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 ~~
Monday, June 1, 2020

This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube,
Pursuant to Governor Baker’s March 12, 2020 Order Regarding Open Meeting Law

Called to order at 4:30 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Cathy Flynn, Land Use Specialist; Holly Backus, Preservation Planner
Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Watterson
Absent Members: Dutra
Late Arrivals: Watterson, 5:30 p.m.
Early Departures: Watterson, 5:40 p.m.; McLaughlin, 8:41 p.m.

Motion to Approve the Agenda. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bill McGowan – Asked that all members angle their devises to be properly.

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. David Webster TR 05-1034</td>
<td>11 South Shore Road</td>
<td>Rev02-0611; shed</td>
<td>67-468.1</td>
<td>CWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pierre Villemejane 05-1040</td>
<td>18 Gladlands Avenue</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>80-221</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 77 Pocomo LLC 06-1050</td>
<td>77 Pocomo Road</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>15-6</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Toscana 05-1041</td>
<td>110 Hinsdale Road</td>
<td>Move off 80sf shed</td>
<td>69-30.1</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ramon Welch 05-1048</td>
<td>6 Wappossett circle</td>
<td>Move on 80sf shed</td>
<td>67-566</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fred Schroeder 05-1036</td>
<td>22 Exeter Street</td>
<td>Dormers- addition</td>
<td>76.4.2-339</td>
<td>Permits Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Richard MacKay 05-1011</td>
<td>120 Baxter Road</td>
<td>Roof change</td>
<td>48-33</td>
<td>Carey Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stafford Meyer 05-1008</td>
<td>41 Dukes Road</td>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>56-324</td>
<td>NAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Greg Glowiacki 05-1026</td>
<td>22 Evergreen</td>
<td>Rev 73194; porch/wind</td>
<td>68-710</td>
<td>Val Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Emily Osgood 06-1049</td>
<td>43 Tennessee Avenue</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>59.4.310</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cisco Sanctuary 05-0970</td>
<td>5 Bartlett Farm Road</td>
<td>Add exterior door</td>
<td>65-13.3</td>
<td>Gryphon Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Patricia Griffen Tr 05-1031</td>
<td>17 Pleasant Street</td>
<td>Gate</td>
<td>42.3.3-77</td>
<td>Mark Cutone Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting
Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch
Alternates
None
Recused
Oliver
Documentation
None
Representing
None
Public
None
Concerns
No concerns.
Motion
Motion to Approve. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote
Carried 4-0//Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye; McLaughlin-abstain

Certificate # HDC2020-(as noted)

Page 1 of 10
### 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. James Powers 05-1042</td>
<td>163 Hummock Pond Road</td>
<td>Ground solar array</td>
<td>65-38</td>
<td>Cotuit Solar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alan Schanzer 05-1001</td>
<td>3 Starbuck Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>60-21</td>
<td>Mark Cutone Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elizabeth Wetherell 05-1033</td>
<td>10 Hickory Meadow Lane</td>
<td>Rev11-0239; rot/windows</td>
<td>41-904</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity
- The connector to be shingled
- Due to lack of visibility

**Voting**
- Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
- Welch
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

**Concerns**
- No additional concerns.

**Motion**
- Motion to Approve through staff per noted concerns. (Camp)

**Certificate #**
- HDC2020-05-(as noted)

### IV. SIGNS

<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. Ronald Bamber 06-1052</td>
<td>3 West Creek Road</td>
<td>Wall sign</td>
<td>55-168</td>
<td>Cara Marquis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comcast 06-1051</td>
<td>1 Monomoy Road</td>
<td>Wall sign</td>
<td>55-68</td>
<td>John Delorie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
- None
- None
- None
- None
- Flynn – The Sign Advisory Committee chair recommend these be approved as submitted.

**Motion**
- Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)

**Certificate #**
- HDC2020-06-(as noted)

### V. VIEWS

<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. Michael Young 05-0990</td>
<td>220 East Point Road</td>
<td>Hardscape</td>
<td>38-36</td>
<td>Julie Jordin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Frank Ryan 05-0989</td>
<td>8 Kings Way</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>41-277</td>
<td>Ahern, LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.
- Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC
- None
- None
- None
- Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp)
- Carried 5-0 //Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye
- Camp – She viewed this; it is well screened so no concerns.
- Coombs – No concerns.
- McLaughlin – No concerns.
- Welch – There is limited visibility; it’s fine.

