



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Diane Coombs (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, Abigail Camp, Vallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Stephen Welch, Terence Watterson, Jessie Dutra

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, February 04, 2020

Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room – 4:30 p.m.

Called to order at 4:35 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist

Attending Members: Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson

Absent Members: Coombs

Late Arrivals: Dutra at 4:40 pm. Camp at 4:43 pm

Early Departures: None

Agenda adopted as amended by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 7 Van Fleet Cir LLC 01-0565	7 Van Fleet Circle	Re-site structure 20'	91-116	Alexander Boyce
2. DiSibio, Amy 01-0569	4 Masaquet Avenue	Window revision	80-194	NAG
3. Jones, Duane 01-0566	4 Yawkey Way	Rev 63904: windows	69-297	Val Oliver
4. Whippen, Wayne 01-0563	13 Quidnet Road	Shed	21-117.7	Thornewill Design
5. Reid, Robert 01-0575	32 Hooper Farm Road	Garage roof change	67-24	Self
6. Reed, Victor 01-0576	19 Miacomet Avenue	Roof change	67-211	Self
7. Richard Phillips Tr 01-0577	19 East Tristam Avenue	Gate/driveway	31-4.1	Jardins International
8. Nashaquisset Coop 01-0567	8 Yompasham	Shed	55-540	Cathy Vizzari
9. Hawthorne Park Prt 01-0462	53 Hummock Pond Road	Shed	56-816	Workshop APD
10. Bank of America 01-0579	15 Sparks Avenue	Pergola change	55-177	Brisbano Architect
Voting	Welch (acting chair), Watterson, McLaughlin			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl, Oliver			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve (Watterson)			
Vote	Carried 2-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	HDC2020-01-(as noted)	

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Whippen, Wayne 01-0564	13 Quidnet Road	Pool/patio	21-117.7	Thornewill Design
• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
2. Peachley, Mega 01-0452	3 Newtown Lane	A/C condensers	55-579.8	Ronan Bradley
• Option 1 from plans; A/C Condensers must be screened and not visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
3. Keith, Katie Designs 01-0561	1 Doc Ryder Drive	Pool	66-209	Permits Plus
• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No additional concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	HDC2020-01-(as noted)	

IV. OLD BUSINESS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Parotto, Linda 01-0535	3 Coon Street	Roof shingles	55.1.4-84.1	George Wing
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	George Wing				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:40)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: no concerns if like kind. The issue was the applicant had requested a color not approvable in the old historic district (OHD).</p> <p>Wing – His client will go with Colonial slate architectural shingles.</p> <p>Welch – That is on the approvable list.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve the Colonial slate architectural. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0535	
2.	Cederview Point, LLC 01-0529	40 Shawkemo Road	Porch/fenestration	27-4	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Camp (acting Chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:43)	<p>Botticelli – Presented an alternative at the table.</p> <p>Oliver – You can't see the building now; she's assuming the vegetation will remain.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comment.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve per Exhibit A submitted at the table. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0529	
3.	Reinemo Family 01-0458	Tuckernuck	New dwelling	95-19	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson				
Alternates	Camp read back in.				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and correspondence.				
Representing	Val Oliver				
Public	Matt Reinemo, homeowner				
Concerns (4:50)	<p>Oliver – Reviewed precedent photos concerning the roof being 9/12.</p> <p>Camp – Thinks most houses on Tuckernuck historically have steeper gables.</p> <p>Watterson – Doesn't think this is visible except possibly from one of the trails (dirt roads) so he has no concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Have to approve due to lack of visibility because of the roof pitch.</p> <p>Pohl – Our charter is visibility from a public way; there are no public ways on Tuckernuck.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve due to lack of visibility from a publicly travelled way. (McLaughlin)				
Vote	Carried 3-0//Camp abstain		Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0458	
4.	Be Kind Devel 01-0420	154 Cliff Road	New dwelling	41-73	Sophie Metz
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Sophie Metz				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:53)	<p>Metz – Presented project.</p> <p>Oliver – This is visible from Hickory Meadows; but it is beautiful and appropriate.</p> <p>Watterson – It's a bit tall at 29'10" but it's pretty tucked away.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Confirmed the 4-light windows are fixed.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0420	

