



# HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION ORGANIZATIONAL 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 30, 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*

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

Staff in attendance: Cathy Flynn, Land Use Specialist; Holly Backus, Preservation Planner; Chuck Larson, Town Procurement Officer  
Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch  
Absent Members: Watterson, Dutra  
Late Arrivals: Camp, 4:35; McLaughlin, 4:46  
Early Departures: McLaughlin, 7:46 p.m.; Pohl, 9:05 p.m.

**Motion to Adopt the Agenda.** (Oliver) Carried 5-0//Coombs, Welch, Camp, Oliver, 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.	2A Evergreen Tr <b>06-1209</b>	2a Evergreen Way	Rev. 05-0494: rmv drmr	68-700.1	Ethan McMorrow
2.	Bluefin Partn LLC <b>06-1213</b>	21 Ellen's Way (lot 23)	Rev. 73122: covrd porch	81-183	Brook Meerbergen
3.	Bluefin Partn LLC <b>06-1212</b>	6 Ellen's Way	Rev. 72149: mve window	81-172	Brook Meerbergen
4.	Bluefin Partn LLC <b>06-1211</b>	6 Ellen's Way	Rev. 72150: door to win	81-172	Brook Meerbergen
5.	Robert Meyer <b>06-1210</b>	149 Main Street	Shed move off to 307 Polpis	41-169	Ethan McMorrow
6.	Robert Meyer <b>06-1224</b>	307 Polpis Road	Shed move on frm 149 Main	25-39	Ethan McMorrow
7.	Jason Harman <b>06-1218</b>	137 Hummock Pond Road	Rev. 01-0072: fence	65-72	Gryphon Architect
8.	Lucy Giovanna <b>06-1220</b>	157 Surfside Road	Driveway/apron	87-6	Ethan McMorrow
9.	Paul Shepard <b>06-1221</b>	41 Nonantum Avenue	66 sf addition	87-41	Twig Perkins
10.	Whitney Matthews <b>06-1222</b>	43 Union Street	Roof change	42.3.2-29	Self
11.	Andrew Corry <b>06-1214</b>	36 Pochick	Front door color change	80-285	Sarah Alger
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns	No concerns.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-(as noted)</b>

**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.	David Gesner <b>06-1207</b>	6 Fox Grape Lane	Pool/fence	67-808	Jardins International
	• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
2.	Van Velle <b>06-1223</b>	10 Maxey Pond Road	Pool/spa/apron	40-100	Ahern, LLC
	• Pool/spa must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
3.	John Trudel <b>06-1219</b>	26 Pequot Street	Rev. 72199: covered porch	80-128	Normand Residential
	• Due to minimal visibility				
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns	No further concerns.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve per noted conditions. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Welch, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-(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. Hist Assoc <b>06-1204</b>	7 Fair Street	Wall sign	42.3.1-50	Norman Residential
2.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1205</b>	7 Fair Street	Wall sign	42.3.1-50	Norman Residential
3.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1202</b>	10 Mill Street	Fence sign	55.4.4-15	Norman Residential
4.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1203</b>	8 Gardner Street	Wall sign	42.3.3-56	Norman Residential
5.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1201</b>	8 Howard Street	Fence sign	42.3.3-11	Norman Residential
6.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1200</b>	99 Main Street	Fence sign	42.3.3-110	Norman Residential
7.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1199</b>	96 Main Street	Fence sign	42.3.3-61	Norman Residential
8.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1198</b>	16 Sunset Hill	Fence sign	41-449	Norman Residential
9.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1197</b>	50 Prospect Street	Fence sign	55.4.4-25	Norman Residential
10.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1196</b>	15R Vestal Street	Wall sign	42.3.3-43	Norman Residential
11.	Nant. Hist Assoc <b>06-1195</b>	4 Mill Street	Wall sign	55.4.4-16	Norman Residential
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and Sign Advisory Committee (SAC) comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	None				
Concerns	<b>Flynn</b> – SAC held for revision.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold all signs for revisions. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

