



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

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

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Stephen Welch (Vice-chair), Diane Coombs, Abby Camp, Vallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Jessie Dutra, Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via ZOOM.

Called to order at 4:03 pm. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Holly Backus, Historic Planner; Esmeralda Martinez, Land Use Specialist, & Fiona Johnson, Administrative Specialist.

Attending Members: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Dutra, Thornewill, Patten

Remote Participants: None

Absent Members: None

Late Arrivals: Oliver (4:53pm)

Early Departures: Dutra (7:37pm)

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion **Motion to Approve as drafted. (Camp)**
Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill-aye

I. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Anne Dewez – Would like to request that the board review the applications for 12 Angola St and 8 N. Mill St together because they have elements on them that are completely inextricably, and it would not be useful or productive to review them separately. Also wanted to request that the minutes of the HDC meeting from April 4th particularly relating to 8 N. Mill St which currently state no concerns be amended to reflect the concerns brought up during that meeting.

Joseph Topham – Is fine with the board reviewing both applications (12 Angola St & 8 N. Mill St) one after the other when they get to them.

I. CONSENTS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Main Top LLC 05-8481	9 Pochick Street	Mini Split Condenser	73.3.1/25	South Shore Climate
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Dutra			
Alternates	Thornewill, Dutra, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Locus map, site plan, photos, sign specs.			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	None			
Motion	Motion to approve consents. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0 // Dutra, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-05-8481

II. OLD BUSINESS 05/16/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Maxwell House LLC 02-6805	15 Cliff Rd.	Addition & renovation	42.4.4/56	MCA+
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates	Oliver			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Doug Mills			
Public	N/A			
Concerns	N/A			
Motion	Motion to approve through staff with front door to change to 6 lite with flanking windows that are separated by some shingles, on the southeast drop the plate of the garage to the eave height of the pent roof on the southeast, go back to the sunroom of the wider windows and no shingles between the post. (Thornewill)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-02-6805
2. 7 White LLC 04-8245	7 White St	Chng windows, doors, add porch	80/9	Emeritus LTD
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates	Oliver			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Matthew MacEachern- Emeritus			
Public	N/A			
Concerns	N/A			
Motion	Motion to approve through staff with lowering the main mass roof by a foot, rotating the person door on the garage around to the nearest adjacent side, centering the garage door, and building up the frontispiece. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-04-8245
3. 7 White LLC 04-8373	7 White St	New garage	80/9	Emeritus LTD
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates	Oliver			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Matthew MacEachern- Emeritus			
Public	N/A			
Concerns	N/A			
Motion	Motion to approve through staff with the person door relocated to replace the most adjacent window and centering the garage door. (Thornewill)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-04-8373

III. NEW BUSINESS 05/23/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 30 North Beach St LLC 05-8458	30 N Beach St	Pool, & sport court	29/130	Ahern LLC
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Miroslava Ahern			
Public	N/A			
Concerns	None			
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted due to lack of visibility. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-05-8458
2. 30 North Beach St LLC 05-8460	30 N Beach St	sport court	29/130	Ahern LLC
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Miroslava Ahern			
Public	N/A			
Concerns	None			
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-05-8460

3.	30 North Beach St LLC 05-8459	30 N Beach St	Gate, hardscape & deck	29/130	Ahern LLC
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten				
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Miroslava Ahern				
Public	N/A				
Concerns	None				
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye			Certificate #	HDC2023-05-8459

