



# HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

4 Fairgrounds Road  
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554  
[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://www.nantucket-ma.gov)

**Commissioners:** Raymond Pohl (Chair), Stephen Welch (Vice-chair), Diane Coombs, Abby Camp, Vallorie Oliver,  
**Associate Commissioners:** Jessie Dutra, Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, July 11, 2023

*Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via ZOOM.*

Called to order at 4:02 pm. and announcements by Mr. Welch

Staff in attendance: Holly Backus, Historic Planner; Esmeralda Martinez, Land Use Specialist, & Fiona Johnson, Administrative Specialist.

Attending Members: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul

Remote Participants: None

Absent Members: Thornewill

Late Arrivals: Pohl (4:07pm)

Early Departures:

Adoption of Agenda.

**Motion**                    **Motion to Approve as drafted. (Coombs)**  
Vote                        Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten-aye

## I. DISCUSSION AND VOTE

- Save Our Sound Endorsement

Public

**Holly Backus** – Ms. Backus acknowledged Val's concerns but wanted to emphasize some important facts. She noted that Nantucket Sound is listed on the national register as a traditional cultural property (TCP) and not as a National Historic Landmark. They mentioned that Cape Wind won their legal battle, and opponents who made similar arguments about the National Historic Preservation Act lost their case. Ms. Backus recalled being a child when the discussion about building Cape Wind in the sound took place, and the reason it was not constructed was due to the developer losing tax credits and incentives needed for financing the project. She explained that wind energy is a top priority for both the federal and state government, mentioning their involvement in the wind farm work group and serving as the Section 106 representative for the National Planning Commission (NPC), a regional planning authority. She emphasized the complexity of the situation and suggested that instead of pushing back directly, it would be more effective to address concerns to the Department of Energy (DOE) at the state level, as they go through the procurement process for offshore wind development. She also highlighted that only one project, Vineyard Wind, has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior and is currently under construction. She emphasized that local governments have limited control over federal energy policies and that offshore wind energy development is seen by the federal and state governments as a crucial step in reducing carbon emissions. She mentioned that the discussion and push for wind energy development fall under Section 110f of the National Historic Preservation Act, which provides special protection to National Historic Landmarks like Nantucket. She emphasized that the intent is to avoid causing harm to the historic district. The speaker acknowledged the complexity of the Section 106 reviews and mentioned that Save Our Sound was created during the time of the Cape Wind project specifically for the sound. She highlighted that while they understood Cape Wind's context, it was important to recognize the differences between the two situations. She expressed uncertainty about how Nantucket withdrawing from the Save Our Sound campaign would impact the proposed offshore wind farm off the coast.

**Heather Murrell Murray** - As she sits here and listening, she doesn't fully understand the details of what the board is discussing, but she grasps the general idea. She is new to this island as a resident. She first came here when she was 45 and is now 53. What she wanted to mention is that since she's been here, she has personally witnessed the erosion taking place. She doesn't know about the cables or whatever the board is referring to that will be placed in the water, but she is concerned about what it will do to Mother Nature in the ocean. Will it anger her and lead to even more erosion? What do you intend to do about that? That's all she wanted to say.

Board

**Oliver** – Ms. Oliver says Save Our Sound successfully won their battle against wind turbines. She also mentioned that the organization garnered support for their cause by involving the Cape and Islands, as well as other townships and organizations. In 2010, the Alliance to Save the Sound, which is a part of Save Our Sound, joined the Smart from the Start campaign. The purpose of this campaign was to identify and select alternative lease sites that would minimize conflict and ensure the establishment of exclusion zones to protect the marine environment. Ms. Oliver mentioned providing a PowerPoint presentation about a month ago, highlighting that the concerns expressed by Save Our Sound for pushing the turbines away from the sound are the same reasons why they want them away from the South Shore. She expressed frustration with Save Our Sound's attempt to obtain National Historic status for the sound, despite it already having that designation. The speaker also mentioned that Save Our Sound's legislative letter used Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard as integral parts of their argument to obtain permanent protection against development, while still allowing for fishing activities and other sustainable use of the marine environment, including electrical transmission infrastructure. Ms. Oliver believes that allowing the wind projects in the sound would be detrimental to the marine environment, endangered species, and historic properties, just like they would be off the South Shore of Nantucket. She considered Save Our Sound's actions to be duplicitous and self-serving, and therefore requested that the audience no longer support the organization. She further requested the elimination of their names from the stakeholders listed on Save Our Sound's website, as she sees herself and the HDC board as stewards of the island and its preservation. Save our Sound does not yet have their National Historic Landmark status, they are still seeking it. They're using Nantucket as part of their argument and are still soliciting money here. Though she is an HDC member she is currently not speaking as such or on behalf of the board, but more so speaking as a citizen concerned about what is happening on the south shore. Her request is that the HDC withdraw as a supporter by sending Save Our Sound a letter stating that.