**V. JOINT MEETING WITH THE NANTUCKET HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

Nantucket Historical Commission called to order at 4:39 p.m. by Ms. Rayport

Nantucket Historical Commission (NHC) Members: Hillary Rayport (chair), Tom Montgomery, Clement Durkes, Mickey Rowland, Georgia Raysman, Angus MacLeod, David Silver

1. Introduction of HDC & NHC members.
2. Sharing of HDC & NHC mission statements.

**Rayport** – Presented PowerPoint about the NHC: members, advisors, purpose, and mission statement.

**Pohl** – Relative to 1975 number, asked if that number keeps moving forward.

**Rayport** – Not to the National Historic Landmark (NHL) designation unless that is upgraded. Regarding the level of structures, it does move due to a standard about when a structure is considered historic; that is 50 years. Not every 50-year-old structure will be worth saving.

Reviewed NCH goals: become a Certified Local Government and use Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) Standard Inventory Form B.

3. Resilient Nantucket:

- Designed for Adaptation (MVP Project) - update and meeting with consultants

**Backus** – Our consultants for Resilient Nantucket, Lisa Craig (The Craig Group) and Phil Thomason (Thomason & Assoc.), are on line. This is a priority for both commissions and the entire Island.

**Craig** – We are committed to working with the Town and residents in dealing with adaptation to rising sea levels. Presented Resilient Nantucket PowerPoint: Status update, community values, recommendation, potential of sea-level rise, Keeping History Above Water, top 10 sites identified to be protected, and Designed for Adaptation.

**Thomason** – Explained his role in holding community charrettes and developing a 4-point approach for design guidelines.

**Craig** – Continued review of the PowerPoint: community forums scheduled for January 21, 2021 and March 21, 2021.

**Pohl** – The HDC would love to be involved in the process; confirmed Ms. Craig would be meeting with Conservation Commission (ConCom) since their goals and ours sometimes conflict.

**Craig** – ACKclimate is a group made of up many Town bodies, ConCom is part of that and are invited to all our meetings.

**Backus** – We do have an overlap; our consultant ensures we all work together. Natural Resources is part of the dialogue.

**Craig** – Introduced “Nantucket: Building with Resilience in Mind.” Reviewed their Nantucket community survey results.

**Welch** – One of his underlying concerns for the HDC is survey questions on changing our process without weighting the inputs of the decision-makers, i.e. HDC members, and without an idea of the background of other respondents; again, given the HDC is the regulatory authority under Massachusetts Special Acts, believes responses should be weighted. Also, he’d like to know how many HDC members responded and how many were in favor of a separate COA for resiliency. From what has been presented so far, over the various presentations, the process is missing intermittent steps involving the HDC, ConCom, etc. input on granular details of draft guidelines; this, separate and before a draft finalized for community charrette and forums; process would benefit from that involvement of each elected body that sits across the table from applicants as regulatory decision-makers.

**Craig** – The survey was anonymous, so she can’t answer that question. A critical aspect was what process are in place that need to be revised or better collaborated on and increase resiliency. There is a well-established process, but it can be amended. Reviewed list of information necessary to make an informed decision on resiliency. On the survey, she feels “I don’t know” responses reflect the need for education on the HDC’s role in the process.

**Pohl** – Regarding flexibility in storefront rehab, our Board needs to become more educated about what options are available and which will fly.

**Thomason** – You are trying to keep the storefront as historic as possible will protecting against flood waters and what materials are available.

**Craig** – Nature-based adaptations are critical. In some instances, raising the streets and topography were acceptable and needs to be considered.

**Pohl** – Explained the Town has stated HDC has no purview over streets but is allowed an advisory capacity.

**Craig** – The depends on the administrative. This is where NHC plays a key advocacy role for HDC. The two main areas of concern are lack of collaborative community planning and review process and protection of Nantucket’s cultural landscape and historic architectural integrity.

**Thomason** – Explained design guidelines being developed by Preservation Institute of Nantucket (PIN) and draft guidelines and test models.

