



# HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

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

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

~~ MINUTES ~~

**Tuesday, August 29, 2023**

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

Called to order at 4:01 pm. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

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

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

Remote Participants: Pohl, Coombs

Absent Members: Thornewill

Late Arrivals:

Early Departures: Pohl (7:17pm)

Adoption of Agenda.

**Motion** **Motion to Approve modified agenda. (Coombs)**  
**Vote** Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver

## I. COMMISSIONERS TO DISCUSS & VOTE

- Election of Officers

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Patten, Paul

Recused None

**Motion** **Motion to go back to tradition of having election of HDC officer after the Town Election. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver-aye

## II. CONSENTS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	14 North Rd LLC 06-8703	14 North Rd	Patio rev 10-2058	43/83	WAPD
2.	Hamlet Alvarado	14 Surfside drive	Add deck & infill addition	67/194.1	Hamlet Alvarado
3.	Chris O'Connell	3 Upper Tawpawshaw	Rooftop solar	53/41	Cotuit Solar
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Paul				
Recused	None				
Documentation	<b>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.</b>				
Representing	-				
Public	-				
Concerns	-				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve consent items. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023- (as noted)</b>

**III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Stoyan Ivanov	18 South Shore rd.	Move off/demo Dwelling	80/66	Linda Williams
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires drawings amended to show dimension of footprint, and overall height.</li> </ul>				
2.	Stoyan Ivanov	18 South Shore rd.	New Dwelling	80/66	Linda Williams
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminate middle bay of covered porch (left to right), reduce height and width of single-windowed dormer by 1' each.</li> </ul>				
3.	Stoyan Ivanov	18 South Shore rd.	Pool & Hardscape	80/66	Linda Williams
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simplify arbor end cuts, either to a single slant or single plumb cut &amp; pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity &amp; pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.</li> </ul>				
4.	22 Easton St LLC	22/24 Easton St	MH move window	42.1.4/12,12.1	WAPD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision approved as follow: 2nd floor window, west elevation; all information not related to this single approved modification to be stricken from the text of the actual application document. And, to avoid processing delays pls start to follow this convention going forward.</li> </ul>				
5.	22 Easton St LLC	22/24 Easton St	GH add rail	42.1.4/12,12.1	WAPD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revisions approved as follow: 1st floor deck steps and railing, west elevation; all information not related to this single approved modification to be stricken from the text of the actual application document. And, to avoid processing delays pls start to follow this convention going forward.</li> </ul>				
6.	22 Easton St LLC	22/24 Easton St	Garage Barn door	42.1.4/12,12.1	WAPD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revisions approved as follow: 1st floor door and lattice, south elevation; all information not related to this single approved modification to be stricken from the text of the actual application document. And, to avoid processing delays pls start to follow this convention going forward.</li> </ul>				
7.	22 Easton St LLC	22/24 Easton St	Studio window	42.1.4/12,12.1	WAPD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision approved as follow: 1st floor windows, two double-hung (vs. three), west elevation; all information not related to this single approved modification to be stricken from the text of the actual application document. And, to avoid processing delays pls start to follow this convention going forward.</li> </ul>				
8.	42/44 ARB Way LLC	9 Arbour Way	Move off/Demo	29/137	Botticelli + Pohl
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approved as move off-demo (move off advertising is required under zoning code).</li> </ul>				
9.	Drake Real Estate	5 Davis Lane	Pool	87/72	Drake Real Estate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity &amp; pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.</li> </ul>				
10.	51 Okorwaw LLC	51 Okorwaw Ave	New Garage	79/64	Linda Williams
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add bracketed pent roof on north elevation &amp; bracketed pent roof to mitigate verticality of gable on west elevation.</li> </ul>				
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Oliver, Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	-				
Public	-				
Concerns	-				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve consent with conditions. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul // Camp abstained			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-(as noted)</b>

**III. OLD BUSINESS 08/01/2023**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Brandon Scimone <b>04-8324</b>	6 Sandpiper Way	Addition	76/89	SCI- Robert Newman
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Robert Newman</b>			
Public	-			
Concerns-				

**Oliver**

- Appreciates the introduction of alternative options but finds the presented design too similar to the existing building.
- Notes the absence of floor plans as a limitation for offering constructive suggestions.
- Suggests the possibility of breaking up the design either by extending forward or backward.
- Focuses on the front elevation, particularly on option number four, which features a one-story mass extending forward and a Dormer that doesn't connect with the middle Gable.
- Expresses the primary concern about the discrepancy in window sizes between the proposed design, which has larger windows, and the middle mass, which has smaller windows ("tiny little Chiclets").
- Recommends making the windows in the middle mass similar in size to the larger proposed windows to improve the design's appropriateness.

