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, March 3, 2020
Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room – 4:30 p.m.

Called to order at 4:30 p.m. and announcements by Ms. Coombs

Staff in attendance: Cathy Flynn, Land Use Specialist; Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist; Esmeralda Martinez, Administrative
Specialist; Holly Backus, Preservation Planner

Attending Members:  Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Watterson

Absent Members: Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Dutra

Late Arrivals: Welch, 4:42 p.m.

Early Departures: Welch, 6:00 p.m.

Agenda adopted as amended by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

II. CONSENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lampe, Dean</td>
<td>2 Okorow Avenue</td>
<td>Cabana</td>
<td>79-131.1</td>
<td>D. Lampe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lee, Jeffrey</td>
<td>9 Aurora Way</td>
<td>Rev. 73198: fence/chimney</td>
<td>56-450</td>
<td>Design Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Westmoor Club</td>
<td>10 Westmoor Lane</td>
<td>Rev. 73263: window/door</td>
<td>41-805</td>
<td>J Graham Goldsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Steinberg, Jeanne</td>
<td>23 Surfside Road</td>
<td>Trim/window color change</td>
<td>55-113.2</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hausberg, William</td>
<td>105 Eel Point Road</td>
<td>Rev. 02-0647</td>
<td>32-5</td>
<td>John Curran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 4 Shawkemo Rd RT</td>
<td>4 Shawkemo Road</td>
<td>240 sf garage move/demo</td>
<td>43-91.1</td>
<td>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting  Coombs, Oliver, Watterson
Recused None
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None
Concerns No concerns.
Motion Motion to Approve. (Oliver)
Vote Carried 3-0
Certificate # HDC2020-02-(as noted) & -03-0### (as noted)

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Forrester, Courtney</td>
<td>141 Polpis Road</td>
<td>Rev. 70753: relocate shed</td>
<td>44-7.3</td>
<td>Normand Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Keith, Kate</td>
<td>1 Doc Ryder</td>
<td>Alterations/fenestration</td>
<td>66-209</td>
<td>Permits Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Everest, Chris</td>
<td>6 Bluebird Lane</td>
<td>Egress window well</td>
<td>68-594</td>
<td>NAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Toce, Margaret</td>
<td>18 Pequot Street</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>80-94</td>
<td>Craig Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting  Coombs, Oliver, Watterson
Recused None
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None
Concerns No additional concerns.
Motion Motion to Approve through staff per noted concerns. (Oliver)
Vote Carried 3-0
Certificate # HDC2020-02-(as noted) & -03-(as noted)
IV. OLD BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schneider, Karl</td>
<td>02-0612 84 Main Street</td>
<td>Deck/stoop/skylight</td>
<td>42.3.3-20</td>
<td>Thorneill Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting: Oliver, Welch, Watterson  
Recused: None  
Documentation: None  
Representing: None  
Public: None

Concerns:  
Staff – Applicant asked this to be held without opening for the next old-business meeting due to lack of quorum.

Motion: Motion to Approve for March 17 at applicant's request.

Vote: Carried

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Larrabee, Rich</th>
<th>02-0711 7 Millbrook Road</th>
<th>New dwelling</th>
<th>56-474</th>
<th>Val Oliver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Voting: Coombs, Watterson  
Recused: Oliver  
Documentation: None  
Representing: Val Oliver  
Public: None

Concerns: (4:35) Oliver – Asked this be held without opening.

Motion: Motion to Hold for March 10

Vote: Carried

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chesley, Richard</th>
<th>02-0732 32 West Chester Street</th>
<th>New dwelling</th>
<th>42.4.3-31</th>
<th>BPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Voting: Coombs, Oliver, Watterson, Welch (arrived 6 minutes into discussion)  
Recused: None  
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.  
Representing: Joe Paul, BPC  
Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law P.C.  
Public: None

Concerns: (4:36) Paul – Confirmed other commissioners can read back in. Presented project.

Coombs – Read HSAB comments: wall-line break along long wall; dormer overlap; glass to be vertical; front door not appropriate; west elevation, overlarge glass with commercial appearance; south elevation fenestration repetitive. Read Holly Backus comments: balcony not appropriate.

Oliver – There is a lot of open space, so this is visible. The south elevation needs to be rethought, way too much glass; the balcony should be reconsidered. This needs more additive massing. Front door needs to be more traditional. Agrees with HSAB about the west elevation. Questions it’s needs to be 29 feet tall; there are no floor heights on the plans.

Watterson – Agrees with HSAB. South elevation seems really over fenestrated; okay with the west elevation. The dormer at the massing brake is atypical. East elevation fenestration needs more sense in its layout.

Welch – West gable seems 2 feet too taller than on the south elevation. Agrees with what’s been said. No concerns due to limited visibility of the north elevation. Concerned about the height and length because this will become a template to fill the lot front to back; it needs more of a sense of secondary massing.