**Craig** – We have an opportunity to test some of these guidelines and strategies in the Washington Street corridor. There is a need for a cultural landscape and natural resources survey and report to help understand the cultural landscape; there are four types of cultural landscape: historic sites, historic design landscapes, historic vernacular landscape, and ethnographic landscape/community. HDC and NHC should work together in an effort to get funding for a cultural landscape survey.

**Camp** – Asked if the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals know about Ms. Craig’s work and what she and Mr. Thomason stand for.

**Backus** – The Planning Director is aware of the fact of aspects of the Master Plan addressing cultural resources.

**Craig** – Why will be critical is the starting the coastal resiliency guidelines and understanding which are cultural and which are natural resources.

**Camp** – A cultural landscape survey would give HDC information to back up our decisions.

**Craig** – Ideally, you will have an office where all these boards sit together to review the resiliency process.

**Pohl** – A lot of times, HDC inherits a plan that had nothing to do with what the HDC’s does. What’s appropriate for on organization’s agenda might not be right for another’s.

**Backus** – There was a lot of discussion about sustainability and how Nantucket does that.

**Larson** – Sustainability is a larger umbrella than resiliency planning; you can’t have sustainability without resiliency.

**Coombs** – With the combination of the two commissions, we will be listened to more by the Town in preserving our historic integrity. She is glad to have NHC join the HDC.

**Rayport** – This overview and the work by Ms. Backus, Ms. Craig, and Mr. Thomason is useful for planning work important in the protection of Nantucket.

4. Presentation by the Nantucket Historical Commission for consideration:

- Certified Local Government (CLG)
- Update Historic Structure Surveys
- National Historic Landmark (NHL) Data
- Preservation Plan
- Proposed Preservation Engineering Study with Matthew Bronski, PE

**Rayport** – These bullet points are projects we might like to get done. The preservation plan can be discussed at another time. Maintaining our historic streetscape was an impetus behind reinstating the NHC; we advocated for the following: a streetscape survey, preservation engineering study, and develop guidelines for rehabilitating historic pavement. We also advocated through the Select Board for reduction of signs along Milestone Road as well as an impact review of a Bartlett Road roundabout; the roundabout has since been pulled from the transportation plan.

We have thought about updating operational, planning, and guidance goals. We would like to align those surveys with the design-review process. Surveys help in applying for grants. Next steps are to become a CLG and require MHC Form B. Explained what a CLG is and why it’s an advantage. Reviewed the MHC Survey and Planning Grants and explained by being a CLG helps obtains those. Reviewed the requirement for being a CLG and the Town’s status thus far. Reviewed the MHC Inventory Form B.

**Pohl** – The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), asked if that would come out of a joint session of NHC and HDC or is there boiler-plate language.

**Backus** – We have a CLG MOU from Gloucester. Through this, a staff person would be the CLG coordinator for the Town.’

**Camp** – She can think of tons of historic houses that should be on the National Registry. We should make a list of houses and create signs for them; it might be more helpful for the public.

**Rayport** – To be on the registry list doesn't impact the owner, it helps with preservation of those structures.

**Pohl** – We have the 1989 MACRIS survey; he can guarantee all the old structures in Town will be labeled individually significant on that survey. Asked how grant money would be prioritized to survey houses.

**Backus** – The only way we could grasp updating the existing surveys is utilizing research on houses. PIN and Nantucket Preservation Trust (NPT) have done an extraordinary amount of work. We would start with the old historic districts (OHD) then expand to structures outside the OHDs.

**Pohl** – That is a lot of houses; this is a multi-year project and we'd be applying for funds for several years.

**Rayport** – Updating those surveys is a critical need. She'd work with MHC and HDC to formulate an approach with advice from local historic organizations. If there is an area that is under stressed, we might want to prioritize that. When a structure goes in front of an advisory board, which is historic, we could off-load some of the work by requiring the MHC Form B is filled out by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Preservation Planner. It might relate to a demolition delay on any structure 50 years or older by requiring the Form B.

