



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Stephen Welch (Vice-chair), Diane Coombs, Abigail Camp, Vallorie Oliver
Associate Commissioners: Jessie Dutra, Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday October 18, 2022

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

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

Staff in attendance: Holly Backus, Historic Planner; Esmeralda Martinez, Land Use Specialist; Adrian Rodriguez, Administrative Specialist; Billy Saad, Land Use Specialist; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker

Attending Members: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra, Patten

Remote participant: Coombs

Absent Members: Thornewill

Late Arrivals: Coombs, 4:07 pm

Early Departures: Dutra, 8:11 pm

Adoption of Agenda:

Motion **Motion to Approve as drafted. (Oliver)**

Vote Carried unanimously

I. DISCUSSION & VOTE

1. None

II. COMMISSION COMMENTS

1. Welch – It's likely that RISE will provide solar recommendations in small packet for review prior to adoption.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. **Chris Young**, Sign Advisory Council (SAC) – We've always acted in the capacity of an advisory role. Understands PLUS is working on an amendment that will close the issue that caused problems in the 1st place. Regarding policies, we're here to advise HDC; there will be a policy change that will allow an applicant to bypass SAC and come straight to HDC which we do not agree with. We are excited to work with Mr. Saad, our liaison. Explained how sign enforcement is different than construction enforcement.

Coombs – Asked about the letter HDC drafted up for the Select Board.

Pohl – He hasn't drafted it up yet.

Coombs – Regarding the letter from Andrew Vorce reconstituting the SAC; she objects to the applicant being able to bypass the SAC.

Backus – That memo was written by Staff and vetted through the Planning Director, Town Manager, and Chair HDC.

IV. SIGNS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Nantaco 07-6683	21 South Water Street	Projecting sign	42.4.2/102	Lee Milazo
2. Nantaco 09-7150	21 South Water Street	Menu/wall sign	42.4.2/102	Lee Milazo

V. CONSENTS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Joan Bunting 10-7194	3 Pine Tree Road	Cabana	68/228	Structures Unlimited
2. Corkish Co-op 08-6970	320e Polpis Road	New shed	24/1.5	Structures Unlimited
3. 39 West Miacomet, LLC 10-7244	39 W. Miacomet Road	Deck & porch Extension	81/147.1	Thornewill Design
4. 7 Hinckley, LLC 10-7243	7 Hinkley Lane	Generator & enclosure	30/170.1	Ahern
5. Shadow Nominee 10-7195	24 Bassett Road	Porch addition	26/61	SCI
6. 73 Vestal St, LLC 10-7233	73 Vestal Street	Hardscape	56/192	Jardins Intl.
7. 58 Walsh, LLC 10-7236	58 Walsh Street	Door changes	29/97	Emeritus LTD
8. Daniel & Anna Day 10-7245	7 Bayberry Lane	Rev 06-6466	67/61	Val Oliver

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Patten

Alternates Dutra

Recused Oliver, Thornewill

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve. (Camp)**

Roll-call vote Carried 5-0//Coombs, Welch, Patten, Camp, and Pohl-aye

Certificate # **HDC2022-(as noted)**

VI. CONSENTS WITH CONDITIONS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Susan Mitchell 10-7206	10 Skyline Drive	Pool & hardscape	79/7.1	Susan Mitchell
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter and to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.				
2. Ryan & Sarah Murphy 10-7239	Maple Lane Lot 4	Hardscape & pool	67/303	Emeritus LTD
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter and to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.				
3. CMR 11 Osprey, LLC 10-7211	11 Osprey Way	Pool	82/3	Linda Williams
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter and to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.				
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Aerial photo 11 Osprey Way, and site plan.			
Representing	Linda Williams, 11 Osprey Way			
Public	None			
Concerns	Camp – Concerned about visibility of the 11 Osprey Way pool from the Hummock Pond Road and the water; she thinks the area is very open and bare. Williams – This lot is not open; there's a massive amount of screening. Reviewed photos showing existing screening. Stated concerns that she feels Ms. Camp is prejudiced against all pools. Coombs – Suggested a viewing. Welch – Screening material should be indigenous plants.			
Motion	Motion to Approve Items 1 & 2 through staff per noted conditions. (Coombs)			
Roll-call vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2022-10-7206/7239
Motion	Motion to Approve Item 3 through staff with pool not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter and to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application. And screened with indigenous plant materials. (Welch)			
Roll-call vote	Carried 3-2//Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye; Camp & Coombs-aye		Certificate #	HDC2022-10-7211

