



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Diane Coombs (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, Abigail Camp, Vallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Stephen Welch, Terence Watterson, Jessie Dutra

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room – 4:30 p.m.

Called to order at 4:33 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: John Hedden, HDC Compliance Coordinator; Cathy Flynn, Administrative Specialist; Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker
 Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Watterson (departed 6:59 returned 7:21)
 Absent Members: Dutra
 Late Arrivals: Oliver, 5:19 p.m.
 Early Departures: Watterson, 7:55 p.m.; Camp and Coombs, 8:31 p.m.

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Hillary Rayport**, 89 Main Street – Announced the reestablished Nantucket Historical Commission (NHC) will hold its first meeting at 9:30 a.m. in the 2 Fairground Road Conference Room; Holly Backus will be their PLUS staff support. NHC will not meeting weekly; how often and when they meet will be discussed at the first meeting.

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Henson, John – 72717	2 Sheep Commons	Rev. 70454: garage	54-270	Concept Design
2. Grey Lady Lane, LLC – 72718	14 Grey Lady Lane	Access ramp	66-707	Val Oliver Design
3. L+M Nautilus Lane, LLC – 72719	1 Nautilus Lane	Fence, outdoor shower	67-176.1	Val Oliver Design
4. L+M Nautilus Lane, LLC – 72720	1 Nautilus Lane	Shed	67-176.1	Val Oliver Design
5. Lori, Leo – 72721	55 Goldfinch Drive	Patio	68-555	Val Oliver Design
6. Jennings, Bill – 72722	2 Marion Avenue	Outdoor shower	82-402	Val Oliver Design
7. Corry, Andrew – 72723	36 Pochick Avenue	Rev. 71051: color change	80-285	Sarah Alger, P.C.
8. Richardson, Duncan – 72724	15 Golfview Drive	Door, window change	66-171	Ethan McMorrow
9. Barber, Beau – 72725	7 Kelley Road	Move/demo shed	54-27	B. Normand Design
10. Ward, Richard – 72726	60 South Shore Road	Rev. 72334: pent roof, door	80-303	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	Welch, Dutra			
Recused	Oliver, Watterson			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	72717 to 72726	

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	10 Surfside Road	Temporary Banner	55-137	Lisa Lothian
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Council – Recommend approval			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72727	

2.	N.I.R. Retail/The Gaslight	3 North Union Street	Wall sign	42.3.1-214.2	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Council – Recommend held. This is for a handicapped accessible sign; menu board is from Starlight and not reapplied for as well as an easel board set that hasn't been applied for, which would probably be denied. These issues being taken care of by the SAC; they will be ticketed by the police.				
Concerns	McLaughlin – There are sign violations and the owner should be cited.				
Motion	Motion to Hold. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin opposed		Certificate #		

3.	Town of Nantucket	Various locations	Temporary signs	N/A	Mary Longacre
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Council – Recommend approvable				
Concerns	None				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate # 72728		

4.	N.I.R.	38 Main Street	Projecting sign	42.3.1-189	Cara Marquis
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Council – Recommend held; waiting for information.				
Concerns	None at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for further information. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		

IV. OLD BUSINESS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	North Head Trust, LLC	Tuckernuck	Roof solar on shed	96-2.4	John Phinney
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Oliver & Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, manufacturer's spec sheet, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	John Phinney – Presented project; it might be visible from North Pond, but he doubts that; it's supposed to be all black.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:51)	Camp – Confirmed the roof pitch faces south. Should be black panels and frame on a black asphalt roof. Also wants the roof completely covered so it reads as one material. Welch – We need a site plan that shows the respective shed and the shed labeled. This proposal is in accordance with our ancillary guidelines on solar. Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Camp; thinks they should be able to fit more panels to cover the roof completely. McLaughlin – Black panels, no white strips. Pohl – We've prefer them to be solid black with no visible metal between the panels. That it's all black would be a condition of the approval. Due to limited visibility, the third panel isn't a concern to him.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with a site plan showing the shed on the property; panels to be solid black; and if a 3rd panel can be added to the upper tier, that may be done. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate # 72729		

