



# 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 ~~

**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

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Kathi Coughlin 05-1013	8 Cottage Street	Roof change	73.1.3-78	JB Studio
2.	Tim Veith 06-1084	12 Okorwaw Avenue	97 sf Addition	79-165	Thornewill Design
3.	Derek Schoettle 06-1077	13 Irving Street	Door/window chg	79-72	Ethan McMorrow
4.	Alan Myers 06-1082	28 Kelley Road	Move/demo 120 sf shed	54-104	Normand Residential
5.	Paul Jensen 06-1063	4 Fishers Landing Road	Pergola	38-157	Gryphon Architect
6.	4 Shawkemo Rd RT 06-1055	4 Shawkemo Road	Rev. 02-0737: deck/otr shr	43-91.1	Botticelli & Pohl
7.	Joann Bennett 06-1078	27 Monomoy Road	Rev. 05-0938: resite shed	54-207	Val Oliver
8.	William Hunter Tr 06-1060	Village Way	Beach Stairs	14-2	Jardins International
9.	6 Shawkemo Rd RT 06-1056	6 Shawkemo Road	Driveway/3' retain wall	43-91.2	Julie Jordin
10.	Steven Cohen Tr 06-1066	19 North Pasture Lane	Hardscaping	44-73	Julie Jordin
11.	40 Polpis Rd, LLC 06-1067	40 Polpis Road	Roof change	54-265	Linda Williams
12.	Rachel Healey 06-1068	37 Washaman Avenue	Separate ganged windows	55-585.9	Linda Williams

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)**

Roll-call Vote: Carried 3-0// Welch, McLaughlin, and Camp-aye

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

**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. Jerry Miller <b>05-1014</b>	63 Boulevarde	Spa/grill area/veneer stone	79-212	Waterscapes
• Must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
2. Steve Boukus <b>06-1083</b>	58 Squam Road	Pool/pergola	13-33	Concept Design
• Must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
3. Brian Larkin <b>06-1081</b>	4B Gladlands Avenue	Outdoor shower	80-122	Concept Design
• Due to lack of visibility				
4. Tim Veith <b>06-1085</b>	12 Okorwaw Avenue	Pool/fence	79-165	Thornewill Design
• Due to lack of visibility				
5. 4 Shawkemo Rd RT <b>06-1054</b>	4 Shawkemo Road	Shed	43-91.1	Botticelli & Pohl
• Due to lack of visibility				
6. 4 Shawkemo Rd RT <b>06-1057</b>	4 Shawkemo Road	Pool-hardscape	43-91.1	Julie Jordin
• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	<b>Welch</b> – Confirmed through staff that none of these have retaining walls taller than 3 feet.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Oliver)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Welch, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Camp-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-(as noted)</b>

**IV. SIGNS**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Nant. Islands Land Bank	Various locations	16 Trail signs-ATS	N/A	Rachel Freeman
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign Design plans, site plan, photos, and Sign advisory committee comments.			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:41)	<b>Flynn</b> – Approved with Sign Advisory Council comments			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff per SAC comments. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-1090</b>

**V. EMERGENCY ENFORCEMENT OF 81 VESTAL STREET**

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

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Leonard Miller <b>05-1030</b>	7 Greenleaf Road	Addition	39-31	Chris Hall Architects
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> , and photos.			
Representing	Chris Hall, Chris Hall Architects			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:42)	<b>Hall</b> – Presented project.			
	<b>Oliver</b> – Appreciates the addition; it creates a sense of hierarchy where there was none. Visibility is minimal, and it fits in.			
	<b>Camp</b> – She was concerned about the height increasing a couple of feet; but she’s okay due to its location.			
	<b>Welch</b> – 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 <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> by fitting into the terrain with retainage used thoughtfully and not placed on the top of the hill.			
	<b>McLaughlin</b> – Anywhere that has more than three or more sets of ganged windows should be reduced to two sets.			
	<b>Pohl</b> – Agrees with what’s been said.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin-nay; Welch, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-05-1030</b>