5. Be Kind Devel **01-0421** 154 Cliff Road Garage 41-73 Sophie Metz
 Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson
 Alternates Welch, Dutra
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Sophie Metz
 Public None
 Concerns (4:58) **Metz** – Presented project.
 No concerns.
 Motion **Motion to Approve. (Watterson)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # **HDC2020-01-0421**
6. Be Kind Devel **01-0422** 154 Cliff Road Guesthouse 41-73 Sophie Metz
 Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson
 Alternates Welch, Dutra
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Sophie Metz
 Public None
 Concerns (5:00) **Metz** – Presented project.
Oliver – Her only concern is the two open wings; keep the one with the fireplace and eliminate the other.
Watterson – Doesn't think it'll be visible.
Camp – Agrees with Ms. Oliver but doesn't think it'll be visible. She doesn't agree about brackets always being straight at 45 degrees; there are a lot of examples of curved brackets.
McLaughlin – Suggested eliminating the curved brackets.
Pohl – Agrees with Ms. Oliver about eliminating the wing without the fireplace. They can come back when it's framed up; we can determine visibility at that time.
 Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with the northern-most wing to be changed to a pergola and no brackets. (Oliver)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # **HDC2020-01-0422**
7. Iliiev, Borislav **12-0380** 9 Maclean Lane Roof & basement access 55-485 JB Studio
 Voting Camp (acting Chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Juraj Bencat, JB Studio
 Public None
 Concerns (5:08) **Bencat** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; moved the basement access to the rear.
 No concerns.
 Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # **HDC2019-12-0380**
8. Lyubomir, Lyobenov **01-0527** 7 Toombs Court New dwelling 68-153.1 JB Studio
 Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Dutra
 Alternates Welch, Watterson
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing John Hodgkiss
 Public None
 Concerns (5:12) **Hodgkiss** – Presented the project; contends there is no visibility.
Oliver – This area is very mixed architecturally with several large buildings; no concerns give the context.
Camp – Would prefer more 1st- and 2nd-floor windows be aligned on the rear and right elevations.
Dutra – Agrees about aligning the 1st- and 2nd-floor windows.
McLaughlin – No comments.
 Motion **Motion to approve through staff aligning the left 2nd-floor window with the 1st-floor window on the right elevations per Exhibit A. (Dutra)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # **HDC2020-01-0527**

9.	12 Lincoln Avenue N.T.	12 Lincoln Avenue	New second dwelling	30-183	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:21)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; offered to remove the connector.</p> <p>Oliver – She would approve this without the connector.</p> <p>Camp – No concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments.</p> <p>Welch – No comments.</p>				
Motion	Motion to approve through staff without the connector. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	73371	
10.	Wilner, Sheila Trust 01-0548	10 Beach Street	Move off/demo dwelling	73.2.4-10	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:30)	<p>Pohl – Read SAB comments: not appropriate; this is contributing. Read Holly Backus comments: 1940s bungalow, contributing; shouldn't be demolished; consider appropriate addition.</p> <p>MacEachern – Presented project; feels a house of this age is on the cusp and others of this age have been moved or demolished. Most correspondence commented about construction parking; there was no opposition to a move or demolition. Doesn't think old Codfish looked like this; it looks like a trailer.</p> <p>Oliver – She's beginning to question what is contributing and what that is based upon; asked for input from a historical expert. Doesn't think this is contributing.</p> <p>Camp – Thinks this is contributing because of its size, windows, and harkens to old Codfish Park; the lot is large enough for this to become a nice cottage. Now everything is being gentrified, and we're losing a part of history. The large 2-over-2 windows are very appropriate to Codfish Park.</p> <p>Welch – This looks like mid-20th-century ranch. He'd like to see photos of what was there mid-century.</p> <p>McLaughlin – This was there in the late 1940s; he doesn't think it warrants contributing status.</p> <p>Pohl – The appropriate location for this to be moved is within Codfish Park. He'd like to see more photos of Codfish Park from before the storm that took out three streets.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for additional information and alternative locations where it might go. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
11.	Wilner, Sheila Trust 01-0547	10 Beach Street	New dwelling	73.2.4-10	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	Neighbor, no name given				
Concerns (5:48)	<p>MacEachern – Presented project.</p> <p>Pohl – Read SAB comments: north elevation looks like back entry but faces street; east elevation too many French doors; south elevation 2nd-floor deck weighs down; 12/12 out of scale. Read Holly Backus comments: proposed dwelling is a lot larger in footprint and scale and out of character with Codfish Park; requested Nantucket Preservation Trust to provide historic photos of existing; those should have been filed into the first application. Should have a shallower pitch.</p> <p>No name given – No neighbors have concerns with removing the existing structure; our main concern is construction timing.</p> <p>Camp – The west elevation is simple and good; fenestration is chaotic. East and north elevations have too many French doors; should have more windows on the 2nd-floor. Agrees the balcony overwhelms the south elevation. West elevation, the gable isn't Codfish Park.</p> <p>Welch – With respect to scale, this should come down to 1.5 stories. He's looking at this through the lens of what's there now; he might make more restrictive comments once he sees the historic photos requested for the previous application.</p> <p>Oliver – Agrees about this being 1.5 stories. Doesn't recall any houses in Codfish Park with 12/12 pitch. Suggested dropping the ceiling height of the 1st floor or bring it down with a mudblock. Porch across the front shouldn't have gables. Agrees with Ms. Camp about the 2nd-floor decks and windows. Would like the awnings.</p> <p>McLaughlin – West elevation, must change dormer to align meeting rail. East elevation, too much glass.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (McLaughlin)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		