VII. NEW BUSINESS 08/16/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. John Lancaster 09-7147	15 Burnell Street	Solar roof array	73.4.2/48	Ack Smart
Voting	Welch (acting chair), Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments, and manufacturer spec sheet.			
Representing	Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:27)	Glidden – Reviewed the project; solar is limited to the porches facing Burnell and Sunset; the roof is wood. Included a letter of support from Steven Stone. The hedge is new and growing up. Backus – We received another photo from Ms. Oliver. Oliver – She took the photos so everyone would be able to understand it's visible from Sunset Road but not Burnell. Camp – She's concerned about the view from Burnell despite the hedge. As seen from Sunset Hill, it will be visible. Coombs – This flies in the face of our guidelines because it's visible on a wood roof. Doesn't know if they can be set so that the entire roof is covered. Welch – He's with Ms. Oliver. The mitigating factor is it's not on a primary façade facing a street. Seem to be at an impasse here. Suggested holding and allowing Ms. Thornewill to read back in.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for more information. (Camp)			
Roll-call vote	Carried 4-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, and Welch-aye		Certificate #	

VIII. NEW BUSINESS 08/30/2022

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Carlos Sousa 09-7070	20 Vesper Lane	Replace fence	55/248	Carlos Sousa
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Dutra				
Alternates	Patten (Oliver sat off)				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape Design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
	Carlos Sousa, for Federal government				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:37)	Williams – Presented project; this is Federal property and so is exempt from HDC review. Sousa – The units have been upgraded and we're hoping to upgrade the aesthetics. This is housing units for transient USCG personnel; it's for privacy of individual families. Pohl – HDC is an advisory board when it comes to Federal property. Dutra – Asked what security issues they are concerned about. He's okay with it. Coombs – Asked if the government would be willing to consider a 5&1. Would prefer the fence top be straight, not follow the contours of the land. Welch – This is a federally funded project subject to section 106. Along Vesper the fences should be pulled back to rear corner of the façades as opposed to the front corner of the structure; half-way down the structure's side is okay. Any section facing a road should have a little bit of vining material, 1 for every other section; 10 plants would make a huge difference. Camp – She likes Mr. Welch's idea of pulling the fence back. She would prefer the fence be only 4' along Vesper. Pohl – Given this is federal land, the reach of our jurisdiction, if the applicant is willing to concede the 2' move back with respect to the Vesper Lane units, that is as good as this will get.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the fence at K2, K1, and B2 to be moved toward the rear a minimum of 2' and vining material added along any length of fence longer than 4 sections visible from Vesper per Exhibit A. (Welch)				
Roll-call vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs, Camp, Dutra, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2022-09-7070
2.	Doherty ACK, LLC 08-6934	2 Mariner Way	New dwelling	55.1.4/72.4	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Dutra, Patten				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
	Blair Hines				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:47)	Williams – Presented project; faces Union Street; this is in the flood zone. She objects to the inclusion of the advisory group comments because that group isn't legally constituted; she has never seen their comments and could not respond. Pohl – Pointed out that anyone can submit comments on a project. Backus – Proposed infill within old historic district (OHD); she gave a plethora of comments based upon her review. The &-shaped structure is very atypical; the shed dormers in additive mass are atypical. The roof walk looks like the feet are not broken up. Recommend a 1-story additive mass element. Read comments dated September 20th, 2022, from Mary Bergman, Nantucket Preservation Trust. Read advisory group comments: This subdivision is located on what was once the outskirts of town; the houses were generally small scale and on the less formal side; the character should read as a "Typical Nantucket House" or Quaker style, but definitely not Federal or formal Greek Revival. This house has the height and scale of a more formal Federal style house and should be toned down by reducing the height and scale. The ceiling heights on both floors are proposed as 9'; this could be reduced, lowering the height by almost 2'; the width of the main mass at 32' is also on the "grand" side and could easily be reduced by shrinking down the massive front entry hall. The "U- shaped" massing to the rear is highly unusual and not appropriate for the neighborhood; the 2 rear towers surround a recessed courtyard further deepened by a 5' rear overhang of the main mass, creating a very inappropriate negative mass. Other concerns are: lacking a chimney, window proportions, French door sidelights, and unusual trim board sizes such as 1x12 rake boards. This house, along with 4 and 6 Mariner Way, needs to be redesigned to conform to traditional Nantucket scale, massing and details, keeping in mind the "edge of town" location and the contextual scale that area requires. It is clear from the proposed site plan, that all 3 houses and garages have been shoe-horned into each lot from setback to setback to maximize the footprint; this approach will result in a massively over-built and out-of-scale development that does not fit into the neighborhood or general character of Nantucket architecture in general. All 3 of these houses should be reconfigured and significantly scaled down. Coombs – Asked what allows them to put a pool into the OHD where pools aren't allowed. It shouldn't be 32' regardless of being in the flood plain; it should not exceed 27'. The "rocket ship" elements on the rear are inappropriate in this area. Three 32' buildings in the OHD on the entrance to the Town are taller than anything else around. They should be simpler. West elevation, the 2 dormers should be a single dormer raised up into the roof. This is very formal in a not-so-formal area.				

