



# HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road  
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554  
[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://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, June 4, 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; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker  
 Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson  
 Absent Members: Camp, Dutra  
 Late Arrivals: None  
 Early Departures: McLaughlin, 8:13 p.m.

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

## I. PUBLIC COMMENT

**Welch** – He has a project under consent with conditions he wants to discuss asked if it should be moved to new business or left as is.

## II. CONSENT

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map-Parcel	Agent
1. Hanig, Marco – 72506	23 Burnell Street	Rev. 72243: windows	73.4.1-26.1	Emeritus
2. Glowacki, Kim – 72507	20 Greglen Avenue	Shed	68-141	Structures Unlimited
3. Pender, Mary Ellen – 72508	5 Luff Road	Shed	66-351	VDHB
4. 68 Hooper Farm Rd ACK, LLC – 72509	68 Hooper Farm Road	Cottage	67-678	Val Oliver
5. Mack, Rob – 72510	2 Farmview Drive	Deck chngs, window	66-179	Val Oliver
6. Lee, Jeff – 72511	9 Aurora Way	Rev. 72297: wind, perg	56-450	Design Associates
7. Lewis, Timothy – 72512	17 York Street	Roof chng, sidewall clr chng	55.4.1-174.1	Self
8. Kremer, Paula – 72513	42A Union Street	Fence	42.3.2-28	Ahern, LLC
9. Lauretta Lane N.T. – 72514	3 Lauretta Lane	Rev. 70310: ext stairs, chmny	14-90	Mark Avery
10. Lauretta Lane N.T. – 72515	3 Lauretta Lane	Rev. 70311: barn doors	14-90	Mark Avery
11. Ross, Adam – 72516	50 Okorwaw Avenue	New garage	79-63	Thornewill Design
12. 77 Pocomo, LLC – 72517	77 Pocomo Road	Rev.72430:bsmt wltk/wnd	15-6	Emeritus
13. Fooshee, Ben – 72518	13 Massachusetts Av	Rev. 71301: windows	60-75	Emeritus
14. Nant. Islands Land Bank – 72519	168 Hummock Pond Rd	Shed	65-13.2	Structures Unlimited
15. Marshall, Margaret – 72520	17 Sherburne Turnpike	Rev. 72350: height changes	30-172.1	LINK
16. Marshall, Margaret – 72521	17 Sherburne Turnpike	Rev.72351:enclose shwr/wnd	30-172.1	LINK
17. Trudel, John – 72522	26 Pequot Street	Frnt door color change/type	80-128	Self
18. Lochner, John – 72523	42 Hulbert Avenue	Door replacements	29-66	SMRD
19. Giragosian, Nancy – 72524	5 Vestal Street	A/C units	42.3.3-144	Self
20. Blount, Susan – 72525	15 Milk Street	Retaining wall	42.3.3-85	Linda Williams
21. Miller, Michael – 72526	17 Main Street	Color change	42.3.1-178	Linda Williams
22. Judson, Richard – 72527	29 Easy Street	Fence	42.4.2-17	Self
23. Kiendl, Phil – 72528	11 Fair Street	Gate	42.3.2-63	Self
24. Sea & Sky, LLC – 72529	120 Tom Nevers Road	Shed revisions	91-40	Mark Avery
25. Ericksen, Ana – 72530	22 Orange Street	Fence	42.3.2-255	Botticelli & Pohl
26. Connors, Timothy – 72531	65 Monomoy Road	Rev. 71924: outdr shwr	43-108	Botticelli & Pohl
27. Ericksen, Ana – 72532	22 Orange Street	Rev. 72399: deck/ramp	42.3.2-255	Botticelli & Pohl
28. 36 Orange Street, LLC – 72533	36 Orange Street	Rev. 71648: demo shed	42.3.2-219	Botticelli & Pohl

Voting: Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Welch, Watterson  
 Alternates: None  
 Recused: Pohl, Oliver  
 Documentation: None  
 Representing: None  
 Public: None  
 Concerns: **Coombs** – Asked about the positioning of the fence for 42A Union Street.  
 Motion: **Motion to Approve. (Watterson)**  
 Vote: Carried 3-0//McLaughlin abstain