**Motion**
- Motion to Approve. (Camp)

**Certificate #**
- HDC2020-05-0989
HDC Minutes for June 1, 2020, adopted July 21

3. Cannonbury Ln, LLC 05-0895 42 Cannonbury Lane Streetscape: boardwalk 73-79 Ahern, LLC

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
Alternates Welch
Recused None
Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC
Public None
Concerns (5:40) (6:45) Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp) Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

Ahern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns: to use reclaimed granite for crosswalks.
Camp – This is all novel, but the use of reclaimed granite is a good solution; she will support this.
Oliver – No concerns.
Coombs – Agrees this is better but wonders how the granite will look because they are all very even.
McLaughlin – No concerns.

Motion Motion to Approve. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-50-0895

4. Eric Rosenfeld 05-0974 57 Quidnet Road Roof top solar 21-89 ACK Smart

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
Alternates Welch
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.
Representing Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart
Public None
Concerns (4:55) (4:45) Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp) Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

Glidden – This was held for a view. He will strike the west elevation panels and place them elsewhere if possible.
Camp – Thinks the panels on the west elevation would be visible as you continue into Quidnet village; not in favor of panels on the west. Would like more uniformity in placement and size of the panels. Likes the idea of using the shed roof. She has concerns about the panels on the south elevation 2nd-floor roof.
Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Coombs about the west elevation. Discussion about the visibility of the south elevation panels.
Oliver – Agrees the west elevation will be visible; the south is a better spot. Suggested putting panels from any 2nd-floor roof plains on the shed south-facing roof to keep the panels set as low as possible.
McLaughlin – Clarified the position and size of the panels.
Pohl – He too is concerned about panels on the west and agrees with Ms. Oliver’s suggestion of a different configuration on the south elevation and using the shed south-facing roof. Pointed out the shed would be a separate application. There are concerns about the panels on the 2nd-floor south elevation roof.

Motion Motion to Approve through staff with no three panels on the west elevation dormer. (McLaughlin) Not carried.
Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0// Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate #
VI. 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>Michelle Black</td>
<td>05-0953</td>
<td>28 Eel Point Road</td>
<td>Sports court</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Voting: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch
   Alternates: None
   Recused: None
   Documentation: Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.
   Representing: Michelle Black
   Public: None
   Concerns (5:49): None

   (4:45) Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp) Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl- aye

   Ahern – Reviewed planting plan submitted per previous request. She placed the sport court as far from Eel Point Road as possible.

   Welch – His concern was regarding the grading submitted with the house approval; versus his recollection of the grading plan that was submitted and the grading plan here, grade has been increased 2 feet on the outside circle of the driveway where the flag is. As far as he’s concerned, this is a house on a hill; and specific retaining grade and landscaping were part of that approval; he wants to see that compared with what’s proposed. His concern is what was approved with the house; the grade in front of the home was discussed and at that time it was stated grade would not change; it has changed. He mentioned the house platform because it’s easiest to read, literally, on the plan. Looking at the northwest corner of the sport court, the existing grade is 30 feet and proposed is to go to 36 feet. This is relevant because it would change the baseline topography for the rest of the lot. We had no reason to believe the grade would change 4 to 6 feet that far from the house.

   Oliver – She’d like to see more information on the grading and fill. Asked why the sport court couldn’t be placed farther down the hill.

   McLaughlin – Fill can be overpowering visually by creating a mountain. Confirmed the fence is 8 feet black vinyl mesh and placed is inside a 4-foot retaining wall.

   Coombs – She would like to see less fill and less retainage.

   Pohl – The grading can become an issue on sloped sites; Mr. Welch mentioned that at the driveway there is 2 more feet of fill than proposed. This application is for a sport court and any grading should be taking place in the vicinity of the sport court, not the house. At the turn-around of the drive, the land slopes off dramatically. The contours around the sport court are stretched to the left side; that means fills is moving over to encompass the sport court. More fill is coming in to level off around the court on a site that already has fill. The issue isn’t the location but the fill between the platform for the house and the sport court.

