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 8, 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; Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist
Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Absent Members: Watterson, Dutra
Late Arrivals: McLaughlin, 4:35 p.m.; Coombs, 5:00 p.m.
Early Departures: McLaughlin, 8:56 p.m.; Welch, 9:05 p.m.; Camp, 9:15 p.m.

Motion to Adopt the Agenda as amended. (Oliver)
Carried 5-0//Camp, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

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>Kathi Coughlin 05-1013</td>
<td>8 Cottage Street</td>
<td>Roof change</td>
<td>73.1.3-78</td>
<td>JB Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Veith 06-1084</td>
<td>12 Okorwaw Avenue</td>
<td>97 sf Addition</td>
<td>79-165</td>
<td>Thornewill Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Schoettle 06-1077</td>
<td>13 Irving Street</td>
<td>Door/window chg</td>
<td>79-72</td>
<td>Ethan McMorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Myers 06-1082</td>
<td>28 Kelley Road</td>
<td>Move/demo 120 sf shed</td>
<td>54-104</td>
<td>Normand Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jensen 06-1063</td>
<td>4 Fishers Landing Road</td>
<td>Pergola</td>
<td>38-157</td>
<td>Gryphon Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Shawkemo Rd RT 06-1055</td>
<td>4 Shawkemo Road</td>
<td>Rev. 02-0737: deck/otr shr</td>
<td>43-91.1</td>
<td>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joann Bennett 06-1078</td>
<td>27 Monomoy Road</td>
<td>Rev. 05-0938: resite shed</td>
<td>54-207</td>
<td>Val Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hunter Tr 06-1060</td>
<td>Village Way</td>
<td>Beach Stairs</td>
<td>14-2</td>
<td>Jardins International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Shawkemo Rd RT 06-1056</td>
<td>6 Shawkemo Road</td>
<td>Driveway/3’ retain wall</td>
<td>43-91.2</td>
<td>Julie Jordin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Cohen Tr 06-1066</td>
<td>19 North Pasture Lane</td>
<td>Hardscaping</td>
<td>44-73</td>
<td>Julie Jordin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Polpis Rd, LLC 06-1067</td>
<td>40 Polpis Road</td>
<td>Roof change</td>
<td>54-265</td>
<td>Linda Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Healey 06-1068</td>
<td>37 Washaman Avenue</td>
<td>Separate ganged windows</td>
<td>55-585.9</td>
<td>Linda Williams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting
Camp (acting chair), McLaughlin, Welch,
Alternates
None
Recused
Pohl, Oliver
Documentation
None
Representing
None
Public
None
Concerns (time)
None

Motion
Motion to Approve. (Welch)
Carried 3-0// Welch, McLaughlin, and Camp-aye
Certificate # HDC2020-(as noted)
III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

1. Jerry Miller, 05-1014, 63 Boulevarde
   - Spa/grill area/veneer stone
   - Must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity
   - Waterscapes

2. Steve Boukus, 06-1083, 58 Squam Road
   - Pool/pergola
   - Must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity
   - Concept Design

3. Brian Larkin, 06-1081, 4B Gladlands Avenue
   - Outdoor shower
   - Due to lack of visibility
   - Concept Design

4. Tim Veith, 06-1085, 12 Okorwaw Avenue
   - Pool/fence
   - Due to lack of visibility
   - Thornewill Design

5. 4 Shawkemo Rd RT, 06-1054, 4 Shawkemo Road
   - Pool/hardscape
   - Due to lack of visibility
   - Botticelli & Pohl

6. 4 Shawkemo Rd RT, 06-1057, 4 Shawkemo Road
   - Pool
   - Must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity
   - Julie Jordin

