



Proposed Minutes for June 16, 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

~~ MEETING ~~

June 16, 2009 – OLD BUSINESS
Cyrus Peirce Middle School Cafeteria – 5:00 pm

Called to order 5:00 p.m. Staff in attendance M. Voigt & T. Norton

I. CONSENT	ADDRESS	PROPOSED WORK	M&P	AGENT
1. Island Buggies Auto Rental – 53861	41 Old South Road	Sign	68-8	W. Siltanea
2. Sabelhaus, Robert – 53862	3 Heather Lane	Porch change	30-241	Botticelli & Pohl
3. Stueck/Epstein – 53863	7 Hamblin Road	Replace windows	30-201	S. Aloisi
4. GHYC – 53864	60 Union Street – HSAB	Widen door	55.1.4-35	Emeritus
5. Bauer, Richard – 53865	60 Orange Street – HSAB	Replace arbor	55.4.1-133	Wingworks
6. Chester Barrett Jr. Trust – 53866	21 Somerset Road	Deck and Color change	56-163	Self
7. Glidden, C. Bud – 53867	13 Waydale Road	Fence	67-32	Self
8. Remwin LLC - 53868	95 Hinsdale Road	Fence	69-24.2	Holcomb Design
Sitting	Roggeveen, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates	Wagley			
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Approve (Williams)			
Vote	4-0, McLaughlin abstain		Certificate #	53861 to 53868

Norton arrived 5:06 p.m.

II. NEW BUSINESS	ADDRESS	PROPOSED WORK	M&P	AGENT
1. Land Bank	1 Fair Street – HSAB	Park – lighting and stone	42.3.1-152.1	D. Bartsch
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	Stone interior wall: David Bartsch – It's been said before that the veneer on the tank of the fountain is Coursed Ashlar, which is still a rather square piece of stone. The Liberty Stone was chosen with the intention of working well with the Ashlar. Suggests breaking Field Stone to give it a more square shape rather than a roundy stone more appropriate in Madaket. Would Connecticut White Line (ref. Greenberg property) be appropriate in that location? Michael May – Does not feel the as-built material of Liberty Stone is appropriate. Lighting: D. Bartsch – 8-foot aluminum pole with 17-inch fixture totaling 9 feet, 5 inches. They are in the pedestrian realm of lighting. M. May – would prefer to see only one light at the gate.			
Concerns	(5:06) Liberty Stone vs Field Stone on interior walls sans fountain: Roggeveen and Williams - Feel Liberty Stone is permissible. It is more in keeping with the formality of the rest of the park. McLaughlin – Liberty Stone is not an appropriate material for Nantucket. Barham – Agrees with McLaughlin that it is not appropriate in that location. A true Field Stone wall was carted away to make room for the new wall, so it is natural to that location. Problem with dark-grey granite for path meeting chalky-white of Liberty Stone walls. Something less worked without such a drastic difference in color to the path material. Norton – Feels strongly Liberty Stone should not be used. It is gauged: cut, chased, worked to fit. Field Stone is balanced and set intact to its natural shape into the wall. Roggeveen - We approved permits, but sign-offs are a function of the town. It is appropriate to say “No” to an as-built revision. It is not appropriate to reopen an approval. Liberty Stone was mentioned in an early rendition of the process, but the majority of the board chose Field Stone. Lighting: Norton – How does this lighting compared to the town lights?			
Motion	Motion to Approve lighting plan as laid out on “HDC two rev. date 6/16/09” Internal walls as “random set Connecticut White Line (as appears on D. Bartsch website ref. Greenberg property at 3 Packet Ln) in place of Liberty Stone.			
Vote	3-2, McLaughlin & Norton		Certificate #	53869