Coombs – Agrees it needs more additive massing. North elevation, asked about the lack of 1st-floor windows. Ganged windows on the north and south elevations should be separated. Has issues with the front door with the porch roof and 2-over-2 windows. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about reducing the height.

Held. (No motion made or voted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rudofsky, Sendra</th>
<th>01-0493 12 Nanahumacke Lane</th>
<th>Roof change/rooftop solar</th>
<th>65-79</th>
<th>Sun Wind, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Voting: Coombs, Oliver, Welch  
Recused: None  
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, sample of red cedar stained black, and manufacturer spec sheet.  
Representing: Tim Holmes, Sun Wind, LLC  
Public: T.J. Watterson – He’s opposed to the black stain; envisions it an eyesore to natural to weather roofing and will look odd and call attention to the rear.

Concerns: (4:51) Held due to lack of quorum.

Holmes – Reviewed changes made and additional information per previous concerns; used Minwax, ebony.

Welch – Feels the stain will have to be revisited to maintain it. Since this is on the back, he has no concerns. If the stain was going onto anything but the low-slope dormer roofs, he would be against it. If it does look funky, come back and we can let it bleach out.

Oliver – She sees Mr. Watterson’s point of staining where the panels are.

Coombs – She will support this to see how it looks especially after a few months.

Motion: Motion to Approve through staff with staining the low-slope dormer roofs and the black stain maintained in perpetuity. (Welch)

Vote: Carried 2-1//Oliver opposed

Certificate # HDC2020-01-0493
HDC Minutes for March 3, 2020, adopted Apr. 27

5. Hulbert ACK, LLC 02-0633 4 Hulbert Avenue Lift/renovate/addition 42.1.4-2 Sophie Metz

Voting
Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Watterson

Recused
None

Documentation
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.

Representing
Sophie Metz

Public
None

Concerns (5:02)
(4:33) Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver) carried 3-0 (Welch not yet here.)

Coombs – Read HSAB (no quorum) and Holly Backus comments.

Metz – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. In this used the exact same size 2nd-floor windows of the main house in the 2nd-floor of this as well. You asked for a water table, but we can eliminate that.

Watterson – Appreciates changes; suggested integrating the water table flush with corner boards and trim.

Oliver – In the drone shots, it is evident that this is with the other house; the blue shutters reflect that. The roof walk is out of place. The south elevation is visible from across the wetland and should have more a feel of the sunroom that was there; the way it reads now relates to the other structure; the proposed doesn’t.

Welch – The roof walk is too much of an adornment with the skirt. Integrating the water table flush into the corner boards will create a different architectural style that reads as modern small cubes rather than stacking; the drip cap is not appropriate for this location. Agrees about the north elevation fenestration; change it to capture the sense of an enclosed porch; though it isn’t visible. South elevation, the single-story mass the four-ganged windows, to him, should read as separated by something. The front door is an improvement over what exists.

Coombs – The “C” window panes as compared to the size of the “B” window panes catch her eye since there are so many. These two houses really stand out so for that reason are important.

Motion
Motion to Approve through staff with no roof walk, no water table, shutters to match the existing design and color, and surveyor certification of minimum flood height increase relative to FEMA code. (Welch)

Vote
Carried unanimously

Certificate #
HDC2020-02-0633

6. Great State Prop. 02-0589 92 Washington Street New dwelling 42.2.3-22 Smith-Hutton Arch

Voting
Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Watterson

Recused
None

Documentation
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.

Representing
No name given.

Public
None

Concerns (5:24)
Coombs – Read HSAB (no quorum) comments.

Owner Rep. – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; have a surveyor letter confirming the 9-foot minimum lift relative to the FEMA flood level. The garage is simulated-divided lights (SDL).

Watterson – Okay with all the changes. Asked what others think about the skirting, should it be on the outside. It’s halfway defensible; this is 65 feet from the road behind the garage and wood windows.

Welch – If this were natural brick it should be painted. The skirting should be separated; it’s detailed and too formal. The A/C should come back as a separate application. This is really high. Agrees about the north elevation fenestration. Asked for a description of the Norwood line of SDL windows; there should be consistency of the windows on all visible facades; he’d like to see a cut-sheet on these windows.

Oliver – She’s not sure what to think about the foundation skirting. Agrees with what’s been said. Preferred the north elevation as it was previously approved; the pane pattern draws attention to it. The windows are SDL; in the old historic district (OHD) the visible facades should be true divided light (TDL).

Coombs – This an important location in the OHD; the small buildings that were there have been demolished and what’s going in doesn’t look anything like what it was. The height should come down; it should be as small and simple as possible. The windows have to be TDL in the OHD.