4.	George Metri 05-8496	12 Angola St	New dwelling	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill				
Alternates	Dutra, Patten				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Joseph Topham				
Public	<p>Mickey Rowland – Agrees with what Holly said about the massing. Thinks this building is much too large and too formal. On the north elevation the garage should not be attached and moved to the back of the lot. On the south elevation the large second floor deck is not appropriate and the OHD. It's unnecessary and should just be eliminated. On the east elevation the two-story garage wing is too tall and boxy. In general, the house should just get scaled down to reflect the scale and formality of the other houses on Angola St.</p> <p>Anne Dewez – What we have here is a lot line to lot line house which is not appropriate for the neighborhood. With a lot of features that really don't work in the neighborhood at all.</p> <p>Patricia Beilman – On the north elevation its 78 feet long and on the west elevation its 72 feet long which are way too big for the neighborhood. The north elevation will create one huge land mass overshadowing the garden by the sea. The front door is very Greek revival and out of context with the house. In the west the lattice work is too elaborate for the neighborhood. In building with Nantucket in mind shutters are discouraged on new houses if they are intended only for surface decoration. In the south elevation the second story deck is too imposing, too long. The two doors on either side emphasis a lack of proportion to the rest of the house. On the south elevation the French doors are inappropriate for Quaker house, being too modern in a suburban area. As stated in building with Nantucket in mind windows should not be joined to create an entire area of glass with a predominantly structural expression. Too many mullions on the structure to the far left on the south elevation. On the north elevation the left wing to be more reflective of the right wing. Order must be established to prevent disturbing the number of shapes. Again, wanted to request the same 3 maps she requested for 8 N. Mill.</p>				
Concerns	<p>Holly Backus – The main block is appropriate, yet a little too formal for this historic Quaker neighborhood. It would be more appropriate if the additive massing was moved off the main block as historically appropriate and recommended in building with Nantucket in mind. Additive massing that is comprised of simple shapes is more traditional and encouraged. Scale back the formality. The garage should be a separate structure and not attached to the dwelling. Overhead garage doors are also strongly discouraged in building with Nantucket in mind when highly visible as in this case. Remove the portico and shutters. How the shed dormer off the south runs into the one-story additive massing is not appropriate. The east should be eliminated and proposed as a separate simple and shorter garage and moved behind the facade of the dwelling.</p> <p>Pohl – If a retaining wall is over 4 feet high it is considered a structure and must obey the set back. Agrees with the board on a lot of the issues. The formality of the 5 bay is an issue. The garage piece is competing too much with the main mass.</p> <p>Welch – Primarily concerns are on the north elevation. Agrees with Carrie on the covered porch. The connection between the main mass and the garage is a particular concern given its height and all the roof material. A garage in this location should be pushed further back. On the west elevation doesn't have a issue with the L except for the length. The structure to the rear is not helping. Having two curb cuts and a garage space and an application that is being contested is not going to be successful.</p> <p>Camp – The five bay is too grand a style for Angola. The garage should be separated to mitigate the very horizontal mass. The far-right hand mass is not needed. The front stoop is far too formal for Angola. The L is far too long and should be reduced. The deck is questionable. The dormer on the east elevation should be eliminated or come in a bit.</p> <p>Coombs – The garage should be set back and be made wider. Agrees with Abby that the 5 bay is too formal for Angola St. The proposed west elevation is very good and very simple. The wing going out could come in a bit. The front door could be a little simpler. Structure can be made a 4 bay. Shutters are not necessary.</p> <p>Thornewill – Not adverse to 5 bay standing alone with if the design were a lot more simple. The right-hand piece is a little too wide. Garage should be separate. Having the door porch on the front of a 5 bay is not a good idea.</p>				
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions and existing and proposed topography plan. Sketching locations where the applicant will be anticipating retainage will be helpful. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Dutra, Patten, Thornewill-aye			Certificate #	HDC2023-05-8496