2.	Stephen Welch	<b>05-1038</b>	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)	<p><b>Welch</b> – Presented project; not meant to be permanent – 720 days – no foundation.  <b>Oliver</b> – We’ve approved these before with a timeframe attached; she has no concerns.  <b>Camp</b> – Okay with this; asked about the material – tan vinyl.  <b>McLaughlin</b> – Feels the visibility is very low and these are all over the Island</p>					
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Camp)</b>					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye				Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-05-1038</b>
3.	Prickly Pear	<b>05-1010</b>	17 Broadway	Rev.03-0845:dormer/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)	<p><b>Oliver</b> – Presented project, circa 1800s, contends there is minimal visibility; there are existing casements on the 1<sup>st</sup>-floor.  <b>Flynn</b> – Read Ms. Backus’ comments: south elevation windows change to 6-over-6; east elevation 3<sup>rd</sup> floor dormer, dormer on shed is dormer on dormer, not appropriate; north elevation refer east elevation.  <b>Coombs</b> – Without the 3<sup>rd</sup>-floor dormer, this fits the area. No concerns with the fold-up windows. East elevation 3<sup>rd</sup>-floor dormer, agrees with Ms. Backus.  <b>Camp</b> – Regarding the east elevation 3<sup>rd</sup>-floor dormer, suggested two separate dormers placed over the triple-set of windows for the sake of balance. Okay with the fold-up windows.  <b>Welch</b> – On the 2<sup>nd</sup>-sheet of the application 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; separate photo shows a 3<sup>rd</sup>-floor dormer, which is something we do not ordinarily see but supports this request. No concerns with the windows, and confirmed East elevation, 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor right ganged windows, 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 to visibility; this could be as well. With respect to balancing on the East elevation, if the dormer width is important to the program, shift the dormer right so the left most window aligns over the center window below.  <b>McLaughlin</b> – The 3<sup>rd</sup>-floor dormers are inappropriate. The fold-up windows are inappropriate for this style of house; should be regular double-hung.  <b>Pohl</b> – The most telling photo is the one from Front Street; you can’t see the 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor dormer, so the 3<sup>rd</sup>-floor dormers wouldn’t be visible, and there is a 3<sup>rd</sup>-floor dormer on a nearby structure. This building isn’t visible from Codfish Park. He’s okay with the 3<sup>rd</sup>-floor dormer. Double-hung inswing are no different than hoppers.</p>					
Motion	<b>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)</b>					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin-nay; Coombs, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye				Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-05-1010</b>
4.	Mark Wendling	<b>05-1023</b>	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)	<p><b>Botticelli</b> – Presented project; only the south elevation would be visible.  <b>Oliver</b> – 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.  <b>McLaughlin</b> – North elevation, asked what the left revised windows are – 9-light casement.  <b>Camp</b> – 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.  <b>Welch</b> – Agrees with what’s been said. He saw a “Nantucket dormer” on a downtown house and it would work with this; they don’t work in all situations but in this instance, with Greek Revival detailing with frieze returns and coping on gable returns, it’s highly ornamental structure vs. simple Nantucket-style and the dormer works. Okay with the fenestration.</p>					
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)</b>					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, Camp, and Coombs-aye				Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-05-1023</b>

<b>5. Ray Pohl 06-1058</b>	<b>24 Pine Street</b>	<b>Fenestration revisions</b>	<b>42.3.2-110</b>	<b>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</b>
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)	<p><b>Botticelli</b> – Presented project.</p> <p><b>Flynn</b> – Read Holly comments: No concerns; love the shutters</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – Supports the revisions.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – No concerns.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – No concerns.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – No concerns.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, and Coombs-aye	Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-1058</b>	
<b>6. Michael Pearlstein 06-1062</b>	<b>20 Derrymore Road</b>	<b>Skylight</b>	<b>41-112</b>	<b>Linda Williams</b>
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)	<p>(5:44) Motion to Hold for representation. (Coombs) Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Pohl-aye</p> <p><b>Williams</b> – Presented project, Circa 1970.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – No concerns.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – The skylight is on the front of the house; she’s not enthusiastic about this.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – No comments.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – No concerns. If they put a dormer in there, that would be more imposing.</p>			
Motion	<b>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)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Camp-abtsain; Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye	Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-1062</b>	
<b>7. Peter Lisi 05-1012</b>	<b>2 Flintlock Road</b>	<b>Dormer/deck</b>	<b>75-50</b>	<b>Shelter 7</b>
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)	<p><b>Olbres</b> – Presented project; the east elevation is probably not visible due to the existing vegetation.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – Suggested ganging the south elevation windows to match what is there. No concerns with the dormer.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Ms. Camp’s suggestion makes sense. If you can see the east elevation, it looks off; shouldn’t be a saltbox.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – Confirmed the north elevation skylight is going away.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – The north elevation dormer as viewed from the east is almost a saltbox and not approvable under our guidelines.</p>			
Motion	<b>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)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye	Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-05-1012</b>	

