



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, Jessie Dutra

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, August 25, 2020

*This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube,
Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Regarding Open Meeting Law*

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

Staff in attendance: Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist; Holly Backus, Preservation Planner
Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
Absent Members: McLaughlin
Late Arrivals: Camp, 4:38 p.m.; Dutra departed between 5:34 to 7:37 p.m.
Early Departures: Dutra, 8:36 p.m.

Adoption of Agenda

Motion **Motion to Approve the agenda. (Oliver)**

Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Coombs, Dutra, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. CONSENT

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map-Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Robert Green 08-1535	5 Ann's Lane	Shed	49-68	Ethan McMorro
2.	Marine Home Center 08-1534	134 Orange Street	Roof change to match existing	55-49	Nolasco Construction
3.	Atana Iliev 08-1528	19B Waydale Road	Demo deck/rebuild/add steps	67-29	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns	No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Coombs, Dutra, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-08-(as noted)

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map-Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Dean Long 08-1533	11 Pippen's Way	Rev. 72563: color/fenest chg	43-94.2	Gryphon Architects
	• Due to lack of visibility				
2.	Linda Yates 08-1531	21 Derrymore Road	Rev. 73093: reduced pool size	41-117	Atlantic Landscaping
	• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
3.	Dalton Frazier 08-1536	73A Hooper Farm Road	Rotate shed; add covered porch	67-330	self
	• Due to lack of visibility				
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns	No additional conditions.				
Motion	Motion to Approve per noted conditions. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Oliver, Dutra, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-08-(as noted)

IV. RATIFY MOTION ON ITEM NOT ANTICIPATED BY THE ACTING CHAIR FROM 8/18/20 MEETING

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Anne Rose 08-1492	62 Boulevard	Move on Cot frm 61 Boulevard	79-211	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl, Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:38)	Botticelli – Explained previous hearing and need to ratify that motion. A corrected site plan has been submitted into the file.			
Motion	Motion to ratify the vote made on August 18. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-0//Camp, Welch, and Coombs-aye		Certificate #	HDC2020-08-1492