2. Taylor, John Et al. Trust	Tuckernuck	Roof solar on shed	96-2.2	John Phinney
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver & Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, manufacturer's spec sheet, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	John Phinney – Presented project; same on different property.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:05)	Coombs – This has more colors than we normally approve. Pohl – This would be approved with the same caveats as for the previous application.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with a site plan showing the shed on the property; panels to be solid black; and if a 3rd panel can be added to the upper tier, that may be done. (McLaughlin)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72730	
3. Schwab, Will	45 North Liberty Street	Fence	41-152	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Jill Schwab – Presented project; only asking for two sections at the back corner.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:10)	Pohl – Read HSAB comments: shouldn't go to street. We usually allow a 5&1 along the back and up the side to the front plane house; from there to the street would be lower. No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Watterson)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72731	
4. Judson, Matthew	143 Orange Street	Fence	55-154	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Linda Williams , for the Judsons – There is no site plan on record anywhere. Reviewed photos. House circa 1930s; only residence left on this side of Orange Street in the immediate area. They are asking for privacy. If this is approved, it would be particular to this property and the situation, so it wouldn't set a precedent. Marta Judson , co-owner – Explained the level to which she lacks privacy.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:15)	Coombs – We have a consideration about allowing a 6-foot or 5-foot fence along Orange Street; it would set a precedent. A really-thick hedge would be as good at blocking traffic noise as a fence. Would like to see more done with plantings with the fence behind it. If you cut back the privet and plant new privet between, it will come back healthy. Welch – You have other problems with the placement of the fence and gate. Suggested taking the issue of noise from the bus stop to the Select Board, as much as we would like to help address we are an architectural review board. Agrees the privet should be on the outside. Could accept the fence at 42 inches on Orange Street and 60 inches on Dave Street. The bottom of the privet along much of Orange Street is between more than 24 inches above the sidewalk, from number of steps and slopes in the images, may be 30 to 32 inches above the sidewalk; a 42-inch fence would be essentially 6 feet tall from the sidewalk; that would be acceptable behind the privet at time of inspection and thereafter. This is old plant material that needs to be replaced or rejuvenated. We've repeatedly asked for a site plan showing the placement of the fence, for various good reasons it is a basic requirement of an application. Camp – Recognizes the problem; but the privet is right on the property line. The privet would either have to come down for the fence or the fence would have to be behind the privet. McLaughlin – The privet is thin, not dead and could be maintained with new hedging to block the fence. The fence should be inside the privet. Pohl – Reviewed the layout of the fence: 4-feet across the front with gate along Orange Street in front of the privet, two 6-foot sections on the left side, and a 6-foot fence right Dave Street back to the driveway. We talked about mitigation for a wall of fence at the last hearing. He'd be fine with a plant in front of the fence.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for further information. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

