



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

4 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
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, September 12, 2023

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

Called to order at 4:03 pm. and announcements by Mr. Welch

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

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

Remote Participants:

Absent Members: Thornewill, Patten

Late Arrivals: Pohl (5:13 pm)

Early Departures:

Adoption of Agenda.

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

I. DISCUSSION

- “Minutes Policy”- Not Discussed.

II. CONSENTS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Heidi Mitchell	73 Vestal St	Rooftop Solar	56/192	Cotuit Solar
2.	Heidi Mitchell	73 Vestal St	Rooftop Solar	56/192	Cotuit Solar
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	-				
Public	-				
Concerns	-				
Motion	Motion to approve. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0// Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye			Certificate #	HDC2023- (as noted)

III. OLD BUSINESS 08/15/2023

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Carl Nielsen 08-8902	2 Cabot Lane	Addition	30/254	EMDA
Voting	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	Thornewill, Patten, Pohl				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Ethan McMorrow- EMDA				
Public	-				
Concerns	<p>Holly Backus-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The house is historically owned by the Phillips family and can be traced back to aerial maps from as early as 1957. - Appreciation for retaining the 6 over 6 windows. - Concerns about the design revision on the original cottage, particularly with the flush dormers and the two-story approach. - Belief that the tier approach from the south is inappropriate, even though it may not be visible from Cliff Road. - Suggested reducing the porch from 10 feet to 8 feet. - A preference for a one and a half story maximum for the porch rather than a two-story design. - Recommendation to build up on the existing structure and create a lower single-story or one and a half-story section in the middle. - A suggestion to revise the one-story addition to include windows flanking the front door and consider reducing the porch and changing the roof type. - Strongly advised against using flush dormers, as expressed by John McLaughlin. <p>Oliver-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appreciation for the changes made by Ethan to make the design more consistent with the existing structure. - Suggested that the front door should have a more traditional and inviting appearance. - Agreement with Holly's observation that the porch appears overwhelming and proposed changing it to a shed roof, noting the possibility of achieving this with the intermediate piece's high wall. - Overall positive impression of the design, describing it as a "funky beach cottage" that aligns with the historical context. <p>Paul-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support Val's idea of a shed roof to replace the tiered gable. - A suggestion to adjust the single-story mass with the front door (E Line) to better align with the porch's gable roof, as it currently appears to compress a small window on the south elevation. - Favorable opinions on the use of 12-light windows for the front door and the flush dormers, noting that they contribute to the variety of the massing. - Concern about the small dormer on the west side, which appears to have only one window despite the floor plan indicating two. Joe recommended making it a flush dormer with a single window to fill the space. - Acknowledgment that the dormer may not be visible, but the suggested change would enhance its appearance. <p>Coombs-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreement with Val's suggestion for a shed roof to avoid the repetition of three gables. - Uncertainty about the front door design on the North elevation, noting a preference for the second-floor window to be centered. - Inquiry about the reason behind the lack of windows on the West side, with an understanding that the building is positioned close to the property line. - Appreciation for maintaining the height and the dormers, with clarification that the dormers are indeed flush except for a small transom dormer. - A desire to see some 1-pane windows replaced with alternative window styles or designs. - Suggested relocating a one-pane window on the South side to a different position. <p>Camp-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired about the reason for the smaller windows to the right of the front door compared to the existing windows. - Expressed a preference for the proportions of the new design, particularly the left side with larger windows. - Liked the design of the front door, considering it suitable for a beachy cottage. - Suggested extending the eave line of the main mass to the left mass to create a more continuous line across the structure. - Acknowledged the existing quirkiness of the design but wondered if it could be made more balanced. 				
Motion	Motion to approve through staff "Exhibit A". (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0// Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye			Certificate #	HDC2023-08-8902

2. **12 Derrymore RT 11-7499 12 Derrymore Lane New dwelling 41/241 EMDA**
 Voting Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
 Alternates Thornewill, Patten, Pohl
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
 Representing **Ethan McMorro**
 Public -
 Concerns -
Motion Motion to approve. (Paul)
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0// Thornewill, Patten, Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-11-7499**

3. **George Metri 05-8496 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 **Joe Topham- Topham Design**
 Public -
 Concerns Application not opened
Motion No Action
 Roll-call Vote Certificate # **HDC2023-05-8496**

V. NEW BUSINESS 08/22/2023

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. George Metri	12 Angola St	Hardscape	55.4.4/78	Katie Mitchell

Concerns Application not opened
Motion No Action
 Roll-call Vote Certificate # **HDC2023-**