V. EMERGENCY ENFORCEMENT OF 81 VESTAL STREET

**NOT ANCTICIPATED BY THE CHAIR WITHIN 48 HOURS** Not discussed at this meeting

VI. NEW BUSINESS

1. Leonard Miller, 05-1030, 7 Greenleaf Road
   - Addition
   - Chris Hall Architects

Concerns (4:42)
- Hall – Presented project.
- Oliver – Appreciates the addition; it creates a sense of hierarchy where there was none. Visibility is minimal, and it fits in.
- Camp – She was concerned about the height increasing a couple of feet; but she’s okay due to its location.
- Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. It does pick up design elements of the existing structure; nicely done and very subtle to the area; this is a great example of a structure that takes Building with Nantucket in Mind by fitting into the terrain and not placed on the top of the hill.
- McLaughlin – Anywhere that has more than three or more sets of ganged windows should be reduced to two sets.
- Pohl – Agrees with what’s been said.

Motion
- Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote
- Carried 4-1//McLaughlin-nay; Welch, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

Certificate # HDC2020-05-1030
2. Stephen Welch 05-1038 13 Waydale Road Temporary shed 67-32 Self

- Voting: Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
- Alternates: None
- Recused: Welch
- Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
- Representing: Stephen Welch, owner
- Public: None

Concerns (4:55)

- Welch – Presented project; not meant to be permanent – 720 days – no foundation.
- Oliver – We’ve approved these before with a timeframe attached; she has no concerns.
- Camp – Okay with this; asked about the material – tan vinyl.
- McLaughlin – Feels the visibility is very low and these are all over the Island

Motion

Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)

Roll-call Vote

Carried 4-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye

Certificate # HDC2020-05-1038

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

- Voting: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch
- Alternates: None
- Recused: Oliver
- Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
- Representing: Val Oliver, V. Oliver Design
- Public: None

Concerns (5:00)

- Oliver – Presented project, circa 1800s, contends there is minimal visibility; there are existing casements on the 1st-floor.
- Flynn – Read Ms. Backus’ comments: south elevation windows change to 6-over-6; east elevation 3rd floor dormer, dormer on shed is dormer on dormer, not appropriate; north elevation refer east elevation.
- Coombs – Without the 3rd-floor dormer, this fits the area. No concerns with the fold-up windows. East elevation 3rd-floor dormer, agrees with Ms. Backus.
- Camp – Regarding the east elevation 3rd-floor dormer, suggested two separate dormers placed over the triple-set of windows for the sake of balance. Okay with the fold-up windows.
- Welch – On the 2nd-sheet of the application which shows 11 Broadway and other imagery: 11 Broadway looks like it has 1.5/12 or 2/12 pitch with the front about 6/12 pitch; the photo also shows a 3rd-floor dormer, which supports this request. No concerns with the windows. East elevation, 2nd-floor right ganged windows, asked if they will be similar in light size – yes. The change to the shed roof is helpful, the dormer in the upper 1/3 of the roof is helpful; we approved a dormer over a dormer on Washaman Avenue with limited visibility; this could be as well. If the dormer width is important to the program, shift the dormer right so the left most window aligns over the center window below.
- McLaughlin – The 3rd-floor dormers are inappropriate. The fold-up windows are inappropriate for this style of house; should be regular double-hung.
- Pohl – The most telling photo is the one from Front Street; you can’t see the 2nd-floor dormer, so the 3rd-floor dormers wouldn’t be visible, and there is a 3rd-floor dormer on a nearby structure. This building isn’t visible from Codfish Park. He’s okay with the 3rd-floor dormer. Double-hung inswing are no different than hoppers.

Motion

Motion to Approve through staff with the east elevation left dormer slid right so the left-most window aligns over the center-ganged window below. (Welch)

Roll-call Vote

Carried 4-1//McLaughlin-nay; Coombs, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye

Certificate # HDC2020-05-1010

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

- Voting: Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch
- Alternates: None
- Recused: Pohl
- Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
- Representing: Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl
- Public: None

Concerns (5:27)

- Botticelli – Presented project; only the south elevation would be visible.
- Oliver – She was recently at this house; agrees John Adams Lane is little more than a well-overgrown driveway and a pool with cabana are in front of this. She has no concerns due to limited visibility.
- McLaughlin – North elevation, asked what the left revised windows are – 9-light casement.
- Camp – Appreciates the changes. North elevation, she preferred the single French door with two windows; a decorative circle in the central gable forward would be charming.
- Welch – Agrees with what’s been said. He saw a Nantucket dormer on a downtown house and it would work with this; this is a highly ornamental structure. Okay with the fenestration.