12. Ash, Diane 01-0546		23 Pine Street	Rev. 11-0244: fenestration	42.3.2-113	Emeritus
Voting	Camp (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Pohl, Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:00)	<p>Camp – Read HSAB comments: north elevation chimney should stay if historic; French doors facing Pine Street not appropriate and too much glass; which is the front door; stubby pergola; prefer 6-over-6; is hardscaping part of this. Read Holly Backus comments: windows to stay as original approved; no concerns with pergola addition; chimney gives it character.</p> <p>MacEachern – Presented project. Hardscaping will be under a separate application.</p> <p>Oliver – Appreciates effort; thinks this should stay at least 6-over-1 but 2-over-2 changes the whole character; don't need shutters on the 2nd floor; should stay simple. The pergola will be visible. Doesn't think they need double doors for the living room. Likes the idea of the chimney but isn't bound to it. Minimize the amount of 1st-floor glass. Suggested the pergola be natural to weather if they have to keep it.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with much Ms. Oliver said. Going back to 6-over-6 will open up solutions on fenestration and options for doors. He'd prefer the chimney stay but losing it doesn't diminish the final product.</p> <p>Dutra – Okay with 2-over-2. Understands concerns with pergola and French doors and would like to see appropriate changes.</p> <p>McLaughlin – East elevation, pergola facing the road isn't appropriate to the neighborhood. The ratio of windows to wall is excessive; proposed windows too tall.</p> <p>Camp – Okay with 2-over-2 and shutters and elimination of chimney. French doors on the street are inappropriate. The 2-over-2 windows look a little tall and perhaps just one French door.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for Revisions. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
13. MacKenzie, Ian 01-0541		2/4 Howard Court	Rev. 11-0163: wndw/chmny	42.3.4-36	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:16)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: incomplete application; pitch might be as-built in progress; existing chimney brick should not disappear; windows on porch should be double-hung; refer to previous HDC approval. Read Holly Backus comments: why increase ridge height; Boston sash true-divided light (TDL) on both south and east elevations which face Howard Court. HDC can exempt the use of simulated-divided light (SDL) windows for reasons of maintaining historic fabric.</p> <p>MacEachern – Presented project; SDL are due to wind-rating but requested the historic exemption letter</p> <p>Camp – Okay with raising 6 inches. Previous windows more appropriate; the proposed windows are too elongated. Chimney seems too stout and could be fixed by adding an owl.</p> <p>Oliver – Existing structures are exempt from the wind-rating requirements. Agrees with Ms. Camp. The 16-light windows should not be casements; she'd prefer they be sliding. Larger windows don't correlate with the door.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with Ms. Camp. Would like to see the chimney about 5 feet above the roof. The proposed window openings are 4'9"; the old ones were 3'9".</p> <p>McLaughlin – Asked about the 16-light windows.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		

