as concerned with size and shape; the color is the problem, would be more acceptable if darker. The board is trying to make something look old that isn’t. Would be OK with a square corner if necessary. On the inner wall, the variegated color and striping is disconcerting. On the inner wall, the current design is acceptable, without a cap.

**Barham:** West elevation, corner block of wall is to cover the remaining distance of the slope (Roggeveen: the entire joint should be eliminated and only vertical joints used). The blocks are too small, more like unit masonry, and seem out-of-scale with the other stonework on Main Street. The color and finish are also inappropriate. Acutely angled corner would be alright although the Land Bank board prefers the rounded wall; alternatively, if the applicant switched to an angled corner then the wall could be chamfered to provide a less acute angle. There is a danger in reviewing the project stone-by-stone. The wall near the steps changes to a variety of smaller stones; it would be preferable to keep the same sized stone throughout. The wall may need to be redesigned to make the corner work in this configuration; there would be no horizontal joint, simply a single large stone. However, in the areas that will be below grade, and therefore unseen, using the materials currently on-site would be acceptable. The cut of the stone looks more like a cleft rock than a sawn block with a flame finish applied. Ashlars on the top course 15” high, climbing to 20” at the cap. The plan needs to show a grade line for reference. Size is paramount. Working with the existing stone but using different mortar joints and a flame finish might be preferable. On the inner wall, the top appears to be grouted while the sides are not. The stone is not fieldstone, and it should have a cap.

**Coombs:** The thin wedge of stones near the cap is distracting, and should be reconsidered. A square (acute) corner would be alright at Fair and Main streets.

**Wagley:**

Motion Motion to **Approve** per the samples provided on May 26<sup>th</sup>. (McLaughlin – no second)

Motion to **Approve** exterior wall (Main Street) with: length not less than 36” in length except at wall ends, at least 15” height, climbing to 20” beneath the cap, square corner OK with wrapped veneer not less than 8” in any direction, existing cap with slight rock face, roughen edges of veneer. A sample to be provided by noon on Friday.

Vote Motion to **Hold** the decision on the interior walls for further information.  
 (no vote), 4-1 (McLaughlin), 5-0 1:20

**Certificate #**

**Proposed Minutes for May 26, 2009**

<b>2. NIR (Haberdashery)</b>	<b>44 Main Street – HSAB</b>	<b>Review previous approval</b>	<b>42.3.1-217</b>	<b>N. McMullen</b>
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	Nathan McMullen			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> . (Williams)			
Vote	5-0	<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53802</b>	

<b>3. Town of Nantucket</b>	<b>Various</b>	<b>Public Way markers</b>	<b>Various</b>	<b>L. Saperstein</b>
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	Lee Saperstein, Kevin Kuester (SAC) – the posts are going to be very tall, and should be made of traditional concrete.			
Concerns	Roggeveen: The original concrete WPA markers should be preserved whenever possible since they are part of the historic fabric. Norton: no problem with granite for new posts; design should include chamfered top Option B is the preferred font.			
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> granite posts for new signs, option B font, maximum 42” inches in height, pyramidal top. Applicant must apply individually for replacement posts. (Williams)			
Vote	4-1 (McLaughlin opposed)	<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53803</b>	
1:37				

<b>III. NEW BUSINESS</b>	<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>PROPOSED WORK</b>	<b>MAP-PARCEL</b>	<b>AGENT</b>
--------------------------	----------------	----------------------	-------------------	--------------

<b>1. Century House</b>	<b>10 Cliff Road – HSAB</b>	<b>New roof</b>	<b>42.4.4-61</b>	<b>A. Rezendes</b>
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	Al Rezendes			
Concerns	HSAB comments read.			
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> . (McLaughlin)			
	Motion to <b>Approve</b> 3-tab (Williams)			
Vote	1-4, 5-0	<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53804</b>	

<b>2. Ramos, Butch</b>	<b>5 Topaz Circle</b>	<b>Addition</b>	<b>66-236</b>	<b>Josiah Newman</b>
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	John Newman, Butch Ramos, Josiah Newman			
Concerns	Shed dormer should be set three feet back from the edge of the roof.			
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> through staff with dormer(s) set back three feet. (Williams)			
Vote	5-0	<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53805</b>	
1:47				

<b>3. Berube, Richard</b>	<b>2 The Grove – MAB</b>	<b>Addition</b>	<b>38-155</b>	<b>Self</b>
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	Dick & Kathy Berube			
Concerns	MAB comments read.			
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> . (Williams)			
Vote	5-0	<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53806</b>	

<b>4. Gifford, John</b>	<b>4 North Wharf – HSAB</b>	<b>Remove chimney</b>	<b>42.3.1-81</b>	<b>J. Morash</b>
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	Jeff Morash			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> . (Williams)			
Vote	5-0	<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53807</b>	