Motion

Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote

Carried 5-0//Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, Camp, and Coombs-aye

Certificate # HDC2020-05-1023
5. Ray Pohl 06-1058 24 Pine Street  Fenestration revisions  42.3.2-110  Botticelli & Pohl

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 Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl
Public None

Concerns (5:39)
Botticelli – Presented project.
Flynn – Read Holly comments: No concerns; love the shutters
Camp – Supports the revisions.
Oliver – No concerns.
Welch – No concerns.
McLaughlin – No concerns.

Motion Motion to Approve. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, and Coombs-aye Certificate # HDC2020-06-1058

6. Michael Pearlstein 06-1062 20 Derrymore Road  Skylight  41-112 Linda Williams

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
Alternates Welch
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Linda Williams
Public None

Concerns (5:57)
Williams – Presented project, Circa 1970.
Coombs – No concerns.
Camp – The skylight is on the front of the house; she’s not enthusiastic about this.
Oliver – Tried to view this but Derrymore was blocked off. Given the building’s siting on the lot, she’s okay; suggested it go up higher on the roof which would mitigate visibility.
McLaughlin – No comments.
Pohl – No concerns. If they put a dormer in there, that would be more imposing.

Motion Motion to Approve through staff with the skylight pushed as far back from the front face of the dormers as possible to mitigate visibility. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Camp-absain; Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-06-1062

7. Peter Lisi 05-1012 2 Flintlock Road  Dormer/deck  75-50 Shelter 7

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
Alternates Welch
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Jason Olbres, Shelter 7
Public None

Concerns (5:45)
Olbres – Presented project, the east elevation is probably not visible due to the existing vegetation.
Camp – Suggested ganging the south elevation windows to match what is there. No concerns with the dormer.
Coombs – Ms. Camp’s suggestion makes sense. If you can see the east elevation, it looks off; shouldn’t be a saltbox.
McLaughlin – Confirmed the north elevation skylight is going away.
Oliver – She didn’t view this. South elevation, suggested one large dormer for simplicity sake. On the front elevation, suggested eliminating the lower garage roof and bringing the wall up to be a single plane.
Pohl – The north elevation dormer as viewed from the east is almost a saltbox and not approvable under our guidelines.

Motion Motion to Approve through staff with combining the south elevation proposed dormer with the existing dormer and putting the two windows in the right together and mull them. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-05-1012
| 8. | Town of Nantucket 06-1072 | 135 Pleasant Street | Electric Charging Station | 55-271 | Lauren Sinatra |
| 9. | Town of Nantucket 06-1073 | 1 Sea Street | Electric Charging Station | 42.4-2.55 | Lauren Sinatra |
| 10. | Town of Nantucket 06-1074 | 14 Airport Road | Electric Charging Station | 78-1 | Lauren Sinatra |
| 11. | Town of Nantucket 06-1075 | Washington Street | Electric Charging - wall mount | 42.3-2-6/84 | Lauren Sinatra |
| 12. | Town of Nantucket 06-1076 | 4 Fairgrounds Road | Electric Charging Station | 67-40 | Lauren Sinatra |

**Concerns (6:04)**

- **Sinatra** – Presented projects; the top can be any color but might keep it silver until signage is applied for; bollards are recommended at all sites and prefer the style at White Elephant. Understands the need to be discrete with the wiring; all feeder lines will be out of sight.

- **Flynn** – Read Ms. Backus comments: no concerns; appropriate use for town-owned utility-type properties; White Elephant example is appropriate.

- **Oliver** – She doesn’t remember White Elephant getting their charging station approved. Asked where the feeder lines will go – different for each site. If lines are going to show, we need to require concealment.