V. NEW BUSINESS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Richard & Deb Hohlt 07-1433	121 Madaket Road	Rev. 72983: roof walk	40/60.1	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> .			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law P.C.			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:40)	<p>Botticelli – Presented project; the berm starts at elevation 50 with Leland Cyprus planted on top. Appreciates comments about more natural vegetation. In terms of mitigating the roof walk, we looked at alternatives; we decided the natural to weather and shingling would calm it down. Reviewed alternatives to simplify the roof line while keeping the roof walk.</p> <p>Cohen – The existing vegetation is about 8 to 10 feet lower than where the berm would be planted. No one disputes it is large and on the top of a hill. However, regarding the roof walk, <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> states roof walks were prolific at one point and were on houses where the roof was difficult to maintain and historically they were for fighting fires so were on large homes with chimneys. Roof walks are almost always only appropriate on 2-story buildings. Cited exceptions where roof walks are appropriate under the modern context. They are on Eel Point Road and Cliff Road but visible from Madaket Road. If you get out of the Cliff Road vernacular and into the rural zone, you don't get the roof walk such as indicated on this house. Pointed out that the skirt is only 15 inches, shingled, with natural to weather balusters.</p> <p>Coombs – This house is huge and dwarfs everything around it and is much closer to Madaket Road than Cliff Road. Photos from Cliff Road are irrelevant. Asked the size of the proposed berm and if we have any specifications on how large a berm can be. Most places the size of the berm is low and not as long as this looks to be. This house faces and is part of Madaket Road; asked if the roof walks Mr. Cohen pointed out are on Madaket Road.</p> <p>Camp – The point about it being on Madaket Road is excellent because on one side there's Sanford Farm, which is completely natural and open. Putting a roof walk on the highest point of this area is absolutely adding to the massing of this structure. A lot of the changes made were good changes. But she's not buying what's being said to make this appropriate; she's against the roof walk. On the Madaket Road side, there's piled up dirt which she supposes will be the berm; she doesn't want Leland Cyprus on top of the berm; the vegetation should be natural to the area like black pine and other natural growth seen along Madaket Road. The first floor should have more shingling on the balustrades and combine the balustrade and shingle on the 2nd floor. She likes the way the balcony was broken up on the north elevation. Don't tell me the history of Nantucket about roof walks.</p> <p>Dutra – About the Leland Cyprus; plants aren't HDC purview but regarding a screen they only work well as a hedge because they get to big and are knocked down by the wind over time. Also, they look contrived. This is a lovely design and he likes a lot of the changes. Each application needs to be viewed individually; the way this sits on the hill and how big it already is, it is hard to ask for more height and massing. The roof walk does have a low impact but anything that adds to the massing is a concern. Now there is more screening than in the winter; most of the vegetation is deciduous so visibility is greater in the winter.</p> <p>Welch – A little while back, we received a detailed report on the history of roof walks on Nantucket; it was very well done. He went through the report carefully then surveyed the area; though he agrees roof walks were not originally outside of Town, now there are many homes around the island not near the water that have roof walks. A natural finish and additional vegetation would help; the main issue is it's a house on top of a hill. The roof walk skirt will grey in with the roof and open balustrades will blend with the sky. He feels the roof walk breaks up the roof line and won't be particularly noticeable from the road. He would urge the owner not to use Leland Cyprus due to its tendencies; red cedar would be good. From the north elevation, he's okay with the 2nd-floor railing being change to shingled railing; the right-side railing is good as it is because it would be too busy if broken up with balustrades. The west is similar. If there's one chimney with old brick, it will stand out; a white-washed single chimney might work. Option D stretches out the roof.</p> <p>Coombs – The changes to the building are okay but she cannot support the roof walk, especially in this location. Most of the trees and brush in the area is deciduous making this structure very visible in the winter; the plants must be evergreen</p>			

and large enough to screen it from all sides. This building should be as quiet as possible. This is too large. *Building with Nantucket in Mind* says do not build on the highest spot; it says that right where Mr. Cohen found his arguments supporting the roof walk.

Oliver – Agrees with much that’s been said. Her biggest concern has been mentioned and that is we should have looked closer to its position on the hill. For her, Madaket Road is not a concern; the vegetation makes it more akin to what’s there. Her concern is the view from Cliff Road; wants the impact of the house mitigated from that direction. She agrees with Mr. Welch that the roof walk isn’t a huge impact; we dropped the ball on siting the house. Agrees about more natural vegetation rather than the Cyprus. Natural brick chimneys would also help.

Coombs – Asked if this should be held for revisions.

Camp – She had concerns on the elevations, wants to see this back.

Dutra – Likes how the roof walk has been kept low and wants that to remain with different alternatives for the chimney(s).

Welch – There are four roof walk/chimney options on the table. He would like to limit the direction of the options. From conversations this evening, Option A is not approvable. Options C and D are both acceptable. He would agree with Ms. Camp with respect to the sidewall skirting on the rear.

Motion **Motion to Hold for minor revisions. (Camp)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0/Oliver, Welch, Dutra, Camp, and Coombs-aye Certificate #

2. Conlon, James L Tr. Et al. **08-1526** 24 Woodbine Street Move off/demo dwelling 80/96 Emeritus
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.
 Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
 Public
 Concerns (5:33) **MacEachern** – Presented project; circa 2001.
 No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve as a move off/demolitions. (Oliver)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Coombs, Camp, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-08-1526**

3. Conlon, James L Tr. Et al. **08-1527** 24 Woodbine Street Move off/demo garage 80/96 Emeritus
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.
 Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
 Public
 Concerns (5:38) **MacEachern** – Presented project, circa 2001.
 No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve as a move off/demolitions. (Oliver)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Coombs, Camp, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-08-1527**

4. Conlon, James L Tr. Et al. **08-1511** 24 Woodbine Street New dwelling 80/96 Emeritus
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
 Public
 Concerns (5:39) **MacEachern** – Presented project; houses in this area are all a similar size; it’s tucked back on a large lot. 21 Woodbine is a similar size and scale.