14. Everts, Hale	12-0300	46 Monomoy Road	Deck addition/alterations	54-71	Ethan McMorrow
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Ethan McMorrow				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:31)	<p>McMorrow – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – It looks like an entire section is being removed and rebuilt out of proportion. She'd like to see a demolition plan and what's being rebuilt with floor plans.</p> <p>Welch – He'd like to see a perspective of the existing and proposed from the east up to the eastern corner of the garage. This is an iconic structure and we need to clearly understand it.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees.</p> <p>Dutra – Agrees.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments at this time.</p> <p>Pohl – East elevation shows the gable facing the street with a lower gable behind, which in the proposed is taller and longer; that is a demolition. Essentially everything but the garage is being demolished.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for existing plans, floor plans, demo plan and two perspectives. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
15. Heyworth, Benton	01-0425	8 Pond Road	Guest house	56-156	CWA
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:39)	<p>Webster – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – We have no previous submittal. Dormers need to come in 3 feet off the edge, especially facing the street. The people door looks taller than the garage door.</p> <p>Watterson – Asked for beefed up trim around all doors. Agrees with the setback of the dormers.</p> <p>Dutra – Agrees with what's been said.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments.</p> <p>Pohl – Asked that there be no shingle course between window head and fascia on the dormer. There's a heavy line on the barn door that shouldn't be there.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff moving dormers in the required 3 feet from the building edge; dormers lowered so fascia is on the window headcasing; and more trim on the east elevation doors; per Exhibit A. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0425	
16. Mueller, Nantucket Assoc.	34 Prospect Street		Garage	55.4.4-77	CWA
Voting	Camp (acting chair), Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:45)	<p>Webster – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – We need previous submittal. We discussed oversized French doors; those are 8 feet over 7-foot garage doors. Northwest elevation, the door is too much of an anomaly in this area; should be plain French door. Questions overall height of the northeast elevation regardless of the drop off; it'll consume the house; suggested retainage to mitigate.</p> <p>Dutra – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. The northeast elevation perceived height is exacerbated by the rails and French doors; suggested removing the rails or a hipped roof to hide them.</p> <p>Discussion on how to mitigate the height of the northeast elevation.</p> <p>Welch – You're 20 feet off Prospect Street while the house is 50 feet off Prospect and the size is way out of proportion; it's too wide and too tall. The streetscape is part of the historical setting; this structure 20 feet from the street is too much. Feels the bigger picture concern is the overall siting and size of the structure. This is almost as wide as the main house is deep and as long as the house and connector; this is a huge structure in the front yard of an iconic structure.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #		

17. Spencer, Steven	01-0471	6 Magnolia Avenue	Demo existing structure	73.3.1-57	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson, Dutra				
Alternates	Welch & Camp read back in.				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and historic documentation.				
Representing	Carrie Thornewill, Thornewill Design Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design Steven Spencer, owner Linda Williams				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:56)	<p>Spencer – Based upon previous comments, we’ve come up with a new proposal; explained their evaluation of the property indicated the existing structure had been significantly altered.</p> <p>Williams – Reviewed the history of the structure as detailed in the historic packet. There was a gambrel structure on this lot in the 1920s which did not have the existing roof line; believes all sides and the roof have been moved or replaced since the mid-1960s. This has been moved at least once.</p> <p>Thornewill – Believes a lot of original sheathing was rotten; even covered sheathing is not original. Feels that the groundcover isn’t any greater than for any other lot.</p> <p>Pohl – Read into the record letters of concerns from Rob Benchley and Angus MacLeod.</p> <p>Dutra – Confirmed that the structure didn’t move after 1923. Not in favor of a demolition of the gambrel. Mr. MacLeod’s points are valid that something nice can be done with this to carry the character of the 1916 structure even without the historic fabric; it is not structurally unstable.</p> <p>Oliver – Questions the survey; it seems each one says contributing. We are holding the Codfish Park house because we want to confirm why it is being noted as contributing. The information is very helpful. Would like the front element to retain its present façade and character. Something of the front mass should be saved.</p> <p>Watterson – Agrees the front gambrel should be preserved.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Wants to see the next application.</p> <p>Pohl – The fate of the front gambrel is tied to what’s being added on and he wants to see the new proposal. The gambrel form is to scale and really attractive and the board would like to see that retained.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold until after review of the new addition. (Dutra)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
18. Spencer, Steven	01-0470	6 Magnolia Avenue	New dwelling	73.3.1-57	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson, Dutra				
Alternates	Welch & Camp read back in.				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Carrie Thornewill, Thornewill Design Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design Steven Spencer, owner Linda Williams				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:20)	<p>Thornewill – Presented the revised project.</p> <p>Pohl – Read into the record letters of concerns from Rob Benchley, Rita Carr, and Mary Wilkes.</p> <p>Dutra – Huge improvement from first submittal; happy how the gambrel forward is more complementary. The rear addition is still much larger and should be minimized in any way such as reduce the height. In the previous submittal the east and west elevation gambrel looked better but with the gambrel forward would be better on the dormers.</p> <p>Oliver – Thinks Mr. Dutra’s suggestion would make it look wider. Appreciates the changes. Changing to 2-over-2 is a concern; there’s something about the scale of having smaller panes especially facing the street.</p> <p>Watterson – In general the redesign “nails it.” The original mass might be subordinate but maintains the history and streetscape. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about the windows especially facing the street.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Noted a typographical error.</p> <p>Discussion about saving the front gambrel.</p> <p>Pohl – In every other historic district, if you have an old building, the new part shouldn’t look like the existing. What will really help is a perspective view. We’re all favorably inclined to what is proposed and looking for minor tweaks to fenestration. We need more information on the front part of the building in order to rule on saving versus dismantling versus razing.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (McLaughlin)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		