Oliver – The front looks traditional; the side mass with double flush dormers should be revisited. North elevation is very long and only has a 1' rebate so reads as a solid line. The rear is atypical. There should have more additive massing. This is the largest of the 3; scaling it back would be appropriate. She doesn't care about the pool in the deck. The 1st floor does not need to be 9'; reducing that would bring the height down.

Welch – General agrees with Ms. Oliver. The one of the 2 gable elements projecting off the rear should be reduced to 1 story. You could address the additional depth off the back with additive massing; the north-most should come down in height. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about the left side. The landscape plan shows a much smaller primary mass with respect to depth. His concern with height is these need to be designed to the minimum flood design elevation.

Camp – Agrees with much that's been said. We spent a lot of time paring down the structures on the other side of Mariner Way to be relevant to Consue Springs and Union Street. This is a lot of building for this site. The main mass on Union Street is okay but the left side 2nd-floor dormers are too much. She doesn't see much additive massing; would prefer an old Quaker style.

Pohl – Agrees with what's been said. To Mr. Welch's point regarding the depth of the deck, there is an overhang the overhangs the rear deck; the pool should be moved completely under that. On the main mass has too much space between the headers of the 1st-floor windows and the 2nd floor; the windows should be raised. The left west window headers are about 1' higher than those on the Main mass. Likes the idea that 1 of the rear extensions be 1 story. The application is for simulated-divided-light (SDL) windows and fiberglass SDL doors; not sure if that's consistent with the existing Mariner Way structures.

Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)

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

Certificate #

3. Doherty ACK, LLC 08-6937 2 Mariner Way Hardscape 55.1.4/72.4 Linda Williams

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Dutra, Patten

Recused None

Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.

Representing Linda Williams

Public None

Concerns (5:13) Not opened at this time.

Motion to Hold to track with the main house. (Welch)

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

Certificate #

4. Doherty ACK, LLC 08-6939 4 Mariner Way New dwelling 55.1.4/72 Linda Williams

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Dutra, Patten

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, advisory comments, and *Building with Nantucket in Mind (BWNIM)*.

Representing Linda Williams

Public None

Concerns (5:13) **Williams** – Presented project; the gable forward has been pulled back so the eave forward is proud.

Backus – Infill within OHD. Looking at how the structure is presented is different; it would be nice to move the front door into the gable forward so it's closer to the road, per *BWNIM*. Should be redesigned and sited; the design doesn't reflect appropriate additive massing; the secondary-mass gable is forward and proud of the eave side main mass. Exterior chimney is not appropriate in placement or concept. Recommends reversing the hierarchy of the proposed.