**Coombs** - Has been following this issue for quite some time and has attended meetings with the HDC representative. Over the years, she has found it inappropriate to place wind turbines where they have been proposed, particularly in the small space between Cape Cod and New York, which now includes New Jersey. There are vast areas, about 300 miles off the coast, where the turbines could be located without being visible. However, they insist on placing them within a confined area that includes Cape Cod, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Block Island, Martha's Vineyard, Nantucket, and the surrounding areas. When compared to other places like Finland, Denmark, and Iceland, we are confined within a small box. Everything that happens within this area is visible, as one can stand in Nantucket and see Martha's Vineyard, or stand in Martha's Vineyard and see everything. They plan to route their cables through the opening between Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket, which is a channel used by fishermen and marine life. These hot cables are unnecessary and harmful to the cool water fish we catch off our coast. By staying with this group, we are allowing our fishing industry to be destroyed. Furthermore, the number of whale deaths in New York and Rhode Island has increased, as whales are found dead due to these projects. They were initially granted a certain allowance of whale deaths, but that number has now been doubled. We have around 360 whales that we are trying to protect, but the developers seem to disregard this by accepting more deaths. The impacts on the whales and the fishing industry are concerning. If mistakes continue to happen, they may not consider it a significant issue. If you have been to the Vatican and looked out towards the South Shore and the Vatican Shore, you can see the boat laying the cables that supposedly come from Martha's Vineyard. In one research paper, I read that over a 10-year period, these turbines would result in significant financial losses, around 800,000 dollars. There would be a loss of tourists and various other negative effects. It is not a cheap endeavor for our town or our island. We were granted a relatively modest contract of around 35,000 dollars to put our name in as a supportive entity, but this pales in comparison to the cost. The important role of our commissions and what we should strive for is to protect the island and maintain its current state. It is criminal to sell our island through such a program. I, for one, would support any efforts to oppose this and do whatever can be done. I have been told several times that it is not worth fighting against something that is not particularly right. However, I firmly believe that if something is worthwhile, it is worth fighting for. These are my personal feelings on the matter.

**Welch** - On the topic of money, it's more of a concern. One of the work groups suggested a 500,000-dollar mitigation settlement, but I pushed for 50 million dollars. Ultimately, we settled at 19 million dollars in today's dollars. As the HDC representative, the HDC signed off on that settlement. It's important to note that the process involved more than just money, as there were leverages and other factors at play. The topic may come up again at the HDC, and he, for one, is completely dissatisfied with the outcome of that process. To clarify, my understanding was that the HDC would receive direct funding for providing various services, and I submitted scopes of services totaling millions of dollars. I understood that the HDC would have a member on the automatic board responsible for overseeing those funds, but none of that has happened. However, this is not the topic for tonight's discussion. From what Val has presented, I understand her point. It seems like an insult to injury from the HDC's perspective, as historic preservation promotes the economic benefit of the community, including the historic maritime identity and the preservation of wide-open ocean vistas. I recall that when the original agreement was put together, the center of the turbine was at around 610 or 680 feet, but since then, those heights have nearly doubled or more. This is not part of the current process or discussion, but I wanted to provide that context. Going back to Val's point, it appears that combining these factors with Save Our Sound's use of Nantucket's endorsement by the Nantucket Historic District Commission is further insulting. We don't believe it's appropriate, and based on the information you presented, I'm not against withdrawing our endorsement. I would like to understand what form you envision this taking. Would it simply involve submitting a withdrawal letter to Save Our Sound, or do you anticipate or expect something else? I would appreciate hearing your thoughts and comments on this matter.