Motion: Motion to Hold for revisions and more information on the amount of fill and the grade changes. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Welch, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl aye Certificate #

2. Deborah Lothian 02-0746 10 Easy Street Hardscape 42.3.1-78 Nantucket Surveyors

   Voting: Camp (acting Chair), Oliver, Watterson
   Alternates: None
   Recused: None
   Documentation: Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.
   Representing: Paul Santos, Nantucket Surveyors
   Public: None
   Concerns (5:31): None

   (4:47) Not heard due to lack of a quorum.

   Santos – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.

   Oliver – Likes the grass and cobble combination, Option 2.

   Watterson – Asked to see the edging details. Also likes Option 2.

Motion: Motion to Approve through staff Option 2 with the division strip to be up to the application. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 3-0//Watterson, Oliver, and Camp aye Certificate # HDC2020-02-0746

3. Pauline Spencer 03-0833 38 York Street Shed 55.4.1-50 Ross Goodwin

   Voting: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
   Alternates: Welch
   Recused: None
   Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
   Representing: Ross Goodwin
   Public: None
   Concerns (6:16): None

   Pohl – Read Ms. Backus notes: no photos, 4/12 pitch should be 8/12 or 12/12; need material for roof and trim.

   Oliver – She viewed this; there is a substantial hedge around a very small shed; she has no concerns.

   Camp – Agrees about the roof pitch and the shingled roof but it’s behind the hedge and the windows match the house.

   Coombs – No concerns even with the 4/12 pitch because this is a shanty.

   McLaughlin – 4/12 pitch roofs were more common in the 1940s and 1950s; no concerns.

Motion: Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl aye Certificate # HDC2020-03-0833
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4. 11 Davis Lane 03-0802 11 Davis Lane New dwelling 82-75 Emeritus

Voting
Welch (acting Chair), McLaughlin, Oliver

Alternates
None

Recused
None

Documentation
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing
Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development

Public
Matt Erisman, 2 Wall Street

Concerns (6:27)
MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Feels the north elevation is well balanced.

Oliver – Her concerns were ignored: she’s asked for the ganged windows and doors to be separated. North elevation, the chicklet windows in the dormers have too much space, especially the far-right dormer with the ganged windows and massive cheek-wall space; either reduce the dormers or increase the windows. The 6-inch change in the secondary mass height is insufficient.

McLaughlin – North elevation right, the deck is 10 feet deep; it should be pulled back to 8 feet; same on the left side.

Welch – North elevation, his concern is the sense of hierarchy between the primary and secondary masses; the walkout stairway will accentuate the height with an implied 3 stories where/if visible. Regarding the small windows in the dormers and the ganging, he hoped modifying those would better define sense of a secondary mass and alleviate those issues. The 2nd-floor deck space is a general rule we’ve been following that the decks be closer to 8 feet deep; feels there should be some accommodation there. The North elevation is still vexing to the Commissioners.

Motion
Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote
Carried 3-0//McLaughlin, Oliver, and Welch-aye Certificate #

5. 11 Davis Lane 03-0803 11 Davis Lane Cabana 82-75 Emeritus

Voting
Welch (acting Chair), McLaughlin, Oliver

Alternates
None

Recused
None

Documentation
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing
Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development

Public
Matt Erisman, 2 Wall Street

Concerns (6:43)
Welch – The abutter’s email reiterated concerns stated by abutters in the previous hearing.

MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns: relocated cabana, reduced height.

McLaughlin – No comments.

Oliver – She’d prefer the roof be a pergola; it would not draw attention to itself. Feels cabanas change the character of the area; doesn’t know why they can’t go into the house to use the bathroom. The natural vegetation should grow embrace the property. The cabana next door is surrounded by a board fence, not vegetation.

Erisman – At the last hearing, Ms. Oliver suggested the cabana shouldn’t exist due to the zoning shed. All the natural vegetation has been cleared to about 4-feet outside their property line to Davis and Trinity. The natural buffer is now gone; he is concerned any vegetation that goes in will not be indigenous. The density of the lot is staggering.