5. 111 Cliff Rd Trust **05-8482** 111 Cliff Rd New dwelling 41/10 Emeritus LTD

Voting Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill
 Alternates Dutra, Patten
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
 Representing **Matthew MacEachern**
 Public None
 Concerns **Holly Backus** – Additive massing towards the rear would be helpful. Appreciates the one-story sections. Would recommend a separate garage structure. Recommends reducing the height down a lot. Would suggest more photographs from the applicant showing what is in this area to see how this architecture fits in.
 Pohl – Agrees with the rest of the board on the scale of the structure being overwhelming. Suggests there is more room to go south.
 Welch – The program seems a little ambitious in respect to the size and the property lines. Agrees with Carrie about comments with respect to the dormer massing and imbalance there. The attached garage negatively affects the perception of the overall size from left to right. This is otherwise a very charming structure.
 Camp – This structure overwhelms the site and is visually too horizontal. Would like to see the left side locked off and the garage separated and pushed back. The scale and massing are the biggest concern, would like to see it reduced.
 Coombs – Agrees with Abby about moving the garage to the rear end. Would like to see the structure come down a bit in height to resemble more what was there. The front door as currently proposed gets somewhat lost between the pillars.
 Thornewill – The attached garage is atypical. Primary and secondary masses are good. The two doors on the secondary mass on the first floor are somewhat confusing, an odd seeming configuration of windows and doors. On the tertiary mass the windowsill is at the eave height and that seems atypical. The first floor shed mass on the side just stops short is also disconcerting and not very harmonious.

Motion **Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill -aye Certificate # **HDC2023-05-8482**

IV. OLD BUSINESS 05/30/2023

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	David Butler 03-8084	50 Walsh St	Renovation	29/100	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill				
Alternates	Camp, Dutra, Patten				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Chip Webster				
Public	Mickey Rowland – The garage door still looks out of scale. The covered porch on the right seems inappropriate and seems to have been extended out.				
Concerns	Holly Backus – The lowering of the porch roof still gives that antebellum look and is not appropriate. Since the garage is not being elevated the people door on the east looks out of place and scale with that skirting added. On the west eliminate that second-floor porch. Pohl – The garage doors need to be smaller. Don't like the roof over the second-floor deck. Would like to see more information on the flood plain issue. Welch – Thinks the design is over fenestrated. Also has concerns with porches and other various elements but overall thinks this design is a net improvement. The two-foot space between the bottom of the floor structure and the design flood elevation is concerning because the current requirement is one foot. Coombs – The structure as proposed is too tall. Suggests moving the garage back out of the way to keep it the way it was. Thinks the garage should be reworked and made simpler. Oliver – Agrees with Stephen that it's a net benefit but thinks anything that can be eliminated or simplified to make it less massive would be helpful. The deck over the deck on the west is an issue. Reducing the roof height would be helpful. The garage component might need to be rethought in its entirety. Suggest the garage remains at its existing height and reconfigure its living space. This way it's more perceived as additive mass. Thornewill – Agrees with the other board members. The second-floor porch roof is too much.				
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions and additional information on the flood plain. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill -aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-03-8084	

2.	Mark Hubbard	02-7994	45 Milk St	New Studio	56/20	Mark Hubbard
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Dutra					
Alternates	Camp, Patten					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.					
Representing	Mark Hubbard					
Public	None					
Concerns	No concerns.					
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Welch)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Dutra -aye				Certificate #	HDC2023-02-7994

3.	Ashkan Vaziri	04-8243	9 Woodbury Lane	New Garage	41/551	Studio PPArk
Voting	Welch, Coombs, Dutra, Patten, Thornewill					
Alternates	None					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.					
Representing	-					
Public	-					
Concerns	Application not opened.					
Motion	Application held at applicants request until next Tuesday's meeting.					
Roll-call Vote					Certificate #	HDC2023-04-8243