19. Silva, David **01-0536** 11 Upper Tawpawshaw Window/deck changes 53-45 Self
 Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson
 Alternates Welch
 Recused Dutra
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing John Newman
 Public None
 Concerns (7:52) **Newman** – Presented project.
Oliver – All that will be visible is the front, which only has one window move down low.
 Motion **Motion to Approve without the pergola. (Oliver)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # **HDC2020-01-0536**

20. ACK Properties, LLC **01-0533** 7 & 9 Hussey Street Pergola/outdoor shower 42.3.4-64 BPC
 Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Dutra
 Alternates Welch, Watterson
 Recused None
 Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, and advisory comments.
 Representing Joe Paul, BPC
 Public None
 Concerns (7:57) (6:38) Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver) Carried unanimously
Pohl – Read HSAB comments: shower should be on Quince Street side; pergola profile helpful; approvable due to existing deck. Read Holly Backus comments: pergola not an appropriate feature; however, proposed is over existing deck; outdoor shower proposed location odd toward the front of the structure.
Paul – Presented project. This might be worth a visit; due to screening the shower will be minimally visible since it starts 4 feet below street level with a 5-foot fence.
Oliver – Wants to view. Pictures would have been helpful.
 Motion **Motion to View. (Oliver)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate #

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes	January 7, 14 & 21, 2020: Motion to Approve. (Dutra) carried unanimously
Review Minutes	January 28, 2020
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Article 62 Preservation of Historically Significant Buildings <p>Pohl – This is to go at the beginning of the Feb. 11 agenda for public participation. Andrew Vorce, PLUS Director, wants to present this due to possible logistical issues. Welch – There is a letter from Town Counsel indicates that the Historical Commission is the body that usually deals with this sort of thing; encouraged members to read that. There’s a political aspect to this; it might make sense to provide an alternative when we don’t have the resource to hold permits for 12 months. His concern is that we come out as not for it as written but if it’s voted in as is, we are in a worse position than previously. Motion to go at beginning of February 11, 2020 agenda. (Welch) carried unanimously</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mission Statement for Town Website vote Vote for two HDC representatives for the MVP-Resilient Nantucket 2/14/20 <p>McCarthy – Ms. Backus wants the HDC to vote on representatives. Welch – Asked for clarification about this as he’s been involved with this already. He’s happy to be involved. The historic preservation guidelines are part of this. Oliver – She is also already involved and happy to continue with this. Motion to Appoint Ms. Oliver and Mr. Welch as HDC representatives to the MVP-Resilient Nantucket. (Camp) Carried unanimously</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Preservation Guideline efforts Organizational Focus Committee Application pictures Roof plans: threshold Plans: Scale of Elevations, Floor & Roof Plans Application checklist: Differentiation between complex/simple; minimum standards Application as Master Sheet Discussion of Net Zero Stretch Code and impacts to HDC Discussion and update on Nantucket Sidewalk Work Group
Commission Comments	Oliver – She put in a warrant article to lower the height, which she presented to FinCom and was asked to get HDC support for that article. Pohl – Asked this be added to the Other Business.

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Town Warrant Article 62 Preservation of Historically Significant Buildings.

Adjourned at 8:15 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Sconset Advisory Board