- **Coombs** – About Washington Street, it’s in the Town parking lot and taking up a parking space in the summer is a problem; she doesn’t think it will be usable in the summer.

- **McLaughlin** – There should be no orange on it; thinks blue is more appropriate and they should all be blue.

- **Camp** – No concerns.

- **Pohl** – Asked if any will require exposed conduits – none.

**Motion**

- **Roll-call Vote**
  - **Carried 5-0//Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye**
  - **Certificate # HDC2020-06-(as noted)**

13. **Nan Isl Land**

- **Bank 06-1047**
  - 168 Hummock Pond Road
  - Farm Stand
  - 65-53.2
  - Sustainable Nantucket

**Concerns (6:20)**

- **Constable** – Presented project; natural to weather spruce; roof to be black standing seam; if we are successful in fund raising, we have a grant to install solar on the southeast-facing roof, away from the road.

- **Coombs** – This supports the community in education and farming; it fits with the Farm.

- **Oliver** – Got clarification on the plans of the north and south elevation.

- **McLaughlin** – Confirmed roof material and angle.

- **Camp** – No concerns. We have solar at Bartlett Farm and okay with the architecture.

- **Pohl** – We are not approving solar at this time.

**Motion**

- **Roll-call Vote**
  - **Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye**
  - **Certificate # HDC2020-05-1047**

14. **Alan Myers 06-1064**

- 28 Kelley Road
- New dwelling
- 54-104
- Normand Residential

**Concerns (6:32)**

- **(631) Motion to skip over. (Coombs)**
  - **Carried 5-0//Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye**

- **Normand** – Presented project; except for the sash, everything is natural to weather.

- **Coombs** – Kelley and Berkeley dead-end at this property. Would like the height reduced to 28 feet since the house is 26 feet. East elevation, there are a lot of staircases; would like the ones on the left side reduced.

- **Oliver** – Given the location and minimal visibility, she has no concerns as long as the area isn’t clear-cut. Asked if the east stairs could be moved to the west or put inside; otherwise we would want screening in place.

- **McLaughlin** – East elevation, there is too much decking on the left.

- **Welch** – The first floor is tall, and this is long; thinks only the north elevation will be visible, which is close to the property line. He doesn’t think there’s much visibility; any would be the 2nd-floor and above. Lack of visibility mitigates the height.

- **Pohl** – He’d love to see it get smaller with less railing; but it is tucked in.

**Motion**

- **Roll-call Vote**
  - **Carried 4-0//Coombs-abstain; Welch, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye**
  - **Certificate # HDC2020-06-1064**
| 15. | 33 Coffin LLC 06-1079 | 33 Coffin Street | Hardscape: other than pool | 73.4.1-26 | CWA |
| 16. | 33 Coffin LLC 06-1080 | 33 Coffin Street | Pool | 73.4.1-26 | CWA |

**Voting:** Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch  
**Alternates:** Camp stepped out.  
**Recused:** None  
**Documentation:** Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.  
**Representing:** Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates  
**Public:** None

**Concerns (6:30):**

- **Webster** – Presented project; the pergola is not part of this application.
- **Flynn** – Read Ms. Backus comments: Landscape plan helpful; proposed gates should relate stylistically.
- **Oliver** – It says the “timber” cedar gate at the driveway is shown as a curved gate, which is very atypical; it should match the maintenance gate. Would prefer this and the pool to be one application. The Google map shows heavy vegetation on the corner; if that remains, she has no concerns.  
- **McLaughlin** – The “V” on the maintenance gates is inappropriate.  
- **Welch** – Agrees with comments on the Type II picket gates. Everything we are not approving should be stricken from the drawing. Some of the plant materials on this plan are associated with the pool. The pool should be moved in half its current distance to the house; doesn’t know if that will impact the proposed hedging. Looking along the bottom of the property and up right side, it is listed as with existing shrubbery; he finds it troubling that has not been continued along Burnell Street. Appendix II indicates the outer hedge to be Viburnum but not which type.  
- **Coombs** – Running the pool against Burnell Street is inappropriate; this is an important corner with nothing protecting the visibility but the hedges. Wants the pool to get closer to the house or to turn. This is a very rural location; believes at one point we asked for this to be less formal, but it has gotten more formal. The pool fence encloses the entire property rather than being tucked up to the pool.  
- **Pohl** – The tops of the maintenance gate pickets look rounded; the landscaper needs to look at the guidelines; this is a deviation from typical Nantucket picket gates. It’s not clear what is and what is not part of this application. Noted that the land along the roads is Town land, not private. He is also concerned about the pool’s proximity to Burnell and the vegetation that would be needed for screening and its being too formal for the area. He’d support an alternate location for the pool and less formal landscaping.  