**Proposed Minutes for May 26, 2009**

5.	Rowland, Milton	15 Commercial Wharf – HSAB	Revisions	42.2.4-9	M. Rowland
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Mickey Rowland				
Concerns	HSAB comments read. Williams: Current proposed window is an improvement over what was previously approved. Barham: Too much glass, and the windows are too tall.				
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> . (Williams)				
Vote	5-0		<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53808</b>	
Break at 7:03pm.					
Return 7:09pm.					
6.	Williams, Mary	3 Magnolia Drive – SAB	Roof material change	73.31.-80	Self
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing					
Concerns					
Motion	Took no action pending the resolution of the paint color.				
Vote	N/A		<b>Certificate #</b>		
7.	Visco, David	17 Youngs Way	Fence	68-327	V. Oliver
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing					
Concerns	An eight-foot fence is inappropriate.				
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> fence at six feet. (Williams)				
Vote	5-0		<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53809</b>	
2:05					
8.	Johnson, Michael	109 Eel Point Road	Shed	32.4	JGGA
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Sue Ellen Robinson				
Concerns	The overhang is too complicated, the trim details are too heavy, should be simple posts rather than columns. The shed won't be visible from the road.				
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> through staff maximum 6"-square posts, and the trim details minimized. (Williams)				
Vote	4-1 (Barham opposed)		<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53810</b>	
9.	Johnson, Michael	109 Eel Point Road	Retaining wall	32-4	JGGA
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Sue Ellen Robinson				
Concerns	No concerns due to distance from road.				
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> . (Williams)				
Vote	5-0		<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53811</b>	
10.	Wareing, Peter	16 Monomoy Road	Revisions	54-52	K. McMullen
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Nathan McMullen				
Concerns	Half-round on North elevation is problematic, and should relate to windows below – it floats ambiguously over the gable; combination of closed and closed railing is problematic.				
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> with the exception of the half-round on the North elevation. (Williams)				
Vote	3-2 (Roggeveen, Norton opposed)		<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>53812</b>	
2:19					

**Proposed Minutes for May 26, 2009**

<b>11. Walsh, Robert</b>					
	<b>8 Howard Court – HSAB</b>	<b>Shed</b>	<b>42.3.4-79</b>	<b>Structures Unltd.</b>	
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Nancy Drazhal				
Concerns	HSAB comments read. Fiberglass front door is not allowed. As proposed, the shed will obscure the front door. Locating the shed anywhere else on the property would be preferable.				
Motion	<b>Motion to View.</b> (Williams)				
Vote	5-0				<b>Certificate #</b>
<hr/>					
<b>12. Briggs, Jason</b>					
	<b>97 Low Beach Road – SAB</b>	<b>New dwelling</b>	<b>75-31.2</b>	<b>CWA</b>	
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Ethan				
Concerns	SAB comments read.				
Motion	<b>Motion to View with a roof plan and a pole at each end of the building.</b> (Williams)				
Vote	5-0				<b>Certificate #</b>
<hr/>					
<b>13. St. John, Charles</b>					
	<b>4 Midland Avenue – MAB</b>	<b>Add exterior stairs</b>	<b>59.3-170</b>	<b>Emeritus</b>	
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Matt McEachern				
Concerns					
Motion	<b>Motion to View.</b> (Williams)				
Vote	5-0				<b>Certificate #</b>
<hr/>					
<b>14. Frazier, Dalton</b>					
	<b>51 West Chester Street</b>	<b>Revisions</b>	<b>41-228</b>	<b>Emeritus</b>	
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs				
Representing	Matt McEachern: changes due to ConCom restrictions.				
Concerns					
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve.</b> (Williams)				
Vote	5-0				<b>Certificate # 53813</b>
2:30	<a href="#">Wagley departs 7:40pm.</a>				
<hr/>					
<b>15. Holt, Matthew</b>					
	<b>108 Squam Road</b>	<b>New cottage</b>	<b>12-36</b>	<b>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</b>	
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs				
Representing	Sarah Alger for Lisa Botticelli.				
Concerns	Bump-out on gable on South elevation is overly fussy and should be redesigned.				
Motion	Motion to <b>Approve</b> with doors 6'8" and the front door (South) should be 3 feet wide and the bump-out removed and gable extended to the same length if needed.				
Vote	5-0				<b>Certificate # 53814</b>
<hr/>					
<b>16. Savel Nominee Trust</b>					
	<b>47 Pocomo Road</b>	<b>Re-site pool &amp; hardscaping</b>	<b>15-19</b>	<b>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</b>	
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli: requests that the application be added to the view list.				
Concerns					
Motion	<b>Motion to View per applicant's request.</b>				
Vote					<b>Certificate #</b>