Welch – Agrees that the height appears tallish; there’s room to come down. Cisco is a low-profile area with regard to vegetation, structures and sense of place in that location. 12 Westerwyck is not an appropriate model; that cabana also has an 8-foot soffit; it appears like a commercial structure. This needs to be viewed in the context of the whole with the pool.

He’d prefer a motion indicating this will track with the pool with revisions.

Motion
Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote
Carried 3-0//Oliver, McLaughlin, and Welch-aye Certificate #

6. 11 Davis Lane 03-00798 11 Davis Lane Pool 82-75 Emeritus

Voting
Welch (acting Chair), McLaughlin, Oliver

Alternates
None

Recused
None

Documentation
Landscape design elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing
Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development

Public
Matt Erisman, abutter

Concerns (time)
MacEachern – There are no significant changes to the pool; the landscape plan wasn’t completed until Saturday.

Erisman – He and his neighbors are outraged. Changes were insignificant; reduction of the pool is less than ½ of 1%; it’s almost the same footprint as the house. Asked that the pool and cabana be eliminated altogether; people think 12 Westerwyck set a precedent. There had been discussion about moving the pool deeper into the lot.

Oliver – She’s been consistent about this not being the area for a pool: it’s the fences, privets, manicured landscaping. By pushing the pool in line with the house, everything could come in and keep the manicured landscape to a minimum; there is a lot of patio around this pool. We had asked for a screening plan; she wants to know what screening is proposed.

McLaughlin – Referred to Mr. Erisman’s letter and his thoughtful comments; agrees with those concerns.

Welch – The site has been cleared, which isn’t reflected on the site plan, whereas the original proposal showed natural vegetation; not having it there is a concern. Pools have been approved with a naturalized buffer distanced from the public way. The pool should be located such that the indigenous plant material can come close to and be surrounded around the pool leaving open yard space to the property lines. What was installed at 12 Westerwyck is not what was approved; therefor it is not an appropriate model.

Motion
Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote
Carried 3-0//McLaughlin, Oliver, and Welch-aye Certificate #
7. 11 Meadow, LLC 02-0722 11 Meadow Lane New dwelling 41-448 Emeritus

Voting Coombs (acting chair), Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
Public None

Concerns (7:14) MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.
Welch – His question is the visibility of the rear from Grove Lane; it would be an oblique angle, so he has no concerns.
Oliver – No concerns.

Motion Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)

Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Welch, Oliver, and Coombs-aye Certificate # HDC2020-02-0722

VIII. NEW 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>1. Island Gas 05-1028</td>
<td>11 Industry Road</td>
<td>Solar Panels</td>
<td>69-295</td>
<td>ACK Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, McLoughlin, Camp, Welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (7:19)</td>
<td>Glidden – Presented project; roof is corrugated metal dark grey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coombs – Her concern would be the pitch of the roof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No others have concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-call Vote</td>
<td>Carried 3-0//Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-05-1028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. TLJ Properties 05-1032 24 Bartlett Farm Road New dwelling 65-86 Emeritus

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLoughlin, Camp, Welch
Alternates Welch
Recused Welch
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
Public None

Concerns (7:28) MacEachern – Presented project.
Camp – It looks like a farmhouse; very appropriate. South elevation, suggested 10-light French doors would be more old-fashioned, in keeping with a farmhouse. It needs a chimney.
Oliver – The west elevation, which is the side, faces the Bartlett Farm Road which is peculiar and with the window in the side of a dormer; you could wrap the porch around to the door. This is larger than structures around it.
Coombs – White trim is inappropriate on a farmhouse. North elevation will be visible and it’s all windows, which should be broken up; the dormer should be smaller. This will be visible from all sides.
McLaughlin – Noted the document says Bartlett Road and the site plan says Bartlett Farm Road. Fenestration is chaotic. South elevation, front door should be a standard 6-panel; windows on the right are too large. The 2-over-2 windows are a modern feature and there are too many.
Pohl – All 1st-floor windows are too tall; building is too tall; agrees about the south elevation dormer is too large; elevation orientation is different; agrees about the white trim.