**Camp**

- Agrees with Val's preference for option four, highlighting the successful design aspect of the Dormer not connecting with the Gable.
- Supports the idea of achieving unity in window sizes, suggesting that the smaller windows be enlarged to match the others.
- Commends the proposed front porch as successful.
- Main concern centers on the mass extending from the front Gable, finding it too heavy and suggesting further reduction in its size for a less overwhelming appearance.

**Coombs**

- Agrees with Abby's assessment and expresses concerns about the front elevation.
- Specifically, she finds the arrangement of the four windows in the Dormer running into the Gable problematic.
- Suggests the possibility of adding two windows on the first floor and removing one window on the second floor to balance the design.
- Believes that this adjustment could make the wing appear less imposing and is open to further modifications based on the interior plans.

**Welch**

- Agrees with previous comments and expresses concerns about the proposed west elevation's primary Gable.
- Finds the four windows on this Gable severely undersized and highlights the need for addressing this issue.
- Suggests modifying the Dormer to reduce its height and improve its profile, particularly on the rear of the structure.
- Recommends incorporating a root roof extension treatment from options 4-4 and 4.1 on the left side if space permits.
- Notes that the window height relationships on the left side are atypical due to the split-level nature of the structure and recommends adjusting them.

**Motion**

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

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver

Certificate #

**HDC2023-04-8324**

2. George Metri <b>05-8496</b>	12 Angola St	New dwelling	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates	Dutra, Patten;			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	-			
Public	-			
Concerns	Application not opened.			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>No action.</b>			
Roll-call Vote			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-05-8496</b>

3.	1010 Wins LLC 06-8669	10 Lincoln Ave	Main house rev11-5270	30/184	Emeritus LTD
----	-----------------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------	--------------

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul

Alternates Camp, Patten

Recused None

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

Representing **Matt MacEachern**

Public **Mickey Rowland-HSAG**

- He acknowledges that the bracket is still a concern, specifically mentioning the awkward angles.
- Suggests a more traditional approach by using a horizontal member with a curved or simple angled support to improve the bracket's appearance.

Concerns-

**Holly Backus**

- Acknowledges that the building is a circa 1902 Colonial Revival style structure contributing to the district.
- Appreciates the changes made to the fenestration for the deck but suggests that the French doors should have 12 lights with kick panels to match the rest.
- Finds the revised bracket to be somewhat awkward and recommends adding elements that reflect the shingle style more effectively.
- Suggests exploring shingled-type brackets and adjusting the angle to better align with the desired architectural style.

**Oliver**

- Appreciates the changes made to the double hung windows.
- Agrees with Holly regarding the bracket detail but also has a concern about the facade's consistency.
- Questions the presence of different types of doors in the same area and suggests maintaining consistency by changing the doors on the facade to match the 12 light with a kick panel style.

**Welch**

- Acknowledges the effort to balance various factors with the bracket design.
- Suggests considering making the bracket an infill with a half-inch inside panel to create an interesting shadow line and eliminate the dark space.
- Notes that the bracket's visibility from the street will likely be limited or oblique.
- Expresses a willingness to accommodate the board's preferences regarding the bracket.
- References Val's earlier comments about the doors, indicating agreement with her points.

**Coombs**

- Finds the bracket unattractive and out of place on an otherwise good-looking house.
- Suggests shingling the bracket and possibly making it thinner to improve its appearance.
- Questions the necessary size of the bracket and wonders if it could incorporate a curve or be matched with the building's slight bend or flange for a better fit.
- Emphasizes the importance of finding a more suitable proposal for the bracket if it's noticeable, agreeing with previous comments on the matter.

**Paul**

- Approves of the window changes and acknowledges Matt's point about the doors.
- Finds the center five doors in a prominent location and appreciates their special treatment.
- Content with the existing French doors as there are other similar doors in place.
- Expresses a preference for the shingled curve, like a previous submission, as it complements the gambrel's design.
- Feels that the curved shingle works well and prefers it over the bracket.