2. **George Curtin 09-9077 7 Beach st Move on shed 73.1.3/23 LINK**
 Voting Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
 Representing **Tory Ewing- LINK**
 Public -
 Concerns Holly Backus-
 - reminded the committee that a move-off application for the same location had been approved earlier.
 - Expressing concerns about the shed's intended position and its orientation, particularly its facing towards Codfish Park.
 - Noting the importance of clarity regarding the positioning of the shed on the corner lot.
 - Recommending a revised site plan to specify the exact orientation and placement of the shed for a clear understanding of its impact.
HDC Commissioners- had no concerns.
Motion Motion to approve through staff, clarification that the gable end faces Cod Fish Park, and that the solid cedar doors face Cod Fish Park. Condition restriction on COA. (Paul)
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0// Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-09-9077**

3. Leonildo/Mariyana Cavaler 08-8982 4B Goldfinch Dr Addition & color chng 68/598.1 Mariyana Cavaler

- Voting Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
- Alternates None
- Recused None
- Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
- Representing **Leo Cavaler**
- Public -
- Concerns
 - Oliver-** Expressed readiness to support the proposal, acknowledging that if the HOA raises any issues, it may require further consideration.
 - Coombs-** Expressed a preference against the dormer but acknowledged that the proposal is acceptable overall.
 - Camp-**
 - Opposed the addition of a third floor with three small windows and a dormer at the front of the house.
 - Supportive of the addition to the left of the house.
 - Did not mind the dormer at the back of the house but suggested that it might be more palatable if centered on the roof plane.
 - Considered the dormer at the front of the house to be awkward and detracting from the overall appearance of the house.
 - Paul-**
 - Agreed with Abby's view that the addition on the left side of the house was a good improvement.
 - Had no issue with the dormer at the back of the house and suggested it could be adjusted, possibly moving it closer to the eave and making it taller to incorporate more windows.
 - Expressed the opinion that the railings may not be necessary and proposed eliminating them while increasing the column size to eight inches if a farmer's porch is added.
 - Welch-**
 - Expressed that he wasn't uncomfortable with the appropriateness of the proposal as it stood.
 - Sought clarification on the potential dormer additions, asking whether the project might involve two dormers on the front for balance.
 - Suggested that if dormers were to be added for balance, having two double window dormers could fill up the roof plane effectively.
 - Recommended making a motion to hold for revisions, allowing the applicant to consult with their neighbor.
 - Noted that the windows in the existing structure looked like one-over-one windows and advised adding a note on the drawings to specify that the windows not marked will be one-over-one until a later date, as they may need replacement to match.
 - HDC Sitting Commissioners-** The comments from the discussion can be summarized as follows:
 - The board sought clarification on the potential addition of dormers to the front of the structure for balance.
 - There was a consensus that two windows in each dormer would be a suitable option to fill up the roof plane.
 - It was recommended to specify in the plans that the front windows should be replaced to match.
 - Joe suggested expanding the rear dormer by moving it out farther to accommodate larger windows.
 - The general consensus seemed to favor the idea of balancing dormers on the front while potentially making adjustments to the rear dormer.

Motion **Motion to hold for revisions. (Coombs)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0// Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-08-8982**

4. Maynard-Greenberg 08-8988	18 Midland Ave	Addition	59.3/165	Christopher Hall Architect
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Christopher Hall			
Public	-			
Concerns	<p>Paul:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledged the design's improvement in the appearance of the existing house, adding a sense of order. - Appreciated the approach of intersecting two-story gables for the central mass and attaching the garage, noting that it added hierarchy to the structure. - Expressed a desire to find a more defined front door in both iterations of the design. - Mentioned a concern about a noticeable subtractive mass on the south elevation, where a Gable was supported by a column. - Commented on the covered porch, which counts as ground cover but is not under the purview of the review. - Liked the use of two-over-two windows in the design. - Suggested that the renderings should show screen panels for the second-story Gable, even if it's not visible, to make it read as an actual mass. - Mentioned the need to revisit the entry sequence in the north deck and recommended having single doors or relocating them around the corner to create a more appealing front entryway. <p>Oliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concurred with Joe's positive assessment, acknowledging the enhancement of the house's appearance. - Expressed a desire for the major additive mass that connects to the garage (specifically on the north side) to drop slightly in height. <p>Coombs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreed with the previous comments made by other members, indicating approval of the design's improvements. - Suggested that the major additive mass connecting to the garage on the north side should be lowered slightly. - Mentioned the need for proper corbelling on the chimney. <p>Camp:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Favored the idea of combining the garage and main structure to read as one mass. - Endorsed Val's suggestion to lower the right-hand mass on the north elevation for improved aesthetics. - Expressed a preference for turning the projecting second-floor area in the back into a sunroom with windows. <p>Welch:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed concern about the small Gable overlaid on the larger Gables on the North elevation. - Suggested that this area could be used to break up the mass with the roof form or by lowering the top plate of the smaller Gable. - Agreed with the idea of incorporating a front door but acknowledged visibility limitations. - Not opposed to lowering the main Gable for differentiation. - Noted that the elements at the rear of the house were atypical but not necessarily inappropriate. - Emphasized the importance of addressing these comments through revisions for approval. 			
Motion	Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0// Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-08-8988

