



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION SPECIAL 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 ~~

Thursday, June 4, 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 2:01 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,
Absent Members: Watterson, Dutra
Late Arrivals: Welch, 2:07 p.m.; Coombs, 2:11 p.m.; McLaughlin, 2:37 p.m.

Motion to Approve the Agenda. (Coombs) Carried unanimous//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, Pohl-aye

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. DISCUSSION REGARDING 81 VESTAL STREET GRADING AND RETAINAGE

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and correspondence.
Representing Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture
Doug Mills, Mark Cutone Architecture
Guy Daniello, owner
Public Chuck Lenhart, 25 Dukes Road
Hollis Webb, 28 & 30 Dukes Road
Ed Toole,
Concerns (2:13) **Pohl** – There has been a lot of public interest about this project, which was approved some time ago, regarding the grading and retainage. He wanted to bring this to a public forum.
Lenhart – There is a structure at 30 Dukes Road that is 105 years old, the oldest on Dukes Road and a contributing historical element. Last summer, Mr. Webb and Mr. Toole got notice on this structure; the design was in keeping with the neighborhood. The lower portion of the sloping property were unchanged; in October, the plan came back for revisions that no one was notified about; it went through without any debate from the neighbors. Our first indication was when the forms went up; it was eye-catching. A plateau was crated for the pool and cabana. The resulting design has a double tier of retaining walls, the first is 5-feet tall and 5-feet off the property line; the second is 10-feet tall and about 10 feet off the property line; the second wall becomes the foundation for the pool cabana giving it a 27-foot high ridge line. On the eastern property line, the upper retaining wall is 10 feet off the property line from the rear of the property to the front of the house. The pool will be 12 to 15 feet above Dukes Road and the roof of the cabana would break the top of the tree line. There's been talk of planting this; but the pool retainage will require safety railings, which will add another 3 feet to this element. If it's planted with evergreens, it won't look natural to the area. He read the minutes and noted that there were questions about screening and that there was a comment about this being minimally visible, which is obviously not the case. He looked through the application material trying to find references to the grading; there was no mention of the retaining walls in the house application. The pool revision moved its location from behind the house to this location, but there is no retaining wall on the plans or mention of grade change. There is no mention of retaining walls on the cabana application, only a note about a 60" grade change at the north; the wall isn't written on the application but only shown on the plans where they are not documented or clouded. The elevation doesn't show the actual distance to the property line or the existing grade.
Toole – Mr. Lenhart pretty much said everything.
Webb – Mr. Lenhart covered all the details on what's going on. The relationship between the wall and his driveway was missed; he hasn't seen anything like this on the Island. He's talked to Mr. Daniello about screening it.
Cutone – It is a challenging site with one of the steepest grades he worked with. Bracken Engineering worked with us; those plans reflect what's in the field today. Until we cleared the land, we weren't aware of how steeply the grade dropped from the cabana/pool site to Mr. Webb's property. The 10-foot wall is mitigated by the lower wall and proposed vegetation. Our cross sections clearly showed the retaining walls and grade change. Feels the main house will put the

cabana in scale. We've developed a site drainage plan to mitigate run off onto abutter's properties. Our approval was contingent upon landscaping and mitigation of the walls, which includes native evergreens. If the abutters let us, we will plant vegetation that would creep onto their properties and increase the buffer. Feels at most you'll see 6 feet of the back wall toward the rear of the property. The lower wall would be timber with 3 feet of exposure and a 10-foot deep vegetative buffer between the wall and the property line. There is an 8-foot deep terrace between the two walls that will be planted with trees. Our intent is to restore the vegetation to its previous density along the north and east and west property lines. Contends that with the proposed plant material; only the upper roof of the cabana will be visible from Dukes Road. The retaining walls showed up on the pool and cabana applications. We did provide contour information on all the applications. **Daniello** – He and his wife love Nantucket and plan to ensure a lot of the green is there and that Mr. Webb and his family have a green view. He is committed to ensuring there is good green between his property and the abutters' properties. All the photos Mr. Lenhard took show the worse possible state for the property; we had to clear for the wall footings. The undisturbed trees are all very mature. Mr. Toole cleared the vegetation on his property that would have blocked the view from Dukes Road; we are working to put that vegetation back.

Pohl – He appreciates the comments; to the degree that the neighbors' private concerns are congruent with HDC concerns, we'll listen to them. Dukes Road, a public way, is our purview.

Camp – She feels the truly sensitive thing is to go back to the drawing board and relocate the pool and cabana and allow the land to berm naturally toward the neighbors and Dukes Road. The scale of poured concrete is insensitive to Nantucket and the natural landscape.

Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Camp. Mr. Daniello talked of a Nantucket countryside but that is not what is proposed here. The proposed completely changes the area landscape. She wants to see a plot plan with the neighboring houses, grades, and distances. There is no residential area on Nantucket with 8 to 10-foot walls. This is a very rural area. We need a redesign.

Welch – Doesn't disagree with comments by other Commissioners. Is concerned in terms of what's on paper, he would need to do a study of what's on paper, what was approved, and what is in place before making a final determination on position. If there are discrepancies those would have to be removed. He would emphasize the concept that this is a neighborly community, and this is a neighborhood issue in some regards, and as a small community sensitivity is important. He would ask that applicant and his architect consider lowering the plateau [showed pool area in section drawing] such that there are 6 steps up to the house. Addressed any issues that might come up with the basement access, with respect to grade changes. Despite what we approved, when you look at the site plan, one of the important elements missing is the structure on Mr. Webb's property at the end of the driveway adjacent to the cabana and retaining wall, which was not presented when we reviewed the applications; this is a material element in HDC's decision making; he hopes this does not become a push-comes-to-shove situation but believes it is leverage for our position.

Oliver – She believes the idea of stepping down the plateau would go a long way. The original location was probably the right location for the pool and cabana. Appreciates the neighbors working together. Whether your neighbor cleared their lots or not, you also cleared the lot. Your solution accretes onto their property in order to soften what you proposed. Stepping down and pulling back is the right way to go.

McLaughlin – He viewed this from the travelled way. He'll make no comment at this time; he'll wait for an application to clean this up.

Pohl – If you have a 30-foot tall tree and you see a roof behind it, that implies the structure behind is taller than the tree. He's hoping there are mitigating factors to be applied. Right now, he would like this put back on Other Business to keep it open for further discussion, if necessary. Suggested another special meeting to further discuss this.

III. NEW BUSINESS FROM 6/1/20

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Leonard Miller 05-1030	7 Greenleaf Road	Addition	39-31	Chris Hall Architects
2.	Stephen Welch 05-1038	13 Waydale Road	Temporary shed	67-32	Self
3.	Mark Wendling 05-1023	4 John Adams Lane	Deck/windows/doors	30-628	Botticelli & Pohl
4.	Prickly Pear 05-1010	17 Broadway	Rev. 03-0845: dormer/wind	73.1.3-112	Val Oliver

Carried over to June 8th meeting.

Motion to Adjourned at 3:26 (Coombs) Carried unanimous//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, McLaughlin, Pohl-aye

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton

Scotset Advisory Board