**Pohl**

- Aligns with Mickey's suggestion of a horizontal bracket rather than one following the roof's shape.
- Proposes a design with a horizontal bracket that includes a small cheek wall, creating a shingle detail.
- Wasn't a fan of the previous curved bracket but believes the horizontal approach would work better.
- Expresses a desire for the doors to have kick panels, although he acknowledges potential challenges in implementing this change.

**Motion Motion to approve through staff subject to exhibit A and limited visibility. (Welch)**

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

Certificate #

**HDC2023-06-8669**

4. Harold Bros. Realty 06-8707 2 4 Highland Ave Guest House (formerly known as Cabana) 30/187 & 289 Emeritus LTD

Voting Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver  
 Alternates Patten, Paul  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing **Matt MacEachern**  
 Public **Abutter (Robin Kelly)**

- The speaker is content with the reduction in height requested for the Cabana by HTC.
- They mention that the development originally started as one parcel but was later divided into two separate addresses.
- It's unclear where the Cabana fits in the plan, especially now that it's designated as a guest house.
- The speaker is concerned about the lack of clarity regarding the Cabana's role in the larger property scheme.
- They express a desire to understand how the Cabana fits into future hardscaping, houses, or structures on the property.
- The landscape and hardscape plans suggest the property will be used as a whole, and the speaker suggests considering the Cabana approval in the context of the entire property.

Concerns-

**Holly Backus**

- Acknowledges the drop in the ridge on both sections of the guest house or cabana.
- Notes that the revised pitch of the porch on the Gable ends appears a bit off and suggests it may make the South facade feel top-heavy.
- Expresses uncertainty about the solution to address this issue but appreciates the reduction in wall height on the second floor.

**Oliver**

- Agrees with the porch design and appreciates the smaller dormers and windows, as well as the reduction in height for the building.
- Express concern about the unbalanced appearance of the building when viewed from the side, particularly regarding how the elements connect and the rear eave line being higher.
- Suggest adjusting the eave line to properly align with the windows for better visual balance.
- Overwhelmed when considering the overall size and scale of the building, and they mention that such projects should be reviewed as a whole in the future to avoid this feeling of overwhelming scale.

**Camp**

- Acknowledges that the 3D representation of the building appears as a small community, which raises concerns.
- Suggests that in the future, such large-scale projects should be presented in a block form for better understanding.
- Comments on the steep pitch of the front porch roof and recommends making it shallower for improved visual balance.
- Mentions that the back of the building appears to rise too high, making it seem disproportionate.
- Appreciates the reduction in height but suggests further reductions, as the current height is still almost 24 feet.
- Expresses the view that a cottage should be on the smaller side, implying a preference for a smaller-scale structure.

**Welch**

- Appreciates some of the changes made, particularly the hierarchy change in the secondary porch mass of the structure.
- Believes that the overall height of the structure should not exceed 22 feet 6 inches.
- Expresses concerns about the complications posed by the dormers when viewed from the west, comparing them to seagulls in flight.
- Emphasizes that the height reduction is the most crucial aspect of the project for him.

**Coombs**

- Agrees with Stephen's suggestion to lower the overall height of the structure to 22 feet.
- Mentions that the area has many taller buildings, unlike what's typical on Island Avenue, suggesting the need for a less imposing structure.
- Points out that since it's intended as a guest house, the building's size exceeds her expectations for such a purpose.
- Expresses a desire for further reductions to make the building more appropriate for its role as a guest house.

**Pohl**

- Suggests reducing the ridge height of the main part of the structure, in alignment with recommendations from other board members.
- He notes that this reduction would also help lower the pitch of the porch roof, which he considers beneficial.

**Motion** **Motion to hold for revisions with the height reduced, the main ridge to 22-6 or thereabouts and the secondary mass reduced proportionately. (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver Certificate # **HDC2023-06-8707**