**Pohl** – In theory, it's a good idea. There are many possible ways it could manifest.

**Rayport** – If a building is more than 50 years old, the Form B will have more information on the structure and site. Our idea is to accelerate the Form B process.

**Backus** – Commissions use it for proposed demolition; the form is submitted by the applicant. It's a nice idea to have it as a requirement but doesn't know how staff would handle review those; no one has the number of applications as our HDC. Utilizing it for demolitions might be helpful but for every application would be a logistic nightmare. The commission has received some extensive history with applications; those would be excellent candidates for Form B.

**Pohl** – If you adopt a policy, it should be across the board. The HDC as a board reviews a lot of applications and could use four more people on staff. If we are going to require the Form B, it would be across the board for every pre-1975 or not done.

**Backus** – It would benefit both commissions for her to research how other commissions use the Form B. Through the benefit of CPC funding, we received a grant to update the surveys; with that, we have a list of all properties on the Island: age, type, architectural notes. She uses the NHL list for her review.

**Pohl** – In reaction to the 1974 Tristram's Landing townhouses, Walter Beinecke took the actions to get Nantucket listed as a NHL. To have those listed as contributing nettles him and puts the survey into question; it has since been updated. The question is what modernism architecture on the Island is good and what is bad.

**Rayport** – Would like to hear from people on the HDC advisory boards.

**MacLeod** – One of the most concerning aspect of review historic structures, is that he believed HSAB reviewed any historic structure that was not in Madaket or Sconset. 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century structures such as one in Codfish Park; right now, it looks like a trailer, but it is part of the cultural heritage of that part of the Island and is contributing even though it might be run-down. You shouldn't be able to tear down or rebuild a structure listed as contributing.

**Camp** – If someone buys a house and we tell them they can't alter the house to the extent they desire, they are in a pickle. It goes back to educating the public about what is historic and our having something to back us up.

**Pohl** – The ConCom and ZBA have very clear charters about when you must and don't have to apply. The large issue is educating happening at a time when someone is trying to buy realtor and putting the onus on the realtor providing the information about what they can and can't do to structure.

**MacLeod** – He though the HDC has the power to require maintenance of the historic fabric; total demolitions and redesigns shouldn't happen. We have to understand the regulations.

**Backus** – The 1985 survey could state a structure is not contributing or significant and now it is; it has to be updated.

**Welch** – The HDC's authority under the Act and Town code is expansive; authority resides within the HDC, it comes down to education on regulations and consistent actions. There are preservation controls that can be put on historic structures of contributing and those deemed higher in importance - Significant Structures. If the Form B were required as a requirement of submission, a phased approach is an imperfect but okay approach - something worth doing is worth doing imperfectly to start; suggest we start the Form B process prioritizing move-off and demolitions of structures of a certain age. One question is identifying and engaging an objective 3<sup>rd</sup> party to complete the Form without the staff having time or necessarily other resources to be able to do so themselves.

**Coombs** – This is an important issue; we need to keep any structure with any age. Many times, we lose a historic structure because they come up with a reason to support their application from another commission. This would give us the help and strength to maintain the historic structures that we have.

**Linda Williams** – The NHL list was thrown at the HDC a few years ago; at that time the HDC decided not to adopt that list because the Board realized it was ridiculous because it listed new structures as contributing. When people go to the GIS, you can go to the tax assessors and the date is incorrect because they date an addition versus the actual structure date. Town Counsel was very clear about not using the 50-year mark because it is not indicative of the historical value of a structure.

**Pohl** – Everything she said underscores the need for an update survey.

**Rayport** – There are different perspectives regarding the NHL survey; she hopes we can accept it was commissioned and paid for by NPT and vetted by architectural historians who had worked on the Island for 40 years. Nothing is perfect, but Ms. Backus uses it. As far as a start for a local official survey, we have it and should use it because the list.

**Backus** – You received a letter from Mr. Bronski indicating he will be on Nantucket on July 14<sup>th</sup> to meet with her, the Director of Public Works and others. Would like at least one member of HDC to attend. We will be meeting in person and social-distancing outside.