Certificate # **72506 to 72533**

**III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map-Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Basken Associates – <b>72534</b>	27 Somerset Lane	Rev. 72434; deck railing	66-134.4	Emeritus
• Due to minimal visibility.				
2. Welch, Stephen – <b>72535</b>	13 Waydale Road	Rev. 71585: apron	67-32	Self
• Due to context of neighborhood.				
3. Foote, Bill – <b>72536</b>	3 Luff Road	Deck extension	66-350	Self
• Due to lack of visibility.				
4. Perun, Pamela – <b>72537</b>	4 Roberts Lane	Add window/A/C units	56-34	Self
• Due to lack of visibility.				
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Welch			
Documentation	Landscape design plans for Item 2, 13 Waydale Road.			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	Motion to Pull Item 2 for discussion adopted by unanimous consent <b>Stephen Welch</b> , owner – Asked for the option to put in a tar apron.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Revise Items 2 to include an option for tar aprons. (Oliver)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve Items 1 through 4 through staff per noted conditions. (Oliver)</b>			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain		Certificate #	72534 to 72537

**IV. SIGNS**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map-Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Robert Graham	5F S. Water Street	Flag sign	42.3.1-270	Naomi Holland
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plan, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign Advisory	None			
Concerns	<b>Staff</b> – The SAC recommends this be held for revisions.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
2. Marine Home Center	5 Bayberry Court Apt 5	Sign	55-705	Patrick Levesque
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plan, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign Advisory	None			
Concerns	<b>Staff</b> – the SAC recommends approval.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72538

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map-Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Famiglio, Mark (OB)	2 Harbor View Way	Driveway/Belgium block	42.4.1-31	Julie Jordin
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	<b>Julie Jordin</b> , Garden design Company – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:45)	<p><b>Oliver</b> – She doesn’t mind the arbor but could only find one arbor in that area over on Easton Street. For her the gates don’t tie into the house, which doesn’t have cross bucks; they are an anomaly. There is too much gravel. The only thing in the area vaguely like this is a commercial building.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – No comments.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – There is some opportunity to better integrate the fence with the house. The arbor gates should be on the rear arbor posts versus the front posts to create sense of entry and eliminate ‘wall effect’. Suggest better integration, as opposed to creating another element with the picket and posts, mentioned another concept with handrail type to eliminate fence posts reading as columns, which don’t blend with respect to formality; another option is to change the porch railing to crossbucks, to match what’s already on the home, or to match the railing on the deck.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – He has no concerns with the project as submitted. Suggested reducing the amount of gravel except around the condensers; suggested widening the pickets on the fence to match the porch railing.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)</b>				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #		
2.	Ard, Warren (OB)	6 Berkley Street	Pool	76.1.3.-43	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	<b>Lisa Botticelli</b> , Botticelli & Pohl – We will supplement the existing vegetation to screen the pool.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:59)	<p><b>Oliver</b> – It is a very young hedge; we don’t want to be able to see the pool. This would have to be approved with the caveat of not being visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – Confirmed the pool has an auto cover.</p> <p><b>Watterson</b> – No concerns.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve with the pool not to be visible at the time of inspection and thereafter in perpetuity. (Watterson)</b>				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	<b>72539</b>	
3.	Ard, Warren (OB)	6 Berkley Street	Rev. 67902: shed solar	76.1.3.-43	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, manufacturer’s spec sheet, and photos.				
Representing	<b>Lisa Botticelli</b> , Botticelli & Pohl – Reviewed the details on the solar panels.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:05)	<p><b>Oliver</b> – The roof and panels need to blend as best they can; if the roof goes to black asphalt, she has no concerns.</p> <p><b>Watterson</b> – Agrees with Ms. Oliver.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – The “C” windows should be fixed.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the roof shingles to be black asphalt. (Oliver)</b>				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	<b>72540</b>	
4.	DJG Associated, LLC	11 Evelyn Street	Fence	73.3.1-93+94	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	<b>Lisa Botticelli</b> , Botticelli & Pohl – There are other fences along that street; this would be natural to weather.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:09)	<p><b>Coombs</b> – Read SAB comments: fence unnecessary and too much.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Watterson)</b>				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	<b>72541</b>	