5.	11 Alliance Way	<b>05-8521</b>	11 Alliance Way	Cabana	39/24.1	Studio PPArk
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Oliver					
Alternates	Thornewill					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.					
Representing Public	<b>James Krapp</b>					
Concerns	<p><b>Camp</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expresses concern about the amount of hardscaping on the site when viewed from Alliance.</li> <li>- Mentions the presence of a tennis court, Cabana, stone wall, and swimming pool, all contributing to a significant amount of hardscaping.</li> <li>- Worried about the lack of vegetation between these hardscaping elements and how to effectively screen them.</li> <li>- Notes that while the architecture appears fine from Alliance, the extensive stonework on the other side of the house, possibly seven to eight feet high, raises concerns, especially considering the house's location on a prominent hill.</li> </ul> <p><b>Coombs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shares concerns about the visibility of the hardscaping, especially from Valley as previously mentioned by Abby.</li> <li>- Emphasizes the significance of natural vegetation in concealing visibility between different areas on the property.</li> <li>- Expresses interest in seeing the hardscaping plan again, particularly regarding the tennis court, Cabana, and how they fit into the landscape.</li> <li>- Seeks clarification on the topography and whether the flat land has been created, as well as the need to keep the Cabana's height down and ensure proper vegetation screening.</li> </ul> <p><b>Oliver</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appreciates the reduction in the structure's size.</li> <li>- Suggests approving the structure with the condition that it remains screened and not visible during inspections in perpetuity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Patten</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expresses appreciation for the changes and reductions in the size and height of the structure.</li> <li>- Suggests adding a caveat regarding screening to the proposal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Welch</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrees with Connie, Diane, and Abby's points, particularly concerning screening.</li> <li>- Proposes a motion that includes a condition specifying that the structure should not be visible at the time of inspection or in the future.</li> </ul>					
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve the cabana in its reduced state with the caveat that it can't be seen at time of inspection and thereafter. (Oliver)</b>					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver-aye // Camp-nay			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-05-8521</b>	

**V. NEW BUSINESS 08/22/2023**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Town of Nantucket	16 Broad St	Windows replacement	42.4.2/30	SMRT/ LFW

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

- Mickey expresses no concerns with the proposal for the windows.
- He addresses Val's concerns by highlighting the age of the building, which was constructed in the 1960s, making it different from older structures.
- Mickey suggests that the distinction regarding window types may become more relevant when dealing with applications for historically accurate styles like Quaker buildings in the future.
- He maintains his support for the current application.

**Concerns- Holly Backus**

- Notes that the structure is from 1964, designed for the Phil Colony Revival Town building, and is contributing to the historic district.
- Mentions that the application involves not just windows but also restoration and rehabilitation components.
- Expresses support for the Green Mountain STL windows, which are energy-efficient, and the replacement of triple tracks with like-kind windows.
- Respects Commissioner Oliver's concerns and suggests the commission could consider a condition or finding related to the unique history and age of the structure, as it deviates from the typical Nantucket vernacular.

**Oliver**

- Raised concerns about the atypical approval of windows like this in town.
- Questions the reasoning and the potential precedent set by this approval.
- Suggests that the application should specify the reason for approval to avoid opening the door to future similar requests.

**Camp**

- Observed a new building in Cod Fish Park with similar windows to the proposal.
- Noticed that the windows had a collar that appeared green, giving them a distinct appearance.
- Mentioned that when viewed from a distance, the green tinge stood out, but she expects the addition of screens in front of the windows to address this issue.
- Noted that the windows on the new house had a grayer look and expressed curiosity about the difference in window manufacturers, as they didn't seem to match the green collar.

**Coombs**

- Disagrees with the notion that a building's age alone should determine window type approval.
- Emphasizes that comparing a 1792 building to a 1964 building is not sufficient to justify window changes.
- Acknowledges the concerns about potential future changes but argues that the regulations should apply regardless of visibility.
- Insists that the guidelines are clear and should be followed without exceptions based on whether windows are visible or not.
- Suggests that any approval should be carefully worded and followed consistently in the future.

**Welch**

- Emphasizes the need to consider window details, specifically the appearance of the window joinery.
- Suggests that gaps between window components should be filled with a wood Bondo or similar material to achieve a more authentic appearance.
- Points out concerns with the sill detail, particularly regarding how the windows are installed and sealed, suggesting improvements for weatherproofing.
- Addresses the concept of infill structures and the need for a clear policy regarding energy code requirements.
- Advocates for establishing guidelines and not exempting infill structures from energy code standards unless there's a specific historic determination.
- Highlights the potential impact of different low-E coatings from various window manufacturers on the appearance of structures.
- Expresses hope that his concerns and suggestions regarding joinery, sill detail, and infill policies will be supported by the commission.

**Pohl**

- Supports addressing the gap issue beneath the sills and suggests that manufacturers can easily adapt to correct this.
- Disagrees with using the town's status to gain special privileges but believes that advancements in SDL windows make them more historically accurate.
- Believes that approving the application won't open the floodgates to similar requests, as the board's decisions are discretionary.

