



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 19, 2019

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

Called to order at 4:31 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: John Hedden, HDC Compliance Coordinator; Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker

Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Watterson, Dutra

Absent Members: None

Late Arrivals: None

Early Departures: McLaughlin, Camp, Welch, and Watterson; 8:45 p.m.

Agenda adopted as amended by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

Terry Norton – Noise during meeting and impacts on audio; cited March 14 meeting disruptions.

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Zabar, Eli – 72069	47 Squam Road	As built window changes	13-22	Permits Plus
2. Casey, Stephen – 72070	33 Pine Crest Drive	Outdoor shower	68-423.1	NAG
3. McIver, Scott – 72071	22 Miacomet Road	Deck	67-336.3	Jeff Morash
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain		Certificate #	72069 to 72071

III. SIGNS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Centre of Town, LLC	35 Centre Street	Awning sign	42.3.1-3	Kevin Anderson
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend approval as is.			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72072

2.	Minucci, Albert – 72073	17 Centre Street	Wall sign	42.3.1-203.4	Scott McIver
3.	Minucci, Albert – 72074	17 Centre Street	Projecting sign	42.3.1-203.4	Scott McIver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend approval of both per SAC comments.				
Concerns	No additional concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per SAC comments. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72073 & 72074	

4.	N.I.R.	44 Straight Wharf	Sign revisions	42.2.4-15	Nathan McMullen
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend approval as is.				
Concerns	No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72075	

5.	Reinemo, Julie	25 Old South Road	Sign	68.1-25	Bob Ramos
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend this be held.				
Concerns	No comments at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		

6.	N.I.R. Retail, LLC	20 Centre Street	Sign	42.3.1-201	Rachel Marahas
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend approval as is.				
Concerns	No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72076	

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.	N.H.A.	13-15 Broad Street	Door change	42.4.2-6	Doug Sehlm
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Doug Sehlm , NHA – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; preference is option “C” shown in the historic photos. TJ Watterson, architect				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:39)	Pohl – Read HSAB comments of March 5: prefer 6-panel doors with appropriate hardware. Mr. McLaughlin had stated that the fan over the door was made by Marine Home Centre. The proposed door, similar to that in the “postcard” photo, has sidelights, which bear no resemblance to anything else. Oliver – She would be okay with the 16-light door and leaving sidelights as they are.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with a 16-light door as shown in the historic photo to be Essex green and no change to the sidelights. (McLaughlin)				
Vote	Carried 3-0		Certificate #	72077	

2.	N.H.A.	15 Broad Street	Brick patio and planters	42.4.2-61	Concept Design
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	T.J. Watterson , Concept Design – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Doug Scholm , NHA – Moving the benches back allows an additional 6 feet to accommodate the public waiting for buses. It gets so crowded people are standing in the garden.				
Public	Dutra – Suggested the benches be placed being between the planters like garden benches.				
Concerns (4:52)	Coombs – Read HSAB comments: proposed brick quantity still excessive. Currently the front of the museum doesn't draw your eyes into a grand presence for our big museum; the benches should be more traditional. Left side, would like the left most bench turned to abut the east facing bench. We might not want people hanging around the museum who aren't using it; they block people who do want to go in; separate the museum entry from the bus stop area. Oliver – Unclear as to the need for the extra 2 feet; it's a shame there would be more brick; would like more planters. McLaughlin – He would prefer historic wood benches instead of the composite-material, slat benches. Welch – Asked if they are looking to address more space or create a place for the museum. He agrees with HSAB about there being too much brick. Larger benches don't address the additional brick; if you're able to partition off some brick with planters and benches, that could provide additional seating. It almost reads as a patio that's missing the yard furniture; he doesn't think that's appropriate for the museum. Discussion about ways to break up the brick work and have a welcoming area for the museum.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #		
3.	Hidalgo, Carlos	55 Fair Street	Rev. 66985:	55.4.1-74	Kelly Ennis
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:13)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #		
4.	Muhlhauser, Craig	100 Main Street	Fence	42.3.3-154	Sean O'Callahan
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Sean O'Callahan – Reviewed the project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:14)	Coombs – Read HSAB comments from March 11: if like-kind, no concerns; if new, board fence should start at rear corner of house. Discussion about the placement of the picket fence and where it should transition to the 5'8" fence, Camp – She personally likes the board and lattice fence; it makes the fence feel lighter than solid board. She's okay with the board fence starting at the second jog in the house. Welch – 86 Main Street has a 5'8" fence adjacent to the brick sidewalk that is almost 100 feet long; this applicant's fence goes back between two houses. Any approval should be subject to landscaping. He has no real objections to this application. Dutra – Agrees with Ms. Camp and Mr. Welch.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the picket fence running from the edge of the sidewalk to the first jog in the building, about 35 to 40 feet, then the board fence extending to the rear of the property and subject to some screening. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		72078