Proposed Minutes for June 16, 2009

2. T.O.N. (D.P.W.)	Main Street – HSAB	Replace brick sidewalk	42.3.1-206+	M. Nabulsi
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	Jeff Willett – Found only one company that manufactures restoration brick, thanks to Linda, the Homer C Godfrey Company Vermont Red Restoration Brick & Vermont Montpelier Red Brick. They are 10 to 20 times more expensive than 53 DD Glen-Gery have been using. At Tonkins of Federal Street, those are replacement bricks. There is a mixture of S&H and Glen-Gery and reused brick. Treatments of trees in the past were a hazard waiting to happen. Have used wood elsewhere downtown. Can work with staff for two things – determine where areas are of critical concern and designate them so we know to come back to commission or use some kind of predetermined brick. Relates the chain of events as he recalls them that lead up to grading and brick work being done as it was.			
Concerns	<p>Michael May – Likes the idea of identifying sensitive sections of sidewalk. (5:53) Memorandum from HDC Administrator passed out to Commissioners. Williams – If you give them (Godfrey Company) one of our old bricks, they will reproduce in mass. Norton – S&H is a harder brick and looks like the Vermont brick; Glen-Gery is a sandy brick. S&H will also make what you want, and they are in Bridgewater. You tell them you need brown and they mine brown clay. You tell them you want orange, and they wait till they hit orange clay. Don't share with McLaughlin that a "blanket" approval can go beyond the three years of an approval, and believe everyone should come in with a new request. I would never have approved that type brick (color and texture) anywhere on Main Street. The wholesale removal of all bricks is of great concern. To add, the pressure-treated surrounds at the trees are inappropriate. The sidewalks are too perfect and formal now. I could move to a better quality brick that resembles historic brick that was there; and would work with the applicant on finding a more suitable material. Other Glen-Gery bricks around town are very different from the historic brick; they are more porous and softer. McLaughlin – These bricks were given a blanket approval 25, 26 years ago and that still stands. Suggest we make the meeting June 30 an organizational meeting to discuss bricks. Barham – S&H brick have a pitted texture that gives it an old and rough look. Would like to see openings around trees expanded some – looks too gentrified too much like Connecticut. Ok with sloping to ease accessibility. My concern is the color/brick itself Roggeveen – Seems the S&H bricks are the more appropriate to use. My concern about Main Street is the color, which is very different from what was there before. We need to post public notices asking help in identifying sections of historic sidewalk areas; then set out a policy document. HDC might consider rescinding all verbal policies. DPW has never had to get permits to widen areas around trees, and don't want to start regulating that. Would like HDC to get a better handle on the costs of various types of bricks including shipping so that we can all agree on a type of brick.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for DPW and HDC staff to do more research on bricks and for help from the public sector in identifying critically important sections of sidewalks that should be preserved.			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		
3. Kelly/Irwin	87 Hummock Pond Road	New dwelling	56-301.1	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates	Wagley			
Representing	Terry Kelly			
Concerns	(6:38) Norton – No problem with design but did not get surveyed or scaled site plan for view packs. Could not find the house. Barham – Also could not find the house. Roggeveen – need the scaled plot plan.			
Motion	Motion to View with surveyed plan with building scaled on it and a ribbon on height pole marking location.			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		

Proposed Minutes for June 16, 2009

4. Keller, Dennis	3 Nosegay Lane – SAB	Solar Panel, Eco-shingles	73.1.4-14	Fletcher. Haigh
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs, Wagley			
Representing	Fletcher Haigh – the color is through out so like cedar as cedar wears down it is still cedar. As this wears down it is still the same color. Color will soften over the first 6 months.			
Concerns	<p>(6:44) Previous concerns read. McLaughlin – will be highly visible and solar should not be visible in any OHD.</p> <p>Barham – Have to view it through the lens of affect on surrounding properties and so don't find the roofing material and proposed solar array a welcomed addition. Concerned the panels face the street and are visible from street and bluff walk. It really changes the character of this building to mount these panels there and would prefer to see photovoltaic placed on the ground somewhere on this large lot. It is not for electricity which must be on the roof. Eco-shingle looks better than I thought it might, but have concerns allowing it right next to OHD and how it will weather. Presently it is very uniform in color and material but worried that as it ages it will look less like roof material and more like old tires. A decision here could negatively affect approvals down the road. Nosegay and the Bluff get a lot of foot traffic.</p> <p>Williams – If the roof shingles were closer to the black of the panels, would have far less trouble. The Eco-shingle is so far back from the road . . . who's to say what will happen in 20 to 30 years.</p> <p>Norton – concerned about visibility of panels that are adjacent to a historic structure and its causing different materials to be used on each building.</p> <p>Roggeveen – there are existing materials that are appropriate for historic buildings. I think we should stick with the existing pallet of roof material that we have rather than searching for a use for used tires. There is a natural context for allowing buildings to weather in, which plastics and rubbers do not allow. In favor of the panels.</p> <p><i>(Check roof approval for historic building on property – presently architectural.)</i></p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions to possible locations for solar off the building			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		
Break 7:10 to 7:20 Wagley depart 7:10 p.m.				
5. Lieb, Richard	10 Derry Lane	AS-BUILT garage doors	41-101	Topham Design
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing				
Concerns	<p>(7:20) Previous concerns read. Barham – Installed doors are painted white and so dominate this building and the main house as well.</p> <p>Coombs – Agree about color and would like to see them grey to match trim.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comment.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve grey to match existing trim. (Williams)			
Vote	4-1, Barham	Certificate # 53870		
6. Scheibel, Ed	1 Maxey Pond Road	AS-BUILT changes	40-107	E. Scheibel
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	Ed Scheibel – changes were minor window/door changes. In my opinion, the round window is appropriate and have submitted photos of other rounds on the island, one which is on Maxey Pond Road. Left the plans off island and redrew the plans as remembered thus the house was built without the approved plans.			
Concerns	<p>(7:23) No drawings, only photos in the view pack; Motion was to view with previous approval.</p> <p>Barham – was relying on the chance to be out there with the information. Presently heavily wooded, but there could be a future owner who removes the trees increasing visibility. The changes are not properly bubbled so there is a serious lack of clarity about what was approved and what was changed. Page 8 dormer meeting rail does not line up. Round window South elevation would not have been approved. Reluctant to approve something AS-BUILT that would not have been approved under normal channels.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Low visibility, no comment.</p> <p>Williams – agrees with McLaughlin.</p> <p>Coombs – Round window, on the South elevation gable wall, highly visible and is not architecturally appropriate to this style house.</p> <p>Norton – Troubled by not having the complete packet to view. Most of the changes are not going to be visible and are appropriate. However, the rounds are i not installed in architecturally appropriate locations and are visible.</p> <p>Staff – there was no deed restriction requiring maintenance of trees.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions to the South elevation round window			
Vote	4-1 Williams	Certificate #		