8.	Town of Nantucket	<b>06-1072</b>	135 Pleasant Street	Electric Charging Station	55-271	Lauren Sinatra
9.	Town of Nantucket	<b>06-1073</b>	1 Sea Street	Electric Charging Station	42.4.2-55	Lauren Sinatra
10.	Town of Nantucket	<b>06-1074</b>	14 Airport Road	Electric Charging Station	78-1	Lauren Sinatra
11.	Town of Nantucket	<b>06-1075</b>	Washington Street	Electric Charg - wall mount	42.3.2-26/84	Lauren Sinatra
12.	Town of Nantucket	<b>06-1076</b>	4 Fairgrounds Road	Electric Charging Station	67-40	Lauren Sinatra
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver					
Alternates	Welch					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.					
Representing	Lauren Sinatra					
Public	None					
Concerns (6:04)	<p><b>Sinatra</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Flynn</b> – Read Ms. Backus comments: no concerns; appropriate use for town-owned utility-type properties; White Elephant example is appropriate.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – 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 useable in the summer.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – There should be no orange on it; thinks blue is more appropriate and they should all be blue.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – No concerns.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – Asked if any will require exposed conduits – none.</p>					
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve all five through staff with the top to be blue. (McLaughlin)</b>					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye				Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-(as noted)</b>
13.	Nan Isl Land Bank	<b>06-1047</b>	168 Hummock Pond Road	Farm Stand	65-13.2	Sustainable Nantucket
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver					
Alternates	Welch					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.					
Representing	Posie Constable, Sustainable Nantucket					
Public	None					
Concerns (6:20)	<p><b>Constable</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – This supports the community in education and farming; it fits with the Farm.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Got clarification on the plans of the north and south elevation.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – Confirmed roof material and angle.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – No concerns. We have solar at Bartlett Farm and okay with the architecture.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – We are not approving solar at this time.</p>					
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)</b>					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye				Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-05-1047</b>
14.	Alan Myers	<b>06-1064</b>	28 Kelley Road	New dwelling	54-104	Normand Residential
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch					
Alternates	Camp stepped out.					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.					
Representing	Ben Normand, Residential Design					
Public	None					
Concerns (6:52)	<p>(6:31) Motion to skip over. (Coombs) Carried 5-0//Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye</p> <p><b>Normand</b> – Presented project; except for the sash, everything is natural to weather.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – East elevation, there is too much decking on the left.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – The first floor is tall, and this is long; however, thinks only the north elevation will be visible, which is close to the property line with a lot of vegetation. He doesn't think there's much visibility; any would be the 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor and above. Lack of visibility mitigates the height.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – He'd love to see it get smaller with less railing; but it is tucked in.</p>					
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve with the caveat that the east elevation stairs and railing are screened at time of inspection and in perpetuity. (Oliver)</b>					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Coombs-abstain; Welch, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye				Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-1064</b>



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 or similar and 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 #

18. Thompson 05-1039	73 Baxter Road	Move/demo garage	49-27	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 (7:23)	<p><b>MacEachern</b> – Presented project; doesn't think this has any historical significance; reusing it is not an option.</p> <p><b>Flynn</b> – Read Ms. Backus' comments: circa 1920-1940; wants to know what's being proposed and why.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – The style of garage doors is post 1940s. It could be moved to the bottom right corner and saved.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Agrees with what's been said; thinks finding a home for this is beneficial.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – 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.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for more information. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Welch, Coombs, Camp, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
19. 12 Lincoln Ave, LLC 06-1069	12 Lincoln Avenue	Rev. 11-0147: cabana chngs	30-183	Emeritus
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)	<p><b>MacEachern</b> – Presented project; contends it's not visible due to location between two buildings.</p> <p><b>Flynn</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – 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 with those elements. The height is changed from 16'2" to 17'6"; that is a change we need to review.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – The porthole windows in the doors should be square; with that change, he'd approve this.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – She thinks the proposed is okay; she prefers the porthole windows.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the porthole windows to be square 4-light and the height to remain 16'2". (McLaughlin)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, and Coombs-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-1969</b>
20. 78 Wauwinet LLC 06-1065	78 Wauwinet Road	New dwelling	14-18	Emeritus
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)	<p><b>MacEachern</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> - South elevation, the gable roof over the door should be 7/12 pitch; meeting rails don't align.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – She's not sure about the visibility from the water; the 14/12 pitch on the south elevation 3<sup>rd</sup>-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.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – The 3<sup>rd</sup>-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.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – 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.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	