5.	Meehan, Beth Ann	3 Ridge Lane	Window revisions	38-90	JB Studios
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Juraj Bencat , JB Studios – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Beth Ann Meehan				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:29)	<p>Camp – Very happy with the west elevation; suggested the “H” window replace the “D” windows, which are too vertical. The “E” windows are too horizontal.</p> <p>Welch – Agree the “D” windows are too vertical; take about three inches off the height. The east elevation would be approved due to limited visibility.</p> <p>Dutra – The east elevation won’t be visible; he’s okay with the plate window. Agrees about the “D” and “E” windows.</p> <p>Oliver – Nothing to add. The east elevation plate window is odd.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the east elevation “D” window being 3” shorter and the north elevation “E” windows to be 3” taller and the “G” window is approved due to limited visibility. (Dutra)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72079	
6.	Hanig, Marco	23 Burnell Street	Rev. 71753: new dwelling	73.4.1-26.1	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:40)	<p>Pohl – Read SAB comments: chimney height does not meet code.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72080	
7.	11 Meadow Ln, LLC	11 Meadow Lane	Rev. 71719: color change	41-448	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed the proposed color pallet; withdrew the shutter color change.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:44)	<p>Coombs – Suggested the shutters match the grey of the front door or be one shade darker; Meadow Lane is an odd place for all white.</p> <p>Oliver – Agrees with Ms. Coombs.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments.</p> <p>Camp – A dark grey would make the shutters too heavy.</p> <p>Pohl – He agrees with Ms. Coombs.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve the color change to the sash and all doors except the front door and through staff with no change to the shutters. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72081	
8.	N.I.R.	38 Main Street	Exterior arbor	42.3.1-189	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:51)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: no concerns.</p> <p>Coombs – This should be painted to match the structure. The “desk” should not be attached to the building.</p> <p>McLaughlin – This arbor is architecturally inappropriate and would set a bad precedent as a decorative thing. It’s also very large and should be 10 or 12 feet back in the alley.</p> <p>Discussion about how far off the sidewalk the arbor should be.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the arbor set 8 feet back. (McLaughlin) Not carried				
Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin opposed		Certificate #	72082	

9.	Hills & Valleys, LLC	14A Greglen Avenue	New dwelling	68-182	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Presented project; W13’xH23’8”xL38;.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:00)	<p>Coombs – It looks narrow; other than that, it’s okay.</p> <p>Oliver – She has issues with it being so narrow; would like to know what’s in front and around it. The cupola draws attention to it and should be eliminated.</p> <p>Camp – Asked if there would be other structures like this. (No) Okay with the cupola if it relates to the other structures on the property.</p> <p>Discussion about the design of other structures that will be on this site.</p> <p>McLaughlin – East elevation, the twin doors should be a more traditional door.</p> <p>Pohl – Agrees with Ms. Oliver.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
10.	Laundro ACK, LLC	4 Hanabea Lane	New com. structure	69-15	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:07)	<p>Oliver – On Mac Davis’ structures, we had asked that what was closest to the road be dropped to 1.5 stories; this is a sheer, 2-story wall. Also, she doesn’t recall anything on this road being 30 feet tall.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees it should not be over 30 feet tall including the monitor.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees the height should come down. The “D” windows are much too small and swim in the wall plain.</p> <p>McLaughlin – This should be no more than 30 feet tall. The side elevations should have double-hung windows.</p> <p>Pohl – The elevation facing Hanabea should be scaled down and agree the ridge should come down.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
11.	Cots World Two, LLC	8 Chester Street	Door change, AC& railing	42.4.3-64	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Linda Williams – She would like to have the same board that sat on the color change. Presented project. Contends the condenser units won’t be visible in the proposed location due to screening. The railing wasn’t the only thing that was “bondo’ed”: gutters, trim, corner boards.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:14)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: front railing should not change, doesn’t need to meet code; prefer A/C to be anywhere else. The balusters will have to be elongated to some degree.</p> <p>Oliver – The air conditioning units (A/C) need to move and should be screened in perpetuity. Would like to have a drawing of what the railing will look like.</p> <p>Coombs – Clarified the changes to the railing and the picket fence to screen the A/C. Suggested elongating the bottom rail but not the cap because the balusters are very heavy.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees with Ms. Oliver about the A/C and the need for a drawing of the railing.</p> <p>McLaughlin – That house has deteriorated severely. No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with drawings of the balustrade submitted into the file and the A/C not to be visible and screened in perpetuity. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		72083

12. K225, LLC	65 Centre Street	Renovation/additions	42.4.3-16	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Watterson, Dutra			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams – Reviewed project and elements that are not original to the house and changes made per previous concerns. The long porch showed up at the same time as the Victorian porch to access it. Juraj Bencat, JB Studios			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:38)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: highly not appropriate.</p> <p>Camp – There is so much work going on, doesn't see why the front elevation 2-over-2 aren't being made 6-over-6. For the right to read as a sun porch, it needs double-hung windows facing the road. She's holding her comments on moving the chimney. The railing across the front is excessive. Not that much to say about the sides and back and it looks appropriate. Okay with extending the north wall out two feet.</p> <p>Watterson – Agrees with much Ms. Camp said; the 2-over-2 aren't original so should be replaced with 6-over-6; the railing and sunporch relate in a bad way and the entry porch should end at the corner of the main mass.</p> <p>Dutra – Still has issues with moving the north wall out 2 feet; the original box should remain the same because, in the photos, it looks like the corner post and frames are original. Okay with the roof walk and moving the chimney. Agrees with Mr. Watterson about the entry deck and railing not going all the way across. Massing off the back is appropriate.</p> <p>Coombs – The house was built in 1821 and is in the national registry as a contributing structure. It is important to stick with some era. The long railing on the front goes back a long time according to the Sanborn maps. She'd like to see what's happening behind the screens on the sunporch. She would prefer the 2-over-2 windows remain; it's gives the history of what was done to the house. She has issues with the chimney and roof walk; the chimney should be traditionally corbelled; the roof walk drops lower than the flashing of the chimney and they should meet. East elevation, this is good but would like to see how far back the porch goes and what's behind it; as a screened porch, the trim around the windows should be lighter.</p> <p>Pohl – He's ambivalent about converting the 2-over-2 windows to 6-over-6, which would be attractive. Appreciates the historic review of the front porch; he agrees with Mr. Watterson about it stopping at the main mass cornerboard. The screen porch as viewed from the street doesn't give enough visual strength that it supports a second floor; agrees with Ms. Camp about plugging in double-hung windows on the west elevation. He's okay with replicating the chimney. He's okay with the idea of extending the north wall 2 feet; but there is a majority who don't; noted that it doesn't need to be extended to make the stairs work.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
	Break 7:16 to 7:22 p.m.			
13. Feeley, James	3 Evergreen Way	New barn	68-726.1	Cottage & Castle
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:23)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Watterson)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
14. Reade, Arthur	17 Millers Lane	New dwelling	68-125	Tommaso Conti
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Tommaso Conti – Reviewed project; abuts on both sides to Nantucket Island Land Bank property.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:23)	<p>Watterson – No concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – She had concerns about the visibility of the back, but he says there will be another house. No concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The plot plan shows the north elevation roof line as 56 feet long.</p> <p>Pohl – That is not a continuous ridge; its two different roof plains with one set 20 feet back.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Watterson)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72084

