



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 ~~

Thursday, August 1, 2019

2 Fairgrounds Road, PLUS Conference Room – 1:00 p.m.

Called to order at 1:00 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Welch

Staff in attendance: Cathy Flynn, Administrative Specialist
 Attending Members: Welch (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver
 Absent Members: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Watterson, Dutra
 Late Arrivals: None
 Early Departures: None

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Mahoney, Ed	6 Sandplain Drive	New dwelling	68-356	KOH Architecture
Voting	Welch, McLaughlin, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Dinah Klamert , KOH Architecture – Changes made per previous concerns on all structures include: lowered height, redesigned dormers, provided wall sections, changed up window patterns among buildings, revised the color schemes. Reviewed specific changes: color to grey, yellow, and white; lowered high ridge 3.5”; aligned dormers with fascia; window to 6-over-1; lowered master suite pitch. Ed, Mahoney, owner			
Public	None			
Concerns (1:04)	<p>Welch – Pointed out that the board is limited today; ensured Ms. Klamert is okay with that. Since the perspective views, which he requested, weren’t provided, for him that could be a continuance. Asked Ms. Klamert to provide an overall “lay of the land” until they ascertain if Mr. Watterson can attend.</p> <p>Oliver – North elevation, the dormers should be set in 3 feet from the side of the building. The 3” lowering is non-discernable; you don’t need an 8-foot ceiling on the 2nd-floor. Every building hovers within the same height give or take a few inches; we wanted some buildings with a larger variable. A typical 1.5 story house doesn’t have a full ceiling on the 2nd floor, that’s why it has dormers; these have full 2nd-floors with dormers.</p> <p>McLaughlin – North elevation, the 1st 2 windows align with the fascia but the third does not; it should be a larger window and also align. The south elevation louvers should be wood. The elevation shows 6-over-1 windows but the window schedule says 2-over-2.</p> <p>Welch - The dormer set in can be from rake-face to rake-face. Agrees with the comments about height and varying the structures to have an overall sense of mass. There were concerns about the overall height relative to constructions methods. The window sill height is unnecessarily high and with the roof could come down; the 8’1.25” 2nd-floor roof height is very large and not required by code. As a traditional massing, these would be on very large lots set back from the street or would be a more formal design where the height would translate into the vocabulary of typical Nantucket homes with additive massing, 8/12 pitches, etc. The height should come down 9 inches with a 7’4” 2nd-floor ceiling. We are trying to compensate for the modular construction of a ceiling on the 1st floor and floor on the 2nd floor, which automatically puts this at a disadvantage of meeting a typical Nantucket height by adding one foot.</p> <p>Klamert – Can’t lower ceiling heights further because of how they buildings are pre-fabricated. Suggested changing the pitch to 8/12 to bring it down 3 more inches; maybe she can bring it down another 1.75”. This is the largest house with the highest ridge. The most she can bring it down is 6” to 8”.</p> <p>Welch – That would flatten the roof, which is a concern for him. This needs to come down more than 3 inches. He’d like to see it down to about 28’3”. The window schedule text needs to be corrected to reflect 6-over-1.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the window schedule update; the height to be no more than 28’3” and north elevation “C” window to become a “B”; dormer setback to be 3-foot minimum and primary roof pitch 8/12 per Exhibit A; the height is approved subject to the modular construction; if that changes to stick built, it must come back to lower height. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried unanimously		Certificate #	72807