**Motion**

**Motion to approve with the mutton joinery perfections to be eliminated either through filling or painting or both. Eliminate the shadow line presentation at the cell. This is a test case on the path to energy resiliency and as part of finding these windows should not have a negative impact on the historic district. The windows to be installed will have the same low e-coding as provided in the specimen and shown in the imagery that was submitted in the application. (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs-aye // Oliver-nay Certificate # **HDC2023-**

2. Bazhen Lapenko                      4 First Way                      Pool & Hardscape                      55/669                      Linda Williams  
Voting                      Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver  
Alternates                      Patten, Paul  
Recused                      None  
Documentation                      Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
Representing                      **Linda Williams**  
Public                      -  
Concerns                      **Camp**

- Indicates her lack of familiarity with the area but notes her perception that there are no pools in the vicinity.
- Expresses a preference for a smaller pool, potentially something akin to a spa, rather than a larger one.

**Coombs**

- Points out that she is unfamiliar with the specific area in question.
- Suggests considering a smaller pool, possibly a plunge pool, rather than a 22-foot-long pool.
- Notes that the visibility of the pool should be considered from various angles, including First Way and Allen's Way.
- Recommends evaluating the views and vegetation in the area when determining the pool size.

**Oliver**

- Mentions her familiarity with the area and notes the presence of several pools in the vicinity.
- Believes the proposed pool is approximately the size of a plunge pool.
- States that there is no visibility issue with their previous caveat, suggesting that it covers the situation adequately.

**Welch**

- The pool will not be visible.
- Believes it is appropriate under the HDCs regulation and guidelines.

**Pohl**

- Agrees with Stephen.
- Motion should the boards typical caveat on pools.

**Motion**                      **Motion to approve with the condition that the pool is not visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application. (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote                      Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver-aye // Camp-nay                      Certificate #                      **HDC2023-**



3.	RUD1250W Nom Trust	19a West Chester St.	Fenestration Revs	42.4.3/7.1	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten				
Alternates	Paul				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing Public	<b>Sai- Botticelli + Pohl</b> <b>Mickey Rowland-</b> Historic Structures Advisory Group (formerly HSAB) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Focuses on the proposed French doors on the south elevation, facing Westchester Street.</li> <li>- Highlights concerns about the visibility of these French doors, which might give the impression of being the front entrance.</li> <li>- Mentions that HDC typically doesn't approve French doors as front doors or those facing the street.</li> </ul>				
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Notes that the structure is a Circa 1893 contributing building in the local National District.</li> <li>- Finds the proposed French doors on the South-Westchester Street elevation inappropriate and suggests a more formal front door.</li> <li>- Questions about the visibility of changes on the north side from Kite Hill.</li> <li>- Recommends an updated site plan that reflects recent changes to the driveway and hardscaping materials approved by the HDC.</li> </ul> <b>Oliver</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expresses her concern regarding the south elevation.</li> <li>- Shares concerns about the proposed shed, particularly if it appears as a front door.</li> <li>- Suggests that if a door is to be included in that location, it should be a regular townhouse-style entry door.</li> </ul> <b>Camp</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrees with what's been said on front door.</li> </ul> <b>Coombs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Also agrees with what's been said regarding the front doors.</li> </ul> <b>Patten</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would be in favor of not having French doors appear as the front door but would be less opposed if they'll be screened.</li> </ul>				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to reconsider the previous motion to hold 19a West Chester St. (Oliver)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for revisions. (Oliver)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>

4.	42/44 ARB Way LLC	9 Arbour Way	New Dwelling	29/137	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten				
Alternates	Paul				
Recused	Ray Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing Public	-				
Concerns	Application not opened.				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>No action.</b>				
Roll-call Vote				Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>

5. Ramsey & Geoffrey Trussell 26 Rabbit Run Rd Reno & Addition 29/9 SCI- Robert Newman  
 Voting Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul  
 Alternates Patten  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing **Robert Newman**  
 Public -  
 Concerns **Oliver**

- Expresses less concern about the elevations, except for the one facing the harbor.
- Finds the ganged windows in all the masses to be a concern, suggesting a simpler facade with fewer or spaced windows.
- Requests a sample of the windows for review.

**Camp**

- Concurs with the concerns about the ganged windows, especially when viewed from the harbor.
- Recommends changing any triple windows to two divided windows and potentially avoiding ganging where there are four windows.
- Expresses agreement with Val's perspective.