Read advisory group comments: Due to the unfortunate configuration of this lot, the larger buildable section is to the rear - far removed from the street; the applicant has chosen to set the garage in the front section directly facing Mariner Way; this is in complete contradiction to what is stated in *BWNIM*. This concept is especially important here within the ROH district where garages should definitely not be prominent. Also worth noting is that the garage is also a secondary dwelling, as stated in *BWNIM*. Placing the garage in this location is entirely inappropriate and should not be approved; if the lot configuration is the problem, then reconfiguring lot lines should be considered; they are all still in single ownership, and redrawing lines between lots 4 and 6 could help both properties; the house on Lot 6 is proposed at an awkward angle relative to the very close neighboring houses which will result in a chaotic streetscape unlike anywhere in town. The massing of the main house on Lot 4 has so many problems it's hard to know where to begin; the front elevation has competing main masses joined by a connector with the "secondary mass" in the same plane as the front wall of the main mass. Other issues include all of those mentioned on Lot 2 plus an oversize balcony and an oddly proportioned front portico. This house along with the other 2 properties need to be significantly scaled down to fit into the context of the neighborhood.

Oliver – Agrees with what's been pointed out. The massing is unusual; it has no real hierarchy or additive massing with all the eave lines being tall. The small porch over the front door should be removed; it's incongruent. The 9' ceilings should be dropped.

Coombs – The front door is much too formal for Mariner Way. The shape of the chimney is bad. There's no additive massing except the porch roof and deck; this is visible from the harbor and Washington Street. The height should be dropped down. It needs to be simplified; it does not fit into the streetscape. South elevation right is too busy and needs to be lower; it doesn't need to fill the lot and should be reduced in size by 1/3. North elevation rear element has only 4 windows; needs to have more windows or be smaller.

Welch – There's a lot wrong with it but it would be rendered not visible by the house in front should that be approved. He doesn't want to make comments at this time; the sense of the group is established.

Camp – Appreciates the main mass looking like a Union Street Federal home; but due to the oblique angle from the street, the front elevation should be swapped; telescope additive massing toward towards Town and the rear. Make room for landscaping between this and the other house.

Pohl – Agrees with Ms. Backus on the south elevation front door migrating closer to the property entry so it's visible. The space between the head of 1st-floor windows and 2nd-floor sills needs to be reduced. The 6 windows on the gable east of the front door are all too small. Wants to know about the use of SDL windows and fiberglass doors on Mariner Way. The rakes and casings seem to be very large; the application calls for a 1X12 rake when they should be 1X8 and the casings should be 1X4.

Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)

Motion	Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye	Certificate #	
5. Doherty ACK, LLC 08-6941	4 Mariner Way	New garage/dwelling	55.1.4/72	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:27)	Williams – Presented project; this is a garage with secondary dwelling.			

Backus – They took some of her comments into consideration. Height is 24'10". Garage door lights and roof over the doors are inappropriate. The rear balcony is too large. The plan shows a base flood elevation of 8'; some of these have to comply with Resilient Nantucket guidelines for new construction; the base floor elevation needs to be clearly noted on the plans and consistent with a flood elevation certificate. HSAG had concerns about this being in the front.

Welch – The grade has been labeled relative to sea level but it's 2' above the grade at the front of the garage. Should be smaller.

Oliver – If they need a guest house, a simple guest house with attached garage or separate garage would be better. This is too out of scale for the main house.

Coombs – This doesn't look like a garage; it looks like a house. The north elevation deck is too large and inappropriate. East elevation has 2 doors and doesn't look appropriate and faces the harbor.

Camp – This should be reduced 2' on each side. The garage doors should be simplified. It looks boxy.

Pohl – Suggested moving the south elevation garage doors left and move the pedestrian door into that space, it would humanize the structure; the 2nd-floor windows should be reinvestigated and add a gable window. It's currently very generic and very atypical Nantucket. No 1X12 rakes; that's an across the board comments as well as finding out about use of SDLs and fiberglass doors.

Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)

Motion	Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye	Certificate #	
6. Doherty ACK, LLC 08-6943	4 Mariner Way	New pool & hardscape	55.1.4/72	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:47)	Not opened at this time.			

Motion to Hold to track. (Welch)

Motion	Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye	Certificate #	
7. Doherty ACK, LLC 08-6930	6 Mariner Way	New dwelling	55.1.4/72.2	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:47)	Williams – Presented project; explained wetland buffers dictate placement of the structure. Pool is in the deck.			

Backus – Infill within OHD. Siting could be better within setbacks and buffers to sit 90 degrees to the road. Flanking additive massing should drop significantly. With a roof walk, the mass should be eave forward. Recommend dropping the eave on the wall connector and right side additive mass; typically a roof walk goes hand in hand with the chimney. Drop the eave.