**Pohl** – Asked that meeting be put on Other Business for discussion.

**Rayport** – She hears the HDC agrees that updating the surveys is a high priority.

**Pohl** – Wants updating the survey put on the HDC agenda for discussion and vote.

**Rayport** – Nantucket becoming a CLG, asked what HDC wants Ms. Backus to bring the HDC in order to progress.

**Backus** – She will ask for other community CLG MOUs; most of them are fairly simple. Any type of agreement has to be approved by the Select Board; over the past year, she’s had conversations with the Town Manager about the advantages of being a CLG.

**Rayport** – We really want to hear from the HDC about what NHC can do to help discharge duties. Asked if HDC wants to meet quarterly.

**Pohl** – He was thinking more frequently than quarterly; meeting with NHC will have a lot to do with our workload. A monthly update wouldn’t be a bad thing. This is a lot of information to process as a board.

**Motion to Adjourn NHC at 7:20 p.m.** (MacLeod) Carried unanimously//Rowland, MacLeod, Durkes, Silver, and Rayport-aye

## VI. ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Discussion regarding 81 Vestal Street grading and retainage

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch

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

Representing Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture

Doug Mills, Mark Cutone Architecture

Guy Dinello

Other speakers Linda Williams

Dan Bailey

Concerns (7:50) **Pohl** – The retaining was presented to the HDC as not being visible. The controversy is the amount of retainage facing Dukes Road. We reviewed a lot of different documentation on this. Everything is being done in conformance with the approved drawings though there were some inconsistencies. As he recalls, the last session it was represented this would not be visible from Dukes Road and it is visible. Our recourse on this is nil; the Building Inspector is allowing work to go forward. This is a very complicated issue; the documentation Mr. Cutone provided regarding retainage is accurate. The Building Inspector decided the discrepancies didn’t warrant a stop work order.

**Oliver** – There is no point; we’ve been told they will do what they are going to do.

**Camp** – She’s trying to figure out where the big drop-off is on the site plan. She doesn’t know how we weren’t aware of the steepness of the drop. During the review process, she remembers talking about the visibility from Dukes Road.

**Cutone** – We are planting out to the east and west sides. Ms. Camp is quoted in the minutes expressing her concern. The north property has been clear cut. He does not recall this was represented as not being visible. This was approved with an aggressive planting plan; since this was developed, we have enhanced that plan and included a planting plan. We talked to the abutters and discussed planting onto their properties to create a natural screen. The engineer plan contains pumps and drywells to handle drainage.

**Williams** – The neighbors came to her; they didn’t have a problem with the application. This was a surprise because revisions and changes weren’t noticed; the Board might want to discuss that. The minutes state, “not visible from Dukes Road.” When something is mis-represented, the HDC has the authority, under the Act, to rescind the approval; that was done with work on Lyons Lane. Suggest HDC go to Town Counsel. The neighbors are okay with the screening but still upset about what happened. There are a number of subdivided lots in that area; the HDC has been very sharp on plateauing properties because of the sharp drop off. This lot has the greatest grade change and plateau. There will be more coming in from that area and HDC needs to keep that in mind.

**Welch** – Action without vision is stumbling around—believes HDC was hamstrung by omission of material information, not suggesting intention on anyone’s part. HDC has control over how elements relate to other buildings and structures in the vicinity. The neighboring east property building wasn’t included in the site plans, disturbs him as seeing a structure so close to the applicant’s property line would triggered closer review including of the grade changes and application heights. Suggested that going forward any grade change greater than 3 feet must include cross sections showing existing and proposed grades, and all buildings on abutting property be included on the site plan.

**Pohl** – He and Ms. Flynn should come up with some language to put grade change on Other Business as a policy discussion. This slipped through the cracks and it’s unfortunate but there’s little we can do.