**Paul**

- Finds the project successful from the west but expresses concern about the east side of the house.
- Mentions that the change from two over two windows is an improvement and that the shed dormers are positive changes.
- Notes the abundance of ganged windows but is fine with it since they are replacing picture windows.
- Mentions confusion about the roof design and suggests that 3D views would be helpful.
- Appreciates the toned-down window colors and asks for clarification on the color of the French doors.

**Coombs**

- Asks for the length of the building from east to west, specifically in regard to the proposed south and north elevations.
- Appreciates the change of windows to two over two and finds it suitable for the picture windows as well.
- Mentions that while there are more windows on the north elevation, they seem more consistent.
- Acknowledges that the building should fit into the area, which has open surroundings.
- Suggests providing more precise elevations for better assessment.

**Pohl**

- Concurs with the concerns previously mentioned by other members.
- Emphasizes his concern regarding the ganged windows on the North elevation, especially due to their visibility from the water.
- Suggests that the design should address the amount of fenestration on the north side.
- Proposes moving the application for revisions.

**Motion**

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

Roll-call Vote

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

Certificate #

6. 450 Green Park LLC **08-8882** 2 Stone Alley Rev Fenestration 42.3.1/102 Emeritus LTD

- Voting Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
- Alternates Patten, Paul
- Recused None
- Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
- Representing **Matt MacEachern**
- Public **Mickey Rowland**
  - Agrees with all of Holly’s comments.
- Concerns **Holly Backus**
  - Points out historical inaccuracies in the HDC survey.
  - Questions the relocation of a historic window based on interior program needs and emphasizes that it should not be moved unless structurally unstable.
  - Mentions that the outdoor shower should not have been included in the landscape plan and clarifies its status.
  - Recommends the Diamond door under the sunroom for basement access instead of the newly proposed one.
  - Expresses concern about the nine-light window proposed and suggests it is inappropriate for the structure.
  - Requests that the application indicate that fenestration should be true divided light (TDL).
  - Asked for the chimney's condition with photographic evidence.
  - Suggests updating the COA to reflect accurate historic information.
- Oliver**
  - Suggests keeping the existing window on the west side.
  - Supports efforts to retain the chimney as close to the original as possible.
  - Finds the existing window below on the east side acceptable.
  - Recommends matching the kitchen window to the existing windows to maintain consistency.
  - Opposed to the outdoor shower.
  - Agrees with the simpler Diamond door on the south side.
- Coombs**
  - Strongly supports retaining the chimney in its current state and suggests working around it by altering the foundation.
  - Agrees with the proposed door on the south elevation for basement access.
  - Opposed to the outdoor shower on the east elevation.
  - Understands the height difference in the window on the east elevation but believes the kitchen window should match the others.
  - Is open to moving the window on the west elevation closer to the hanging out gable.
- Welch**
  - Supports the retention of the three over six windows on the North elevation as they were previously approved.
  - Notes that the modified fenestration on the East elevation (three over six) is not a significant concern because it's unlikely to be visible.
  - Agrees with the simplification of window styles on the East elevation.
  - Opposes the outdoor shower unless it's placed on the south elevation out of view.
  - Appreciates the barn door on the South elevation but is not as concerned about it since the south side may not be visible from any vantage point.
  - Suggests that the chimney replacement may not be necessary unless thoroughly documented to prove its structural instability.
- Pohl**
  - Agrees with all of Stephen’s points.

**Motion** **Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp)** Certificate # **HDC2023-08-8882**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye

7.	John Brazilian Trust	34 Easton St	Parking/ OD shower	42.1.4/18	David Bartsch
----	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------	---------------

Voting Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul  
 Alternates Camp  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing **David Bartsch**  
 Public **Mickey Rowland**

- Mickey finds the paving material highly unusual and suggests a simpler material like shell or gravel.
- He emphasizes that the outdoor shower is not appropriate in front of the house and should be placed on the side or in the back.

Concerns

**Holly Backus**

- Emphasizes the need for compliance with resilient Nantucket design guidelines for this infill structure.
- Suggests that guidelines for Paving and Hardscape should be followed.
- Requests photos of the existing conditions, which would be helpful for the review.
- Advises keeping the running bond pattern for the driveway apron instead of switching to herringbone.
- Details for the proposed Bluestone walkways and the large patio area along the harbor should be clarified.
- Finds the placement of the 4x4 outdoor shower odd and suggests relocating it to a more suitable location.