**Discussion about combining these two into one application.**

**Motion:** Motion to Hold for revisions and combining these two applications into one with elements not being asked for to be removed from the plans. (Coombs)  
**Roll-call Vote:** Carried 5-0//Welch, Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, Pohl-aye  
**Certificate #**

| 17. | Paul Zevnik 06-1071 | 24 West Chester Street | GH-addition | 42.4.3-57 | Emeritus |

**Voting:** Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch  
**Alternates:** Oliver stepped out.  
**Recused:** None  
**Documentation:** Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.  
**Representing:** Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development  
**Public:** None

**Concerns (7:11):**

- **MacEachern** – Presented project; no indication this is an older structure.  
- **Flynn** – Read Ms. Backus’ comments: garage non-contributing; east new garage gable pitch should match existing; windows should match.  
- **Camp** – This is 100-plus feet off the road; There are three gables with doghouse dormers that could be replicated. The north elevation could stand another window.  
- **Welch** – Agrees with what’s been said.  
- **McLaughlin** – West- and east-elevation meeting rails on flush dormers should align.  
- **Coombs** – No concerns.  
- **Pohl** – The one elevation that is the least successful is the north, which faces the road. He’s not keen on the gable dormer with three windows; there are literally no windows on the first floor.

**Motion:** Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)  
**Roll-call Vote:** Carried 5-0//Welch, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye  
**Certificate #**
| Voting | Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch |
| Alternates | Oliver stepped out. |
| Recused | None |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments. |
| Representing | Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development |
| Public | None |

### Concerns (7:23)

- **MacEachern** – Presented project; doesn’t think this has any historical significance; reusing it is not an option.
- **Flynn** – Read Ms. Backus’ comments: circa 1920-1940; wants to know what’s being proposed and why.
- **Coombs** – This has been in place since at least the 1940s; she doesn’t understand why it has to be removed when it’s grandfathered in. Does not support demolishing this; it has enough age and history to stay on lot.
- **Camp** – She’d like to see it remain on the property and be renovated. It has charm and character. Believes this is a Sears and Roebuck house.
- **McLaughlin** – The style of garage doors is post 1940s. It could be moved to the bottom right corner and saved.
- **Welch** – He thinks finding a home for this is beneficial.
- **Pohl** – If you move it 3 feet off the property line, you can put windows in. What’s on the table now is the fact that if no one takes this, we’d be approving a demolition. Asked Mr. MacEachern to do more historical research.

**Motion**

**Motion to Hold for more information. (Camp)**

**Roll-call Vote**

Carried 5-0/Welch, Coombs, Camp, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

---

| Voting | Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch |
| Alternates | Pohl lost connectivity |
| Recused | None |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments. |
| Representing | Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development |
| Public | None |

### Concerns (7:35)

- **Flynn** – Read Ms. Backus’ comments: visible, not appropriate; east bi-fold doors not appropriate; west elevation, removed doors, and windows changed from 2-over-2 to 6-over-1.
- **Oliver** – She has no concerns. Our concern was always the open yard facing east might make the doors more visible. Her only concern would be visibility from the east.
- **Welch** – The pool and cabana are swapping with the same relationship; along the property line there will be windows instead of doors. He has no concerns. The height changes from 16’2” to 17’6”; that is a change we need to review.
- **McLaughlin** – The porthole windows in the doors should be square; with that change, he’d approve this.
- **Camp** – She thinks the proposed is okay; she prefers the porthole windows.

