



Proposed Minutes for June 2, 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 ~~

June 2, 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. Vaughan & Holland - 53816	2 South Beach Street - HSAB	Sign – Oran Mor	42.4.2-60	C. Freeman
2. NIR – 53817	13 Old South Wharf – HSAB	Projecting sign – Ireland Galleries	42.2.4-2	
3. NIR – 53818	13 Old South Wharf – HSAB	Wall sign – Ireland Galleries	42.2.4-2	
4. NIR – 53819	13 Old South Wharf – HSAB	Quarterboard – Ireland Galleries	42.2.4-2	
5. Brent Young – 53820	117 Orange Street – HSAB	Projecting sign – KAM Appliance	55.377	K. Gralton
6. Brewster Equities LLC – 53821	12 Oak Street – HSAB	Projecting sign - Dreamland	42.4.2-27	P. Roggeveen
7. Dreamland Foundation – 53822	17 S. Water Street – HSAB	Rev. COA 53439 – shed roof	42.3.1-11.1	B. Hunter
8. Oliver, William – 53823	20 Atlantic Avenue – HSAB	Fence – Type II picket	55.25	Self
9. Hearst Residence – 53824	1 Baxter Road – SAB	Hardscaping – paving	73.1.4-12	Jardins Intl
10. Williams, Mary – 53825	3 Magnolia Avenue – SAB	Roof material change	73.3.1-80	Self
11. Nantucket Land Bank – 53826	48 Tennessee Avenue – MAB	Rotate building on site	59.4-92	B. Perry
12. Deombeleg, Alan – 53827	137 Polpis Road	Deck – enlarge	44-7.1	T. Burns
13. Gregoire, Gary – 53828	32B Polpis Road	Deck – enlarge	54-252	Self
14. Facteau, Richard – 53829	24 Clarendon Street	Fence – 3-rail split	76.1.3-125	Self
15. Hughes, Charles – 53830	11 Fairgrounds Road	Shed	67-39	Structures Ultd
16. Dimock, Donald – 53831	61 Bartlett Road	Rev. COA 53308 – remove deck	66-99	E. McMorrow

Sitting Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham
Alternates Coombs, Wagley//Roggeveen recused from items 6 & 7

Representing
Concerns

Motion Motion to Approve

Vote Unanimous

Certificate # 53816 to 53831

Hill Holdgate absent

Proposed Minutes for June 2, 2009

II. OLD BUSINESS	ADDRESS	PROPOSED WORK	M&P	AGENT
1. Nantucket Land Bank	1 Fair Street – HSAB	Pocket park	42.3.1-152.1	D. Bartsch

Sitting Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham
 Alternates Coombs, Wagley
 Representing BLOCK SIZE

David Bartsch – 36” long minimum, 15” height to 22”, Land bank choose to stick with curved wall (Option 4), slight rock face on vertical wall cap, roughening edges of veneer to look more like PNB foundation overhanging top block give irregular shadow line which is fine but do we want to stress all stones or just the cap for that effect present 9X18 veneer made from granite with “I believe” a split face finish and thermal treatment.

Alan Reinhart, Eric Savetsky, Bob Gardner, Phil Bartlett

INTERIOR WALL

Bartsch – Want to go with granite cap that is finished like bluestone in finish and size. Don’t want a wall cap that matches the paving stone, so went with dark granite. Wall stone at yard termed fieldstone is from disassembled walls. Thought granite more square and in keeping with rest of material. It was a design decision based on what I think is fieldstone and looks best with the rest of the material. We believe that what is built interior today was approved and would love to put a dark granite cap on it and move forward. Ordered Liberty Stone. We term Liberty Stone as Fieldstone. Cost \$11K to build to tear out \$13K, to reorder & rebuild \$21K

Savetsky – this is granite matches what is used elsewhere and lichen covered PA rock is not in keeping with rest of park materials. To tear out and rebuild is onerous especially where “Fieldstone” and color were not designed in original application. Want to find out in a court of law what is defined as Fieldstone.

Bartlett – Who besides HDC will really care about the looks? We’re not going to turn around and spend another 50-60-thousand dollars on this project. We wanted something nice.

Reinhart – I can show you on the moors stone exactly like what has been installed.

Concerns

(5:05) BLOCK SIZE

Williams – Barham and I went out and walked every bit of Neil Patterson’s yard and saw a block without chiseled edges. Flame finished stone is more porous and darkens quickly.