4.	Robert Sarkisian	03-8052	8 North Mill St	New dwelling	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill					
Alternates	Dutra, Patten					
Recused	Oliver					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.					
Representing	Joseph Topham					
Public	Robert S. –					
	Mickey Rowland – The main concern is the 10-foot-high retaining wall behind the houses. The application proposed is completely changing the contour of the site. The subterranean garage should be eliminated. Agrees with Holly about massing should be telescoping back. Saltboxes usually face the front of the house unlike what’s proposed on the south elevation. Maybe the gable on the south elevation should become just a straight gable with dormers on both sides.					
	Anne Dewez – States that this new submission of plans contains elements that the HDC has already rejected. Considers these houses inappropriate for the neighborhood. Is concerned about both the lots being flattened and the height is the proposed retaining wall on each property. This submission ignores the recommendations previously made by Holly Backus, Mickey Rowland, and the board on grade. Hopes that the board addresses the hillside before addressing the structures and allows for the public to speak again if they get into discussing the structures.					
	Pam Clark – Is concerned about the drainage in the area as well as the change in topography.					
	Anne Davis – Agrees with Anne Dewez and HSAG. Shares the concerns of her neighbors that the walls at 12 Angola and 8 N. Mill will be impactful. What is proposed should be compatible with the neighborhood, these applications are not.					
	Patricia Beilman – Is an agreement with the concerns of the neighbors. Requests that the applicant submit 3 maps of the two lots (12 Angola and 8 N. Mill) together. The first map to show landscaping and retaining wall without the structures, a second map to show landscaping retaining wall and proposed structures, and the third map to show the current topography.					
	Joan Taylor – Is agreement with the neighbors. Every single commissioner commented and had great ideas about how to address the grading the last time this application was heard. She feels no effort was made to address those requests.					
	Jesse Dutra - The back corner of the lot is the high part of the grade and the wall. Suggests potential following the contour of the grade and maybe make the wall curve at some point with the contour. That would allow to bring the wall more into the property and facilitate better terracing. Suggests also potentially using the building as part of the wall.					

Concerns

Holly Backus – Concerned about the elevation along N. Mill St which should be what faces along Angola. What is currently proposed to face Angola is not appropriate with this Quaker neighborhood. In addition, the additive massing is not keeping with building with Nantucket in mind and following simple shapes. It should telescope back. If the north stays on Angola that rear massing should be drop and provide the appropriate additive massing in a one story or even one and a half story scale.

Pohl – Don't think the underground garage is appropriate. The more successful examples provided are examples of terracing. 10 S. Mill is a good example of terracing and respecting the grade. The architecture of the house is the least of the issues here. The main issue with this project is that very large wall.

Welch – Agrees with most of what Carrie said. The retainage being on the side of the structure rather than the rear is a concern. Also agrees that Angola St should be the front. Thinks the design can be salvaged. Made so that the retainage isn't perceived as strongly and is not such a visual presence. Terracing at this location due to the existing grade could be very difficult to make work.

Camp – Thinks it's more appropriate to have the front door on Angola St. The massing doesn't relate to the size of the lot, thinks it would fit better on the site as a smaller story and half with less building on it. Besides the hill the program is overbuilt.

Coombs – The claim that retaining walls exist in other places around the neighborhood is immaterial. Structural elements in specific areas should fit in with their specific area. Certain structural elements might be suitable for one part of the neighborhood and not the other. This is an important historic area, and it should be maintained. Cross sections should be provided to see where the dirt is and how much was dug out. If the architecture remains small it is alright, but it should be broken up to fit into the land, not vice versa.

Thornewill – The example of the proposed retaining wall is on the side of the house and therefore would be more visible than if it were towards the back of the house. The second curb cut with the driveway going down to the underground garage is inappropriate. If a garage is desired, it should be hatched towards the back of the property. Agrees that Angola should be the front.

Motion

Motion to hold for revisions, more information of the land and the slope. (Coombs)

Roll-call Vote

Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill -aye

Certificate #

HDC2023-03-8052

5. Nantucket G & S **04-8321**

81 Vestal St

Pergola

56/254

MCA+

Voting

Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten

Alternates

Welch, Oliver, Patten

Recused

None

Documentation

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

Representing

Doug Mills- MCA+

Public

None

Concerns

Pohl – Agrees with Connie.

Camp – Would like to see a landscape plan.

Thornewill – The existing horizontal boards on the outside kitchen should be singles instead.

Patten – Not opposed to the pergola or the trellis.