5. Adam Glick	31 Eel Point Rd	Move off/demo dwelling	39/52	WAPD
Concerns	Application not opened			
Motion	No Action			
6. Adam Glick	31 Eel Point Rd	New dwelling	39/52	WAPD
Concerns	Application not opened			
Motion	No Action			
7. Adam Glick	31 Eel Point Rd	New garage/studio	39/52	WAPD
Concerns	Application not opened			
Motion	No Action			

8. Matthew Stone 09-9088	47 Milk St	Rev pool house stairway	56/201	LFW
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	-			
Concerns	<p>Holly Backus- Expressed concern about the visibility of the proposed structure from the back end (Saratoga and/or Vestal), despite its invisibility from Milk Street. She considered the design atypical.</p> <p>Oliver- odd, but no visible.</p>			
Motion	Motion to approve due to lack of visibility and color noted on the application. (Oliver)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye/ Camp-nay		Certificate #	HDC2023-09-9088
9. Matthew Stone 09-9109	47 Milk St	Inset roof deck revisions	56/201	LFW
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	-			
Concerns	<p>Holly Backus-</p> <p>-Raised concerns about the visibility of the proposed structure but personally believed it wouldn't be visible.</p> <p>-Questioned the blending of the shingled structure with the background and received confirmation that the structure would have shingled cheek walls and shingling on the bottom, which she found satisfactory.</p> <p>Oliver- concern about the lighting.</p>			
Motion	Motion to approve with the conditions & restriction due to lack of visibility. (Oliver)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye/ Camp-nay		Certificate #	HDC2023-09-9109
10. Thomas Glendening 09-9091	15/17 Pilgrim Rd	Move off/demo shed	41/214	LFW
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Paul			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	-			
Concerns	No concerns			
Motion	Motion to approve through staff; as a move off/ demo and dimensions & height to be added and to be advertise and add overall dimensions. (Oliver)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-09-9091
11. Thomas Glendening 09-9092	15/17 Pilgrim Rd	Move off/demo cottage	41/214	LFW
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Paul			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	-			
Concerns	<p>Backus- Noted that there was an HDC survey on file for the property, but it lacked a date. The oldest structure on the lot dates back to 1973.</p> <p>Mentioned that the Cottage was constructed in 1997, and there was uncertainty about the age of the shed, which could be between 1973 and 1997.</p> <p>Expressed a preference for salvaging the structure rather than demolishing it.</p>			
Motion	Motion to approve through staff move off/ demo and it will be advertised and over dimensions to be added. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-09-9092

12. Thomas Glendening 09-9093 15/17 Pilgrim Rd Move off/demo dwelling 41/214 LFW

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

- Acknowledged that the structure in question is a ranch-style building, which is a contributing structure within the local National district.
- Emphasized that ranch-style houses are part of Nantucket's historic character.
- Expressed her understanding that it might be challenging to move the structure, which is a shame as moving contributing structures can allow them to retain their contributing status and make them eligible for tax credits.
- Expressed a hope that, if possible, the building could be moved or partially moved.

Motion Motion to approve through staff as move off/ demo; let people take salvage stuff and overall dimensions to be added. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote Carried 3-2 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver-aye// Camp, Coombs-nay Certificate # **HDC2023-09-9093**

13. Susan Devine 09-9094 19 Liberty St. Hardscape 42.3.4/111 LFW

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

- Concerns about the existing hardscape and proposed changes to the historic dwelling on the locks located in the Westco acre lots, dating back to 1793, known as the Ebenezer Raymond house, a typical Nantucket structure highlighted in Everett Crosby's book "95% Perfect."
- Difficulty in identifying the existing hardscape versus the proposed changes on the site plan, especially regarding the extension of the Brick Bond running bond driveway and dimensions, the presence of an existing white fence, and the condition of the privet hedge.
- Initial misunderstanding about an 8-foot gate, clarified to be a 3-foot tall gate flush with the 18th-century structure's facade. Concerns raised about this gate and its positioning relative to the historic property.