HDC Minutes for July 16, 2019, adopted Aug. 8

5. Pihl, Dean	15 Mizzenmast	Rev. 66511: hardscape	66-379	Thornewill Design
Voting Alternates	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	None			
Representing Public	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.			
Concerns (5:48)	Luke Thornewill , Thornewill Design – We would like to use the same stone as currently exists.			
	None			
	Camp – Wants to see the stone type.			
	McLaughlin – No comments.			
	Welch – As shown this will be approximately 2-feet from the property line; it matches what was approved at the house; no other comments.			
	Coombs – This is inappropriate for Mizzenmast along the street; the existing is okay by the house.			
	Pohl – Agrees with Ms. Coombs. New England fieldstone is the cobble looking; Pennsylvania stone is flat.			
	Discussion on Ms. Coombs motion: placement of the wall 5 feet from property line.			
	Welch – Suggested placing at approximately 5 feet from the property line with indigenous plant clusters placed in front.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted 2-feet back from the property line. (McLaughlin) Not Carried.			
	Motion to Approve through staff with the wall to be a maximum of 18 inches tall 5-feet off property line and indigenous plant clusters per Exhibit A. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-1//Coombs opposed	Certificate #	72732	
6. Pihl, Dean	15 Mizzenmast	Fence	66-379	Thornewill Design
Voting Alternates	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	None			
Representing Public	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.			
Concerns (6:00)	Luke Thornewill , Thornewill Design			
	Val Oliver – All homes along Mizzenmast have split-rail fences.			
	Pohl – Reviewed the project: 6-foot fence on three sides behind the house and stepped down going up to the road.			
	Coombs – There is no property along Mizzenmast that is completely fenced off; this area was specifically designed so houses would complement each other and is open.			
	McLaughlin – Not appropriate, the fence is too height.			
	Camp – This is inappropriate for the neighborhood; it should come down in height and start at the right deck and the porch on the left.			
	Welch – The 6-foot fence on the north side would start in plane with the front and on the south side in plane with the front of the house; planting of climbing material on every third section along the sides.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per Exhibit A. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-1//Coombs opposed	Certificate #	72733	
7. Sharp, Randy	76 Polpis Road	New dwelling	43-177	Thornewill Design
Voting Alternates	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson			
Recused	Welch			
Documentation	None			
Representing Public	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Concerns (6:07)	Carrie Thornewill , Thornewill Design – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
	None			
	Oliver – Wishes there were more additive massing rather than being all 2-story.			
	No others have concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (McLaughlin)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72734	
8. Brody, Paul	11 E Street	Solar panels	60.2.1-4	BPC
Voting Alternates	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Recused	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Documentation	None			
Representing Public	None			
Concerns (6:13)	Joe Paul , BPC – Asked this be held			
	None			
	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold at applicant's request. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

HDC Minutes for July 16, 2019, adopted Aug. 8

9. Kiss, Robert	12 Creek Lane	New dwelling	38-98	BPC
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Joe Paul , BPC – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:13)	<p>Coombs – Read MAB comments: east elevation, no symmetry and large windows on 2nd floor; west elevation, two large windows are inappropriately masquerading as doors and too much glass; this is a simple structure and windows should be 6-over-6.</p> <p>Watterson – Appreciates most of the changes. North elevation main mass, the fenestration arrangement loses the sense of balance with this proposal; would like more weight on the front door to anchor it back perhaps with single-wide sidelights.</p> <p>Oliver – North elevation, the secondary door looks more like a front door; it should switch with the proposed front door, which looks secondary. Dormers over the sun porch make it overly complicated.</p> <p>Welch – North elevation, the small left additive proportions skew the perception of the “A” window size; but it’s not visible so that eliminates that concern. Agrees with Mr. Watterson about the front door. He thinks the rear elevation will not be visible, expect may the 2nd-floor at a distance.</p> <p>McLaughlin – West elevation, the deck should be no more than 8 feet deep.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees with what’s been said. The dormers go up to the ridge; they should come down off it.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for minor revisions. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
10. Byrnes, Randy	9 Liberty Street	Minor alterations/color chg	42.3.1-57	Concept Design
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	T.J. Watterson , Concept Design – Reviewed application and changes made per previous concerns; wants to discuss the suggested color change with the owner.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:26)	<p>Coombs – Read HSAB comments from June 17th.</p> <p>Camp – She’s okay with the changes but not Navy Blue for the shutters, which is too trendy; shutters should be a more historic color like Newport blue.</p> <p>Oliver – Also okay with the changes and navy for the door; suggested the shutters be black.</p> <p>Welch – No concerns as submitted.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Confirmed the proposed colors.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
11. Bradford, Andrea	128 Main Street	Clapboard color change	42.3.3-97	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Andrea Bradford , owner – Wants white clapboard; the shutters are black and doors Folger blue. Stephanie Bradford			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:36)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: needs contrast, prefer grey.</p> <p>Coombs – Okay with the proposed.</p> <p>McLaughlin – White is approvable; there are 7 white-on-white houses between the bank and monument.</p> <p>Coombs – No concerns.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (McLaughlin)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72735