**Paul**

- Suggests providing a photograph of the paving material for better understanding.
- Proposes relocating the 4x4 outdoor shower to the side or back of the house.
- Mentions that the shower with a wood floor and joists could be considered a structure and might have setback issues.
- Agrees that having the shower in front of the house is not appropriate.

**Coombs**

- Recommends using P Stone for the front paving to allow proper drainage.
- Suggests moving the shower to the edge of the building and making it less formal, not raised.
- Advocates for informal pavers at the back going towards the harbor and incorporating planting on both sides of the building.
- Agrees with Holly regarding the running bond pattern.
- Emphasizes the need for casual landscaping in the front parking area to blend with the surroundings.

**Oliver**

- Requests more information for better decision-making.
- Inquiries about the glass fence mentioned at the bottom of the drawing and whether it extends the existing glass fence around the property.
- Notes that having additional details will be helpful.

**Welch**

- Requests pictures for reference.
- Finds the driveway surfacing material atypical and possibly inappropriate.
- Deems the outdoor shower inappropriate in its current location.
- Suggests a simpler solution, like a whiskey barrel with a water spigot and a smooth boulder for sitting, surrounded by grass.
- motion for this application includes a site visit.

**Motion Motion to hold for a view, revisions and more information. (Coombs)**

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

8.	Matthew & Marta Judson 8877	143 Orange St	Addition	55/154	Permit +
----	-----------------------------	---------------	----------	--------	----------

Voting  
 Alternates  
 Recused  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing  
 Public  
 Concerns Application not opened

**Motion NO Action**

Roll-call Vote Certificate # **HDC2023-**

9. Katherine Potter **08-8866** 14 Berkley St Addition 76.1.3/233 JN Design  
 Voting Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul  
 Alternates None  
 Recused none  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing **Josiah Newman**  
 Public -  
 Concerns **Holly Backus**

- The proposed changes alter a simple 1994 structure with asymmetry.
- The two-story addition to the rear of the front Gable and the one-story addition with a second-floor deck are considered large.
- Visibility is a significant concern for the commission.
- Photos of the neighborhood context are needed.
- Finds the design atypical and has concerns about the chimney.

**Paul**

- The proposed design includes asymmetry and changes to a 1994 structure.
- Concerns about visibility, especially due to the proximity of houses in the neighborhood.
- The front door's location has been altered, and it now faces a secondary mass, which is confusing.
- The front entrance involves a bridge-like structure with stairs leading to a well-like area, which may not be ideal for visibility and aesthetics.
- The flat-roofed addition on the Berkeley Street side is unusual and might not be appropriate, especially with the visible chimney.
- Suggests adding a porch on the Cumberland Street side to mitigate the bridge-like effect and lower the perceived height.

**Coombs**

- Concerns about visibility and the amount of detail in the proposed design.
- Questions about the blue section in the chimney.
- Believes the corbelling at the top of the chimney is inappropriate.
- Finds the existing north elevation quiet and prefers the front door to be in the middle of the building.
- Suggests separating the windows on the west side of the north elevation.
- Not in favor of the deck around the chimney.
- Recommends moving the front door to align with the stairs going down.
- Emphasizes the need for the design to fit in with the surrounding neighborhood on Berkeley and Clarendon Street.

**Patten**

- Struggles with the design of the north elevation, particularly the chimney and balcony.
- Questions the blue representation (copper flashing) on the chimney.
- Prefers the simplicity of the existing house.
- Agrees with the idea of adjusting the windows on the north elevation.
- Expresses uncertainty about the direction of the proposed design.

**Welch**

- Requests a dashed line on the site plan to indicate the existing location, size, and orientation.
- Suggests using "views" to address incomplete applications and provide an opportunity for commissioners to preview.
- Expresses concerns about the proposed chimney, extensive decking, and overall massing, particularly on the north elevation.
- Believes additional information and a view could help clarify the design and address concerns.

**Oliver**

- Suggests including a prominent front door, possibly with a porch roof, to enhance the entry's presence.
- Expresses concerns about the amount of railing, proposing the use of grates or alternative materials to reduce the visual impact.
- Recommends downsizing the chimney.
- Agrees with the idea of a view for further evaluation.