**Motion**

**Motion to Approve through staff with the porthole windows to be square 4-light and the height to remain 16’2”. (McLaughlin)**

**Roll-call Vote**

Carried 5-0/Camp, Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, and Coombs-aye Certificate # HDC2020-06-1969

---

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

### Concerns (7:51)

- **MacEachern** – Presented project; any visibility would be from Fargo; from the water, only the third floor would be visible due to the dense vegetation; assured there won’t be any clear cutting toward the water or Wauwinet Road.
- **McLaughlin** - South elevation, the gable roof over the door should be 7/12 pitch; meeting rails don’t align.
- **Oliver** – Appreciates the traditional design. Doors and windows have no sizes. It would be helpful to have scale box on each elevation. Suggested having the garage considered in conjunction with the house.
- **Camp** – She’s not sure about the visibility from the water; the 14/12 pitch on the south elevation 3rd-floor dormers is too steep; the fascia strip is overly ornate. The last house on Fargo is laid-back; she’d like this formality toned down.
- **Coombs** – The 3rd-floor doghouse dormers should be wider with the windows adjusted to fit; the bottom two panels of the sidelights should be wood panels. At 29’10” with a skirted roof walk, it looks too tall and too heavy. It’s overly long at 110 feet; you are going to lose a huge amount of vegetation thus opening it to visibility. The south elevation should be simpler.
- **Pohl** – He feels this is a redesign; it flies in the face of the rural guidelines. He guarantees it will be visible from Wauwinet Road and the water, especially with all the details painted white. Thinks this would benefit from a view with height poles.

**Motion**

**Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)**

**Roll-call Vote**

Carried 5-0/Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate #
Proposed HDC Minutes for June 8, 2020

VII. 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>1. Diane Ash 05-1070</td>
<td>23 Pine Street</td>
<td>Hardscaping</td>
<td>42.3.2-113</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **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**: Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
- **Public**: None

**Concerns (8:16)**

- **MacEachern** – Presented project; the colors are based upon the Hilfiger house on Lincoln Circle.
- **Flynn** – Read Ms. Backus’ comments: Circa 1957; non-contributing; Seabrook for shutters and door not appropriate.
- **Camp** – Seabrook is inappropriate for Pine Street; it could be greyed down. Okay with other changes.
- **Oliver** – Seabrook is not Pine Street.
- **McLaughlin** – The contrast between blue and brown is too much; Seabrook blue is not appropriate. The double doors are forward of the right front door, which should be a standard 6-panel door.
- **Welch** – Agrees with respect to comments about the color. The shutters are appropriate.

**Motion**

- **Motion to Hold for revisions. (McLaughlin)**

**Roll-call Vote**

- Carried 5-0/\Camp, Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, and Coombs-aye

**Certificate #**

HDC2020-05-0945

---

**2. Faro Strada, LLC 05-0945**

- **Street Address**: 20 Sankaty Head Road
- **Scope of work**: Garage
- **Map/Parcel**: 48-31
- **Agent**: Botticelli & Pohl

- **Voting**: Coombs (acting chair), Oliver, Welch
- **Alternates**: None
- **Recused**: Pohl
- **Documentation**: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
- **Representing**: Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl
- **Public**: None

**Concerns (8:35)**

- **Botticelli** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.
- **Oliver** – She looked up different garages and compared this with the existing, this is an improvement.
- **Welch** – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. The roof form is more appropriate.