Motion

Motion to approve through staff changing the horizontal board around the kitchenette to shingled wall. (Thornewill)

Roll-call Vote

Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten-aye

Certificate #

HDC2023-04-8321

6. Sheep Pond Property **04-8372**

14-16 Sheep Pond Rd

New dwelling

62/29

Emeritus Ltd

Voting

Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill

Alternates

None

Recused

None

Documentation

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

Representing

Matthew MacEachern

Public

N/A

Concerns

No concerns

Motion

Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote

Carried 4-0 // Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill-aye

Certificate #

HDC2023-04-8372

7.	41 Hulbert LLC 05-8498	41 Hulbert St	Renovation	29/18	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Dutra				
Alternates	Patten				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	Holly Backus- circa 2005, infill non-contributing within the Brant Point neighborhood.				
Motion	Motion to approve through staff with 6 over 1s, natural to weather skirt, 4s spaced ½” – ¾”, natural brick piers. (Dutra)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Dutra-aye // Camp abstained		Certificate #	HDC2023-05-8498	
8.	Tyler Albright 03-8166	11 Cannonbury Lane	Pergola	74/22	Ahern LLC
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Miroslava Ahern				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	Holly Backus- appreciates location of pergola.				
Motion	Motion to approve. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-03-8166	
9.	Tyler Albright 03-8106	11 Cannonbury Lane	Pool & hardscape	74/22	Ahern LLC
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Miroslava Ahern				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	Holly Backus – Reduce patio if possible or push pool back a bit.				
Motion	Motion to approve through staff with pool not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter, pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill-aye // Camp-nay		Certificate #	HDC2023-03-8106	
10.	Nicole & Phillip Hadley 04-8300	4 Underhill Lane	New garage	73.3.2/38.1	WAPD
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	N/A				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	Application not opened.				
Motion	Held for representation.				
Roll-call Vote			Certificate #	HDC2023-04-8300	
11.	Redcliff LLC 04-0875	40 Youngs Ways	New duplex	68/235.1	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Victoria Ewing				
Public	none				
Concerns	Camp- make middle column smaller. Welch- site plan that includes parking needed, to verify stair access and parking				
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions and a site plan showing the parking. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-04-0875	

12. Nantucket Development LLC 04-8363	8 Sconset Ave	Addition	49.3.2/28	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Dutra			
Alternates	Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Victoria Ewing			
Public	n/a			
Concerns	Application not opened.			
Motion	Held for next Tuesday's meeting.			
Roll-call Vote			Certificate #	HDC2023-04-8363

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

- **Save our Sound Endorsement – Not Discussed.**
- **Sparks Ave Preliminary Development**
 - **Linda Williams** – Provided schematic and site plans. Oriented the building to show visuals from the school, stop and shop, and other directions. The visual shows a massing plan, windows were also added to sort of orient the building. Wanted the board to weigh on whether the plan is going in the right direction or not. The planning board is making it one building but the idea was to make it look like it was more than one building from the street side. There will be an entrance on one side and the exit on the other. The parking lot is in the rear of the building. Because the structure will be in the commercial mid island area you cannot have the front plane of the building more than five feet from the front yard setback. The wings can be done at five feet with the window boxes etc. and move the center section back. The structure's got 32 affordable units and commercial on the first floor.
 - **George Berg** – Hoping for some constructive feedback from the board. This footprint is slightly different than what the plan from the planning board is. The planning board plan was a little bit flusher with the street but the intention here was to push the building back and create the two masses on either side with a connector in between. The play on the front elevation was to try and scale the street side to a more pedestrian friendly scale where retail is on the lower level particularly on the front side and residential units on the back. They felt that was appropriate to try and break that up. The intent is for 32 units, mainly on the second and third level. The roof line is being used to create a well so that the mechanical equipment's visibility can be minimized for the public. The fenestration was put on to give the structure some scale. Trying to develop properly pitched roofs as far under the 40-foot ridge height as possible. The height proposed is currently at about 38 feet. Looking at opportunities from the Cumberland farm side and the house fitter's side while also trying to be cognizant of the neighborhood to the rear in trying to buffer the structure and make sure that what the neighbors are looking at has some level of scale. Feels these plans still have ways to go but is looking forward to the boards input.
 - **Pohl** – We're looking at something that is clearly designed as one building. Symmetrical in every possible way. Everything's organized all tidally to say I am one big building. What you get downtown is one building that's one height with one type of windows, then next door is another building. Agrees with Stephen's notion that this can give the exterior perception of three to four buildings rather than one gigantic building. Focus on a variety of forms for this for now.
 - **Welch** – There is one model that is successful, and that is town. The school, the new school, the hospital, and the stop and shop are all examples of structures that don't necessarily fit into the historic fabric of Nantucket. This is not successful unless it's four buildings patterned after the structures in town. They don't have to be four buildings in respect to the interior program, but they should be four buildings with respect to the exterior programming. 4 or 5 buildings might be the magic number, but the more buildings there are the more it starts to look like a movie set than an actual community so he would advise the applicant to be careful with that. Town structures deal with roof massing by raising plates and lowering pitch so there can be some success with that. The trees shown in the rendering are too small, maybe bigger 25-foot trees and landscaping would help the integration, softening of the buildings, and overall aesthetics of the project. Parking on the sides and rear should be sensitive to integrating the community. A space that is not successful with this is the space at the front of the stop and shop. It is not a very interactive space. It's not laid out to be interactive, there aren't trees that provide canopy, there aren't appropriate style benches, it doesn't capture your interest and hold you there as a place to interact. You can't accomplish all of that here but as Val stated you are setting a tone for what is out of town "town". One of the successful elements in town is that these structures, even though they've made it a denser area, work well with the residential areas right next to them. You don't want to be like the school, for example, muddying up area because it looks like a big residential building. This structure is nicely done but is not yet representative of what would be successful in this area.
 - **Camp** – The scale of this structure is overwhelming. Three structures will create a very large shadow on Sparks Av. This structure should not exceed a height of a story and a half. Massing can telescope off to the North. Gables when they intersect another massing should not look fake, please create something that truly has some architecture to it. One mass is overwhelming, three different masses with walkways in between and landscaping to individual areas and stores would be better.
 - **Coombs** – Does not see the length of the building in the docs received. This building is about as non-Nantucket as you can get. The middle part of the massing has its own identity. No matter how broken up this structure is, as presented it only has one eave line and that is not going to work. The parking that you're counting on is adjacent to a residential area and this entire project is too big to be placed as presented within this residential area. The structure is too big for the area and resembles buildings on the cape. The applicant should consider what this island is and how to give this building the right character and scale to match that thought.