Pohl – West elevation, the gable rake crosses the chimney; asked if that is a deep overhang (yes).

Camp – She’s concerned about the size and its fitting into the neighborhood. Likes the design.

Coombs – Part of this should drop down to one story; this is 60-foot long; there is no additive massing. This is a countrified area, and this is very square and formal looking.

Oliver – Looking at the locus map, she’s not sure this matches other houses in area in size. This is 78 feet long. She supports the house but not attaching the garage, unless it is properly screened.

Welch – The slightly-not-symmetrical works. Agrees a little screening goes a long way in mitigating the perception of the size with the attached garage.

Pohl – Agrees with comments said regarding the overall massing and connecting this to the garage.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Oliver, Welch, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

5. Conlon, James L Tr. Et al. **08-1509** 24 Woodbine Street New garage 80/96 Emeritus
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
 Public None
 Concerns (5:55) **MacEachern** – Presented project.

Welch – It doesn't show in 2D but regardless of the size of the garage, the garage doors and the Dutch gable, the garage being forward of the main mass and covered porch will work against this. The Dutch gable creates a strong sense of the roof mass that overwhelms the structure; what contributes to the perception is the size of the garage doors.

Oliver – The driveway coming in right in the middle of the house creates an open vista of the structure; that view should be mitigated so the public sees more vegetation. Feels the garage should not be connected to the house, though that is based upon its visibility.

Camp – It's too tall and detracts from the main house. The breezeway doesn't look like one; open with columns might give it a feeling of airiness.

Coombs – The height should drop down to below 25 feet, which is the maximum height per the guidelines. The gable is very predominant. North and south are the most dominant.

Pohl – The cross gables are very voluminous. The height is an issue.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)**

Roll-call Vote Carried // Oliver, Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

6. Nicole Whidden **08-1472** 11 Davis Lane Pool/spa/driveway/boardwalk 82/75 Ahern
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Landscaping design plans, site plan, correspondence, and photos.
 Representing Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC
 Public Matt Erisman, 2&4 Wall Street
 Joe Gagliano, 10 Westerwyck Road

Concerns (6:01) **Pohl** – In the last two or three days, we've gotten a dozen or more letters of concern from various neighbors – too numerous to read in; be assured the letters had been disseminated to all the board members for them to read prior to the meeting.

Ahern – Presented project; a mix natural vegetation, including cedar and pine, will blend in with the neighborhood; specified LED lights for the pool interior.

MacEachern – The previous application by the prior owner had the pool rotated 90 degrees and closer to Trinity Avenue.

Erisman – This area has small lot sizes with low vegetation; the prior owner cleared the lot beyond his bounds. He doesn't know how to restore natural vegetation without looking manufactured. Cisco is natural wilderness with houses mixed in. It looks like there are attempts at perimeter vegetation but he's not sure what will be done around the immediate pool. Feels this is an exploitation of the area which jeopardizes the quietude of Cisco. He hopes that if the new owners spend some time in Cisco, they will have a change of heart. This pool is more than 100 square feet (SF) and the cabana a beacon of light and noise in the open landscape.

Gagliano – There's not a lot of detail on what's happening on the northern end. Cedars and pitch pines can grow to over 30 feet and the grouping at the perimeter would create a wall; no other areas of Cisco have that type of border. The pool is large and there is visibility of the cabana from the three roads. This whole complex is about 3,000 SF of hardscape; that footprint is bigger than the house; this sits in the middle of a natural area and is different from everything in the area. Can't emphasize the quietude, low moors, and night sky that is this area. Once we lose what we have, we will never get it back.