**Welch** – Suggested the HDC is not forfeiting its rights or authority under the law.

**VII. OLD BUSINESS**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	<b>K225, LLC 06-1130</b>	65 Centre Street	Hardscaping	42.4.3-16	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:46)	<p><b>Williams</b> – Reviewed revised plan to preserve a tree and site photos; the fence provides privacy for neighbor’s backyard.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – Appreciates the changes to a more natural look. Towards the street, suggested the fence be replaced with a hedge; if the neighbor doesn’t mind the fence, she has no concerns.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – No concerns.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – No concerns; didn’t realize how large the lot is.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – No concerns.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-1130</b>
2.	<b>78 Wauwinet Rd, LLC 06-1065</b>	78 Wauwinet Road	New dwelling	14-18	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and correspondence.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:58)	<p><b>MacEachern</b> – Reviewed documentation and changes per previous concerns; because vegetation is so tall, the water view from the second floor is limited; the elevation text is accurate.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – The site plan showing topography is so small that’s it’s almost useless, especially after the fact. There’s a discrepancy of 6 feet in elevation between the site plan sheet and Town topography; the Town topography indicates between 20 and 22 feet at the tennis court; he’s looking for a comparison of the existing to the proposed that mimics the Town topography. If the Town topography is wrong, he wants to know why because this would be visible from the ocean.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Appreciates the changes. Her vote would be based upon on no visibility in perpetuity. She appreciates Mr. Welch’s concerns about the topography in light of the previous discussion.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Doesn’t know where the tennis court Mr. Welch mentioned is, (neighbor’s property). Likes the changes; from Fargo you see the narrowest elevation.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – Feels the architecture is out of sync with Wauwinet; if it’s not visible she’s okay. Questions the need for the roof walk.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – Appreciates the idea of approving with no visible in perpetuity, the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor and roof walk are all white. We have 3<sup>rd</sup>-floor dormers, a freeboard, and a roof walk towering up there; he can’t approve this unless all that is changed.</p> <p>Discussion on the motion:</p> <p><b>MacEachern</b> – He feels much of the information requested in Mr. Welch’s motion is in the packet.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – There’s a discrepancy between what staff provided to commissioners and what’s seen on the screen.</p> <p><b>Flynn</b> – The high-resolution elements did not arrive in time to be included to the commissioner’s packet.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – The supplemental topography information on the screen is not an interactive format that he can review.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for Commissioners to review the supplemental topography information. (Welch)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

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

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver  
 Alternates None  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.  
 Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development  
 Public None  
 Concerns (8:18) **MacEachern** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; working to generate a screening plan; just erected the ridge poles; feels the north elevation gable dormer is “quirky.”  
**Coombs** – Confirmed current ridge height is 27’. South elevation, the two 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor porches are too much. Would prefer vegetative screening that is more natural to that area.  
**Oliver** – Would like to view this with the poles. The west elevation facing Bartlett Farm Road is a problem with the pent roof and saltbox form; would prefer the proposed south elevation faced Bartlett Farm Road. A formal hedge doesn’t fit the area. North elevation, if the “living room” roof could be dropped.  
**Camp** – She is not as concerned with the west elevation facing Bartlett Farm Road; it’s an okay silhouette. South elevation, the balcony French doors look very tall; thinks 6 panes would look better.  
**Pohl** – Appreciates the color change and reduction in height. The north elevation dormer is very large and heavy with a lot of shingle space.

Motion **Motion to View with height poles and hold for revisions. (Oliver)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

4. 33 Coffin St, LLC **05-1009** 33 Coffin Street Decks/balcony 73.4.1-26.1 CWA

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Oliver  
 Alternates None  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.  
 Representing Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates  
 Public None  
 Concerns (8:35) **Backus** – Read SAB comments: competing masses; too much height, remove dormers and change pitch.  
**Webster** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; believes SAB looked at last submission.  
**Oliver** – Front elevation is fine; west elevation is successful; agrees the single-door gable dormers are more appropriate.  
**Coombs** – West elevation is good.