HDC Sitting Commissioners-

- Expressed concerns about the vagueness of the current site plan, stating that it lacks the necessary details to understand the proposed changes accurately.
- Request for a more detailed and legible site plan with clear notations, including top of wall and bottom of wall elevations for retaining walls, as well as specific annotations for proposed changes, such as the extension of the patio and fence.
- Mention of the need for a potential on-site visit to better assess the situation, especially given the difficulty in interpreting the current plan.
- motion to request an improved, well-annotated site plan with clear details regarding proposed changes, as well as the potential for an on-site visit, is made and seconded.

Motion Hold for revisions & upon receipt of site plan; view/site visit. (Welch)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-09-9094**

14. K22S LLC 09-9089	126 Main St.	Fenestration revs	42.3.3/98	LFW
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams/ Chip Stahl			
Public	Kevin Toth- 128 Main st-			
Concerns	<p>-Comments revolved around the issue of abutter notices not being provided for certain applications. They expressed frustration over the lack of clarity regarding when these applications would be discussed and mentioned a similar situation involving Mr. Dalton. Toth argued that discussions should not proceed without proper notice and raised concerns about a previously denied application that might have had a different outcome with proper notice. They urged the HDC to make a motion to postpone discussions until neighbors receive the required notice, as per HDC's abutter notice policy. Additionally, Toth called for measurable consequences for repeated violations of this policy, emphasizing that this experienced developer, and their agent should know better.</p>			
Backus-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observed that the structure in question, the contributing EW Cobb Arthur B Collins house, is a typical Nantucket building from around 1750. - Noted that alterations to this structure were approved in the past year. - The current proposal involves fenestration alterations on the east and south elevations. - Expressed concern that the proposed fenestration changes, even though on the addition and not the historic main block, might not be appropriate. She specifically mentioned the ganged windows on the East Elevation as being of concern. - Acknowledged that the addition is set back, but she emphasized that it would still be visible obliquely from Main Street. - Mentioned that the shifting of fenestration on the south elevation might be visible from Vestal, depending on the presence of other structures. If visible, she believed it would be inappropriate. - Expressed her main concern about the proportions of the fenestration changes, noting that they push out the windows and doors to the sides, contrary to their historically accurate location in the bays. - Questioned the reason behind pushing the fenestration to the sides and speculated it might be related to the kitchen. 			
Camp-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focused on the East Elevation and noted the new gang windows along with a "C" window to the left. - Expressed concerns about the "C" window, particularly if it were visible obliquely from Main Street, and suggested it might be better as a "B" window to appear more historically accurate. - Considered the revisions to be minor, particularly on the back of the house, and emphasized that the kitchen bump-out on the first floor remains unchanged. - Acknowledged that the configuration of doors and windows had been spread out but emphasized that the changes were minor, involving a margin of only an inch and five. 			
Paul-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed agreement with Abby's perspective, particularly in reference to the South elevation. - Found the proposed changes to be relatively minor compared to the previous approval. - Examined the Ganged window on the east elevation and believed it would not be very noticeable to pedestrians walking by. - Raised a concern about the "C" window to the left of the Ganged window, suggesting that making it taller might be a preferable design choice instead of having three "C" windows. 			
Coombs-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questioned the presence of "B" windows on the proposed East Elevation and inquired whether it was on the main building. - Linda clarified that the "B" windows were proposed for the kitchen, which had historically been located in that area. - Expressed her opinion that having double little windows in every kitchen may not be necessary, suggesting that if a "D" window is used, the "C" window should also be replaced with "B" windows to make all three windows the same size. - Recommended making all the kitchen windows the same size if a "D" window is used, and Linda agreed with her suggestion. 			
Welch-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussed the East Elevation, agreeing with a proposed change to either reposition or increase the size of a window. - On the South Elevation, he mentioned that the spacing appeared atypical but clarified that this wasn't a concern since it wouldn't be visible. - Directed the discussion to the West Elevation, noting that there were no changes. - Confirmed there were no changes on the North Elevation. - Primarily pertained to the various elevations of the project, with particular attention to window changes and missing corner boards. 			
Pohl-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expressed his agreement with the proposal to increase the size of the third window from the left on the East Elevation to a "B" window. - Referred to Joe's earlier comment about the narrow corridor between the building and its neighbor, suggesting that the double kitchen window might not be easily visible due to the oblique angle. - Indicated his satisfaction with the project as long as the one change to the East Elevation window is implemented. 			
Motion	Motion to approve through staff; with the modification of changing the "C" window on the first floor of the East Elevation to a "B" window. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye		Certificate #	HDC2023-09-9089

15. KMS126 NT 09-9090	126R Main St.	Move off/ demo garage	42.3.3/98.1	LFW
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams/ Chip Stahl			
Public	-			
Concerns	HDC Sitting Commissioners discussion-			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant explained that the proposal is to demolish the existing garage and recreate it with a few changes, including the addition of real carriage doors. The main point of contention was whether the HDC should issue a separate approval for demolition and new construction or a combined one. - Welch raised the concern that if demolition and new construction are combined into a single approval, it might be challenging to enforce the construction of the new building if the demolition already occurred. - Concerns were raised about the enforceability of requiring both demolition and new construction to be part of one approval. - Suggestions were made that Town Counsel should provide guidance on how to address this situation legally and whether the HDC can use a memorandum of agreement to ensure compliance with the new construction. - It was discussed that combining both approvals would simplify the process, but this may not be possible due to administrative requirements. - The idea of requesting a legal opinion from Town Counsel was proposed, and it was suggested that this request should be formally submitted. - The applicant mentioned the possibility of renovating the garage instead of demolishing it, provided the new structure is kept in the same design and location. - The possibility of withdrawing the current application and submitting a new one for renovation was discussed as an option. - The discussion concluded with a suggestion to request the withdrawal of the current application without prejudice and await the results of the new application. - The final decision was to put the current application on hold while the applicant considers their next steps and formally requests the withdrawal. 			
Motion	Motion to hold for more information and town counsel opinion. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye	Certificate #	HDC2023-09-9090	
16. Jennifer K Dolins	15 Stone Post Way	Shed rev 03-8159	73.3.2/73	Todd Burns
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Paul			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	James Krapp- Studio Ppark			
Public	-			
Concerns	No concerns			
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye	Certificate #	HDC2023-	
17. ABCET LLC	56 Baxter Rd	Hardscape driveway	49/54.1	Will Stephens
Concerns	No Action			
Motion	Application not opened.			
18. 43 W Miacomet LLC	43 W Miacomet Ave	Move off/demo	86/13.2	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Paul			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt McEachern- Emeritus			
Public	-			
Concerns	-			
Motion	Motion to approve through staff w/ additional information; move off/ demo. (Oliver)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye	Certificate #	HDC2023-	

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>
1.	Jason Mendelson 08-8879	69 Monomoy rd.	Window color chng	43/102	Studio PPark
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	Patten				
Recused	None.				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	James Krapp- Studio Ppark				
Public	-				
Concerns	Backus- no concerns				
Motion	Motion to approve. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0// Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye			Certificate #	HDC2023-08-8879
2.	16 Quaker Project LLC 08-8955	16 Quaker Rd	Hardscape	41/176.1	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Paul				
Recused	None.				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
Public	-				
Concerns	<p>Oliver-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visited the site but couldn't see much due to a hedge. - Main concern is the driveway and its connection to terracing and walls. - Uncertain about the wall's appearance, especially in comparison to the picture. - Thinks the pergola is fine and likely being reused. - Noticed a contrast between rustic walls and modern granite steps. - Finds it challenging to visualize the whole project in this format. - Suggested "brick apron" as a more appropriate description. <p>Camp-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considers the project an anomaly compared to Quaker Road. - Suggests reducing the size of the parking area. - Thinks that having just a few cars visible in traffic is unappealing. - Notes the requirement for the sea of driveway by the planning board. - Recommends using a taller privet hedge or similar plants to hide the cars from view at a side angle. - Expresses concern about the design's fit on the road. <p>Coombs-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disapproves of using gravel or white cell for the project. - Suggests making the driveway less wide between the two front buildings to create a more natural driveway and parking area. - Observes that the current setup looks as if the area was found and used for parking. - Expresses concern about the number of cars, noting that only two cars are allowed due to zoning regulations. - Emphasizes that only two cars side by side are permitted, and the parking area should be screened. <p>Welch-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expresses concern about screening the parking area due to height restrictions within 10 feet of the street. - Mentions existing privet along Quaker Road to the left of the entry. - Comments on the functionality of the layout, stating it might be challenging to maneuver. - Discusses the front yard, noting that it's not directly visible from certain angles. - Acknowledges the necessity of the layout due to approved and built dwellings. - Recommends steps that are complementary to fieldstone and extending the material to the walkway. - Suggests Old Stone as a more appropriate material due to its aged appearance. - Agrees that brick is suitable, particularly for the apron. - Mentions that the patio in the picture will be replaced with grass. - Concludes that Old Stone is a better choice given the context. <p>Pohl-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addresses the differences in priorities among town agencies. - Explains the requirement for two parking spaces for a secondary structure in the RO (Residential Old Historic) zone. - Supports an all-brick approach, not just for the apron but for all areas. - Agrees with Mickey's previous comments about using naturalized Granite steps instead of formal bluestone. - Suggests using Salvage Granite steps and irregular bluestone for the walkway. 				
Motion	Motion to approve through staff; whole driveway brick and naturalize stone for steps and the walkway. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1// Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver-aye/ Camp-nay			Certificate #	HDC2023-08-8955

3. QV3 NT 05-8446	22 Vestal St	New dwelling	41/39	Linda Williams
-------------------	--------------	--------------	-------	----------------

Voting Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul

Alternates Oliver

Recused None.

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

Representing **Linda Williams**

Nick Demaio

Public **Homeowner- 22 Vestal St.**

- Expresses the challenges of navigating the regulatory processes for a new construction project on Nantucket.
 - Acknowledges the importance of rules, regulations, and historic preservation.
 - Shares concerns about the subjective nature of feedback received during the review process.
 - Describes the efforts made to address comments and revise the project.
 - Feels the comments about the size of the house are unfair, considering that other homes on the street share similar characteristics.
 - Appreciates Linda's assistance in aligning the plans with the neighborhood's aesthetics.
 - Emphasizes the goal of building a home that fits seamlessly into the neighborhood.
 - Calls for a balance between individual opinions and adherence to established regulations and standards.
 - Highlights compliance with setbacks, ground cover limits, and height restrictions.
- The homeowner emphasizes the desire for fair and consistent treatment in the regulatory process and underlines the project's compliance with relevant regulations.

Concerns

Backus-

- Expresses appreciation for the changes in the OMD (Old Mill District) and the reduction of the left-side additive mass.
- Mentions support for the application, especially with the left-side additive mass pushed back.
- Notes that 18 Vestal Street in the neighborhood has a similar configuration.
- Appreciates the revised site plan showing connections to both streets.
- Acknowledges the removal of the rear chimney, which was initially mentioned.
- Expresses concern that the removal of the rear chimney and reconfiguration of the rear additive mass seem to increase the height of the structure, particularly the ridge.
- Comments positively on the removal of the witch window.

Camp-

- Expresses satisfaction with the main mass of the structure.
- Concerned with the left-side mass, which, although set farther back, doesn't seem to relate to the main mass.
- Suggests improving the relationship between the two masses by using the same size window or making adjustments to the left-side mass, such as increasing its size or height.
- Draws a comparison to the similarity between the proposed design and 18 Vestal st.

Welch-

- Expresses the perception that there is excessive programming on the lot.
- Finds the rear mass too tall and too long, impacting views from both sides.
- Attributes part of the perceived width to the fenestration and roof pitch.
- Suggests reducing the width and height of the rear mass and the size of the bump-out on the East.
- Advocates for a smaller footprint and more balanced programming.
- Confirms that his primary comments revolve around the massing and size of the structure, along with mentioning the roof pitch.

Coombs-

- Believes the building is too large for its location, especially on the East Elevation.
- Expresses concern about the East Elevation, where the addition and existing structure are the same height, creating a long and massive appearance.
- Suggests reducing the size of the building to avoid extending from sideline to sideline, as most houses in the area do not.
- Recommends reducing the number of windows on the first floor of the addition on the East.
- Questions the purpose of a small structure in the addition, implying it might be a kitchen or similar space.
- Shares a similar concern for the West side, noting that the house is too large for the lot.

Paul-

- Shares concerns about the scale of the building, especially in the rear addition.
- Likes the idea of a simple gable on the south but suggests lowering the eaves on the rear addition.
- Considers making the east elevation a shed roof instead of a cross gable to harmonize with the main mass.
- Recommends reducing the verticality on the south elevation by pushing in the second-floor Gable addition.
- Notes that this adjustment might not be visible from most angles.
- Concludes by emphasizing the need to scale down the rear addition.

Motion

Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp)

Roll-call Vote

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

Certificate #

HDC2023-05-8446

4.	Caroline Saye	4 Birdsong Ln	Sunroom rev	55.4.4/80.1	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	Oliver				
Recused	Thornewill.				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Luke Thornewill				
Public	Brook Meerbergen-				
	- Offers a friendly point of view, emphasizing that the approval of the garage last week helps mitigate the visibility of the west elevation of the sun porch.				
Concerns	Backus-				
	- Notes that the structure is an infill project within the OHD (Old Historic District) in a Quaker neighborhood.				
	- Expresses appreciation for the revisions made to the project.				
	- Believes that the initial approval of the left side screen porch was more successful and had a better relationship with the main block.				
	- Suggests that the first version was more appropriate.				
	Welch-				
	- Discusses the west elevation of the sunroom, suggesting four windows as more appropriate than two.				
	- Raises a question about the visibility of the hip roof one-story wing at the rear, which is not part of the proposal.				
	- Acknowledges that the minor changes were consistent with previous views.				
	- Proposes reducing the width of the sunroom to a three-bay design.				
	Paul-				
	- Initially concurs with Stephen regarding the reduction of the sunroom edition from four bays to three.				
	- Agrees with Holly that the proportions of the first approval were the nicest.				
	- Later considers Brooke's input and the site plan, noting the distance from the street and the garage's overlapping of the sunroom.				
	- Questions the use of materials, confirming that everything is shingles.				
	- Ultimately, fine with the submission, given the distance from the street and the sunroom's partial obscuration by the garage.				
	Camp-				
	- Notes the change from a hip roof to a Gable on the sunroom addition.				
	- Suggests pulling in the dormer cheek walls on the second-floor window on the far right of the sunroom.				
	- Expresses a preference for the previous hip roof design, finding it old-fashioned and charming.				
	- Mentions her preference for the previous hip roof design.				
	Coombs-				
	- Advocates for the removal of the summer screen porch.				
	Pohl-				
	- Expresses gratitude for the change from a hip to a Gable roof on the sunroom but points out that the low pitch of the hip roof was the issue.				
	- Suggests that a hip roof with the current steeper pitch would be more suitable.				
	- Believes that maintaining the steeper pitch and switching to a hip roof could eliminate the need for a triangular pediment above the windows and improve the North elevation.				
	- In favor of reverting to a hip roof design with the current steeper pitch, highlighting the potential benefits for the North elevation.				
Motion	Motion to approve through staff with going back to hip roof steeper pitch 7 ½". (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0// Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye			Certificate #	HDC2023-

5.	Dan Stobie	60 Hulbert Ave	Stair's dormer roof	29/58 58.1	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	Camp				
Recused	Thornewill.				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Luke Thornewill				
Public	-				
Concerns	<p>Backus-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides background on the structure, noting its shingle style and historic significance. - Acknowledges the shingle deck walls as appropriate for the proposed balconies. - Appreciates the removal of a non-characteristic friendship stair, emphasizing that a single stair is more suitable. - Recommends reducing the scale and size of the second-floor decks. - Expresses concerns about the windows and the need for a window survey, particularly for any existing windows being replaced. <p>Welch-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questions the inconsistency in the termination height of the Gable-front dormers on the north elevation. - Expresses concerns about the presence of the roof walk, which seems to be against previous suggestions. - Notes that the Gable on the third floor stands out and wonders why it's not present on the north or east elevations. - Realizes that the chimney on the east elevation is existing, not a proposed addition. - Comments involve inconsistencies in the dormer height and the presence of the roof walk. <p>Paul-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports Pohl's comment about tweaking the second-floor decks, particularly reducing the deck on the North elevation. - Suggests reducing the size of the third-floor Dormers, especially the one on the left side of the North elevation. - Questions the possibility of eliminating the Gable on the right (west elevation) to simplify the design. - Expresses a preference for the existing Gable on the right. - Likes the infill of the first-floor porch with screen panels, finding it helpful to ground the design. - Emphasizes the importance of reducing the prominence of the third-floor Dormers and potentially retaining the roof walk. - Appreciates the infill on the first-floor porch. 				
Motion	Motion for minor revisions. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0// Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye			Certificate #	HDC2023-

6.	Melissa Neier	11 Prospect St	New shed	55.4.4/42	Twig Perkins Inc
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	Alyssa Corry- Twig Perkins Inc				
Public	-				
Concerns	-				
Backus-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The main dwelling on the lot is a 1848 Greek Revival built by OED B Long. - Appreciates the changes that have been made, but she believes that the doors should be simpler, as noted previously. - Acknowledges that the sighting of the building did not change and that it remains atypical. - Notes that the shed's windows match the main dwelling with a six-over-six design. - Suggests that the doors within the shed should be simpler, in line with the Greek Revival style. - Believes that the doors provided in the shed are too formal and should be reminiscent of the once pastoral area of town. 				
Welch-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appreciates the reduction in size but prefers the previous location of the structure, which provides a better view as you approach Prospect from Joy Street. - Suggests that by using a 2x6 and a 12-inch center floor system on a mud sill, it might be possible to gain an additional four and a half to five inches in height, possibly even six inches, as every inch is crucial. - Recommends rotating the structure 90 degrees to allow for a better view towards the historic house as you move down Joy Street. This would prevent the structure from obstructing the view as it does now. - Suggests that the doors should face towards the house, with the small gable facing outward. This would create a simpler, more accessory-like structure and reduce potential distractions from the historic home. 				
Coombs-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Believes that having six windows in the shed would be more appropriate than the current nine, as it seems excessive. - Note that the East elevation already has six windows, suggesting a similar design for the shed. 				