**Motion**

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

**Roll-call Vote**

- Carried 3-0/\Oliver, Welch, and Coombs-aye

**Certificate #**

HDC2020-05-0945
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Andrew Wade, My Generation Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (8:40)</td>
<td>Wade – Doesn’t think it is the HDCs jurisdiction is zoning; this will have to get Zoning approval. This is silver panels on seven structures with silver roofs. The silver panels almost identically match the roof. There is a rail on the roof for viewing. Buildings A through E have silver roofs and they are willing to withdraw the application for Buildings F and G, which have black roofs. This is a commercial building and the panels are a means for the owner to make additional revenue. The HDC doesn’t have the jurisdiction to talk about use or where the electricity is going. Oliver – This is an unprecedented number of panels; this goes beyond generating power to operate a business and into a commercial venture to produce energy for sale. She looked up zoning and there is no clarity if this is an acceptable use for this zone; wants to hear from the Planning Board regarding the Solar Overlay District. Feels this should first reviewed by Nantucket Airport. This doesn’t meet our solar guidelines criteria. Our jurisdiction is the entire Island, which is a National Historic District. This is such a large array, over 1600 panels; that is why we have a Solar Overlay District as voted at Town Meeting. She wants to know what other entities think about this project and if it is a viable process; this would open any building to having panels installed just to generate money. We’ve tried to keep panels at a minimum. Camp – The magnitude of this gives pause; she doesn’t see Nantucket benefitting. It’s a good idea to check with the Airport; we don’t know if it will interfere with flying when the sun is at certain angles. This is all very new and she’s not sure how she feels about it. McLaughlin – Because of the situation and possible complications, we need more information. Coombs – Suggested holding for review by and conversation with the Planning Board. We have established guidelines for solar panels, which we try to follow. Our charge is to ensure every project is in keeping with the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Hold for more information. (McLaughlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-call Vote</td>
<td>Carried 4-0/\Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, and Coombs-aye Certificate #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Motion                  | Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver) |
| Roll-call Vote          | Carried 5-0//Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-05-0990 |

### 10. Michael Young 05-0990

- **Certificate #**
- **38-36** Julie Jordin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Julie Jordin, Garden Design Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (8:59)</td>
<td>Jordin – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Oliver – No concerns; this is far off the road and the retaining wall is only 3-feet tall. Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver Coombs – Also agrees. Camp – All she’ll say about the retaining wall is it looks too squared off.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Motion                 | Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver) |
| Roll-call Vote         | Carried 5-0//Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-05-0990 |
11. 33 Coffin St, LLC 05-1009 33 Coffin Street Decks/add balcony 73.4.1-26.1 CWA

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates
Public None
Concerns (time) Webster – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.
Oliver – West elevation, the gable doesn’t break the roof line, which is long; the void in front of the dormers doesn’t read on the plans. The higher gable over the lower gable is overly busy.
Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Oliver.
Pohl – He also agrees. The west elevation is going to be very visible from Burnell; the whole gesture of stepping the center gable up to break the ridge line isn’t successful; it’s still very long.

Motion Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//VO, DC, and Pohl-aye

12. Whitney Matthews 05-0968 43 Union Street Rev 70375; reduce size 43.3.2-29 Ethan McMorrow

13. TLJ Properties 05-1032 24 Bartlett Farm Road New dwelling 65-86 Emeritus
14. 11 Davis Lane 03-0802 11 Davis Lane New dwelling 82-75 Emeritus
15. 11 Davis Lane 03-0803 11 Davis Lane Cabana 82-75 Emeritus
16. 11 Davis Lane 03-0798 11 Davis Lane Pool 82-75 Emeritus
17. Eric Rosenfeld 05-0974 57 Quidnet Road Roof top solar 21-89 ACK Smart
18. Noreen Salvitz 05-0972 34 Meadow View Drive Roof top solar 56-136 ACK Smart

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None
Concerns (9:15) Not opened at this time.

Motion Motion to Hold for the beginning of the next meeting. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes May 19 & 26, 2020: Motion to Approve. (Coombs)
Roll-call vote Carried 3-0//VO, DC, and Pohl-aye

Review Minutes June 1, 2020

Other Business • Next HDC Meeting Tuesday June 16, 2020 at 4:30pm
Commission Comments None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:
1. None

Motion to Adjourn at 9:17 p.m. (Oliver) Carried 3-0//Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton

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