15.	202 Eel Point R.T.	202 Eel Point Road	Newdeck,frnt dr &wndws	38-2.3	Sanne Payne
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Dutra				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing Public	Sanne Payne – Reviewed photos supporting minimal visibility.				
Concerns (7:35)	Coombs – There is a huge amount of fenestration on the west and north elevations; when the sun is setting, it’s going to reflect on the windows. If something happened to the pine trees, all four sides would be visible. No others have concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 4-0//Coombs abstains		Certificate #	72085	
16.	Herbst, Richard	39 North Pasture Lane	Gazebo	44-77	CWA
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing Public	Amy Ledoux , Chip Webster Associates – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Concerns (7:43)	Oliver – If you take off the little top piece of the chimney it will match better. She thinks it will be visible from the back. Welch – If you remove the chimney top piece, the chimney will have to be taller. Camp – It matches the main dwelling; she has no concerns. McLaughlin – No comments.				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 3-2//Oliver and Coombs		Certificate #	72086	
17.	Sanford, Henry	5 Catherine Lane	Addition	66-7	Concept Design
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos, and <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> .				
Representing Public	T.J. Watterson , Concept Design – He didn’t make changes; it was held for a view.				
Concerns (7:47)	Oliver – The concern was that the south addition was more prominent than the main mass and has a higher eave line. West elevation, the skylights in each dormer is unusual and the dormers have three windows already. Camp – East elevation, the left side ridge with the chimney should be dropped so it doesn’t conflict with the main mass. McLaughlin – South elevation, the dormer roofs should be 4/12; the three dormers draw the eye and should be broken up into six small dormers. Welch – Agrees with what’s been said except this is 317 feet from the street. No concerns with the skylights. Coombs – West elevation, there should be one skylight per elevation, according to the guidelines. The chimney looks very tall. Review of the guidelines regarding skylights.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted due to limited visibility. (Welch) Not carried.				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72087	
18.	Marchese, Joseph	7 Copper Lane	New dwelling	43.3.3-91.1	Concept Design
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Dutra				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing Public	T.J. Watterson , Concept Design – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Concerns (7:57)	Coombs – Read HSAB comments from March 18: east elevation ganged window to be separated and evenly spaced with other windows. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Dutra)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72088	

19. Heller, Jeff	7 East Lincoln Avenue	Move/demo dwelling	42.4.1-8	Robert Newman
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Dutra			
Alternates	none			
Recused	(Welch left the room)			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, engineering report, historic documentation, video of flooding event, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<p>Robert Newman, Sandcastle Construction Inc. – Read Ted Burnham’s engineering report supporting demolition of the structure. Received three new letters of support. Summarized Don Meyers’, contractor, letter supports the proposal. Reviewed Michael May’s history of the property.</p> <p>Doug Collatz, caretaker – Last year, Nantucket had five of the top-ten recorded floods. His concern is that if we lift it and reuse any part of it, he’d end up rebuilding every part of the structure.</p> <p>Jeff Heller, owner – Thanked the Board for their efforts. They want a home that we love and is in keeping with the character of the street. They feel by lifting the home, the bones of the home will be strained. Reviewed their efforts to be transparent with the commission.</p> <p>Carol Heller, owner</p>			
Public	none			
Concerns (8:00)	<p>Staff – Reviewed his efforts to get a third-party engineer to inspect the structure and write a report.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Elmer Swain built the house in the late 1930s. If there is documentation it’s not salvageable, he’s okay with the demolition.</p> <p>Pohl – The idea of lifting the house out of the flood plain is not a concern of the board; the crux of the issue is demolishing it. The age of the house is a point of debate: Michael May puts it at 1929 and Mr. McLaughlin puts it at late 1930s. If the work exceeds 50% of the assessed value of the building, then you have to bring everything up to current code; the HDC can grant exemptions to issues which are not a life-saving issue, such as the energy code. He agrees with Ms. Oliver and Mr. Dutra to let this go with the new house reflecting this structure.</p> <p>Read HSAB comments: house can be lifted with thoughtful addition; letter outlines standard lifting practice and not justification for demolition.</p> <p>Coombs – The additions if added to the existing house would be fine. We have to look at permitting a demolition because of flooding as establishing a very dangerous precedent, especially in this area; that would risk the entire north-shore area. The engineer stated the house is in good condition; the justification of cost is not a consideration of the HDC. She cannot support a demolition.</p> <p>Oliver – From the beginning, she’s had no concerns with this. She would like the new design to reflect the existing house on the front. She feels there is enough information supporting the demolition; she interpreted the report as the house was not salvageable.</p> <p>Dutra – Agrees with Mr. Pohl but understands Ms. Coombs concerns. Raising the existing out of the flood plain changes the character of the house. He agrees with Ms. Oliver about maintaining the characteristic of the existing structure.</p> <p>Discussion about the facts of the engineering report and whether or not it is slanted toward the desires of the owner.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted with the understanding the new design will be similar to the architecture of this structure. (Dutra)			
Vote	Carried 4-1//Coombs opposed	Certificate #	72089	
Discussion about which commissioners could make a Thursday meeting and to hear the new dwelling and Ms. Oliver’s project with the rest being held for Thursday, March 21 meeting.				
20. Heller, Jeff	7 East Lincoln Avenue	New dwelling	42.4.1-8	Robert Newman
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	<p>Robert Newman, Sandcastle Construction Inc. – Reviewed project and reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Doug Collatz, caretaker</p> <p>Jeff Heller, owner – Expressed frustration with the Board apparently asking for a redesign.</p>			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:45)	<p>(8:40) McLaughlin – The house as he sees it now, would have to come down 6 inches in height.</p> <p>Dutra – The front door on the side, which makes more sense.</p> <p>Oliver – The saltbox form harkens back to the original and keeping that form would go a long way to her approving this. It’s important to maintain the front façade.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. The approval of the demolition was predicated on the replacement structure reflecting the existing.</p> <p>Pohl – What we are all after is to retain as many elements of the simple original building as possible. We all understand it is getting taller, but we want as much of that original character in the original design. The proposed is very complicated with: Juliet balcony, front porch with columns and capitals, roof walk, dormers, and formality.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #		