Coombs – This is inappropriate for this area, which is roving, ranging moors and always has been. This doesn't need to be paved and landscaped with plants all around it, like New Jersey. Feels there is no need for the pool, cabana, and associated landscaping to be larger than the house; the neighbors have as much right to enjoy their properties as this owner. The pool and hardscaping need to be reduced. Fencing isn't shown.

Camp – Cisco is an area of sandy roads across moors to the dunes. The way the trees are located around the perimeter will take away from the beauty and openness of the area; it's unnatural. Pull the screening closer to the pool and leave it open around the outside. We need a rule that says you can only brush cut what is needed to do any work. Wonders about the Zoning and Planning Boards, who are saying you can have pools here. Don't turn this into suburbia. The pool is too large.

Welch – Agrees with what's been said; particularly shielding the pool not to be visible from the street with the screening clustered in a naturalized form around the pool vs. along the lot perimeter; these types of landscape plantings start to resemble the areas vs. the tall trees and lack of yard views on Masaquet Avenue; Cisco is rural open space, which is a historical setting that should be preserved. We do have control over the setting, how proposed structures present themselves to the historic setting, size of pool, location of the cabana, concept of clustering these features, and shrinking the area that needs to be screened. He'd like to see an aerial mockup of the proposed along with the neighboring structures.

Oliver – Pools out here are inappropriate; the original intent of the developers is disappearing. This is too formal; less is more – boardwalks and driveways and patios and out structures are large and looming over the horizon and could be

eliminated. This house is going to draw attention to itself. Everything should be consolidated; an open yard with perimeter screening won't help. This needs to be simplified.

Pohl – Agrees with much that's been said. Moving plantings closer to the problem area will make the screening more effective without making it look like the owners are fencing themselves off from the neighborhood. North side of the property lacks screening. Equipment should be in the basement.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions and a more significantly detailed planting plan and reduction in the pool size. (Oliver)**

Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Coombs, Camp, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate #
 7. Nicole Whidden **08-1473** 11 Davis Lane Cabana 82/75 Emeritus

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates None

Recused None

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

Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development

Public **None**

Concerns (6:38) **MacEachern** – Presented project; pool equipment will go into the basement.

Oliver – This could be simplified even more: don't need gable windows; it could be as simple as a natural-to-weather pergola; anything to mitigate the structure would go a long way.

Coombs – Agrees. South elevation, looks like a takeout area at Surfside Beach. This is only 14 feet from the house; she doesn't see the need for it to have a barbeque and bathrooms. It needs to be simpler.

Welch – Not adverse to a simpler structure. He's concerned about the cabana that was approved there; this is not in keeping with the neighborhood. North and west walls should be open, and this placed closer to the pool.

Camp – Agrees. This looks modern; suggested a lean-to or broke back.

Pohl – The consensus is smaller.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)**

Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Camp, Welch, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

8. Linda Flanagan **08-1464** 19 Longwood Drive Move/demo guest house 71/41 M. Cutone Architecture

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.

Representing Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture

Public None

Concerns (6:45) **Cutone** – Presented project, circa 1998; have had interest in the building.

No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve as a move-off/demolition. (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-08-1464**
 9. Linda Flanagan **08-1459** 19 Longwood Drive New guest house 71/41 M. Cutone Architecture

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture

Public None

Concerns (6:50) **Cutone** – Presented project; this will also act as a pool house so has a mud sill. Neither structure is visible from the street. Review of a photo of the existing house.

Oliver – Looking for photos of the house wastes a lot of meeting time. This is larger than the existing house; she wants to understand the relationship.

Welch – This is a net gain; it has additive massing. His concern is the east elevation dormers relative to the roof size, however, he believes this will not be visible. It would be helpful in the future take photos and have them handy out of respect for our time.

Coombs – This is nicer than the main house; if it blocks the main house, great.

Camp – No concerns.

Oliver – The thing over the shower is different but won't be visible.

Pohl – Agrees this is an improvement over the main house. He supports it.