- **Oliver** – Overtime there’s been an evolution of mid-island patterns that has created a challenge of introducing a vernacular that combines commercial and residential elements. Encourages the applicant to pioneer a new development that sets a standard for future projects on the island. Existing structures like stop and shop, boys and girls club, and the school emphasize the need for new shops, business services, and housing that share a common identity and traditional forms with the rest of Nantucket. The commercial identity should have a village character with pedestrian access. Try incorporating separations between large buildings and avoiding the mainland commercial plaza look. Proposed adding dormers and adjusting rooflines to add another level. Recommends enhancing the inner play between the building façade and the sidewalk, using period spacings, indented front doors, large and small windows, and dividing the building into multiples or creating the illusion of multiples. Expresses a desire for the building to be more visually interesting and suggests making each segment slightly different.
- **Thornewill** – Overall impression is the relentless symmetry of the of this structure. The relentless height of the long ridge the entire length of the building, the single door going in. The overhanging second floor masses cantilevering over empty space as if it’s a porch. These are all things she doesn’t think are successful. Agrees with the board about other concerns. A little weary of three or four buildings because that then resemble the “Commons”, please don’t use that as a reference point. There’s a tough task ahead and she’s excited to see how it all unfolds.
- **Patten** – This structure is large. Likes the idea of modeling it like buildings in town. Agrees with all that the board has already shared.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approved Minutes Motion Vote	Held for next Tuesday’s meeting.
Review Minutes	February 23, & March 9, 2023.
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next HDC Meeting- June 6th at 4pm *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. - COMMUNITY RM. • Classification of street trees & vegetating mapping • Discussion of Wind Turbines • Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, intro (update as needed) • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings • Hardscaping • Discussion of salvaging demolitions • Discussion of options for house moves

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 8:25pm. (Welch)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye

Submitted by:

Adrian Rodriguez- Administrative Specialist
 Esmeralda Martinez -LandUse Specialist

YouTube link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sHdHhbqd-xs&t=1139s>

Nantucket Old Historic District

Sconset Old Historic District

Madaket Old Village