Read advisory group comments: The proposed siting of this house is at a severe angle to the rest of the subdivision creating a very chaotic streetscape; this house needs to align with the others or be only slightly skewed. Significant changes will need to be made, starting with the lot layout in order to enable appropriately scaled houses with appropriately placed outbuildings in back. For this building, the massing and formality need major adjustments to fit into the context of this section of town; the gable forward approach is probably not appropriate here especially at this scale.

This house along with the other 2 properties need to be significantly scaled down to fit into the context of the neighborhood.

Oliver – South elevation, the massing is atypical with all the eaves are all 2nd-floor, but different height roofs is chaotic looking. Agrees no gable forward; it doesn't need a roof walk in this gable-forward configuration. Lowering the pitch would make it more typical; the pitches are higher than normal. The rear balcony should be eliminated. We need to think about simple forms with discrete individuality with the houses sitting quietly side-by-side and blend into the existing fabric of the townscape in this area.

Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. This should be smaller to fit within the buffers and conform with the houses around it. Straighten it out, reduce the size, and simplify.

Welch – This needs to be simpler. You've been given thoughtful redesigns on all the structures. All the buildings should be smaller and simple.

Camp – The gable forward should have simpler lines; it's currently very prominent. The main mass is too wide, and the side mass should be reduced; the 6-light eave window should be a 4-light. Okay with the orientation to the road.

Pohl – South elevation, if it goes to an eave forward, the roof walk would be more in keeping; okay with the right hyphen but if it goes away with the 2-story main gable dropping down to a 1.5-story mass, that would hugely simplify it. Same comments still apply.

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

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

Certificate #

8. Doherty ACK, LLC **08-6931** 6 Mariner Way Hardscape 55.1.4/72.2 Linda Williams

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Dutra, Patten

Recused None

Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.

Representing Linda Williams

Public None

Concerns (4:59) Not opened at this time.

Motion **Motion to Hold to track. (Welch)**

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

Certificate #

Break 5:50 to 6:02 pm

IX. NEW BUSINESS 09/13/2022

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Elizabeth Phillips 09-7030	4 Pittman Road	New shed	73.4.2/61	Elizabeth Phillips

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten

Alternates Dutra

Recused Welch

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.

Representing Elizabeth Phillips, owner

Public None

Concerns (6:02) **Phillips** – Presented project.

Backus – The dwelling is circa 1928 “Victor Allo House” per HDC survey. The plans should show in ¼” scale the proposal with dimensions and roof pitch; the shed-roof design okay but the void area for the firewood is atypical and out of character and fronts on the road. Windows and doors should match the main house. Need clearer to-scale plan.

Read advisory group comments: application incomplete; no dimensions on site plan, no floor plans, elevation don't show scale or details, no window or door schedule. Wood storage area creates negative massing and should be enclosed on the east and west.

Pohl – The lattice on the front is atypical; it might be worthwhile to consider shingling the plane. Roof pitch looks like a 4/12.

Camp – In general, it's fine. Her site plan shows intended privet; asked if the doors will be visible from the street. The 4-over-4 window is sweet and in keeping with ‘Sconset.

Oliver – Agrees with Ms. Camp. The east faces the driveway; without the lattice it'll be a shingle wall with a rose trellis. Okay with the lattice over the fire storage. Okay with the 4-light window. Suggested a floor plan.

Patten – Nothing to add. She'd prefer the lattice at the wood storage be shingled.

Coombs – Where the firewood goes should not have a floor. Would prefer a 4-light window to the 4-over-4. The batten doors should be traditional.

Pohl – The back faces Pittman and is screened by a hedge, he's okay with the front.