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-08-1459**

10. Linda Flanagan	08-1460	19 Longwood Drive	Pool	71/41	M. Cutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscaping design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:59)	Cutone – Presented project; autocover. Welch – Unlike a recent application, the lack of yard view, due to wooded nature of this lot makes, all the difference. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-08-1460
11. Jim Caulfield	08-1454	8 Sheep Pond Road	Main house addition	63/3	M. Cutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:01)	Cutone – Presented project. Welch – This is an improvement. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-08-1454
12. Jim Caulfield	08-1457	8 Sheep Pond Road	Second dwelling addition	63/3	M. Cutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:05)	Cutone – Presented project, circa mid-1970s. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-08-1457
13. Jim Caulfield	08-1453	8 Sheep Pond Road	Cabana addition	63/3	M. Cutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:08)	Cutone – Presented project. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Camp, Coombs, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-08-1453
14. Jim Caulfield	08-1452	8 Sheep Pond Road	Pool	63/3	M. Cutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscaping design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:09)	Cutone – Presented project, autocover. There is some vegetation, but it will have to be enhanced by indigenous plants. Welch – Additional vegetation is appropriate; it should be close to the pool and be indigenous in an naturalized layout. We need a landscape plan for the screening. He would like to hold this pending a landscape screening plan. Oliver – We never ask about lighting; out there at night, asked if that is a concern. Pohl – According to Town Counsel, lighting is not within our purview unless it's for a commercial building; there is a Town bylaw for dark skies.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for a landscape screening plan. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Oliver, Coombs, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

15. Jim Caulfield	08-1455	8 Sheep Pond Road	Shed	63/3	M. Cutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:14)	No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Oliver, Coombs, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-08-1455
16. Steven L Cohen	Trust 08-1521	55 Sankaty Road	Pool	49/69	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	(Camp stepped off for a break)				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscaping design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Lindsay Congleton, Atlantic Landscaping Inc.				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:14)	Backus – Read SAB comments: no concerns due to lack of visibility. Congleton – Presented project and described existing hedging, which screens the pool. Oliver – If SAB has no concerns, neither does she. Coombs – Agrees. This pool is 15X30; this is as big as the room she’s in. Welch – Looking on google, this setting is inappropriate for a pool of this side unless fully screened from view.				
Motion	Motion to Approve with the pool to be screened at time of inspection and thereafter. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Coombs, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-08-1521
17. Mary O’Connell	08-1508	8 Center Street (Sias)	Rev. 12-0352: relocate A/C cond	73.1.3/76	Concept Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	(Camp still out.)				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	T.J. Watterson, Concept Design				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:20)	Watterson – Presented project; to be enclosed in natural-to-weather, cedar lattice. Backus – Circa 1790. Read SAB comments: A/C might be noisy and visible to visitors in the square; previous location preferred; want to know about screening. Coombs – Lattice screening has worked well on Shell Street; thinks this will work. Welch – Given the location and visibility, he’d like a detailed drawing showing the proposed lattice enclosure from inside the fence; noted that these units typically need a ground clearance of 10 to 12 inches. Oliver – She wants to view this.				
Motion	Motion to View and hold for additional information on the lattice. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Welch, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
18. James Crowley	08-1532	8 Wall Street	Drvway/walkway crushed shell	82/79	Paulo Vicente
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	(Camp still stepped out)				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscaping design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Paulo Vicente, Vicente Burin Architecture, LLC.				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:28)	Pohl – This was going on consent until a neighbor voiced concern; she never expressed the concerns. McCarthy – This has to go to the Planning Board for the double curb cut. Vincente – There is no curbing; the drawing is deceptive. Went to the Planning Board, the two curb cuts are grandfathered. Backus – They don’t need an apron on the dirt road. Welch – There are other properties on this road with two curb cuts. Asked the drawings be modified to eliminate what appears to be curb banding around the parking area. The “stockade” fence should be labeled “existing split rail.” Oliver – Curbing on a dirt road is very heavy.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with drawings corrected to show the stockade fence labeled existing split rail and the banding representing curbing removed. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-08-1532