Proposed Minutes for June 16, 2009

7. Wiands, Catherine 6 Surfside Drive Fence 677-334 Self
 Sitting Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs
 Alternates
 Representing
 Concerns (7:43) Coombs - Should be normal 1-over-5 and extends beyond front of house.
 Barham – Agree.
 McLaughlin – the application is vague about the fence type.
 Norton – could put in a lower fence, max four feet, forward of the house.
 Motion Motion to **Approve** Through Staff only to front plane of house and a 6-foot board not pressure treated wood.
 Vote 4-0 **Certificate # 53871**
- Roggeveen & Williams depart 7:49 p.m.**
8. Nair, Howard 35 Okorwaw Road AS-BUILT cottage 79-152 H. Nair
 Sitting Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs
 Alternates
 Representing
 Concerns (7:49)
 Motion Motion to **Approve** due to lack of visibility
 Vote 4-0 **Certificate # 53872**
9. Nair, Howard 35 Okorwaw Road AS-BUILT shed 79-152 H. Nair
 Sitting Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs
 Alternates
 Representing
 Concerns (7:49)
 Motion Motion to **Approve** due to lack of visibility
 Vote 4-0 **Certificate # 53873**
10. Nantucket Lot 51 LLC 135 Eel Point Road New dwelling 33-12 J.G. Thorsen
 Sitting Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs
 Alternates
 Representing J. Gwynne Thorsen – site is not part of the dune fields. It is a low house with a lot of space below ground. Could put
 up poles indicating four corners of main house.
 Concerns (7:51) McLaughlin – no comments.
 Barham – toward the road there will have to be six or eight feet retained. Appreciate the low design, but runs contrary
 to guidelines against putting building on highest point. The building is sited in the wrong place and should be moved
 to a less sensitive location. Takes a curious approach to additive massing, one functional/one faux chimney, hip roofs
 flanking center piece. Character from water is strikingly different than from other angles. Flanking roofs from water
 should come to a pyramidal point. Roof lines on East elevation are over complicated. This building is going to be
 visible from many angles. West elevation deck becomes very tall due to sudden drop in ground.
 Coombs – why not move over to area where grade is 20. Tri-peak. East elevation French doors as front door. West
 elevation visibility from Eel Point on is a long view with a lot of windows and no additive massing.
 Norton – *Building with Nantucket in Mind* indicates buildings should not be constructed on highest elevation. This is a
 building on highest point with cutting back the hill crest to level the ground thus changes character of the “dunes”.
 Motion Motion to **Hold** for revisions
 Vote 4-0 **Certificate #**
- Roggeveen & Williams returned 7:59 p.m.**