Motion

**Motion to remove the HDC names as of now from the endorsement of Save Our Sound via a letter request. (Coombs)**

Roll-call Vote

Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye

**II. DISCUSSION FOR EVALUATION**

- 7 Fair St- Window replacement

Representing **Brook Meerbergen**  
 Public **Mickey Rowland** – All for anything that gets the new windows to look as close to the original windows as possible.  
 Concerns **Holly Backus** – No Concerns.  
**Motion** **Motion to approve through staff subject to review of the paint on site, and submittal of an HDC application pertaining to the scope of work discussed here today. (Welch)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye Certificate # **HDC2023- (as noted)**

**III. SIGNS**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Town of Nantucket	67 Baxter Rd	Post signs		Siasconset Civic Assos.
2.	29 Center St LLC	16 ½ Federal St	Temporary sign	42.3.1/70	29 Center St LLC
3.	Town of Nantucket	Main St	Lamp post signs		David Bernard
4.	Boys & Girls Club	61 Sparks Ave	Temporary sign	55/139.4	David Bernard
5.	Nantucket Garden Club	Various location	Temporary Sign		Debbie Thomas

Voting Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten  
 Alternates Paul  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing -  
 Public -  
 Concerns -  
**Motion** **Motion to approve items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten-aye Certificate # **HDC2023- (as noted)**  
**Motion** **Motion to reconsider approval of item 3. (Oliver)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten-aye Certificate # **HDC2023- (as noted)**  
**Motion** **Motion to hold item 3 for revisions. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten-aye Certificate # **HDC2023- (as noted)**

**IV. CONSENTS**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Cabko Inc.	18B Bartlett RD	Garage rev 03-8134	67/113.1	NAG
2.	Rocky Fox	12 Bailey Rd	New Shed	55 106.2	Linda Williams
3.	ACK15CHR LLC	8 Chuck Hollow Rd	Rev to Cabana	72 31	Val Oliver
4.	J & M Holdings	59 Polpis Rd	Demo dwelling	54/26	Linda Williams
5.	4170 and Down LLC	107 Tom Nevers Rd	Rev 5090-Color change	91 26	Chip Webster
6.	Bent Shimmo Trust	4 S Valley Rd	Trim, Color, & roof Change	43 165	EMDA
7.	Fernando Osorio	77 Hummock Pond	Demo/ Move off Dwelling	56 311	Linda Williams
8.	Heidi Zimmerman	25 Beachgrass	New Dwelling	68 381	Val Oliver
9.	PS & QS LLC	105 Surfside Rd	Ground Solar	80 4	Ack Smart
10.	Vecchio London	67r Fairgrounds	Rev 4248-Move Stairs	67 177.1	Val Oliver
11.	Carlos Moreira	1 Rosemary Way	Add door to garage	69 20	Val Oliver
12.	Sconset Casino Assoc	15 New St	Historic Determination	73.4.2 68	Val Oliver
13.	Marcia Coyle	61 Pochick	New Dwelling	79 159	Val Oliver
14.	Naive Melody LLC	3 Tetawkimmo	Alterations Rev 03-8092	53 30	BPC
15.	Kenneth Gentner	45 Goldfinch Dr	New Fence	68 550	Kenneth Gentner
16.	Conway Family	167 Surfside Rd	cabana	87 118	Val Oliver
17.	8 Winn St	8 Winn St	Add shingle rail rev 11-5174	41 51.2	EMDA
18.	Elliott Gumaer	4 Charles St	Addition/raise floor	29 52	NAG
19.	256 Polpis LLC	256 Polpis Rd	Addition Rev 7967	25 25	Botticelli + Pohl
20.	St Paul's Episcopal Church	20 Fair Street	Door Change	42.3.2 65	EMDA
21.	Theodorakos Trust	79 Pocomo rd	Window Walk & Window	15 5	CWA
22.	Shimmo Property LLC	14 Shimmo Pond Rd	New Garage/Apt	43 17	Gryphon Arch

Draft HDC Minutes July 11, 2023

23. Julie Reinemo	2 Eli Place	New Dwelling	67 767	Karsten Reinemo
24. Deividas Nagys	16 Somerset Rd	New Shed	56 302	David Nagys
25. 6 Daisy LLC	6 Daisy Lane	Bld Reduce width Rev 7517	68 241	Emeritus LTD
26. Brian Herlihy	3 Rudder Lane	Addition	66 361	JB Studio
27. 92 Main Street LLC	92 Main St	Fens Revs	42.3.3 63	Botticelli + Pohl

Voting Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul  
 Alternates Pohl  
 Recused Oliver  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing -  
 Public -  
 Concerns -

**Motion** **Motion to approve consent items. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye Certificate # **HDC2023- (as noted)**