Motion Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLoughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-05-1032
3. Bob Constable 05-1029 3 Barrett Farm Road Roof color change 40-80.1 Thornewill Design
Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
Alternates Welch
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design
Concerns (7:46) Thorneill – Presented project; weatherwood.
Oliver – She and Ms. Camp viewed this; the panels aren’t visible from Madaket Road and barely visible from Barrett Farm Road. Weatherwood is dark grey with brown flakes; feels this will be okay.
Others agree due to minimal visibility.
Motion Motion to Approve. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Camp, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye
Certificate # HDC2020-05-1029

4. Reyelt Nominee Tr 05-0950 38 Derrymore Road Move-demo main house 30-72 Hanley Cons/Sophie Metz
Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
Alternates Welch
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
Representing Sophie Metz
Concerns (7:52) Metz – Presented project.
Backus – Circa 1963 ranch; contributing for architecture of that period; it does have a survey. This is a type if 1960s architecture; it’s up to the HDC to determine if they want to preserve architecture from that era. The NACR survey was done in 1989 and needs to be updated; since then, this house has reached the 50-year benchmark.
Oliver – The Massachusetts Cultural Resource Inventory states it’s on the national registry inventory, but the NACR survey says it’s not contributing.
Camp – She doesn’t think this is a good example of period architecture and doesn’t need to be saved.
Coombs – Looks to be in good shape and nice for housing. It’s an acceptable 1-story house that fits into the area. Would like to know what’s going in its place.
McLaughlin – This has no historical architectural value.
Pohl – The 50 years of age benchmark is a moving target. Doesn’t think this is a “really great example” of 1960s ranch style
Motion Motion to Approve as a move-off/demolition. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye
Certificate # HDC2020-05-0950

5. Reyelt Nominee Tr 05-0951 38 Derrymore Road Move-demo guest house 30-72 Hanley Cons/Sophie Metz
Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
Alternates Welch
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
Representing Sophie Metz
Concerns (time) Backus – Circa 2003.
Metz – Presented project.
No concerns.
Motion Motion to Approve as a move-off/demolition. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye
Certificate # HDC2020-05-0951
6. **Hannah Gardner 05-0988** 6 Gull Island Rev. 67657 and 72922 42.4.3-61 Sarah McLane

**Voting**
Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch

**Alternates**
None

**Recused**
Pohl

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

**Representing**
Sarah McLane

**Public**
None

**Concerns (8:07)**

**McLane** – Presented project; all original windows will be restored; south elevation is not visible.

**Oliver** – North elevation, the proposed rear addition isn’t as successful as the previous approval; suggested turning the gable and running the roof the other way. There is a way to turn the west elevation addition and not lose headroom.

**Camp** – Some of the charm of the building is an anomaly; the original windows are really old with hand-blown glass; wants a full window survey and restoration of the original windows. The oriel window is charming and should remain. Okay with the right gable as seen from the north, but it should have a window. Her main concerns are the north, east and west sides.

**Backus** – Circa 1800s; Lancaster indicates 12-over-12 and 9-over-9 windows and Greek doorway; okay with oriel window replacement; reduce of rear gable; replicate the traditional ell.

**McLaughlin** – The east elevation oriel should duplicate what’s there. There is no access for the roof walk. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about the addition as seen from the front.

**Welch** – Agrees with comments made. Understands concerns with lowering the roof as seen from the north elevation; but the existing west elevation competes much less with the hierarchy of the main mass; this adds a large mass on the west elevation; suggested reducing the height with some of the living space built out on the 1st-floor to the west and south. Suggested Ms. McLane direct any questions (about suggestions made to her at the meeting) through the staff.

**Motion**
Motion to Hold for revisions and further information. (Welch)

**Roll-call Vote**
Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Welch, and Coombs-aye

---

7. **Town of Nantucket 05-1037** 25 Bunker Road North Building, storage 78-2.1 SMRD

**Voting**
Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

**Alternates**
None

**Recused**
None

**Documentation**
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

**Representing**
Steve Roethke, Steve M. Roethke Design

**Public**
None

**Concerns (8:42)**

**Roethke** – These are identical buildings and can be considered together; presented project.

No concerns.