**Motion** **Motion to hold for a view, additional information including what existing on the site plan. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-08-8866**

<b>10. Dennis Wellner</b>	<b>8 Walsh St</b>	<b>Hardscape</b>	<b>42.4.1/83</b>	<b>Wellner Architects</b>
Voting	Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Coombs			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Julie Wellner</b>			
Public	Mickey Rowland			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrees with concerns about the patio size, considering it large for the neighborhood.</li> <li>- Expresses preference for using a more natural-colored stone material rather than Bluestone.</li> </ul>			
Concerns	<p>Holly Backus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expresses concerns about the large impervious area and runoff in the AE 7 flood zone.</li> <li>- Emphasizes the importance of not discussing drainage or pervious/impervious materials.</li> <li>- Recommends reducing the patio size and using stones similar to the front walkway.</li> <li>- Suggests a shift to a more organic field instead of blue stone.</li> </ul> <p>Paul</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests using organic Fieldstone for the patio with a more organic shape and rounded corners.</li> <li>- Recommends changing the stair design to help hide the deck.</li> <li>- Proposes adding a fence to gate off the side yard from the front yard to reduce visibility.</li> </ul>			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for a view. (Welch)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul		Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>

**VI. OLD BUSINESS 08/29/2023**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
<b>1. Dennis Wellner</b>	<b>8 Walsh St</b>	<b>Replace window &amp; door</b>	<b>42.4.1/83</b>	<b>Wellner Architects</b>	
Voting	Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Coombs				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Julie Wellner</b>				
Public	-				
Concerns	<p><b>Holly Backus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appreciates the reduction in deck size.</li> <li>- Suggests the use of the Craftsman-style side door as shown in option three.</li> <li>- Recommends matching the front screen door with the other storm/screen doors for consistency.</li> </ul> <p><b>Camp</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is in favor of the Craftsman type door.</li> </ul> <p><b>Patten</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is in favor of the door that matches the front door.</li> </ul>				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve using option 1 for the door. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul		Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>	

2.	54 Prospect LLC	4 Birdsong Lane	Garage rev 5465	55.4.4/80.3	Brook Meerbergen
Voting	Camp, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	Patten				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Brook Meerbergen</b>				
Public	<b>Mickey Rowland</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The structure is still long.</li> <li>- Sliding doors are wide, they're traditionally narrower on barns</li> </ul>				
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Believes these revisions address the board's previous comments.</li> </ul>				
	<b>Oliver</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expresses confusion about the dimensions provided.</li> <li>- Requests clarification on the overall width and scale relative to the house.</li> <li>- Suggests keeping the structure at the approved size.</li> </ul>				
	<b>Welch</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advises the applicant to include dimensions on the drawings.</li> <li>- No concerns with the proposed structure.</li> <li>- Suggests a smaller size would be better, but overall design is charming and appropriate.</li> </ul>				
	<b>Coombs</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests adding windows to the barn-style sliding door on the south elevation.</li> <li>- She recommends breaking down the door with two or four windows at the top.</li> </ul>				
	<b>Camp</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prefers the original size of the structure and finds the proposed size overwhelming.</li> <li>- Thinks the idea of barn-style doors is interesting but suggests toning it down a bit.</li> </ul>				
	<b>Paul</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Likes the overall building design.</li> <li>- Suggests making the sliding barn-style door slightly narrower, perhaps by 12 inches, to address issues with the track and corner board.</li> <li>- Proposes adding a window within the sliding barn door, so when it's closed, it covers the other window, creating a visually interesting effect.</li> </ul>				
Motion	<b>Motion to approve through staff shrinking down the barn door so that the track doesn't overlap the person door, put a window in it that is equal to all the window 1s on that elevation, and that window would be centered under the window above it, also add dimensions to the plans. (Paul)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs-aye // Oliver-nay			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-</b>

Approved Minutes –	July 11 & 18, 2023.
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve minutes for July 11 &amp; 18<sup>th</sup>. (Camp)</b>
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten-aye
Review Minutes -	
Other Business -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Discussion of Previously Approved Best Practices.</b></li> <li>• <b>Next HDC Meeting- September 5<sup>th</sup> at 4pm *HYBRID &amp; IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid</b></li> </ul>
<b>Potential Items for Discussion-</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classification of street trees &amp; vegetating mapping</li> <li>• Discussion of Wind Turbines</li> <li>• Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, Intro (update as needed)</li> <li>• Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings</li> <li>• Hardscaping</li> <li>• Discussion of salvaging demos</li> <li>• Discussion of options for house moves</li> </ul>

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 8:19pm. (Coombs)**  
Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul

Submitted by:

Adrian Rodriguez

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/jtRY0ojxtos>

Nantucket Old Historic District

Sconset Old Historic District

Madaket Old Village

DRAFT