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-05-1009**

5. Great State Prop. **02-0589** 92 Washington Street New dwelling 42.2.3-22 Smith-Hutton Arch

Voting Coombs (acting chair), Oliver, Welch  
 Alternates None  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.  
 Representing Scott Hutton, Smith-Hutton Architects  
 Public None  
 Concerns (8:45) **Hutton** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; on Washington Street Extension next to the yacht club; have engineer documentation clarifying the need to have a clear 5 feet from grade; using simulated-divided light (SDL) windows with traditional-looking mullions; the garage has SDL windows. We plan to landscape around the house.  
**Oliver** – She is struggling with the skirt; it takes away from the façade and doesn’t feel the fewer posts is less busy. Feels it’s far enough off the road for the SDL but would prefer if the façade facing the street were true-divided light (TDL). Suggested plantings in front of the skirt.  
**Welch** – Agrees with Ms. Oliver regarding the south elevation and the brick columns. Appreciates the engineer certification on the base elevation. Norwood SDL muntin profile is more historically correct than Marvin; based upon the fact that it’s so distant from the street, he’s not so concerned about the SDL. The garage/apartment is between the house and street. There will be a quieting effect based upon the natural to weather skirt and the brick to be Quaker grey. Appreciates the air-conditioning units (A/C) being removed from the application. Agrees plants a couple of feet tall would mitigate the verticality; much higher and the house would look like it’s floating.  
**Coombs** – The front of the house should have TDL; that’s what we required in the OHD. Asked if break-away panels need to be in the skirt.  
**Backus** – Read HSAB comments: A/C should not be on the façades facing the street or the water. Break-away panels goes back to the need for a policy on skirts of lifted houses. Agrees about the idea of plants in front of the skirt.

Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with TDL windows on the south elevation façade, plantings between 2 and 3.5 feet across the front, and no A/C at this time. (Welch)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Oliver, Welch, and Coombs-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-02-0589**  
 Oliver – Mr. Pohl’s computer died; he’s asking to close after the 23 Pine Street application and continuing the rest to Thursday, July 2.

<b>6. Diane Ash 06-1070</b>	<b>23 Pine Street</b>	<b>Rev. 05-0940: mat/clr chg</b>	<b>42.3.2-113</b>	<b>Emeritus</b>
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (9:05)	<b>MacEachern</b> – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. <b>Backus</b> – Read HSAB comments: asked why the other door was white. <b>Camp</b> – Mr. MacEachern has a point if the porch doors are green; she agrees with how it’s presented as an enclosed porch. <b>Oliver</b> – She’s not sure about leaving the porch door as white. <b>Welch</b> – He’s fine as it is but suggested the front façade sashes be green to be a little more cohesive.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-0// Oliver-abstained; Camp, Welch, and Coombs-aye	Certificate #	<b>HDC2020-06-1070</b>	

<b>7. Mary Heller Tr 05-0908</b>	<b>37 Ocean Avenue</b>	<b>Roof top solar MH</b>	<b>73.3.2-49</b>	<b>ACK Smart</b>
<b>8. Mary Heller Tr 06-1136</b>	<b>37 Ocean Avenue</b>	<b>Roof top solar garage</b>	<b>73.3.2-49</b>	<b>ACK Smart</b>
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (time)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	<b>Continued to July 6<sup>th</sup>.</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried //	Certificate #		

<b>VIII. OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
Approve Minutes	June 1, 4, 8, & 16, 2020: held for revisions at Mr. Welch’s request.
Review Minutes	June 23, 2020
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next HDC Meetings: Thursday July 02, 2020 at 1:00pm and Monday July 6, 2020</li> <li>• HDC review of revisions to HDC Background Summary to finalize for web page</li> </ul>
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Nantucket Historical Commission Introduction, Mission, Priorities and Goals PowerPoint
2. Resilient Nantucket Designed for Adaption PowerPoint.
3. MHC Inventory Form B
4. Gloucester CLG MOU

Motion to Adjourned at 9:15 p.m. (Oliver) Carried unanimously//Oliver, Camp, Welch, and Coombs-aye

Submitted by:  
Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board    Sconset Advisory Board    Sign Advisory Committee