VI. OLD BUSINESS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Tim Quinlisk 03-0793	88 Quidnet Road	Partial demo/re-site/addition	21/109	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Welch (acting chair), Coombs, Camp, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Pohl, Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl				
Public	Sarah Alger, Sarah F. Alger P.C.				
Concerns (7:37)	Linda Williams for neighbors				
	Botticelli – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
	Williams – Her clients were concerned because the ridge pole seemed high; they appreciate the plate being dropped and thus the height. The south elevation is a vertical wall from their perspective; dormers seem heavy; the double windows aren't for egress so could reduce and the dormer moved above the eave line.				
	Alger – Objects to the characterization of the “vertical wall” on the south elevation. This is appropriate to the neighborhood.				
	Camp – South elevation, the roof over the shower could be a shed roof; it would be quieter. Did a great job of keeping the character of this house and sensitively done.				
	Backus – Staff found revisions regarding the cover over the shower, she's curious if the pitch of the gable could match the pitch of the existing gable bump out.				
	Dutra – Ms. Backus suggestion makes sense on the south elevation; would prefer the shower roof not a shed roof; asked if the shower enclosure could be shingled; would like the peak of the gable to be at the same height as the existing gable bump out roof and tuck the shower to the right to hug the window as the bump out does.				
	Coombs – Likes the way the building came out. It would be interesting to see the south elevation shower shingled; as it catches one's eye. Thinks this will fit in nicely. Okay with the vertical boards on the east elevation.				
	Welch – Appreciates the changes. He's good with the concept of changing the pitch on the gable over the shower and shifting it to the right. The element of the open balustrade, on the 1 st floor south into the basement likes the idea of light and ventilation in there; on the 2 nd floor, that should be a shingle wall rail that doesn't need to extend to the east.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the shower gable roof pitch to match the existing south elevation bump out gable and the 2nd-floor south elevation to shingled railing. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Dutra, Coombs, Camp, and Welch-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-03-0793
2.	MacGregor – ACK 07-1375	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar Building A	68/29.1	My Gener. Energy
3.	MacGregor – ACK 07-1376	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar Building B	68/29.1	My Gener. Energy
4.	MacGregor – ACK 07-1377	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar Building C	68/29.1	My Gener. Energy
5.	MacGregor – ACK 07-1378	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar Building D	68/29.1	My Gener. Energy
6.	MacGregor – ACK 07-1379	5 Sun Island Road	Roof top solar Building E	68/29.1	My Gener. Energy
7.	MacGregor – ACK 07-1380	5A Sun Island Road	Roof top solar Building A	68/29.1	My Gener. Energy
8.	MacGregor – ACK 07-1381	5B Sun Island Road	Roof top solar Building B	68/29.1	My Gener. Energy
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
Public	Jeanie Bridge, My Generation Energy				
Concerns (8:00)	None				
	Williams – Minimally visible and same color as the nearly flat roofs. The power cannot leave the Island; by law it must be used on Island. These are direct feeds so there are no transformers or outside batteries. None of the trees are on Sun Island Storage property.				
	Camp – She's glad the power will stay on the Island. This is an opportunity to beautify the area with more vegetation. She wonders about who stands to make money off this; if we okay this and the solar energy is being stored, she wonders who sells it to the town (My Generation Energy).				
	Coombs – We should review our solar policy and include commercial buildings, so we don't end up having the whole area along Nobadeer Farm Road being covered in solar panels; it needs to be controlled somehow.				
	Backus – She talked to Lauren Sinatra: A) the purview of HDC is architectural elements and B) the generated power will stay on the Island. That isn't HDC purview, but it is a benefit to the Island.				
	Welch – The applicant's agent provided a revised site plan showing clarity of what is proposed, which was helpful when he viewed it. It is important we are make determinations for the right reasons; this concept of whether something is good for the Island's energy program is not HDC purview and it could be a double-edged sword. He believes that with this application, the bank size is an issue mitigated because it is not directly visible. Noted Hinsdale is primarily commercial, and this is probably a future direction for commercial properties. Approving this does not set a precedent for solar panels on main-mass roofs facing the road.				
	Oliver – She has nothing positive to say about this. It does fit our guidelines, so she will vote on it.				