12.	85 N. Sankaty Rd, LLC	85 Sankaty Road	New dwelling	49-91	M. C. Architect
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Mark Cutone , Mark Cutone Architecture – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:41)	<p>Coombs – Read SAB comments: roof porch appears shallow; roof too high; doesn’t look ‘Sconset and needs redesign. Oliver – The wider middle mass helps. Her biggest issue is the connector pieces, which is an atypical way to marry masses; it should go back to a more traditional connector. Make the flanking masses different. The rear massing is more traditional, except the connectors. Watterson – Agrees with Ms. Oliver especially the need for more traditional massing. Welch – The main mass is more successful, but the previous connectors were more successful. West elevation, the heights of the secondary masses should be more different; the eave heights appear to be the same. McLaughlin – No comments. Coombs – North elevation flush dormers, the windows should go up to the dormer eave to align the meeting rails.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for massing revisions. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	
13.	85 N. Sankaty Rd, LLC	85 Sankaty Road	Garage	49-91	M. C. Architect
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Mark Cutone , Mark Cutone Architecture – Explained to changes to the drive to mitigate visibility.				
Public	None				
Concerns (time)	<p>Coombs – Read SAB comments: reconsider after house approval. Oliver – East elevation, the dormer windows are tight to the eave; that is the change that needs to be made to the main house. This faces the street and is the first thing you see. Watterson – No comments. Welch – Understands Ms. Oliver’s concerns; this sits farther back from the road than the neighbor’s garage; plant material is a mitigating factor. Feels the shed roof toward Sankaty is not a concern. His only concern is the flush dormer meeting rails. McLaughlin – The meeting rails on the flush dormers must drop about 8 inches to align.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the meeting rails dropped to align with the eaves. (McLaughlin)				
Vote	Carried 4-1//Oliver opposed			Certificate #	72736
14.	85 N. Sankaty Rd, LLC	85 Sankaty Road	Pool	49-91	M. C. Architect
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Mark Cutone , Mark Cutone Architecture – Presented project; was tracking.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:56)	No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (McLaughlin)				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	72737
15.	Smith, Horace	97 West Chester	Garage addition	41-838	Emeritus
Voting	Oliver (acting chair), McLaughlin, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:58)	<p>McLaughlin – The cupola is highly inappropriate and should be eliminated. The structure is 4-square. Welch – Still too tall; should come down more. Eliminate the cupola; it over complicates the structure. Noted where 6 inches could come out of the height; probably could reduce the interior height as well. Oliver – If the garage were in back of the house, it would be approvable; asked if they could use the driveway easement and move the garage.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 3-0			Certificate #	