Motion
Motion to Hold for revisions and a tear sheet for the windows and the A/C removed from the application. (Welch)

Vote
Carried

Certificate #
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th>11 Meadow, LLC 02-0722</th>
<th>11 Meadow Lane</th>
<th>New dwelling</th>
<th>41-448</th>
<th>Emeritus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Coombs, Oliver, Welch</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>Watterson</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (5:42)</td>
<td><strong>MacEachern</strong> – This was held for a view. <strong>Oliver</strong> – This is appropriate design; it’s unfortunate is the way the lot was cut up creating two long skinny lots in a neighborhood with low density; asked for this house to be pushed back to mitigate that perception. <strong>Welch</strong> – He’d like to see the previously approved house to see this in context to that; these doors are almost 8 feet with 5-foot windows; it’s tall. The issue of location on the lot is difficult to deal with; it should be no closer to the street than any other primary structure in the neighborhood; a little diversity in depth is okay. Where the dwelling sits impacts the primary mass sets relative to the street sets the tone for the streetscape.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Carried 3-0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th>Frates, J 02-0726</th>
<th>2 Ash Street</th>
<th>Rev. 73273; add dormers</th>
<th>42.4.2-96</th>
<th>Emeritus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Coombs, Oliver, Welch</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>Watterson</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (5:50)</td>
<td><strong>Coombs</strong> – Read HSAB comments. <strong>MacEachern</strong> – reviewed the project.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No concerns.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Approve. (Welch)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Carried 3-0</td>
<td>Certificate # HDC2020-02-0726</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.</th>
<th>Paton, Scott 02-0585</th>
<th>33 Orange Street</th>
<th>Hardscape/Arbor</th>
<th>42.3.2-199</th>
<th>The Garden Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Coombs, Welch, Watterson</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Landscape plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Jacob Williams, The Garden Group</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (5:52)</td>
<td><strong>Williams</strong> – Reviewed changes made and information per previous concerns. <strong>Welch</strong> – Asked about the privacy fence; it should match the one at 13 Orange. <strong>Watterson</strong> – Asked about the fence and arbor and that it is colored. No concerns.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Approve through staff with on-site drainage and privacy fence to match 13 Orange Street. (Welch)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Carried 3-0</td>
<td>Certificate # HDC2020-02-0585</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th>123 Madaket Rd N.T. 02-0724</th>
<th>123 Madaket Road</th>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>Mark Cutone Architect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Coombs, Oliver, Watterson</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (6:02)</td>
<td><strong>Cutone</strong> – Presented project; circa 1984; a late request from the client is the north elevation 2nd-floor windows mulled against the door and pull the deck in to the corner. <strong>Oliver</strong> – She loves this. <strong>Watterson</strong> – It’s well done. No issues with the design. North elevation won’t be visible. <strong>Coombs</strong> – Don’t cut down the trees.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Approve through staff the north elevation changes per Exhibit A. (Oliver)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Carried unanimously</td>
<td>Certificate # HDC2020-02-0724</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Breen, Faith 02-0745 19 Broadway A/C unit 73.1.3-111 Josh Morash

Voting Coombs, Oliver, Watterson
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
Representing Joshua Morash
Public None
Concerns (6:06) Coombs – Read SAB and Holly Backus comments: circa late 1800s, contributing, screen A/C. Morash – Presented project.
Oliver – The horizontal conduit encased in natural to weather cedar shingles is a great idea; likes the vertical conduits looking like a downspout.
Watterson – Likes the idea of shingling the conduits in. The lattice screening the unit is appropriate.

Motion Motion to Approve through staff with vertical south elevation conduit boxed in and painted to resemble a downspout and the rest boxed in cedar single and natural to weather lattice to screen the A/C and the heater, per Exhibit A. (Oliver)

Vote Carried unanimously
Certificate # HDC2020-02-0745

12. Knutzen, Sarah 02-0677 21 Lyons Lane Garage/studio/cabana 71-12 Ethan McMorrow

Voting Coombs, Oliver, Watterson
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Ethan McMorrow
Public None
Concerns (6:15) McMorrow – Presented project; house is circa 1970.
Oliver – No concerns, except the exterior stair should tuck into the side and not stick out.
Watterson – The elevations are mis-labeled.

Discussion about what to do with the stairs to tuck them against the house.

Motion Motion to Approve through staff with the stairway direction reversed to run along the building and correction of the cardinal points. (Oliver)

Vote Carried unanimously
Certificate # HDC2020-02-0677

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Review Minutes February 18 & 25, 2020

Other Business
- Application pictures:
  Oliver – If we have all the information at the meeting, it won’t take as long; the staff aren’t making sure it’s all there.
- Mission Statement for Town Website vote
- Historic Preservation Guideline/Nantucket Resiliency updates
- Time management
- Organizational Focus Committee
- 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 None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:
1. None

Adjourned at 6:24 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board  Sconset Advisory Board