- Suggested it should be moved closer to the driveway, but not right in front of the house, to have a full view of the front of the house.
- Acknowledgment of the challenge of putting the shed closer to the existing driveway, which would block access to the front door of the house.

Paul-

- Supports Stephen's idea of rotating the Gable to open up the view to the front door of the house.
- Believes that sliding the shed back to its previous position closer to Prospect Street makes sense in this context.
- Suggested that the shed's doors could face inward, as Stephen recommended.
- Emphasize the importance of considering its location due to its visibility in a heavily traveled area, especially in the front yard where it blocks a unique form of architecture in the neighborhood.

Motion **Motion to approve through staff; rotate gable 90 degrees, door face the house; relocate to the original location proposed with respect to Prospect St., reduce overall height at top plate and ridge by 6" and the doors to be 6 lite. (Welch)**

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

7. Harold Brothers Realty LLC 6 Highland Ave Hardscape 30/288 Jardins Intl

Voting Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul
 Alternates Patten, Thornewill
 Recused None.
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
 Representing **Elisabeth O'Rourke- Jardins Intl'**
 Public Jenny Clark- neighbor

Concerns **Backus-**

- Concerned about the potential impact of the driveway apron and Belgium Block on the root systems of the town trees, as they appear to be very close to that area.
- Primary concern was the potential impact on the trees, but it seems that the proposed driveway layout does not pose a threat to the existing trees.

- The sports court has been entirely removed, and the current proposal involves a Hardscape application, including a fence, shell driveway, Belgium Block apron, and granite pavers.
- Acknowledges that other driveways in the area have used Belgium Block, although she's unsure about Highland.
- Primary concern is with the design of the fencing.
- Suggests that the white picket fence on one side, with a gate, and a 4-foot solid board natural weather fence on the other side should be consistent in style and color.
- Questions whether the board fence might need to be painted, as it might look odd in white, given the context of the area.
- Recommends that, if a white fence is used, some vegetation should be planted in front of it to mitigate the visual impact.
- Main concern revolves around the consistency and appearance of the fencing, especially in relation to the predominantly white surroundings.

Motion **Motion to approve through staff to change from the 5 to 6' hedge shown at the front of the property to painted picket fence with climbing hydrangea or rosa rugosa. (Pohl).**

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

Application to not heard-

8. William Hopkins 12-7557	7 Hallowell Ln	New dwelling	30/93	Kristopher Megna
9. Harold Brothers Realty LLC	2-4 Highland Ave	Pool landscape	30/289 187	Jardins intl
10. CCTACK LLC 04-6106	120 Old South rd.	Commercial Bld	68/969	CWA
11. CCTACK LLC 04-6105	122 Old South rd.	Commercial Bld	68/969	CWA
12. CCTACK LLC 04-6104	124 Old South rd.	Commercial Bld	68/969	CWA
13. Ack NorthStar Dev LLC	2 Braeburn Ln	Primary dwelling	39/41	Brook Meerbergen
14. Ack NorthStar Dev LLC	2 Braeburn Ln	Garage studio	39/41	Brook Meerbergen
15. Cory Piper 08-8853	37 Chuck Hollow rd.	New dwelling	75/108	Sanne Payne
16. Starbuck Court Nom Trust	1R Old North Wharf	Fenestration change	42.3.180	Emeritus
17. Geaux Dahlin	12 Darling St	Fenestration change	42.3.2/115	Gryphon Arch
18. Town of Nantucket	10 Sun Island Rd	New staff housing revs	69/3.1	Gryphon Arch
19. Carolyn M Higgins Rev Trust 8907	6 Fair St	Reno	423.1/151	Botticelli + Pohl
20. 79 Polpis R E Holdings 07-8837	79 Polpis Rd	Gazebo	44/23.3	Reid Yenor
21. Nantucket Boat Basin	29 Commercial Wh	Move off/demo	42.2.4/3	Dennis Patnaude

Approved Minutes –	August 8, & 15, 2023. Motion to approve minutes. (Welch)
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0// Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye
Review Minutes -	
Other Business -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of Previously Approved Best Practices. • Next HDC Meeting- September 19th at 4pm *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid
Potential Items for Discussion-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classification of street trees & vegetating mapping • Discussion of Wind Turbines • Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, Intro (update as needed) • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings • Hardscaping • Discussion of salvaging demos • Discussion of options for house moves

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 8:40pm. (Welch)**

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

Submitted by:

Esmeralda Martinez

YouTube link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JpisFOsQNio&t=11095s>

Nantucket Old Historic District

Sconset Old Historic District

Madaket Old Village