16. Walker, Jon	112 Wauwinet Road	Renovation/addition	11-20	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; thinks the design is highly contextual and expressed frustration at this being drawn out because of the abutter.			
Public	<p>Linda Williams, for Gale Arnold– We have repeated a lot of these things because we feel strongly about them, and they have not been addressed. She doesn’t find any changes to be substantial. East elevation still is 75 feet long and see through from west to east. A chimney that size and height is inappropriately located on the outside wall of a secondary mass; the “fake roof” covering the chimney doesn’t help. There are a bunch of weird pitches; doesn’t think 2 different pitches on one elevation visible from a public way is approvable. West elevation, the 4- to 3-ganged windows got bigger and there are still 5 ganged sets so no change in the amount of fenestration. The connector was to go to one but is still double. The air-conditioning units (A/C) aren’t shown on the elevation as they should be; they appear on the floor plans. The transoms are inappropriate. It should be natural to weather, not white.</p> <p>Ben Normand, Rowland & Associates, for Gale Arnold – Designed Gale Arnold’s house about 10 years ago; he was asked to look at this to get a feel of context. The locus view shows wide lots with at least 100-foot width; this is a very narrow lot. Across the street are very small 1-story structures. Wauwinet is a small-scale village. On the south elevation, the 2nd-floor is a flat wall with no relief in the plain; thinks a cross section view would be helpful.</p> <p>Nicholas Brown, Pierce Atwood, for Gale Arnold – Understands the owner’s frustration; the neighbor is also frustrated because she feels her concerns are not being fully considered. The house is oversized for a narrow lot; without those changes, the process will continue in another from.</p> <p>Gale Arnold, owner – This will be within 5 feet of my property and does not reflect the other neighbor at 114, which is a tiny house. This is more modern than it needs to be in a fishing village.</p>			
Concerns (7:07)	<p>Pohl – This is a public process and the public has the right to express their opinions. The applicant has to count on the board to make a decision based upon all concerns. The first rule of this hearing is there will be no back and forth.</p> <p>Oliver – Asked that the speakers not repeat themselves and each other.</p> <p>Pohl – The set back is 10 feet at the closest point to Ms. Arnold’s property line.</p> <p>McLaughlin – He’s watched this come through and we’ve made recommendations and changes have been made. He thinks this has come a long way. He feels this submission is appropriate to the area and it represents itself. This is ready to go.</p> <p>Welch – Appreciates the changes. West elevation, downsizing the 4 ganged-window to 3 on the left additive mass and 4 ganged under the porch reduced to 3 and reportioning the doors in the other additive mass were helpful changes, as well as lowering the dormer. North elevation, the wider door is fine; changing pitches are fine. South elevation, the changes to the “E-4s” is appropriate, and the dormer and roof pitch changes are appropriate. East elevation, between that and the other elevation the 11/12 and 12/12 pitches are imperceptible. Supports Mr. McLaughlin’s comments that this is contextually and architecturally appropriate. We have a duty and an obligation to listen to the comments and concerns of neighbors; but also, he takes what was submitted seriously and tries to deliberate on it in that regard. Looking at the landscape comparisons facing the homes from the roads don’t show a village nature; the images show the properties 106 through 110 have more landscaping on the street; if this has landscaping along Wauwinet Road, we would see the plant material. Regarding the village concept, he finds a disparity between what is represented and what we see. Across the street those, are all closely spaced; the one across from 108 is a very small undeveloped lot and will have a smaller home. Doesn’t feel the acreage and frontage on the harbor side is relevant; the spacing of the homes is relevant. The spacing between 106 & 108R is significantly less than between the 110 and 112; for him, the difference is the buildings, not the lot size. We’ve reviewed the information and he feels comfortable with what was submitted. South elevation as drawn along with the east and west provides a clear understanding of the relationship. Agrees a color change is necessary. Agrees a color change is necessary. The A/C should be shown on the hardscape plan and the hardscape application is required. The A/C should be shown on the hardscape plan and the hardscape application is required. An issue that’s come up after the fact is the fireplace going to gas and having a termination cap that wasn’t approved; if that happens, we want to see that.</p> <p>Oliver – The photos show her that there is no arch-type of styles in this area and there is a lot of glass facing the water. This is in keeping with the neighborhood. Agrees the smaller lot frontage is irrelevant and they can landscape along the street. It does come close to the south lot line but is within zoning.</p> <p>Pohl – It’s <i>de minimis</i> but he’d prefer the sheets of the chimney to go straight down; doesn’t think the throat has to be that high. Agrees with what’s been said. He has concerns about the white; he had hoped it would be moved back more but the alternative would be to go to something more neutral, grey tones. Appreciates reduction in the fenestration.</p> <p>MacEachern – Suggested trim to natural and sash and doors to terratone.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the chimney to go straight to the roof no cheats; all trim natural to weather and window sash and French doors to be terratone and opaque wood doors natural to weather. (McLaughlin)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72738	
Break 7:42 to 7:47 p.m.				

17. O'Brien, Peter	36 Low Beach Road	New dwelling	74-55	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photo, sand advisory board comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:48)	No concerns.			
	Welch – No concerns. The connectors here are successful to the overall massing because of the gable ends.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72739
18. Crowley, Seamus	46A Nobadeer Frm Rd #1	Addition	69-35	Topham Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:50)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
19. Splain, Erin	11 South Shore Road	New dwelling	67-468.1	CWA
Voting	Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Chip Webster , Chip Webster Associates – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:52)	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72740
20. Sea La Vie	42 Dukes Road	2 nd floor addition	56-249	NAG
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Bill McGuire , Nantucket Architectural Group – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:54)	Camp – It now appears as a 1.5-story house because of the broke-back and north elevation dormers; the previous looked more like a full 2 stories.			
	Coombs – North and south elevations, suggested changing the pitches of the porches so the break in the roof hits the base of the windows; north elevation would get steeper and the south elevation would get shallower; also, the dormer roofs should drop to hit the top of the windows.			
	McLaughlin – Agrees with Ms. Coombs.			
	Welch – Think's the 9-foot ceiling could be reduced. The box soffit should be reflected to extend the roof.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	