Barham – Patterson described material delivered to park site as cleft. Prefer curved edges/corners. Ok with Y stones under cast. Patterson felt he could closely replicate the look of the Pacific National Bank (PNB) foundation.

Norton – Agree with Barham on design. Don’t think stone presented at meeting does not achieve what HDC is looking for. Flame finish gives an aged look.

McLaughlin – Not in favor of the park. Went to Patterson’s second road past brick shop there are stones similar in color and texture as those at bank, 180 feet of them that would be more appropriate material.

Roggeveen – Can stone be planed after installation? (Bartsch - could be)

INTERIOR WALL

Roggeveen – original plans referred to “Fieldstone” with granite cap. Issue is stone work with some sort of cap. Uncertain about term “Fieldstone,” which is used loosely around Island. Whatever a stone is called, is the finished wall approvable, that is the issue before us.

Williams – Talked to Patterson about “Fieldstone” and looked at many types at his yard. The stone at 1 Fair is not “Fieldstone”; according to Patterson, it is manufactured in his shop. OK with a 2” bluestone cap. I have applauded Land Banks’ efforts concerning this park from the beginning. The stone Bartsch proposes can be mitigated and the visibility is minimal from the Fair street. I can live with it.

Norton – Would never approve this wall as designed, never have, and never will. Those stones are inappropriate.

Barham – Agree with Norton. At Patterson’s saw stones picked from fields with lichen growing on it and stones from river bottom that are called fieldstone. Stone chopped in a shop could never be called fieldstone. What was meant by fieldstone if fieldstone was intended to mean anything during the discussions leading to the approval? Concerned about the introduction of yet another color in stone material. Stone installed looks largely out of place on Main Street.

McLaughlin – The proposed stone is inappropriate for down town. Conversely have heard people wondering why something so modern is going in there, why wasn’t it just left a grassy lawn? Original plans never detailed the interior walls.

Roggeveen – Field stone is formed geologically, not in a shop. The park is formal by lay out not necessarily the material. Williams and I agree with Land Bank. Once drawn in, it is acceptable for blocks constructing the wall to look different. Majority of board does not agree with Bartsch. Possible to go forward with everything except the veneer along the interior walls. Whatever Patterson defines as fieldstone, that is what should have been ordered. If what was ordered and delivered was not what was approved, then it has to be corrected or a revision applied for.

Conclusion

Block Size – Granite sized in 29 May plan cut, plane finished that most resembles PNB across street with cap with same finish on top and vertical rock face.

Interior Wall – Majority of board understand that what was built was not what was approved. Have a green light to go ahead with rest of park except for interior wall, can return later for a consensus on material.

Proposed Minutes for June 2, 2009

2.	51 Baxter Road LLC	51 Baxter Road – SAB	New cottage	49-16	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli				
Concerns	(6:28) McLaughlin – garage door facing road. Barham – height, and startled at amount of ground cover, would like it moved closer to road like other secondary buildings along the road. Original building was square and smaller, this is very massive compared to other secondary buildings along street. Large shed balcony on East elevation. Williams – support going for variance to move closer to road. Should go to one story like others. Balcony on second floor. Norton – agree. Roggeveen – Garage needs to be a free-standing element, present design would put car in part of house.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions (Williams)				
Vote	5-0			Certificate #	
3.	Walsh, Robert	8 Howard Court – HSAB	Shed	42.3.4-79	Structures Ultd
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Nancy Drazhal				
Concerns	(6:34) Norton – House is a contributing structure and the shed blocks the view of the house. It needs to be located so it doesn't do that. Barham – Needs to be relocated. McLaughlin – Agrees. Williams – Agree.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for resiting and door & windows to be wood & TDL. (Norton)				
Vote	5-0			Certificate #	
4.	Briggs, Jason	97 Low Beach Road – SAB	New dwelling	757-31.2	C. Webster
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing	Chip Webster – 6 feet shorter in length and 3 feet shorter in height. Our attempt to simplify massing Ethan Griffin – there is a serious reduction in height from neighboring houses and others have similar massing.				
Concerns	(6:37) SAB comments read. Roggeveen - Massing issues are fundamental and should go over those and save details for later. Williams – Has the same problem as the other one did, though much simpler. Rectangle with gables to disguise 90-foot length. Cross gables and side gables forward of front door. No additive massing. Front door treatment inappropriate. Barham – Too symmetrical which reflects lack of additive massing. Long-running ridge. Needs to be more diagrammatic. Needs to be less formal and less massive. Norton – Chimney caps need to be detailed out. Agree with massing issues. McLaughlin – Agree. Roggeveen – Everything out there looks the same; building designs have deviated so much from the norm that they no longer look like typical Nantucket. I advocate to returning to basics. We need a “story” built off a main mass.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Williams)				
Vote	5-0			Certificate #	
5.	St. John, Charles	4 Midland Avenue – MAB	Add exterior stairs	59.3-170	Emeritus
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing					
Concerns	(6:49) McLaughlin – stairs, which are hanging out, are visible from the pond.				
Motion	Motion to Approve due to lack of visibility. (Williams)				
Vote	4-1, McLaughlin			Certificate # 53832	
6.	Savel Nominee Trust	47 Pocomo Road	Re-site pool & hardscape	15-19	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham				
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley				
Representing					
Concerns	Held for revisions at agent's request.				
Motion					
Vote				Certificate #	