**Motion**
Motion to Approve both Item 7 & 8. (Oliver)

**Roll-call Vote**
Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye

---

8. **Town of Nantucket 05-1027** 25 Bunker Road South Building, storage 78-2.1 SMRD

**Voting**
Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

**Alternates**
None

**Recused**
None

**Documentation**
Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.

**Representing**
John McMeeking, SMRT Architects

**Public**
None

**Concerns (8:48)**

**McMeeking** – Presented project; retaining wall is 4-feet.

**Welch** – Appreciates the schools coming up with a cohesive campus plan. As long as the retainage receives vegetative landscaping to soften it from the back, he has no concerns. Visually this is a 10-foot “wall” on top of a 4-foot wall.

**Coombs & Oliver** – No concerns.

**Camp** – Leland Cyprus could break the wind and screen the wall and fence as well.

**Motion**
Motion to Approve through staff with Leland Cyprus planted on the north and west sides. (Welch)

**Roll-call Vote**
Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye

---

9. **Town of Nantucket 05-1022** 5 Backus Lane Tennis crts/retain wall/fence 67-16 SMRT Architects

**Voting**
Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

**Alternates**
None

**Recused**
None

**Documentation**
Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.

**Representing**
John McMeeking, SMRT Architects

**Public**
None

**Concerns (8:48)**

**McMeeking** – Presented project; retaining wall is 4-feet.

**Welch** – Appreciates the schools coming up with a cohesive campus plan. As long as the retainage receives vegetative landscaping to soften it from the back, he has no concerns. Visually this is a 10-foot “wall” on top of a 4-foot wall.

**Coombs & Oliver** – No concerns.

**Camp** – Leland Cyprus could break the wind and screen the wall and fence as well.

**Motion**
Motion to Approve through staff with Leland Cyprus planted on the north and west sides. (Welch)
10. Cisco Sanctuary **05-1035** 162 Hummock Pond Rd. Seasonal retail container 65-13.3 Gryphon Architect

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Ethan Griffin, Gryphon Architect
Public None

Concerns (8:58)

**Griffin** – Presented project; applying for 180 days from erection date.

**Coombs** – This will come down in the winter and is way back from the road. This will fit in.

No concerns because it’s temporary.

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)**
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Welch, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-05-1035

11. Leonard Miller **05-1030** 7 Greenleaf Road Addition 39-31 Chris Hall Architects

12. Mark Wendling **05-1023** 4 John Adams Lane Deck/windows/doors 30-628 Botticelli & Pohl

13. Prickly Pear **05-1010** 17 Broadway Rev.03-0845: dormer/wind 73.1.3-112 Val Oliver

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused Oliver
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None

Concerns (9:06)

Not heard at this time.

Motion **Motion to Hold. (Welch)**
Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

14. Stephen Welch **05-1038** 13 Waydale Road Temporary shed 67-32 Self

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Alternates None
Recused Welch
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None

Concerns (9:06)

Not heard at this time.

Motion **Motion to Hold. (Oliver)**
Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Coombs, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

15. Faro Strada, LLC **05-0945** 20 Sankaty Head Road Garage 48-31 Botticelli & Pohl

Voting Coombs (acting Chair), Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused Pohl
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None

Concerns (9:06)

(6:26) Motion to Hold for the end of the agenda. (Oliver) Carried 4-0//Welch, Oliver, and Coombs-aye

Not heard at this time.

Motion **Motion to Hold. (Welch)**
Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Oliver, Welch, and Coombs-aye Certificate #
### VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

| Approve Minutes | May 11 & 19, 2020: **Motion to Approve May 11 and hold May 19**. (Welch) Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye |
| Roll-call Vote  | May 26, 2020 |
| Review Minutes  | |
| Other Business  | • Next HDC Meeting Monday June 08, 2020 at 4:30pm  
• Discussion regarding 81 Vestal grading and retainage |
| Commission Comments | None |

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. None

**Motion to Adjourn at 9:09 p.m.** (Camp) Carried unanimously//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

[Historic Structures Advisory Board] [Sconset Advisory Board] [Madaket Advisory Board] [Sign Advisory Committee]