Pohl – He doesn't think there is a difference between residential and commercial; fortunately for this proposal, it's discrete. These aren't visible, and he supports alternative energy when it works.

Motion **Motion to Approve 5 Sun Island Road A-E and 5A and 5B Sun Island Road due to limited visibility. (Welch)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-1//Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye; Oliver- nay Certificate # **HDC2020-07-(as noted)**
 9. MacGregor – ACK **07-1382** 9 Sun Island Road Roof top solar Building A 68/29.1 My Gener. Energy
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates Dutra
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.
 Representing Linda Williams
 Public None
 Concerns (8:24) **Williams** – Presented project.

Welch – Understands this will have limited visibility due to the roof pitch.

Motion **Motion to Approve subject to limited visibility. (Welch)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-1//Coombs, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye; Oliver-nay Certificate # **HDC2020-07-1382**

10. Kamadif, LLC **07-1310** 32 Dukes Road Patio/retaining wall 30" high 56/188 Atlantic Landscaping
 Voting Coombs (acting chair), Oliver, Welch, Dutra
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Landscaping design plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Lindsay Congleton, Atlantic Landscaping Inc.
 Public None
 Concerns (8:27) **Congleton** – Reviewed addition information per previous concerns. Patio is 22.7 and top of wall will be 25.5 catching the grade on the right. All runoff is captured on this property; there is a drainage system.
Welch – He viewed this, and it looks fine.
Oliver – Viewed as well; it looks good.
Dutra – Doesn't see the elevation numbers on the topographic lines. No concerns.
 (Ms. Camp allowed to comment but not sitting on this – Trusts Mr. Welch and Ms. Oliver's assessments.)

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Welch, Dutra, Oliver, and Coombs-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-07-1310**

11. Sea La Vie, LLC **07-1408** 42 Dukes Road Rev. 67176: patio & pool 56/249 NAG
 Voting Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Landscaping design plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Bill McGuire, Nantucket Architectural Group
 Public None
 Concerns (8:36) **McGuire** – Put up red tape and planted four cedar trees to show what it will look like; once the trees grow with more trees, the wall will not be visible. The stone is square-cut ashlar.
Camp – This is similar to the previous application in that it needs to be screened from the road. Wants additional screening between the pool and house left of the stairs and gate.
Oliver – She viewed this and has grave concerns because having seen it, the stone is very unusual and there is a lot of it; she hesitates to permit more stone work without screening on the walls.
Welch – The thing to be clear about in the drawings is that much of the height and length of the stone wall along the end of the drive is fully visible, adjacent to quite a bit of other tall, fully visible stone wall; the area just in front of the wall needs to be planted across the north elevation of the wall to screen the wall completely. The end result would be that the stones won't be visible in area left of the existing shed grass slope.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions to the vegetative screening plan and reconfiguration of the stairs. (Camp)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

12. Brian Harris **06-1165** 50 Weweeder Avenue Pool/hardscape 79/15 M. Cutone, Architecture
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Landscaping design plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture
 Public None
 Concerns (8:53) **Cutone** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.
 No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve with the pool not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter. (Oliver)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-06-1165**