Roggeveen – depart 6:52 p.m.

Proposed Minutes for June 2, 2009

7. Presta, Barbara	53 Orange Street – HSAB	Window revisions	42.3.2-153	D. Wiley
Sitting	Norton, , Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	David Wiley - Chris Skehel			
Concerns	(6:52) Williams – lacks an actual window and door schedule that details sizes and manufacturer. Black grate over top of basement window on North elevation. Norton – Why is foundation highlighted? Due to grade change is going up 8 inches. South elevation basement windows match size of glass, but on North elevation is a totally different size. Glass size should all be the same.			
Motion	Motion to Approve Through Staff with corrected drawings reflecting door steps, 6-light window on North elevation needs to match pane size, egress window needs to be 12 over 12, need proper window/door schedule, black wrought iron grate over window wells, and call out step material.			
Vote	3-0	Certificate #	53833	

Roggeveen - return 7:05 p.m.

8. MacLeod, Judith	56 Orange Street – HSAB	Addition	55.4.1-80	Lyman Perry
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs , Wagley			
Representing	Scott Hutton – Color coded drawings showing what remains and what changes (green remain, red removed)			
Concerns	(7:01) Norton – West elevation second-floor dormers don’t have correct setback and don’t look right architecturally. Need details on door surround and window trim, would be fine with putting headcasing back on. Hesitant about roofwalk without historical data. North elevation addition is 1898 and 6/9 windows potentially could have been original to structure and don’t want them removed. South elevation, appreciate removal of bump out. Reuse windows. East elevation is overwhelming and feels as if an awful lot is being done to it. Feels very massive. McLaughlin – Screened areas under porch are visible and set a bad precedence. Barham – Agree with Norton. Chimney would disappear into roofwalk and unless strong evidence exists would not agree to roofwalk. West elevation shed dormers on front; perhaps should be gable with dropped eave and windows should be smaller. East elevation dormers are not set back 3 feet on center 3 rd floor dormers and should be smaller. More of the original doors should be reused. Williams – Roofwalk is too wide. Agree with Norton on North elevation windows. East elevation 3 rd -floor dormer should not be crowded. Roggeveen – South elevation roofwalk shows a railing that does not appear on other elevation. West elevation should be a single gable. Seems odd to allow an infill house to have a roofwalk and not this one. The design of this house could support a roofwalk.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Williams)			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		

9. MacLeod, Judith	56 Orange Street – HSAB	New garage/apartment	55.4.1-80	Lyman Perry
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley, Hill Holdgate			
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for main house			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		

10. MacLeod, Judith	56 Orange Street – HSAB	Demo existing garage	55.4.1-80	Lyman Perry
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley, Hill Holdgate			
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for main house			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		

Roggeveen - depart 7:27 p.m.

Proposed Minutes for June 2, 2009

11. Merson, John	71 Baxter Road – SAB	Move/renovate main house	49-26.1	J. Merson
Sitting	Williams, Barham Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	John Merson – Hip roof does require us to go up higher. Added a fence to hide slanted windows. 6A shows modified hip roof. 6B shows regular hip roof.			
Concerns	(7:28) Barham – 6B hip roof is promising. Like the vertical fence treatment hiding the windows. South elevation, the picket treatment of railings looks out of place; the vertical should be carried into porch & balcony railings. Cantilevered balcony on East elevation would like to see it blended into horizontal roofs. Coombs – East elevation lower left windows need to be aligned with ones above. Williams – West elevation 6B, left roof needs to be corrected hip drawing.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions on ¼ scale drawings with roof plan.			
Vote	3-0	Certificate #		

Roggeveen - returned 7:40 p.m.