**Motion** **Motion to reconsider approval of item 18. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-1 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Coombs-aye // Oliver-nay Certificate # **HDC2023- (as noted)**

**Motion** **Motion to move previously approved item 18 from consent to consent with conditions the condition requiring the flood design elevation and a FIRMette map. (Pohl)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye Certificate # **HDC2023- (as noted)**

**V. CONSENTS WITH CONDITIONS**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	13 Commercial Wharf LLC	13 Commercial Wh.	Raise Building rev	42.2.4 10	NAG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consent with conditions – need updated Elevation Certificate and FIRMette map</li> </ul>				
2.	Conway Family	167 Surfside Rd	pool location Rev	87 118	Val Oliver
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity &amp; pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.</li> </ul>				
3.	Scott Marks	11 West Dover	New windows/doors	55.4.1 197	Shelter 7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add plank-frame style trim.</li> </ul>				
4.	Colin Barnicle	24 Lincoln St	Rooftop Solar	73.4.2 132	Cotuit Solar
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solar panels on west-rear facing roof planes</li> </ul>				
5.	Shenandoah Trust	40 Easton Street	Revs to 2022-08-6925	42.1.4 20	Botticelli + Pohl
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South Elevation, 2nd Flr: Double-hung window sets proposed to be moved to far left and right of main structure, add structural mull to each set; in proportion, decrease width of 2nd floor deck.</li> </ul>				
6.	Feder Brothers LLC	72 Milk Street	Deck Mods/Front railings	56 7	Brook Meerbergen
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject to limited visibility.</li> </ul>				
7.	Rachel Powers	164 Hummock Pond	New Garage	65 13.1	JB Studio
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all glass garage doors. (Shown in 3d image)</li> </ul>				
8.	Peter and Melanie Zschau	28 Friendship Lane	Add Attic Dormer	56 337	Peter Zschau
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The dormer will be inset from gable end by three feet on either side.</li> </ul>				

Voting Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul  
 Alternates None  
 Recused Oliver  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing -  
 Public -  
 Concerns -

**Motion** **Motion to approve consent with conditions. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Patten-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-(as noted)**

**Motion** **Motion to submit a letter to Jesse Dutra to thank him for his years of service, wonderful member of the HDC whom will be missed. The board appreciates everything he did. (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye

**V. OLD BUSINESS 06/27/2023**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Bob & Jeanette LLC	43 Kendrick Rd.	New dwelling revision	76/4.3	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Thornewill				
Recused	None.				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Chip Webster</b> <b>Stephen Cohen</b>				
Public	-				
Concerns	<p><b>Welch</b> – Concerned about chimney potentially not being in compliance.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – The application before us is merely about posts being decreased, which, to me, is pretty irrelevant. In terms of this application, it is approvable, but she does want to say that knowing the grave concerns we had from the onset about most of this, from the first floor up, and the reservations to approve that were always based on a lack of visibility and sworn testimony during the hearings, she feels that the boards process has failed them as people reviewing applications. The return requests for the items that were removed for the initial approval got placed back on the consent agenda, probably placed there because of the no visibility clause from the first approval. She just wants to say that she personally takes responsibility for not having reviewed this closer when it was put on the consent agenda, and she's sorry that she did not challenge it. This is an example of homeowners building for themselves in mind and not Nantucket. Unfortunately, the promises of 'can't be seen' will no longer be a condition that she trust when making an approval based on that, and she hopes to scrutinize every plan from here on out to the nth degree because this is unfortunate.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to approve through staff replacing the vertical elements being removed on the structure with 4 vertical elements on the property border. With those elements along the border being no less than a 3-inch caliper trees along the rear property line. The Lancashire one in each corner and two even spaced along the remaining property line. Also, the as-built fee. (Welch)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver-aye // Camp-nay			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>

2.	Balaji Gandhi <b>01-7686</b>	9 New Jersey Ave	MH Addition & Reno	60.31/408	Shelter 7
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Jason Olbres</b>				
Public	-				
Concerns	<p><b>Holly Backus</b> – No concerns with the revision.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – The door on the west elevation could be like a tongue and groove with a small window in it so that it harkens back to a more of a boathouse feel. Nice job on the revisions.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Agrees with Abby.</p> <p><b>Patten</b> – Has no concerns. The applicant did a good job with the changes.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Appreciates the changes.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to approve through staff with French door on south and west elevation and the blank framing throughout. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-01-7686</b>



3. Aaron Panner **04-8291** 6 Hickory Meadow As built new fence & gate 41/205 Scott Fritz

Voting Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver

Alternates Thornewill

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.

Representing **Scott Fritz**

Public **Mark Evans 2 Hickory Meadow Ln** – Here to give background information. Appreciates the decision the board has before them today. Hopes that the board would require this fence to within its property the same distance from 4 Hickory Meadow as from 8 Hickory Meadow. The group of abutters are concerned about this proposed fence being the right height, looking the right way as requested by the board and also to be off of peoples property lines. Neighbors also hope this fence has the proper amount of vegetation and screening to conceal it. States that none of the neighbors have a fence that is quite like this.

**Sarah Koch 4 Hickory Meadow Ln** – Its unusual for the street to have this fence. As the board has seen the aesthetic of the fence which is very uncommon does not blend in with the landscaping. Would prefer that the fence be 30 feet from the road, front and back. This fence makes the property look fully enclosed which is very rare on island. Would like for the bottom and top to be removed and as the board requested. The more this fence can moved in, being less visible from the street on all sides the better.

**Stephen Hoffmeister 8 Hickory Meadow Ln** – Wanted to clarify if in fact there would be a set back from their property line at 8 Hickory Meadow. Both party’s engineers have concluded that a significant portion of the fence as currently constructed sits on the 8 Hickory Meadow property. If a setback is instated he would like to make sure it also applies to the fence on his side. The plans submitted seem to show a good portion of the fence on the property line. Just wanted to clarify that in fact the fence would need to move inside 6 Hickory Meadow 5 to 10 as the board requested during the last meeting.

Concerns **Welch** – The concept of these fences are that they aren’t becoming a symbolism of partitioning the public from the private behind a case or kind of hard fence. This should be pressure treated wood which is either green or black wired mesh with screening and then it literally disappears into natural material. Is fine with the gate at 5 feet natural to weather as submitted, the fence PT post natural to weather as submitted, no top or bottom rail as submitted, wired mesh to be black or green. Fence should be a minimum of 7 – 10 inside the property line on the sides and rear. Supplement existing vegetation with more vegetation for screening. On the front at its closes should be minimum 15 feet from Hickory Meadow, minimum 25 feet at its farthest point along Hickory Meadow, except at the gate which should be a minimum 30 feet from Hickory Meadow. Screening along the front and sides, noting that there should be no linier plantings.

**Coombs** – This property is the only property in this area that has a visible fence. This fence also encloses the entire house on the proper line. This fence shouldn’t be more than 6 feet. The fence should end just beyond the pool on the property. The rest of the area should be open country. The fence should be in at least 5 feet within the property line.

**Oliver** – Needs to come off the property line. Looking back at an old application with the neighbors black fence, black metal with the wire and that seems to blend in nicely. Also agrees with Diane about the fence not needing to go all the way down to Westchester St. Less is more.

**Camp** – Agrees with Diane on avoiding that caged in effect. Would propose the fencing in the front 15 to 20 feet off the road. Proposes a variety of vegetation for screening in front and around gate area. Proposes more like 10 feet off the property lines on the sides in order to put up sufficient vegetation for screening.

Motion **Motion to approve through staff with 7 foot posts 5 feet black or green wire mesh fence. Fence around sides to be 7 - 10 feet inside the property line. Rear fence to be 20 – 30 feet inside the property line. The front to be 15 - 25 feet off Hickory Meadow. Gate to be 30 feet from Hickory Meadow. All with 7 foot wire where needed and supplemental natural vegetation for screening. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-04-8291**

4. Doherty ACK LLC **08-6993** 4 Mariner way Garage revision 55.1.4/72 Linda Williams

Voting Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver  
 Alternates None  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing **Linda Williams**  
 Public **Mickey Rowland** – The front of the building on the south elevation should have a proper front door rather than a 9 lite door to add a little bit more character to the front somehow. The gable window at the top is a little small. The other windows on the first floor are tall and narrow.

Concerns **Holly Backus** – One story window seems to be very slender on the west elevation. Recommends revising the COA so it reflects the change in the architecture and the structure itself. Would want the structure FEMA verified.  
**Camp** – Agrees with the comments about the windows being a bit vertical.  
**Coombs** – On the west elevation the first-floor window on the left side should be moved over under the dormers left side window. The front door would be good if it became a 4 panel rather than the 9 lite that’s proposed. On the north elevation the windows should be a little farther apart if the outdoor shower wasn’t there.  
**Oliver** – Main concern is the front not looking like the front, agrees it should have a standard front door with more trim. Agrees with what’s been said about the windows.  
**Welch** – Make the windows a little wider and make proper adjustments to the front door.

**Motion** **Motion to approve through staff making the front the door on the south elevation into a 4-panel door with more of a frontispiece by enhancing the trim around it, widen all the double hung windows, the windows labeled 3 on the plans change to 1s as on the previous submission, trims to be quaker gray. (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye Certificate # **HDC2022-08-6993**

5. Nantucket Develop LLC **04-8363** 8 Sconset Ave Addition & Renovation 49.3.2/28 LINK

Voting Welch, Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten  
 Alternates Dutra  
 Recused Oliver  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing **Victoria Ewing**  
 Public -

Concerns **Holly Backus** – The flush dormers in the façade are not appropriate and should be the traditional shed and dormers. On the south the dormer needs to come off the ridge as required in BWNIM. The web for the north dormers should not run into that wall. The plans should show the structures’ existing conditions.  
**Camp** – The gang dormers on the front are overwhelming. Windows on the first floor should be smaller.  
**Coombs** – On the south elevation the dormer should drop down from the roof and the windows on it should be separated. Agrees with Abby on the windows. The front looks busy, would make the either single windows or split them apart and make them a little wider. Perhaps the dormers should not be flushed.  
**Patten** – Just concerned about the dormers and the number of French doors.

**Motion** **Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-04-8363**

6. Town of Nantucket 20 South Water Windows 42.4.2/29 SMRT

Voting Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver  
 Alternates Patten, Paul  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing **Linda Williams**  
 Public Brook Meerbergen  
 Concerns -

**Motion** **Motion to hold for a view, installing a Green Mountain SDL window into any existing window aperture of the applicants choosing on this structure. (Coombs)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-**

**VII. NEW BUSINESS 07/11/2023**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Town of Nantucket	16 Broad St	Window replacement	42.4.2 30	SMRT
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Paul				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Linda Williams</b>				
Public	Brook Meerbergen				
Concerns	<p><b>-Holly Backus</b> – If we the town can get our hands on an SDL Green Mountain window to have it roughly installed in the rough opening this commission would use that as a view.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – Needs to see a window in place in order to make a decision.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Suggest that as a view the board more closely than typical coordinate when to meet the applicant to go view the window being installed as a sample.</p>				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for a view, installing a Green Mountain SDL window into any existing window aperture of the applicants choosing on this structure. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>
2.	Richmond Great Point D. LLC	1 Gooseberry Place	New dwelling	68 335	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	Oliver, Patten				
Recused	none				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Linda Williams</b>				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	<p><b>Welch</b> – No concerns.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – Would prefer a different color sash.</p> <p><b>Paul</b> – Has no concerns.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Agrees there should be some color variation within all these structures.</p>				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve as submitted. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>
3.	Richmond Great Point D. LLC	2 Gooseberry Place	New dwelling	68 335	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	Oliver, Patten				
Recused	none				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Linda Williams</b>				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	n/a				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve as submitted. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>
4.	Richmond Great Point D. LLC	3 Gooseberry Place	New dwelling	68 335	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	Oliver, Patten				
Recused	none				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Linda Williams</b>				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	n/a				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve through staff with a silver gray trim package, gable vents, 4 lite windows, and upside down doors on the drawings to be corrected. (Welch)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>



5.	Richmond Great Point D. LLC	6 Gooseberry Place	New dwelling	68 57	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	Oliver, Patten				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Linda Williams</b> <b>Dinah Klamert- KOH</b>				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	n/a				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve through staff with a silver gray trim package, gable vents, 4 lite windows, and upside down doors on the drawings to be corrected. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>
6.	Richmond Great Point D. LLC	7 Gooseberry Place	New dwelling	68 57	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	Oliver, Patten				
Recused					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Linda Williams</b> <b>Dinah Klamert- KOH</b>				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	n/a				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve with the louvers changing to 4 lite windows and the upside down doors on the drawings to be corrected. (Paul)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>
7.	Christine Iller	69 Hummock Pond	Demo Dwelling	56 320	Rob Newman
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul				
Alternates	Oliver, Camp				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Robert Newman</b>				
Public	n/a				
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b> – This is a contributing structure. Rehabilitation could be done to this structure. Contributing structures could be exempt from the building code. Suggest the original structure that was added on to maybe be saved and kept on site. <b>Welch</b> – Agrees with the rest of the board a portion of this structure might be salvageable. Thinks that if a new structure in the future replaces this one he would like for the silhouette of the new build to resemble this one. <b>Patten</b> – Agrees that it is sad this structure has gone through such neglect. But agrees with the rest of the board that maybe a portion of the structure can be saved. <b>Coombs</b> – The structure has enough interesting characteristics that she is not ready to say it should be demolished. <b>Paul</b> – Likes the structures details and the ad-hawk history of it. Agrees with Diane that are some parts of the structure that maybe can be saved.				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve through staff as a partial demo subject to an application for relocation on site. Including replication of porch, to include demo plan and submission of relocation site plan sufficient for partial demo.</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-0</b>
8.	Clay Street Development	44 Skyline Drive	Move on House	79 990	Structures Unlimited
Voting					
Alternates					
Recused					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Nancy Drazhal</b>				
Public					
Concerns	Application not opened				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>No action.</b>				
Roll-call Vote				Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>

9.	Nicholas Terino	74 Arkansas Ave	As built Fence	59.4 41	Nicholas Tesino
Voting					
Alternates					
Recused					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Nicholas Terino</b>				
Public					
Concerns	Application not opened				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>No action.</b>				
Roll-call Vote					Certificate # <b>HDC2023-</b>
10.	Harold Brothers Realty INC.	2 & 4 Highland Ave	Garage	30 187&289	Emeritus Ltd
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Paul				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Matt MacEachern</b>				
Public	<b>Mickey Rowland</b> – The dormer facing the street could be a little narrower.				
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b> – No concerns <b>Welch</b> – Needs to be moved back to that it is not forward of the building to the right. The garage doors are oversized and need to be simplified. <b>Oliver</b> – This design is appropriate. Would suggest redesigning the garage doors to a similar design that looks like 4 little doors. <b>Coombs</b> – On the east elevation suggests separating the two windows on the first floor to make them wider so they sit just outside the windows above them. <b>Camp</b> – Agrees with Stephen on pushing the garage back a bit.				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve through staff bringing in the sides of the dormer 18 inches total, pushing the garage back into the lot 3 feet, windows on the east elevation first floor to be moved further apart by two feet, garage doors to look more like 1930s bi-fold door. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye				Certificate # <b>HDC2023-01-7686</b>
11.	Harold Brothers Really LLC	2 & 4 Highland Ave	Cabana	30 187&289	Emeritus LTD
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Paul				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Matt MacEachern</b>				
Public	<b>Mickey Rowland</b> – The building is a little bit tall and thin looking when you look at it from the west elevation. The dormers and meeting rail issue has been brought up. Would rather see this corrected by lowering the building rather than raising it and making the dormers more traditional recess dormers rather than flush dormers. <b>Jenny Clark</b> – Is an abutter at 2 N. Cliff Wy. Is also concerned about the height of this building.				
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b> – The structure is a little tall for a cabana. The length of the porch was also a question, you want to make sure that its compliance is consistent. Biggest concern is the height and meeting rails. <b>Oliver</b> – Would love to see it come down a little bit. It's actually taller than the garage that should be obscuring it. Doesn't read to her like a second dwelling due to all the doors. Directly across from the doors there's another door if you can see that from anywhere you can look straight through the house. The dormers could come down and sit on top of the window casing. Would appreciate and attempt to make front door more of a standard front door. <b>Coombs</b> – Agrees that the structure is too big for the area. On the west elevation all the different gables make it too busy. A simpler fenestration particularly on the north side would work better. <b>Camp</b> – Agrees that the height should come down. The windows on the second floor appear too vertical and could be smaller. <b>Welch</b> – Agrees that the height is a concern. Agrees with Diane about the west elevation. The dormer on the north elevation needs to be smaller. The top plate also needs to come down on that section so that it appears more subsidiary than it does currently. Between that reduction and probably 9 or so inches out of the overall height would make it approvable.				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for revisions. (Welch)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye				Certificate # <b>HDC2023-</b>

12. 1010 Wins LLC	10 Lincoln St	Cabana revisions	30/184	Emeritus LTD
Voting				
Alternates				
Recused				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Matt MacEachern</b>			
Public				
Concerns				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Held for next meeting.</b>			
Roll-call Vote			Certificate #	
13. Davkim Smiley LLC	10-12 Davkim Lane	Parking Structure	68 61&62	Emeritus LTD
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Matt MacEachern</b>			
Public	n/a			
Concerns	<b>Oliver</b> – The building on this site is so huge and now we’re going for 91 foot multiple level parking. Seems like too big of an anomaly. She is not in favor of this. <b>Coombs</b> – Agrees with Val. <b>Camp</b> – Nothing about this structure indicates integration of building with Nantucket in mind. <b>Welch</b> – Structure should be reduced in size and screened by trees and vegetation.			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for revisions. (Welch)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-01-7686</b>
14. 9B Crow’s Nest LLC	9B Crow’s nest way	Move off/Demo	12 20.2	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting				
Alternates				
Recused				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Lisa Botticelli</b>			
Public				
Concerns	Application not opened.			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>No action.</b>			
Roll-call Vote			Certificate #	
15. 9B Crow’s Nest LLC	9B Crow’s nest way	New Dwelling Revs 6995	12 20.2	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting				
Alternates				
Recused				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Lisa Botticelli</b>			
Public				
Concerns	Application not opened.			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>No action.</b>			
Roll-call Vote			Certificate #	

16. Craig Frascati	2 N Mill st	Roof replacement	55.4.4 17	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Heather Marrell -AMPC LLC</b>			
Public	<b>Mickey Rowland</b> – Thinks that is wise to instead of trying it out on this historic building for the board to see how it looks after a year on other structures outside of the OHD where’s its previously been approved.			
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b> – These new shingles are not yet vetted. Specifically on a structure within the OHD in the Quaker historic neighborhood. Would recommend the commission see how they function and hold up on the island in a location outside the OHD in the locations where they’ve been previously approved. Before venturing to allow this on a historic structure. <b>Pohl</b> – The first time this type of shingle was approved it was from a submission from Robert Newman, suggest the applicant touch base with him.			
Motion	<b>Motion to hold for precedent photos or a view of those properties. Application to be heard at the next meeting provided the board is able to do a view of those properties or those precedent photos have been provided to them for review. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-01-7686</b>
	REST HELD			
17. More than Enough LLC	30 Russell’s Way	New Dwelling	77 8.1	CWA
18. Stubby’s	39 Hooper Farm Rd	Demo Garage	67 127	Val Oliver
19. Stubby’s	39 Hooper Farm Rd	2 <sup>nd</sup> Dwelling	67 127	Val Oliver
20. Stubby’s	39 Hooper Farm Rd	3 <sup>rd</sup> Dwelling	67 127	Val Oliver
21. Foggy SBB LLC	2a Sanford Rd	Window/door change	55 811	Gryphon Architects
22. Lori Meinke	17 Ames Ave	2 <sup>nd</sup> half – story addition	60.2.4 17	Twig Perkins
23. Maria Mitchell Assoc	3 Vestal St	Fenestration change -stoop	42.3.3 146	Normand
24. 4 Rays Court N.T.	4 Rays Court	New garden Shed	42.3.2 3	Normand
25. Spencer Goldsmith	56 Madaquecham	Rev-shift firepit add sun shelf	88 65	KMLD
26. 54 Prospect LLC	4 Birdsong Lane	Garage Rev 5465	55.4.4 80.3	Brook Meerbergen

VI. PUBLIC DISCUSSION	
<b>Motion</b>	May 30 & June 6, 8, 13 2023
<b>Vote</b>	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill-aye
<b>Approved Minutes –</b>	May 30 & June 6, 8, 13 2023
<b>Review Minutes -</b>	June 20, & 27, 2023.
<b>Other Business -</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Next HDC Meeting- July 18<sup>th</sup> at 4pm *HYBRID &amp; IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. - COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid</b></li> </ul>
<b>Potential Items for Discussion-</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Classification of street trees &amp; vegetating mapping</li> <li>● Discussion of Wind Turbines</li> <li>● Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, Intro (update as needed)</li> <li>● Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings</li> <li>● Hardscaping</li> <li>● Discussion of salvaging demos</li> <li>● Discussion of options for house moves</li> </ul>

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 8:40pm. (Welch)**  
 Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye

Submitted by:

Esmeralda Martinez

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/g3UPYVRri9U>