13. 137 Hummock Pond Rd 07-1391	137 Hummock Pond Rd	New 2 nd dwelling	65/72	Brook Meerbergen
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Brook Meerbergen			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:56)	<p>Meerbergen – Reviewed previous concerns; suggested he could shift the building about 12 feet left away from the driveway. His client wants screening between this and the main house so there is a visual separation.</p> <p>Welch – His only concern is moving it all the way to the property line; suggested splitting the difference.</p> <p>Camp – Her only concern is the height; she doesn't see houses that tall out there and it looks like it could be reduced a couple of feet.</p> <p>Coombs – One of the buildings has to be no more than 25 feet tall. There are big barns out there but not big houses; this has to come down in height. Agrees with Mr. Welch about moving it over.</p> <p>Oliver – Confirmed the structure's location regarding the photo looking down the driveway at the existing.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
14. Dex Dog, LLC 08-1440	6B Arrowhead Drive	Solar revisions	69/58.1	SunWind, LLC
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.			
Representing	Tim Holmes, SunWind, LLC			
Public	None			
Concerns (9:07)	<p>Pohl – He was out there today and looked at this; the shingles look dark grey, not black.</p> <p>Welch – The exposed shingles are a little darker than those on the small building, but they aren't black. There was lengthy discussion to have the solar panels justified to roof edge and bottom; these are not; not looking for a pound of flesh but something has to be done; he would accept painting them black.</p> <p>Coombs – The exposed shingles should be painted black.</p> <p>Oliver – She didn't view this. It would be great to do something to mitigate that corner.</p> <p>Camp – No comments.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the exposed shingles painted black. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried unanimously//Camp, Oliver, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2020-08-1440
15. 60 Walsh St, LLC 08-1512	60 Walsh Street	Gym/rec barn	29/85.2	Botticelli & Pohl
16. Mark Wendling 07-1395	4 John Adams Lane	Cabana	30/628	Botticelli & Pohl
17. Richard Chesley 02-0732	32 West Chester Street	New dwelling	42.4.3/31	BPC
18. Cliff Lane 81, LLC 07-1392	81 Cliff Lane	Addition	30/165	BPC
19. Wayne L Rogers Trust 08-1522	5 North Liberty Street	Door replacement	42.3.4/7	NAG
20. South Water Assoc 02-0629	5 South Water Street	Second/third flr add	42.3.1/270-75	Emeritus
21. Thompson 05-1039	73 Baxter Road	Move off/demo exst garage	49/27	Emeritus
22. Thompson 07-1292	73 Baxter Road	Garage	49/27	Emeritus
23. Bartlett Farm House, LLC 06-1110	24 Bartlett Farm Road	Pool	65/86	Emeritus
24. Stephen Frohwein 07-1285	32 North Liberty Street	Addition	41/159	Emeritus
25. Wilner, Sheila 01-0548	10 Beach Street	Demo existing dwelling	73.2.4/10	Emeritus
26. Wilner, Sheila 01-0547	10 Beach Street	New dwelling	73.2.4/10	Emeritus
27. Hummock Pond Holdings 07-1427	287 Hummock Pond Rd	Move on to 289 HPR + addtn	83/39	Emeritus
28. Hummock Pond Holdings 07-1426	287 Hummock Pond Rd	Re-site garage + alts	83/39	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (9:15)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Held for Thursday, August 27 at 1 p.m.			
Roll-call Vote	N/A		Certificate #	

VII. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approve Minutes Motion Roll-call Vote	July 21 & 28, 2020 and August 3, 6 & 10, 2020 No action at this time. N/A
Review Minutes	August 18, 2020
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next HDC Meeting Thursday August 27, 2020- if needed • Next HDC Meeting New Business Monday August 31, 2020 • HDC review of revisions to HDC Background Summary to finalize for web page including vote: held. • Resilient Nantucket Community Forum #1(virtual) September 18, 2020(11:30-1:00pm) – (6:00pm-7:30pm): held. • Discussion of Certified Local Government (CLG) and possible vote: held. • Review policy of Move/demo hearings in relation to new dwellings: held. • Discussion of adding Tuckernuck to MAB: held.
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 9:18 p.m. (Coombs)**

Roll-call Vote Carried unanimously//Oliver, Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Scosnet Advisory Board

Madaket Advisory Board