12. Merson, John	71 Baxter Road – SAB	Move off garage	49-26.1	J. Merson
Sitting	Williams, Barham Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	John Merson			
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for main house			
Vote	3-0	Certificate #		

13. Lawler, Joseph	6 Packet Drive – SAB	New dwelling	73-48	M. O'Connor
Sitting	Roggeveen, Williams, Barham			
Alternates				
Representing	Maurice O'Conner – changed floor plans to identify main and secondary masses. Simplified massing. Joseph Lawler – Created a floor plan then drove around 'Sconset discussing design elements we liked.			
Concerns	(7:42) Barham – Still find it busy. South elevation has too many substantial dormers, begs the question if a full 2-stories wouldn't be better. Symmetrical porch that extends beyond main mass element. Large 2 nd -floor porch over main entrance. North elevation outdoor shower visible from road. Williams – Agree with Barham. South elevation oversized deck, railing should be shingled. Main mass steps up two feet. Sidelights should be broken up to smaller pane sizes. 6/1 windows don't work on this style of house. The 4-lights and 6/1 and French doors and sidelights are all in conflict; need to pick one style and go with it. Roggeveen – Agree with Barham. Have a very tall 1½-story house. Could simplify by going to 30 feet with full 2 nd floor. Need to pick a house design the work out a floor plan. On Nantucket starting with a floor plan and putting a skin on it doesn't work. Also, can't mix and match elements from various houses into one.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and to talk to staff. (Williams)			
Vote	3-0	Certificate #		

14. Lawler, Joseph	6 Packet Drive – SAB	New garage	73-48	M. O'Connor
Sitting	Roggeveen, Williams, Barham			
Alternates				
Representing	Maurice O'Conner Joseph Lawler			
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for main house			
Vote	3-0	Certificate #		

Proposed Minutes for June 2, 2009

15. Auerbach, Herbert	18 Long Pond Drive – MAB	Garage/studio	59-20	D. Holcomb
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	David Holcomb – Reduced the height and deck size. Changed garage doors to 10 light vertical doors. 9/9 windows match main house.			
Concerns	<p>Fay Gilfoy – Deck is adjacent to “my” deck so it would be like they are on my deck.</p> <p>(8:12) Norton – Still at issue with the complexity of the gables compared with the very simple form of the main house. West elevation above doors the pop-up flush gables. North elevation is way more complicated than it needs to be. South elevation 2nd-floor deck not appropriate. This is becoming a second dwelling, not a garage. Williams – why do garage doors face the way the do? Wider & longer than main house. It is bigger the main house with more details so can not be considered an ancillary building. Massive 8-foot doors especially the small door to the right of W elevation. 2-foot bumpouts are something we are not approving anymore. McLaughlin – no comments. Barham – Each elevation has a pent roof. Agree about deck. Agree that needs to be simpler form. Seven-foot doors don’t need 9-foot ceilings. There are ways to drop it down even more. Roggeveen – supposed to garage with studio. Typically garage is main and lawnmowers added; the ancillary storage needs to be moved to ancillary massing. There is no way this is just a studio, it is a potential apartment.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions (Williams)			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		

III.HDC BUSINESS	
Review Minutes -	May 26
Approve Minutes -	May 19 – adopted by unanimous consent.
60 Day Denials -	
Other Business -	<p>22 Hussey Street – Williams – Barham and I met with S. Andersen, they have almost enough old brick to go around the whole house. Barham – basement windows stuck into concrete walls in modern fashion instead of brought forward with brick work as of old. Want to bounce that off HDC. Roggeveen – windows should be flush with brickwork. Staff to convey to S. Andersen about windows.</p> <p>Prospect Hill Cemetery – requesting and 18” deep instead of 12” deep wall. Unanimous consent that is ok.</p>
Commission Comments	<p>White Elephant fence – staff is looking into it.</p> <p>Replacement columns on Pleasant Street – what was put back matches exactly what was taken away.</p> <p>Concrete retaining wall – Wheymouth St. Signed off during winter, but following u p with letter ref planting with ivy.</p> <p>1 Fair Interior Wall – asked if could put cap on and let HDC get a look at it in the final condition and whether or not visible.</p>

Adjourned 8:45 p.m.

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