21. Whitney, John	27 Broadway	Window changes	73.1.3-91+91.1	NAG
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Bill McGuire , Nantucket Architectural Group – Reviewed supplemental information requested.			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:08)	<p>Pohl – The photo of the as-built shows too much shingle over the south-, east-, and north-elevation windows as opposed to what was drawn. The idea of the slightly-pitched roof was that it was a sleeping porch; now it looks like the back side of a townhouse; we were leaving the existing roof and filling it in with windows, but something wasn't done right. The proximity of the window headers to the eave is wrong.</p> <p>Welch – In the photo, take the shingle line and extend it and it looks to terminate in the edge of the roof; in the drawing it's at least 9 inches higher. Photos of the east and north elevations versus the drawing, he would have asked for a setback. The south porch scales deeper than it was approved. He wants to look at this; a view would be helpful.</p> <p>Camp – She also wants to see this.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Should have research done on how this became what is in the photos. The only thing that can save the flat roof, is to put a 7-inch gable on top of it. He wants to see the signed application.</p> <p>Further discussion about what caused the issue with the 2nd-floor sleeping porch windows and shingle courses and how to correct it.</p>			
Motion	Motion to View. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
22. Halbern 7 Lovett	17 Washaman Avenue	Renovations	55-239	Kent Murphy
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Kent Murphy – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; could make the awning windows double hung.			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:30)	<p>Oliver – West and east elevation, the 3rd-floor dormers still need to be smaller so that the side setback is 3 feet from the wall and it should be pulled away so as not to intersect the main roof; the dormer would be 2 windows with no shingle space.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The awning windows should be fixed or in-swing.</p> <p>Welch – The 2nd-story gable addition on the rear from the eave up, its proportion is off; it's mitigated by the fact visibility will be limited; bits and pieces will be visible. From the other side, the two fascias will be flush with the exterior wall; shingles there will be on the same plain and depth, and the roof fascia to the rafter end will drop; that will look odd.</p> <p>Pohl – It would be a “fake break.” The only way to reconcile Mr. Welch's concern is to move the whole thing.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the east and west 3rd-floor dormers to be setback 3 feet from the gable end and set back from the main roof plane and the two “A” windows to be double hung. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 3-1//Welch opposed		Certificate #	72741

V. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approve Minutes	June 25 & 27, 2019: Motion to Approve. (McLaughlin) Carried unanimously
Review Minutes	July 9 & 11, 2019
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of update on Vineyard Wind project. Welch – Bureau for Ocean Energy Management confirmed there was direct adverse effect; asked for a letter to reiterate the points and requests made in HDC's previous letter, that those are strong concerns, and appreciate continued consider for Nantucket as a National Historic Site. Motion to Allow Mr. Welch to write a letter to Vineyard Wind recapping our position on. (Pohl) Carried unanimously • Discussion of synthetic materials. Pohl – The Builders Association sent an email about a presentation for HDC at one of their meetings about the fasteners. He explained to them what HDC is looking for and that the presentation has to be at one of our meetings because it has to be publicly noticed. He'll get back to them. Welch – Suggested that they bring in manufacturer tear sheets. • Discussion and update on Nantucket Sidewalk Work Group. No action at this time. • Discussion of implementing a timer during HDC application review. No action at this time. • Discussion of National Grid Distribution Reliability Project in regard to new utility poles and overhead wires. No action at this time.
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. None

Adjourned at 8:47 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Sconset Advisory Board

Madaket Advisory Board

Sign Advisory Committee

Tuckernuck Advisory Board