2. Mahoney, Ed	2 Sandplain Drive	New dwelling	68-356	KOH Architecture
Voting	Welch, McLaughlin, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Dinah Klamert , KOH Architecture – Changed the roof to a shed on the rear bump out to change from 6 Sandplain. This is the same modular design as 6 Sandplain, so they will apply those comments to this structure regarding height, dormers, correct the window schedule to reflect 2-over-2 windows. Colors: sandtone sash, white trim, Nantucket red door. Ed, Mahoney, owner			
Public	None			
Concerns (1:33)	McLaughlin – There is no information about the roofs on the application. North elevation has a similar window issue as 6 Sandplain; suggested three small windows. Oliver – The front door should change to match the windows. Mr. McLaughlin’s suggestion results in not all windows aligning. Suggested turning it to address Beach Grass and leave the driveway where it is. Welch – Those are decks and patios; the drawing determines what is built not the narrative text of the application in that each drawing of an approved set is stamped “No changes without HDC Approval.” Not very concerned about the north elevation windows due to being on the back. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about looking so much alike and book-ending 6 Sandplain; but that is a vocabulary within this area. Finds that unfortunate and not in the applicant’s best interest.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the window schedule update; the height to be no more than 28’3”; dormer set-back to be 3-foot minimum; primary roof pitch 8/12; and change the front door per Exhibit A; the height is approved subject to the modular construction; if that changes to stick built, it must come back to lower height. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried unanimously		Certificate #	72808
3. Mahoney, Ed	4 Sandplain Drive	New dwelling	68-355	KOH Architecture
Voting	Welch, McLaughlin, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Dinah Klamert , KOH Architecture – Reviewed changes made; lowered height by 6” so height is 28’2”; could apply similar changes. Ed, Mahoney, owner			
Public	None			
Concerns (1:46)	Oliver – This is again in the same height range as the others and fundamentally read the same; this structure is one inch shorter than the flanking structures. The design is okay but in massing and height is too similar to those either side. Changing the front door to a 6-panel door would help with diversification; they are also all the same. Should label the window types on the floor plan and elevations. Suggested this have a mud sill. Doesn’t see the height differences as being significant; she’d prefer the height remain at 9/12. McLaughlin – East elevation, can’t tell where the left small window is located; it should be pulled off the corner and made a full-sized window. West elevation, three windows, 2 short and one large; windows should be same size. Welch – Our purview is context and Ms. Oliver’s concerns are valid; there are more commonalities than differences. East elevation, the floor plan showing the small window’s location in the dormer doesn’t match its location in the elevation; the floor plan needs to be fixed to match the elevation. The east elevation left window could be made larger. West elevation 2 nd floor, if the middle window is over a tub, it can remain small; the left window will match the “Bs” to its right. We need to get this height down by lowering the interior ceiling height and lowering pitch to 8/12. Doesn’t think the mud sill would work due to the modular construction. He was hoping to see the street perspective to ascertain the discernibility of the height of the structures. Discussion clarifying the orientation notations on the elevations, site plan, and floor plans.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with height brought down to 27’11”; front door to be 6-panel; east and west elevation to be “B” as noted in Exhibit A; the height is approved subject to the modular construction; if that changes to stick built, it must come back to lower height. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried unanimously		Certificate #	72809