5.	North Head Trust, LLC (OB)	Tuckernuck	Roof solar on shed	96-2.4	John Phinney
6.	Taylor, John Etal Tr (OB)	Tuckernuck	Roof solar on shed	96-2.2	John Phinney
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Watterson				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:12)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold Items 5 &amp; 6 for representation. (McLaughlin)</b>				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
7.	Leo, Nick	6 Madaket Road	Rev. 70948: window/dormer	41-184.1	Ethan McMorrow
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson				
Alternates	None (Welch left the room)				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	<b>Ethan McMorrow</b> – Presented project; also, the owner wants to add transoms over the west elevation door and remove the clapboard from the main front mass. Pulling the dormer face out would lower the windows; the bottom of a 2 <sup>nd</sup> -floor window has to be at least 24 inches from the floor.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:13)	<b>Oliver</b> – The side door on the west elevation shouldn't have transoms. Would like the north elevation dormer to be larger to have room for larger windows. <b>Coombs</b> – Agrees with Ms. Oliver about removing the transoms over the west elevation door and increasing the size of the north elevation dormer windows. <b>McLaughlin</b> – The north elevation dormer is “highly” inappropriate with the style of the structure; should be larger with different windows. <b>Watterson</b> – Agrees about no transoms over the side door; this is the edge of the rural area and transoms are formal. Okay with the dormer and other changes. <b>Pohl</b> – Asked the reason the dormer can't come out further to allow for 3-over-3 windows. He could be okay with the proposed dormer configuration.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (McLaughlin)</b>				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
8.	Gilbreth, Rebecca	92 Hulbert Avenue	Raise Bug Light 1	30-51	Ethan McMorrow
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Watterson				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	<b>Ethan McMorrow</b> – Presented project, this is the smaller of the two and to be raised 4 feet; historically, the lights would not have aprons around the base.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:30)	<b>Pohl</b> – Read HSAB comments: no concerns. <b>McLaughlin</b> – All structures raised should have a board or lattice skirt around the base. <b>Welch</b> – Northwest elevation, asked about the landscaping (shrubs); the growth will obscure much of the base. No others have concerns.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)</b>				
Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin opposed		Certificate # <b>72542</b>		
9.	Gilbreth, Rebecca	92 Hulbert Avenue	Raise Bug Light 2	30-51	Ethan McMorrow
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Watterson				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	<b>Ethan McMorrow</b> – Presented project, this is the taller of the two and to be raised 2 feet; repeated that historically, the lights would not have aprons around the base.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:38)	<b>Pohl</b> – Read HSAB comments: no concerns. <b>McLaughlin</b> – Same concern that it should have a skirt around the pilings. <b>Welch</b> – He acknowledges Mr. McLaughlin's concerns about changes to historical context and more so to structures being raised without being properly masked; however, in this instance it is appropriate, in part due to its being obscured by vegetation, and in part due to its being a very small, simple structure, given historic imagery provided apron inappropriate. Raising historic structures needs to be done sensitively. No others have concerns.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)</b>				
Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin opposed		Certificate # <b>72543</b>		

10. Williams, Glen	277 Madaket Road	2 <sup>nd</sup> -floor deck & patio	59.4-335	Robert Newman
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Robert Newman</b> , Sandcastle Construction Inc. – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:40)	<b>Pohl</b> – Read MAB comments: no concerns. The drawing should be corrected to show the 1 <sup>st</sup> -floor window and door flipped, as indicated in the photo. <b>Oliver</b> – We need a floor plan for the file; no concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	<b>72544</b>	
11. 48 Walsh Street Trust	48 Walsh Street	Rev. 71873: deck	29-101	Robert Newman
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Robert Newman</b> , Sandcastle Construction Inc. – Presented project. Reviewed context photos. <b>Dave Champoux</b> , Landscaper – Reviewed the planting plan to screen the deck.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:45)	<b>Pohl</b> – Read HSAB comments: not appropriate; south elevation railing too heavy; deck doesn't relate to shed. <b>McLaughlin</b> – In light of the 14 photos, almost every raised deck has an apron. He has no concerns. <b>Welch</b> – The design is successful in bring down the perception of height of the house; however, it's confusing to the eye because the deck sits so high relative to the house side wall, but the skirt is high. Looking at the whole, it should come down one step from the house. There is a lot of construction on Walsh Street; He feels strongly that a 7- to 8-foot hedge shown on the plan is an inappropriate architectural element. Right now Walsh Street is becoming a green alley way; he feels the hedge, if approved as screening, should be approved at no taller than 6 feet. <b>Coombs</b> – The proposed deck is too high and too large; in past hearings, we discussed its being lower at length. Thinks it will be visible from the rear and should be reduced with open railing. <b>Watterson</b> – The off-putting part is the wide stair in the middle; suggested the stairs face sideways. <b>Oliver</b> – It should be all shingled all the way to the ground like a wall; part of the perception of its size are the vertical elements. <b>Pohl</b> – The proposed deck is flush with the house 1 <sup>st</sup> floor; Mr. Welch's suggestion of coming down one step is good; but the shingle and sideway stairs ideas will be good too.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
12. 77 Pocomo, LLC	77 Pocomo Road	Move off/demo dwelling	15-6	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, historical information, and photos.			
Representing	<b>Matt MacEachern</b> , Emeritus Development – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:06)	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as a move-off/demo. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	<b>72545</b>	
13. Smith, Jared	24 Clarendon Street	Roof Walk	76.1.3-125	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:09)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for representation. (McLaughlin)0</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

14. Savov, Tsvetenin	10 Wappossett Circle	Driveway & patio	67-570	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	<b>Tsvetenin Savov</b> – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:10)	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	<b>72546</b>	
15. Corry, Andrew	36 Pochick Avenue	Color change	80-285	Sarah F. Alger
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:16)	<p><b>Staff</b> – This is to request the front door change from blue to white.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – This is an incomplete application. We don't have the previous approval and don't know the approved colors.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Having viewed the drawings the information is there, but it is incredibly small due to scale of the photocopy reduction--they might not understand our issue in understanding the application, one of which is the print is too small.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – It wouldn't be his inclination to put a white door with natural trim.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for a complete application.</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
16. Laurretta Lane N.T.	3 Laurretta Lane	Rev. 70484: entry, window	14-90	Mark Avery
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	<b>Mark Avery</b> – Presented project; believes the trim is white.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:20)	<p>No concerns.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – No concerns. However, we don't know what the approved trim color is; we need to discuss with the shared staff about ensure applications have all the required material.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	<b>72547</b>	
17. Blount, Susan	15 Milk Street	Windows headers	42.3.3-85	NAG
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Steve Theroux</b> , Nantucket Architectural Group – Presented project. Linda Williams			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:25)	<p><b>Pohl</b> – Read HSAB comments: no concerns.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	<b>72548</b>	

18. Deuster, Bob	13 Monomoy Road	Open air structure	54-198	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting Alternates	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Recused	Welch			
Documentation	None			
Representing Public	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Concerns (6:29)	<b>Lindsay Congleton</b> , Atlantic Landscaping Inc. – Presented project; owner wants a hipped pergola roof.			
	None			
	<b>Oliver</b> – A hipped pergola is a no-go; it’s very close to Sandwich Road and would be visible. An open, flat, natural-to-weather pergola would be okay. The solid wall of shiplap should not be white.			
	<b>Coombs</b> – Should be natural to weather. Agrees about the flat pergola.			
	<b>McLaughlin</b> – Agrees.			
	<b>Watterson</b> – Nothing to add.			
	<b>Pohl</b> – He would not approve a hipped pergola.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
19. Millard, Jessica	5 Cudweed	Pool & hardscape	82-143	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting Alternates	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	None			
Representing Public	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.			
Concerns (6:36)	<b>Lindsay Congleton</b> , Atlantic Landscaping Inc. – Presented project.			
	None			
	<b>Welch</b> – It should be subject to the lack-of-visibility caveat.			
	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve with the pool not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter in perpetuity. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	<b>72549</b>
20. Beaudette, Rick	3 Anna Drive	Pool & hardscape	55-245.4	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting Alternates	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Recused	Welch			
Documentation	None			
Representing Public	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.			
Concerns (6:40)	<b>Lindsay Congleton</b> , Atlantic Landscaping Inc. – Presented project.			
	None			
	<b>McLaughlin</b> – Believes this will not be visible.			
	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve with the pool not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter in perpetuity. (Oliver)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	<b>72550</b>
21. Scheier, Mark	10 Sunset Ridge Lane	Driveway & hardscape	73.4.2-49	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting Alternates	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	None			
Representing Public	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Concerns (6:45)	<b>Lindsay Congleton</b> , Atlantic Landscaping Inc. – Presented project.			
	None			
	<b>Pohl</b> – Read SAB comments: no concerns; don’t mind the bluestone cap.			
	<b>Oliver</b> – Asked to view for context.			
	<b>Welch</b> – Asked that they consider replacing the timber wall with a continuation of the stone.			
	<b>Coombs</b> – We don’t approve walls having bluestone caps.			
Motion	<b>Motion to View and Hold for pictures. (Welch)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
22. 262 Polpis, N.T.	262 Polpis Road	Demo cottage	25-1	M. C. Architecture
Voting Alternates	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Recused	Welch			
Documentation	None			
Representing Public	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Concerns (6:51)	<b>Mark Cutone</b> , Mark Cutone Architecture – Presented project; circa 1954.			
	None			
	<b>McLaughlin</b> – This has no architectural value; no concerns.			
	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as a demolition. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	<b>72551</b>





26. Qureshi, Abrar	4 Bartlett Road	Generator	82-23.2	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Welch, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	<b>Val Oliver</b> , Val Oliver Design, Inc. – Propose to add fencing to the vegetated screening. <b>Dennis Patnaude</b> , Project Executive/Director of Plan Operations – State regulations require vaccination storage be kept in regulated temperatures.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:18)	<b>Coombs</b> – They need to have screening. The generator is necessary, and they’ve done the best they can. <b>Welch</b> – It will be adequately screened; he has no concerns. <b>McLaughlin</b> – Confirmed the dimensions and location of the generator and fence. <b>Watterson</b> – Nothing to add.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted with a 36” picket fence around the generator’s east and north sides. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	<b>72553</b>	
27. 14 Bishops Rise, LLC	14 Bishops Rise	Deck/pergola	40-124	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Welch, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	<b>Val Oliver</b> , Val Oliver Design, Inc. – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:24)	<b>Pohl</b> – We don’t have a drawing; we need the height. <b>Welch</b> – Asked about the visibility of the pergola from Bishops Rise; basically, the far side of the pergola would be visible from a distance. No other concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with a pergola constructed as per photo and to be 8-feet tall. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	<b>72554</b>	
28. The James Family	2 Saccacha Avenue	Demo/move off	82-23.2	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Welch, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	<b>Val Oliver</b> , Val Oliver Design, Inc. – Presented project, circa 1995.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:29)	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as a move or demo. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	<b>72555</b>	
29. N.I.R.	25 Center Street	Door/sash color change	42.3.1-166	Patrick Taaffe
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:31)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for representation (Welch)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
30. Halbern, Robin	17 Washaman Avenue	Dormers	55-523.9	Kent Murphy
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:31)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	<b>Motion to View and Hold for representation. (Welch)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

31. 55 Grove Lane, LLC	55 Grove Lane	New dwelling	41-419	Sophie Metz
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Sophie Metz</b> – Presented project; doesn't believe this is visible; the awning windows are not visible.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:32)	<p><b>Oliver</b> – It is appropriate even if it were visible; she went out there and it is not visible.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – The awning windows should be fixed.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – You can't see it; to see the awning windows, you have to pull into the driveway.</p> <p><b>Watterson</b> – Agrees this will not be visible; no concerns.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin opposed	Certificate #	<b>72556</b>	

32. Turner, Michelle	1 Washington Avenue	Hardscape: gate	60.2.4-81	George Turner
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>George Turner</b> , owner – Presented project; it's very open & his neighbor on Baltimore has a full privet hedge. There is no proposed lighting; it shouldn't be on the plans.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:39)	<p><b>Pohl</b> – Read MAB comments: cedar arbor not in keeping &amp; not shown on plan; all gates should match, 4-foot wide with cedar posts. If it weren't for the arbor and gate, HDC would have no jurisdiction over the privet hedge. He thinks HDC should focus on the architectural aspect. The arbor and gate are too formal; they should be simplified. The gate shouldn't be framed out, just vertical board.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – This is a very visible sight from every direction. That amount of privet is very not-Madaket. Suggested more natural plantings to break up the line of privet along the roads. She wants to view this; there's a lot of information including lighting and she wants to absorb all of it. Agrees about the vertical board gates. At the point (Madaket and Washington) there is a bunch of different, lower plants; there should be more of that; her concern is the linear look of the privet.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – In Madaket, privet, unlike in some other areas of the island, isn't historically associated with long solid hedge row. His perspective is, something that's before the HDC and proposed as part of an application for hardscaping or with a structure, or any traditional architectural element, that is itself an architectural element, should be addressed; in this instance privet becomes an architectural feature that changes the character of the streetscape and area when it, as it looks to be, is over 300 feet of privet on two roads. A naturalized planting or series of naturalized planting to break up formally maintained tall hedge is appropriate to better aesthetic effect in context. The horseshoe pits, which are not traditional enclosed in stone retaining walls, and fire pit in the middle of the yard should not be visible at the time of inspection and thereafter. Recapped that the privet hedge should be broken up with more groups of natural plantings; break up the privet with some type of other plant materials; gave some examples, should be relate to Madaket; less columnar, less formal; and, the horseshoe pits built up with retaining walls are very formal; they should not be visible.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Agrees that if plants are changing the streetscape, it should be considered. Madaket and 'Sconset and Nantucket have different vegetation; something that is more the center in Town shouldn't be put in Madaket.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – No comments.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

33. 450 Green Park, LLC	2 Stone Alley	Addition	42.3.1-102	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Watterson			
Alternates				
Recused	McLaughlin			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, minutes from hearings on previous submittal, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Victory Ewing</b> , LINK – Presented project; willing to provide a window survey.			
Public	<b>Chris Skehel</b> , Cottage Group – The dashes delineate which windows are remaining; the window schedule clarifies that.			
Public	<b>Linda Williams</b> , for Virginia Andrews – Asked that the information in the packet submitted at the table be entered into this record. They've been asked to add on toward the south. It's the only lot that doesn't front on Orange Street and is below the bluff. This is very visible from Orange and Union Streets and Stone Alley. The addition is not properly scaled and has no additive massing. The owner has bermed and planted trees along Stone Alley, which completely changed the view and context of Stone Alley.			
Public	<b>Steven Cohen</b> , Cohen & Cohen Law P.C., for J. Crosby – The design as proposed is basically the same as previously submitted; this board has told the applicant what an appropriate addition would be. The applicant should do a small addition off the other side as has been asked. This addition is 3 stories at the rear and overwhelms the historic structure; recommends the HDC deny the application because concerns have not been addressed. Asked that HDC accept the prior information into the record. The siting is inappropriate; this design overwhelms Stone Alley. Nantucket's historical architecture is Quaker, which is simple.			
Public	<b>Sarah Alger</b> , Sarah F. Alger P.C., for Virginia Andrews – Agrees with Mr. Cohen. Asked the HDC to look at the berm. This is an inappropriate addition; asked for a denial or a complete redesign.			
Public	<b>Whitney Gifford</b> , Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, & Gifford LLP, for 14R Orange Street – Most of his comments were covered by Mr. Cohen and Ms. Alger. His client's quality of life will be completely undone by this addition. It is inappropriate for the reasons previously stated. Asked the Chair about the ridge height from grade of the east elevation as shown on Page A101. South elevation fenestration is close or exceeds the 50% rule.			
Public	<b>Virginia Andrews</b> , 1 Stone Alley – What's proposed will change the character of the Stone Alley neighborhood. The berm and trees have already changed Stone Alley.			
Concerns (8:04)	<b>Pohl</b> – Read HSAB comments: Not appropriate; redesign or deny due to lack of response to HSAB & HDC concerns; ask to step down; overwhelms building and site; 1-story wrap-around deck overly large; parallel ridge create competing masses; need window survey; changing stone alley topography need survey stamp. That the plans aren't to scale is a big problem. The east elevation ridge is 35 feet from grade. We need to have floor plans.			
Concerns (8:04)	<b>Welch</b> – We should redouble our efforts. Asked for clarification if the HSAB comments are voted; the comments seem to contradict themselves. If we are going to accept the new application as an extension of the previous, and/or the previous record of materials are to be accepted, what we hear now and going forward should not be a rehash of what we've heard before – relevant material already entered into the record should simply be referred to. Feels the commission should establish a process; if we are going to submit past information, we don't need to hear that information repeated. He believes the new application should be discussed as such, on its own merits. Having acknowledged the fact that the drawings aren't ¼-inch scale, asked if the scale is consistent throughout.			
Concerns (8:04)	<b>Coombs</b> – The drawings are not to scale; they should be ¼-inch scale. We should look at this as a new application and not bring up the last submittal, unless it is relevant to this design.			
Concerns (8:04)	<b>Oliver</b> – This massing idea is far better than previous iterations of big boxes; this has started to move in a good direction. She agrees it would be nice for the original structure to sit by itself with the addition trailing to the south. Pulling away from the street would also help. We need properly scaled drawings and changes need to be bubbled. The overhangs are very large as compared to the existing. Asked what the windows with dash lines signifies; it's not clear on the window schedule. West elevation, the skinny side windows on the cantilevered façade look like they are at an angle. She feels there will be substantial retaining; we need heights from fill or grade noted on the plans. The dormer pitches are too shallow. The middle section seems to have a 2 <sup>nd</sup> -floor wall with a roof and no windows. Consider stepping the addition down more. Agrees that the wrap-around deck is too large; it swallows up the house.			
Concerns (8:04)	<b>Coombs</b> – She would like to see more 1-story additive massing; the addition makes the house too large for the piece of land it's on. We have discussed going south and not running down the hill. The pictures of structures on Union and Orange Streets don't reflect the character of Stone Alley.			
Concerns (8:04)	<b>Watterson</b> – Agrees with Ms. Coombs. Massing is the most fundamental thing: it should be put outward rather than eastward; there is a 12-foot grade change leaving an atypical massive addition; 1-story massing is critical in being subordinate to the existing.			
Concerns (8:04)	<b>Welch</b> – The berm and planting is out of line; however, it's not part of the HDC application process. We have to address plantings in the Act to, if not part of an application, make it an architectural feature. With regard to public comments on the priorities of Zoning, those and HDC priorities are sometimes in conflict; for instance, the master plan allows over 34-foot structures in some areas but HDC looks at historical, lower, additive massing. With regard to persons speaking on the application, he doesn't want it to be misconstrued that someone is denying a person's right to be heard or for information to be entered into the record; the procedure is simply to not rehash old topics and if something previously submitted or stated is relevant to simply reference that fact. The elephant in the room is the lack of additive massing and the proximity of what is proposed, so close to Stone Alley. The east is an inappropriate location due to extending down the hill and it is inappropriate for such a small structure to have such a large addition. In terms of inappropriateness, the 1 <sup>st</sup> -floor deck is			