HDC Minutes for March 19, 2019, adopted Apr. 4

21. Brown, Christina	69 North Liberty Street	Porch revisions	41-142	Val Oliver
22. Talles, Peter	28 Long Pond Drive	Window revisions	59.4-109	Rowland & Assocs.
23. Shaver Nant. Home, LLC	75 Cliff Road	Addition	30-162	BPC
24. Sullivan-Krueger Fam Tr	6 New Lane	New dwelling	41-294	BPC
25. Sullivan-Krueger Fam Tr	2 Ackermuck Way	New dwelling	41-294	BPC
26. Union Lodge	30 Main Street	Rev. to entries & chimney	42.3.1-215	McMullen & Assoc.
27. 25A Pine Street, LLC	25A Pine Street	Renovations	42.3.2-112	McMullen & Assoc.
28. 25A Pine Street, LLC	25A Pine Street	Hardscape	42.3.2-112	McMullen & Assoc.
29. Ellemakes4, LLC	3 Sophie's Way	Cabana/guest house	41-213.3	Sophie Metz
30. Hulbert ACK, LLC	2 Hulbert Avenue	New dwelling	42.1.4-2.1	Sophie Metz
31. Hulbert ACK, LLC	2 Hulbert Avenue	Guest house	42.1.4-2.1	Sophie Metz
32. 41 Chuck Hollow N.T.	41 Chuck Hollow Road	New dwelling	75-110	M. Cutone Architecture

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Dutra

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns (9:04) Not opened at this time.

Motion **Motion to Hold Items 23 to 35 for Thursday, March 21. (Coombs)**

Vote Carried 4-0 Certificate #

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes	February 26 & 28, March 5, 2019: Motion to Approve. (Coombs) Carried 4-0
Review Minutes	March 12, 2019
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of update on Vineyard Wind project. Held • Discussion of public information session on upper Main Street sidewalk and road work. Held • Discussion of design work session meeting for Surfside Crossing. Held • Discussion of drafting a letter to the Select Board in regard to upper Main Street sidewalk and road work. Held • Discussion and possible vote to expand Historic Structures Advisory Board map for review of applications. Held • Discussion of approvable roof shingle colors, roof color change applications being placed on the Consent agenda and posting approved colors on the Town website. Held • Discussion of potential work at the airport and section 106. Held • Review and possible vote on draft letter in regard to support for designating Nantucket Sound as a National Historic Landmark. Held
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. None

Adjourned at 9:06 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Madaket Advisory Board

Sign Advisory Committee