4. Mahoney, Ed	2 Lilac Court	New dwelling	68-366	KOH Architecture
Voting	Welch, McLaughlin, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Dinah Klamert , KOH Architecture – Same design as 4 Sandplain, so it would have the same changes; on the west elevation, moved mudroom door; showing fireplace. Asked if the fireplace vent is built lower than shown on the plans, does that require an application. Ed, Mahoney, owner			
Public	None			
Concerns (2:08)	Welch – Technically, if anything comes in different than as shown on the approved stamped plans, that requires an application for a revision. The orientation of the gables to the road has a larger impact. Oliver – Feels her concerns aren’t being addressed everything is so cookie cutter and this process is futile; after today, she is not going to sit on any more of the applications for this area. For every suggestion, the argument is they can’t due to the modular construction. The 9/12 pitch is better looking on this than 8/12. McLaughlin – Same window situation as 4 Sandplain. Orientation isn’t clear on the plans. Welch – Ms. Oliver has made very valid concerns about diversification of design and height; he’s resigned himself to these looking very similar and that will be the vernacular of the neighborhood. Front door is different and appropriate for the style. Will come down to 27’11”.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with height reduced to 27’11”; and west and east elevation small “C” windows to be “D” windows; per Exhibit A; the height is approved subject to the modular construction; if that changes to stick built, it must come back to lower height. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried unanimously	Certificate #	72810	
5. Mahoney, Ed	4 Lilac Court	New dwelling	68-365	KOH Architecture
Voting	Welch, McLaughlin, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Dinah Klamert , KOH Architecture – Redesigned to a 2-story structure with no dormers; removed bracketed porches; height is 28’1 from 28’7”; main mass pitch is 8.5/12. Ed, Mahoney, owner			
Public	None			
Concerns (2:18)	Oliver – East elevation, the windows should align 1 st floor to 2 nd floor. The front door should be 4-panel to match the windows. McLaughlin – There are five small “C” double hung to 15 larger double hung. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about the door. Welch – The configuration of the dormers is a concern; suggested they be two smaller gable-forward dormers or make the frontis around the front door simplified. This façade, having a dormer, is much less formal than those shown in context photos from Town.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per Exhibit A with the south front door to be 4-panel with simplified trim; overall height at 27’11”; east elevation 1st-floor “A” to change to a “B” and align with the window above; the height is approved subject to the modular construction; if that changes to stick built, it must come back to lower height. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried unanimously	Certificate #	72811	
6. Burch, Chip	5 Lilac Court	New dwelling	68-361	KOH Architecture
Voting	Welch, McLaughlin, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Dinah Klamert , KOH Architecture – This is a simple, 2-story, gable forward; ridge is 28’6”; could go to 8/12 pitch and take some height out of the 2 nd floor; simplified the side elevation. Ed Mahoney , for Chip Burch – The site will have 98 single-family homes and 225 apartments units.			
Public	None			
Concerns (2:31)	Oliver – With the 7/12 roof and all the windows, it doesn’t work. Too many windows on the front and they don’t align. Suggested eliminating the porch and making this a 4-bay with a formal alignment and front door; that would make it a Greek revival; the windows should be 6-over-6 in that case. McLaughlin – Feels the application is illegal because it isn’t signed by the owner. Welch – The 7/12 isn’t appropriate; should be 9/12 with no change to the overall height. Front elevation is over fenestrated; previous iteration was better. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about making this a Greek revival with a formal front. Suggested holding it for minor revisions and provide an exhibit showing our requested changes; we want a final look at it. Need to rethink the colors; suggested driving around to see good combinations. The application does need to be signed.			
Motion	Motion to Hold per changes provided in exhibit and change to the color pallet. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried unanimously	Certificate #		

V. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approve Minutes	None
Review Minutes	July 16, 2019
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of update on Vineyard Wind project. No action at this time. • Discussion of synthetic materials. No action at this time. • Plastic sheds. No action at this time. • Discussion and update on Nantucket Sidewalk Work Group. No action at this time. • Discussion of implementing a time 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. • Discussion of Net Zero Stretch Code and impacts to HDC. No action at this time. • Discussion of HDC appeals at 41 Chuck Hollow Road and 1 Sunset Ridge Lane. No action at this time.
Commission Comments	<p>Phil Pasten, Richmond Development – Stated that 25% of these will be affordable done out of courtesy and make a fair deal with the community. Our goal is to have good-looking buildings; however, the cost factor is higher than we thought due to cost of the design and the amount of fenestration. We have people who can't afford the rent and we can't charge any less. We are constricted by the modular construction; if they can't do it, we have to go stick-built and the price goes up more. Each week day, three people ask for housing when this isn't advertised.</p> <p>Welch – That isn't our purview; but we appreciate the need for affordable housing. However, our job is to create through approvals appropriate structures both island wide and in the contextual setting of specific areas. We're not trying to make the process difficult for the applicant, but we have to go through our process. Ms. Klamert has tried to accommodate our needs. For our liking, the heights are too tall and there isn't enough diversity amongst the homes. The bottom line is you have five approvals today. Our mission is different (from other boards). A difficult aspect of working with modular construction is that they do not need to ship those with a full 2X10 ceiling joist system for the 1st floor if there is a 2nd floor; if they could accommodate that.</p> <p>Oliver – We live the housing crisis. Everything is being crammed into the mid-island.</p>

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. None

Adjourned at 2:58 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton