



MEETING POSTING

TOWN OF NANTUCKET

Pursuant to MGL Chapter 30A, § 18-25

All meeting **notices and agenda** must be filed and time stamped with the Town Clerk's Office and posted at least 48 hours prior to the meeting (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and Holidays)

Committee/Board/s	Nantucket Historical Commission
--------------------------	---------------------------------

Day, Date, and Time	Friday, March 18, 2022 10:30 AM – 12:30 PM
----------------------------	--

Location / Address	REMOTE PARTICIPATION VIA ZOOM The meeting will be aired at a later time on the Town's Government TV YouTube Channel: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC-sgxAlfdoxteLNzRAUHIXA
---------------------------	--

Signature of Chair	Hillary Hedges Rayport
---------------------------	------------------------

WARNING: IF THERE IS NO QUORUM OF MEMBERS PRESENT, OR IF MEETING POSTING IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OML STATUTE, NO MEETING MAY BE HELD!

Hillary Hedges Rayport (Chair) Angus Macleod (Vice-Chair) David Silver (Secretary) Clement Durkes, Thomas M. Montgomery, Georgia U. Raysman, Milton Rowland; (Alternate Commissioners: Barbara White, Susan Handy, Ben Normand)

Staff Liaison: Holly Backus

AGENDA

Please list below the topics the chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting

Join Zoom Meeting

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/94332358504?pwd=N25KSGR2QldOeWFuc2tKUXcvaERGdz09>

Meeting ID: 943 3235 8504

Passcode: 770019

One tap mobile

+16465588656,,94332358504#,,,,*770019# US (New York)

- Public Comment
- Approval of Minutes (January 21 and March 2)
- Old business
 - Letters re: 3 Beaver Street
 - Letter re: ATM articles
- MHC advised Surveys of Historic Resources
 - Update on 2021-2022 survey

- Status of 2022-2023 grant
- 2022 Workplan
 - Discussion of how to advance our agreed upon initiatives, which are:
 - Initiate Preservation Plan for Town Owned Historic Resources
 - Initiate discussion with Tribes and State Archaeologist
 - Assess archival needs with respect to historic town records
 - Develop concept for small loan fund
- Other Business
 - Use it or lose it FY 2022 budget for architectural surveys
 - Spa/Hot Tub survey

Minutes of Nantucket Historical Commission Special Meeting – March 2nd, 2022

Commissioners Present: Hillary Rayport (Chair), Angus Macleod (Vice Chair), David Silver (Secretary) Mickey Rowland, Clement Durkes, Georgia Raysman, Barbara White, and Tom Montgomery.

Staff: Holly Backus

Guests: Erin Doherty and Polly Waldorf (3 Beaver St)

2.) Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve minutes of the NHC's February 18, 2021 Meeting: Tom

Second: Clement

All in favor via roll call

3.) Announcements

Please provide comments on PAL's sample Form Bs to Holly ASAP. Hillary requested to be sure any historic pavement in public way outside of structures was also noted in surveys.

Working group: Angus, Barbara, Tom, and Betsy Tyler, will meet in early March with MHC for a phase review.

4.) Discussion of the State Historic Preservation Tax Credit (HPTC) Application Process

-The Chair presented draft forms proposed to be completed and submitted along with review materials when applicants are requesting letters of support from the NHC for HPTC applications. The purpose of the forms is to strengthen and standardize communication and make it easier to organize information. Commissioners reviewed suggested changes and endorsed the form. Chair to work with Holly and Town staff to have these forms available to HPTC applicants, via NHC website.

Angus: motion to accept the form as drafted.

Tom: Second

All in favor via roll call

5.) HPTC Assessment Reference Sheet

The Commission discussed a drafted 'reference sheet' intended to inform applicants of what the NHC looks for when supporting, or declining to support, applications for HPTC. Since the Nantucket Historical Commission wants to see these credits applied to projects on Nantucket, we want our community and developers to not be aware of the HPTC process and requirements. HPTC encourage historic rehabilitation of structures and promote community benefit. Projects that can prioritize preservation, as well as community goals, will be vigorously supported.

A productive discussion ensued, and some critiques were made so that the Commission can finalize the discussion and move to adopt the reference sheet at a future meeting.

6.) 3 Beaver Street HPTC Application: Request for NHC Letter of Support

The Commission discussed a prospective letter of support for the ongoing project at 3 and 3A Beaver Street, a project by Heirloom, a Short Term Rental hospitality company. This conversation was continued from the February meeting. Erin Doherty, consultant and Preservation Planner with Epsilon, and Polly Waldorf, the project manager, were on the call to answer questions.

Commissioners questioned why the structure must be lifted by the proposed 3ft. Several commissioners and staff pointed out that the structure was outside the FEMA AE flood zone and in an area with an estimated 0.2% change of flooding, at grade. Commissioners questioned intensifying habitation in the basement. Several commissioners stated raising the building 3' would change the character of the streetscape and the structure, and was not consistent with an 18th century lean-to house.

The applicant presented documentation of the 18th century chimney stack collapsed into rubble. The chair presented images of the chimney stack, dated 2019 and April 2021, that had been submitted to staff and directly to her by a third party. The pictures had been taken under prior ownership as part of an architectural survey. The Commissioners were able to see an intact chimney stack at the second floor and intact flues at the attic floor. The Part II application prepared by Epsilon and submitted to the US Park Service and the MHC by Heirloom showed boards laid over the flues in the attic. Commissioners asked the applicant why the boards laid over the flues had not been lifted, so the flues could be photographed as part of the existing conditions documentation in the Part II application. Ms. Doherty responded that it just wasn't done.

The Commission cited one additional cause for concern as it relates to this project: community benefit. With affordable housing at the top of the Master Plan and the select board

Several commissioners expressed concern that the existing conditions had not been adequately documented in the Part II application, that raising the structure, while approved by the HDC, was not necessary based on the flood zone, was inconsistent with the character of the 1750s building, and was only being undertaken to increase bedrooms in the basement. Commissioners expressed that the project was not a historic rehabilitation of this 1700s structure and did not identify and preserve its defining characteristics. Also, that the alterations were not being undertaken because of a flood zone or to create community benefit consistent with Town priorities.

Motion to not offer a letter of support for the project 3A Beaver Street: Tom

Second: Mickey. Hillary, Angus, Georgia, David, Tom, Mickey: Aye. Clement: No.

All other commissioners in favor. The motion passes with a 6-1 vote.

Motion to instruct Hillary and Angus to draft a letter to the MHC explaining the Commission's position: David

Second: Tom. All in favor via roll call, passes 7-0.

7.) NHC's Support for FY2022 Warrant Articles

Article 80: Solar Panels: The commission supports the FinCom motion

Article 81: Amend the NP&EDC. The Chair recused and Angus assumed the role of chair. The commissioners decided not to comment on this article, given the sponsor is chair of the NHC.

The chair rejoined the meeting.

Article 13: Pleasant Street Sidewalk: Appropriation Request

The NHC supports the FinCom motion and supports sidewalk repair. The NHC continues to look forward to working with the Town on discussions re: sidewalks in the historic district and around the NHL. The Commission requests Town Administration and Select Board provide for review of design and materials for sidewalk rehabilitation in the Historic District.

Article 92: 31 Easy Street Real Estate Conveyance

Article 91: Real Estate Acquisition 31 Easy Street: discussion of the prospect this historic structure will be demolished. Decision not to comment at this time.

Motion to submit a letter of consideration summarizing our comments to the joint meeting of the planning board, select board, and FINCOM: David

Second: Angus

All in favor via roll call

8. 2022 Workplan: deferred to next meeting

9. Other business: Decision to write a letter of congratulations and greeting to DPW director Stephen Arceneaux. Discussion of telephone pole "struts" being installed – NHC had resolved in October 2021 to avoid the struts, at least in the most sensitive areas, and request selective pole replacement. Town Administration did not communicate this advice to the Select Board, and instead reported that NHC has no concerns. Regardless, Town operations manager Erika Mooney and Town Manager Libby Gibson advised the struts could not be avoided. Mickey Rowland offered to follow up with Erika.



HISTORIC PRESERVATION CERTIFICATION APPLICATION
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
REVIEW & RECOMMENDATION SHEET
PART 2 / PART 3—REHABILITATION

SECTION 1. APPLICATION INFORMATION

PROJECT NUMBER

Historic Property Name Simeon Gardner House

Property Address 3 Beaver Street, Nantucket, MA, 02554-3801

Certified Historic Structure (select one) ☒ Yes ☐ Pending

☒ Part 2

☐ Preliminary consultation (date) _____

☐ Applying for state tax credit

☐ Part 3 (Part 2 previously reviewed)

☐ Completed rehabilitation work conforms to work previously approved

☐ Completed rehabilitation work differs substantively from work previously approved
(describe divergences from Part 2 scope of work in Section 5)

☐ Part 3 (Part 2 not previously reviewed)

Application received (date) 11/2/2021

☐ Amendment (applicant signature date _____)

Additional information requested (date/s) _____

☐ Request for an advisory determination for a phase

Complete information received (date) 11/2/2021

☐ Property visited by SHPO staff (date/s):

Transmitted to NPS (date) 1/28/2022

Before _____, during _____, and/or after _____ rehab.

SHPO REVIEW SUMMARY

☐ No outstanding concerns

☒ In-depth NPS review requested

☒ Applicant informed of SHPO
recommendation

SECTION 2. APPLICATION MATERIALS

Sent previously: ☐ Photographs ☐ Other (list) _____

Attachments: ☒ Photographs ☐ Rolled plans ☒ Flat plans, large size ☒ Flat plans, 11" x 17" or smaller ☐ Other (list)

Sent separately: ☐ Photographs ☐ Rolled plans ☐ Flat plans, large size ☐ Flat plans, 11" x 17" or smaller ☐ Other (list)

Documentation remaining on file in SHPO (e.g., masonry repointing samples, specifications) _____

SECTION 3. SHPO RECOMMENDATION

Mary Cirbus, Elizabeth Sherva

, who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, has reviewed this application.

This rehabilitation work (select only one):

☐ meets the Standards.

☐ meets the Standards with concerns.

☐ meets the Standards *only* if the attached conditions are met (Part 2 and Amendments only).

☒ does not meet Standard number(s) _____ and for the reasons described in Section 5.

☐ does not meet Standard number(s) _____ as completed, but could be brought into conformance with the
Standards if the remedial work recommended in Section 5 is completed (Part 3 only).

☐ warrants denial for lack of information.

☐ is being forwarded without recommendation.

1/28/2022

Date

Brona Simon SHPO

State Historic Preservation Office Signature

SECTION 4. ISSUES

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Alteration of significant exterior features or surfaces | ☐ Alteration, removal, or covering of significant interior features or finishes |
| ☐ Window replacement | ☐ Changes in significant interior plan, spaces, or circulation patterns |
| ☐ Additions, including rooftop | ☐ Other (explain) _____ |
| ☐ Extensive site work, adjacent new construction, or demolition of adjacent structures | |

SECTION 5. SHPO EVALUATION

Explain the recommendation and any concerns, particularly issues checked in Section 4. Where denial is recommended, explain fully. For Part 3s, describe any work that differs substantially from the approved work. For Part 3s that do not meet the Standards as completed, describe remedial work, if any, that could enable the project to meet the Standards. Comment on notable aspects of the project, such as technical design innovations or creative solutions.

Please see attached comments.

SECTION 6. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE EVALUATION

Date

National Park Service Signature

Simeon Gardner House
3 Beaver Street
Nantucket, MA 02554

Part 2 Comments

The MHC has reviewed the application and provides the following comments:

- The application proposes to remove a modern three-part casement window system at the north façade, enlarge the opening, and install a new French door system. This work does not meet the Standards (Standard 2). MHC suggests that the existing dimensions of the opening remain, or that the opening be modified to include a single door only.
- The application proposes to remove an existing window at the west elevation of the cottage and install infill, and to construct a new window opening at the south elevation. This work does not meet the Standards (Standard 2). MHC suggests that the existing opening and façade remain intact.

The MHC also finds that the application is not complete. The following information should be provided for review:

- Clarification on the excavation of the crawl space and new proposed foundation. Please include more information regarding proposed materials (color, wall material, mortar profile and color, etc.) More information should be provided regarding the visual impact of raising the house and introduction of new egress windows and associated window wells at the basement. How visible with the windows be? Can the footprints of the window wells be decreased?
- Clarification regarding how the new basement meets requirements for floor mitigation. Will there be mechanicals at the new basement level?
- Clarification regarding the proposed new entrance at the front elevation and additional information regarding when this original entrance was removed. Please provide historic documentation and/ or photographs showing the original entrance. Please also submit additional information regarding the dates of the entrances on the east and west elevations.
- Clarification regarding the proposed new exterior stairs, railings, and fences. Please submit historical documentation showing the original fencing as noted in the application.
- Additional information regarding the proposed shed dormer at the north slope of the roof. Is there historic precedent for a dormer at this location?
- Additional photographs of the existing fireplace/ chimney and more information regarding its current conditions. The submitted photographs do not show the chimney stack in the attic or at the roof. Has the chimney been partially dismantled? If so, when was it dismantled or infilled? MHC notes that the removal of a character-defining chimney stack does not meet the Standards. A sizeable chimney is a character-defining feature of a house of this time period.
- Clarification regarding original finishes and partitions at the first and second floor. Please submit additional photographs showing floors, doors, and trim throughout the house in greater detail. Are the partitions at the first and second floors original? MHC notes that there appears to be original

floors at the second floor closets and original doors at the second floor bedrooms. MHC notes that the removal of original or historic material does not meet the Standards.

- Clarification regarding original finishes and partitions at the cottage. Please submit additional photographs showing floors, doors, ceilings, and trim throughout the cottage in greater detail.
- Clarification regarding the proposed new staircase connecting the basement and first floor. Please submit additional photographs of the existing dining room, particularly the area to be removed for the new staircase. Is there any original or historic material in this area? Will there be any bannisters or partitions in front of the windows?
- Fully dimensioned window drawings and additional context regarding the proposed new entrance at the main house.
- Clarification regarding window color. Is there historic precedent for white windows? MHC notes that earth-tone window colors are typical for houses of this age and type on Nantucket.
- A mechanical plan. Will there be any exterior condensers, piping, or other mechanical equipment? If so, please submit a site plan or other plan showing their location(s).



NANTUCKET HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Town of Nantucket
2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

COMMISSIONERS

*Hillary Hedges Rayport (Chair) Angus Macleod (Vice-Chair) David Silver (Secretary)
Clement Durkes, Thomas M. Montgomery, Georgia U. Raysman, Milton Rowland*

March 4, 2022

Ms. Brona Simon
State Historic Preservation Officer
Massachusetts Historical Commission
220 Morrissey Boulevard
Boston, MA 02125

Re: Application for State Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit for 3 Beaver Street, Nantucket.

Dear Ms. Simon:

After reviewing the Part I and Part II submission and additional information provided on February 18th, the Nantucket Historical Commission voted not to offer a letter of support for the project at 3 Beaver Street. The Commission found the project is not primarily a preservation project but rather, seeks to modify the building in ways that undermine its historic setting and vernacular floor plan; specifically:

1. Raising the building three feet constitutes a major change in its historic setting and in the character of the neighborhood, such that the structure will no longer be characteristic of an 18th century lean-to building. Raising buildings can be advisable; but this building is well outside the AE flood area. Moreover, the developer proposes two below-grade bedrooms and baths, with window wells, intensifying occupancy in the area of concern for flooding.
2. The existing conditions report did not investigate loosely laid floorboards in the attic, set over the flues of the original eighteenth-century chimney. The very large (approximately 14' x 7') original chimney stack was not adequately documented. Accordingly, in November 2021, the NHC requested the applicant document the chimney stack. In February 2022, Epsilon provided the NHC with photographs taken after interior demolition had commenced, showing the chimney stack disappeared into rubble. On March 1st, the NHC received photographs from a third party, that had been taken with permission of the prior owner from 2018 to March 2021. These photographs show the substantial survival of an eighteenth-century chimney and fireboxes. Photographs documented the stack at the second floor, the chimney tops at the attic, and interior pictures of the existing flues, obtained by dropping a camera into the flues. The applicant's lack of attention to investigating this character-defining feature as part of the existing conditions survey is an alarming oversight in the planning of a preservation project. The chimney stack, which included multiple bake-ovens, represents a major character-defining element of the house's eighteenth-century architecture, plan, and historical value.

The foregoing changes constitute a severe loss of important character-defining elements of the house and its setting. They run counter to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for historic rehabilitation, and counter to the premise of the HPTC program, which depends on thorough documentation of existing conditions.

The intended use is high-occupancy short term rental, as part of the applicant's growing portfolio of rental properties catering to large group travel. Short term vacation rental *can* support historic preservation. But in this case, the historic features are being adversely affected. The Nantucket government is currently grappling with whether intensely developed and managed vacation properties have adverse effects on Nantucket's neighborhoods and housing supply.

For these reasons, the NHC declines to support the project.

Sincerely,



Hillary Hedges Rayport
Chair, Nantucket Historical Commission

cc:

Erin Doherty, Epsilon Associates
Holly Backus, Preservation Planner, Nantucket
Ray Pohl, Chair, Nantucket Historic District Commission



Exposed flues, documented under previous owner, 2019.



23. Attic, view northeast

Attic documentation provided in Part II application, November 2021, showing boards covering flues.



Chimney stack at second floor, documented in 2021 (under previous owner)



8. Second floor, collapsed former chimney stack, view west

Photograph of second floor chimney stack, submitted by applicant to NHC February 17, 2022

For March 17, 2022

STRs Can Support Preservation

Dear Editor:

Given the discussions about short term rentals, readers of last week's article "Historical Commission Opposes Tax Credits for STR" might think the NHC declined support for Heirloom's 3 Beaver Street project because it was an STR. In fact, the NHC has supported three projects intended for STR in the recent past. We declined to support the 3 Beaver Street project because it did not preserve key historic features of the 1755 structure. The features were marked for demolition to create a large-group STR in a very small, very old, dwelling house, and the developer wanted to use Historic Preservation Tax Credits (HPTC) to help pay for it.

State and Federal HPTCs are a powerful incentive for preservation. Developers can get a tax rebate of up to 40% of qualified rehabilitation expenses. However, projects must meet standards for historic rehabilitation, including the interior. This begins with documenting what is historically important about the structure, before starting any work, and taking steps to preserve these features.

Developers should also be aware that the State program, which awards \$55 million annually, considers community benefit as well as preservation. For example, 25% of state awards must go to affordable housing. When the NHC writes letters of support for projects, we advise the Massachusetts Historical Commission on the level of community benefit and whether the project is consistent with the Town Master Plan or Select Board Strategic Plan. Projects which preserve historic structures and meet Town goals or have other community benefits – such as rehabilitating a derelict building, or creating a community resource, deserve the most vigorous support.

Historic buildings cannot be saved if they are not used. Well planned STRs can support preservation of historic structures. We hope many more developers will consider taking advantage of tax rebates, whether for STRs, year-round or seasonal workforce housing, or office, retail, or restaurant use. Non-profits can also use tax credits; there is an active resale market for these financial instruments. But all HPTC projects must preserve the important features of historic structures. If you have questions about how tax credits work and whether your project might qualify, please email the Historical Commission at nhc@nantucket-ma.gov or speak with Town Preservation Planner Holly Backus, in the PLUS department. Thank you.

Hillary Hedges Rayport, Chair
Angus Macleod, Vice Chair
David Silver, Secretary
Nantucket Historical Commission

Subject: RE: Archeology preservation plan
Date: Monday, March 7, 2022 at 4:12:08 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: Doherty, Jennifer (SEC)
To: Hillary Hedges Rayport

Hmm, not me I don't think! You might try the [National Park Service grants page](#) or the [National Association of THPOs](#), though.

Jennifer B. Doherty

Local Government Programs Coordinator
Massachusetts Historical Commission
220 Morrissey Boulevard
Boston, MA 02125-3314
Office: (617) 727-8470
Remote: (617) 807-0685
Jennifer.Doherty@sec.state.ma.us

From: Hillary Hedges Rayport <hrayport@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 10:46 AM
To: Doherty, Jennifer (SEC) <Jennifer.Doherty@sec.state.ma.us>
Subject: Re: Archeology preservation plan

CAUTION: This email originated from a sender outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mail system. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you Jenn.

I seem to remember receiving a roundup of sources of funding for projects affecting indigenous people. Did that come from you? If yes and it's not too much trouble, I would appreciate receiving it again.

Thank you, and I look forward to hearing from your colleague.

Best,
Hillary

From: "Doherty, Jennifer (SEC)" <jennifer.doherty2@state.ma.us>
Date: Monday, March 7, 2022 at 9:58 AM
To: Hillary Hedges Rayport <hrayport@mac.com>
Subject: RE: Archeology preservation plan

Hi Hillary,

I've forwarded your inquiry on to one of our archaeology staff, but generally yes, archaeology reconnaissance and preservation plans are something that communities do. We occasionally get requests for funding for them through the Survey & Planning Grant program.

Thank you,
Jenn

Jennifer B. Doherty

Local Government Programs Coordinator
Massachusetts Historical Commission
220 Morrissey Boulevard
Boston, MA 02125-3314
Office: (617) 727-8470
Remote: (617) 807-0685
Jennifer.Doherty@sec.state.ma.us

From: Hillary Hedges Rayport <hlayport@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 9:42 AM
To: Doherty, Jennifer (SEC) <Jennifer.Doherty@sec.state.ma.us>
Subject: Archeology preservation plan

CAUTION: This email originated from a sender outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mail system. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jenn,

I hope this email finds you well.

I'm writing to seek advice and referrals about planning for archeological resources. Is there such a thing as an archeological preservation plan, and how might Nantucket go about exploring whether to undertake such a planning effort on Nantucket?

Many thanks.
Hillary

Hillary Hedges Rayport
hlayport@mac.com
(617) 697-6429