Proposed Minutes for June 16, 2009

11. Sanibel Nominee Trust	14 North Water Street – HSAB	Addition to main house	42.4.2-83	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Roggeveen, Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham			
Alternates	Coombs			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli			
Concerns	(8:13) McLaughlin – French doors facing street. Southwest elevation windows should be same as rest of house. Skylight drawn and none on application. Barham – front elevation, original front door was centered between bays with window above, door located left out of alignment and should stay. Modern sidelights detract. Flight of stairs toward street characteristic to this house; “Friendship” stairs architecturally don’t work. Northwest elevation uncovered, elevated deck on corner & large thing with a fireplace. Both sides of the house are classic to that period of design. Additions should be off the back as much as possible. Would like to see some of the small Victorian “bracelet” windows retained. Norton – agree with Barham. Double front doors could work with the style and give increased light. If door is original to structure, would be best to save. Williams – Friendship stairs don’t work. Agree with keeping door centered. Three French doors should not face the street. Front should be maintained. <i>((All windows “and doors” should be True . . . on window/door schedule))</i>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		

Roggeveen departed 8:29 p.m.

12. Sanibel Nominee Trust	14 North Water Street – HSAB	Addition to garage	42.4.2-83	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for main house			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		

13. Harman, Jason	137 Hummock Pond Road	New dwelling	65-172	J. Harman
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates	Williams recused			
Representing	Jason & Natasha Harman			
Concerns	(8:30) McLaughlin – Too many windows to be a board and batten barn. Cupola too tall. Coombs – North & South elevations chimney & cupola too heavy. Dormer windows West & East elevations should not be ganged. North elevation un-gang windows on right. Barham – very visible house that is trying to be a barn and it does not work. Cupola is very high. Fenestration should go more like a barn or more like a house. Very large 40X50 feet. Chimney and cupola too close together. Cupola is too wide and should have windows on all four sides, but then would be too tall. Dormers don’t look like barn dormers, especially to front of house. Norton – At 28’ 10 11/16” is too tall for an outlying area. This is a town height building. Should come down to 27 feet maximum height. That would allow cupola with windows. Plans lacking proper window & door schedule. Leaching oil finish not approvable.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Barham)			
Vote	4-0	Certificate #		

14. Harman, Jason	137 Hummock Pond Road	New cottage	65-172	J. Harman
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates	Williams recused			
Representing	Jason & Natasha Harman			
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for main house			
Vote	4-0	Certificate #		

Proposed Minutes for June 16, 2009

20. Bayberry Farm LLC	10 Wauwinet Road	Revisions	20-13	V. Wilson/Link
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing	Tori Wilson			
Concerns	(9:26)			
Motion	Motion to Approve (Williams)			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #	53875	
21. Hofford, Gregg	6 Milestone Crossing	Revisions	68-461	Emeritus
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for beginning of June 23			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		
22. Piccirillo, Paul	125 Orange Street – HSAB	Door & Exterior stair	55-394	Emeritus
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for beginning of June 23			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		
23. Briggs, Jason	97 Low Beach - SAB	New dwelling	75-31.2	CWA
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for beginning of June 23			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		
24. Grillo, Heather	169 Polpis Road	Addition	44-18	CWA
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to View special pack to come up on June 26			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		
25. Grillo, Heather	169 Polpis Road	Move on-site shed	44-18	CWA
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to View special pack to come up on June 26			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		
26. Savel Nominee Trust	47 Pocomo Road	Pool and hardscaping	15-19	Botticelli & Pohl
Sitting	Norton, McLaughlin, Williams, Barham, Coombs			
Alternates				
Representing				
Concerns				
Motion	Motion to Hold for beginning of June 23			
Vote	5-0	Certificate #		

Proposed Minutes for June 16, 2009

27. Balling, Dan 110 Pleasant Street Revisions 55-149.1 SMRD
 Sitting Norton, McLaughlin, Barham, Coombs
 Alternates Williams recused
 Representing Moved to end of agenda at applicant's request
 Concerns
 Motion Motion to **Hold** for beginning of June 23
 Vote 4-0 **Certificate #**

III.HDC BUSINESS	
Review Minutes -	June 9
Approve Minutes -	May 26 & June 2 hold for next week
60 Day Denials -	<i>Deck, 33 Union Street for a deck - Motion to DENY due to lack of response 5-0 53876</i>
Other Business -	10 Columbus Ave, about 10X13 roofwalk being roughed out with enclosed shaft and skylight. Did we approve it? Old North Wharf on non-water side has Andersen windows on shed. (across from 6 Old North Wharf)
Commission Comments	

Adjourned 9:32 p.m.

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

TAB – Tuckernuck Advisory Board MAB – Madaket Advisory Board

PRELIMINARY