<b>21. Diane Ash 06-1070</b>	<b>23 Pine Street</b>	<b>Rev. 05-0940: matl &amp; clr chg</b>	<b>42.3.2-113</b>	<b>Emeritus</b>
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)	<p><b>MacEachern</b> – Presented project; the colors are based upon the Hilfiger house on Lincoln Circle.</p> <p><b>Flynn</b> – Read Ms. Backus’ comments: Circa 1957; non-contributing; Seabrook for shutters and door not appropriate.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – Seabrook is inappropriate for Pine Street; it could be greyed down. Okay with other changes.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Seabrook is not Pine Street.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Agrees with respect to comments about the color. The shutters are appropriate.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Welch, McLaughlin, and Coombs-aye		Certificate #	

**VII. OLD BUSINESS**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	-------------------	--------------

<b>1. Diane Ash 05-0939</b>	<b>23 Pine Street</b>	<b>Hardscaping</b>	<b>42.3.2-113</b>	<b>Emeritus</b>
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:28)	<p>Motion to move up on the agenda. (Welch) Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Welch, and Coombs-aye</p> <p><b>MacEachern</b> – Reviewed the project and changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Her comment was “less is more and there are no other pergolas on Pine Street”; the pergola too shallow and doesn’t offer anything. The patio area should be significantly reduced.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – She wants more softening than was done; this is right on the street and needs to be screened from the public space. Agrees with Ms. Camp about the pergola. There are other plants beside privet that could be used; it should reflect the street more, which has trees.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – The pergola looks awful hanging off the front of the building.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Doesn’t disagree with retaining a transition from public to private space; however, this area of Pine Street between High and Twin Streets is all parking with trees; a tree in front would help. If the hardscaping isn’t visible, it’s not our purview.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//McLaughlin, Welch, Oliver, Camp, and Coombs-aye		Certificate #	

<b>2. Faro Strada, LLC 05-0945</b>	<b>20 Sankaty Head Road</b>	<b>Garage</b>	<b>48-31</b>	<b>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</b>
------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------------------------

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)	<p><b>Botticelli</b> – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – She looked up different garages and compared this with the existing, this is an improvement.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. The roof form is more appropriate.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-0// Oliver, Welch, and Coombs-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-05-0945</b>



HDC Minutes for June 8, 2020, adopted July 21

3.	Sun Island Fuel, Inc <b>02-0661</b>	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar- Bldg A	69-29.1	My Generation Energy
4.	Sun Island Fuel, Inc <b>02-0662</b>	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar- Bldg B	69-29.1	My Generation Energy
5.	Sun Island Fuel, Inc <b>02-0663</b>	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar- Bldg C	69-29.1	My Generation Energy
6.	Sun Island Fuel, Inc <b>02-0664</b>	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar- Bldg D	69-29.1	My Generation Energy
7.	Sun Island Fuel, Inc <b>02-0666</b>	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar- Bldg E	69-29.1	My Generation Energy
8.	Sun Island Fuel, Inc <b>02-0667</b>	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar- Bldg F	69-29.1	My Generation Energy
9.	Sun Island Fuel, Inc <b>02-0669</b>	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar- Bldg G	69-29.1	My Generation Energy

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

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.

Representing Andrew Wade, My Generation Energy

Public None

Concerns (8:40) **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 is 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.

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

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, and Coombs-aye Certificate #

10. Michael Young **05-0990** 220 Eel Point Road Hardscape 38-36 Julie Jordin

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing Julie Jordin, Garden Design Company

Public None

Concerns (8:59) **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.

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 <b>05-1009</b>	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)	<b>Webster</b> – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. <b>Oliver</b> – 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. <b>Coombs</b> – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. <b>Pohl</b> – 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	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-0//Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	

12. Whitney Matthews <b>05-0968</b>	43 Union Street	Rev 70375; reduce size	43.3.2-29	Ethan McMorrow
13. TLJ Properties <b>05-1032</b>	24 Bartlett Farm Road	New dwelling	65-86	Emeritus
14. 11 Davis Lane <b>03-0802</b>	11 Davis Lane	New dwelling	82-75	Emeritus
15. 11 Davis Lane <b>03-0803</b>	11 Davis Lane	Cabana	82-75	Emeritus
16. 11 Davis Lane <b>03-0798</b>	11 Davis Lane	Pool	82-75	Emeritus
17. Eric Rosenfeld <b>05-0974</b>	57 Quidnet Road	Roof top solar	21-89	ACK Smart
18. Noreen Salvitz <b>05-0972</b>	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	<b>Motion to Hold for the beginning of the next meeting. (Oliver)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-0//Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	

<b>VIII. OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
Approve Minutes	May 19 & 26, 2020: <b>Motion to Approve.</b> (Coombs)
Roll-call vote	Carried 3-0//Oliver, Coombs, 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. Draft of minutes as listed

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