inappropriately large as a single mass for this existing structure. The 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor deck is appropriate. It would be more appropriate to bring the massing off to the south, the flat roof element would be replicated or preserved. The south elevation window glazing proportions are off, square vs. traditional rectangular forms; that might be a drafting issue. Fenestration needs to be cleaned up to using a common vernacular. Agrees with previous comments about the soffits and overhangs and dormer roof pitches. Agrees with other comments on additive massing. Requested: Cross section of north-south and east-west, a retainage plan with cross sections, the elevations and floor plans in full 1/4-inch scale, hardscaping related to retainage, window survey that conforms with HDC specifications as noted on the website, history of the deck and to what extent it is historical, clarification with respect to windows being reused or relocated or new on the elevations, and heights on the elevations.

**Pohl** – The applicant has said they are nowhere near allowable groundcover; that fact in combination with the desire for more single-story massing means there is plenty of room to do that. Agrees with what’s been said. We need a new topo plan showing the new grade to include spot grades and retaining; he’d prefer not to see retainage and for the natural slope to be left alone. We need properly scaled elevations with ridge height from grade and the fenestration markers to reference back to details; we need floor plans; we need a window survey. It’s obvious to us all that the wide windows are inappropriate. We’d all love to see more of this addition going south; trying to make the entire addition go east presents two problems – creating a wall on Stone Alley and fighting the natural grade. There was talk about us voting to deny this application; in reality this is a new application and should be given a little time.

Motion **Motion to Hold for additional information and revisions and the list of additional information as previously stated and the application not be put back on the agenda until all requested information is submitted and to go back to HSAB. (Welch)**

Vote Carried 5-0

Certificate #

VI. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approve Minutes	May 21, 2019 – no action at this time.
Review Minutes	April 10, and May 28, 2019
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of update on Vineyard Wind project.</li> <li>• Discussion of synthetic materials.</li> <li>• Review and possible vote on upcoming HDC schedule. Voted May 30, 2019</li> <li>• Discussion of sidewalk work performed in front of 86 Main Street.</li> <li>• Discussion and update of Sidewalk Work Group.</li> </ul>
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. None

Adjourned at 9:17 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:  
Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Sconset Advisory Board

Madaket Advisory Board

Sign Advisory Committee