Motion

Motion to Approve through staff with a floor plan with more information and eliminate the lattice on the east and west elevations. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, Patten, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

Certificate #

HDC2022-09-7030

2. Deborah Wasil 09-7015	51 Pleasant Street	Replace windows	55/32.3	Structures Unlimited
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:13)	Backus – Applicant asked this be held so they can provide a window survey. Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for more information at applicant's request. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Oliver, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
3. Town of Nantucket 09-7049	16 Broad Street	Alterations	42.4.2/30	Rick Sears
4. Town of Nantucket 09-7057	20 South Water Street	Alterations Bldg 1	42.4.2/29	Rick Sears
5. Town of Nantucket 09-7058	20 South Water Street	Alterations Bldg 2	42.4.2/29	Rick Sears
6. 5 Sherburne Way, LLC 09-7003	5 Sherburne Way	New Beach stairs	30/38	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Dutra, Patten			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl, Welch			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:14)	Pohl – Presented project. Backus – Conservation Commission approved this. No concerns; it's natural to weather. Oliver – Asked if everything under the stairs and land must be kept open (yes). No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Oliver)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Dutra, Patten, Oliver, and Camp-aye		Certificate #	HDC2022-09-7003
7. Michael Zarcone 09-7010	16 Cherry Street	Minor alterations	55/379	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Dutra			
Alternates	Patten			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Val Oliver, V. Oliver Design			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:15)	Oliver – Presented project; circa 1984 Backus – Circa 1984 infill within OHD. Could have been on consent. Read advisory group comments: No concerns. No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Dutra, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2022-09-7010
8. John Welch 09-7039	40 D Union Street	Infill dormer	42.3.2/89	Gryphon Architects
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Ethan Griffin, Gryphon Architects			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:17)	Griffin – Presented project. Backus – Couldn't find National Historic Landmark (NHL) data for this. This was built prior to design guidelines. Not sure adding gable is appropriate. Read advisory group comments: This fronts on the Town Pier parking lot and is very visible. This type of dormer could be considered if it were recessed a couple feet, but not as a flush dormer. Camp – No concerns. Welch – For the record he's no relation. The setback of the dormer 6" would be good. Oliver – Agrees with Mr. Welch. Coombs – No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2022-09-7039

9. Eleven Lincoln Ave Tr	09-7051	32 Jefferson Avenue	New guest house	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting	Welch (acting chair), Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Dutra, Patten				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:21)	Pohl – In deference to the neighbor, his client has agreed to drop this down. Asked that it be held for October 25 th . Not opened at this time.				
Motion	No action at this time.				
Roll-call Vote	N/A			Certificate #	
10. 40 OSR, LLC	09-7045	40 Old South Rd 39/40	New dwelling mixed use	68/410	Emeritus LTD
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Dutra, Patten				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:23)	MacEachern – Presented project; buildings on lot 39 & 40 are connected at the 2 nd floor. Explained the decks and roof of the connector pieces. The intent is a perception of one large building with rhythm and balance. Modular construction. Welch – As he reads the east elevation, the connector appears as the 2 nd -floor being an enclosed space. Camp – What catches her eye is the pattern of parking spaces and breaking it up so it doesn't look like off island. Okay with combining the two buildings. Rather than the cupolas, a belvedere might work. Oliver – Eliminate the cupolas. The dormer looks to have a lot of space above the windows; either drop the dormer or push the windows up. Coombs – They are exactly the same and will be visible from Old South Road; she would like the two to be different. The parking is all identical as well. Thinks landscaping would help break up the sameness. The cupolas need to go; these don't look like barns. Pohl – There's a lot going on here he'd like to see done in Richmond and across from Airport Park. He likes this.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff cupolas eliminated without prejudice and drop the dormers. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2022-09-7045
11. 40 OSR, LLC	09-7046	40 Old South Rd Lot 41	New Dwelling mixed use	68/10	Emeritus LTD
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Dutra, Patten				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	Billy Cassidy				
Concerns (6:41)	MacEachern – Presented project; grey trim black sash. This lot is held in different ownership. This will be stick frame. Landscape will be critical; parking in front allows more parking. This is adjacent to 2 bike paths and all structures will have a rapport with the rear vegetation. Cassidy – This corner will be look spectacular. We thought long and hard about this. Oliver – Concerned with the façade facing Old South; there's a disparity between the perspective and the elevation drawings. She would prefer the eave lines not be all connected; the dormers roofs are all 3/12 and could be 4/12. The cupola should be eliminated. West elevation dormers are oversized for single windows. Coombs – There are 28 parking spaces along Forest Avenue in front of these structures; it should be handled differently. The west elevation dormers, either the windows should be larger or reduce the dormers; 3 rd -floor "A" windows look narrower than the "As" on the 2 nd floor. Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver, especially the chunky dormers. The parking is about 15' from the bike path and cries out for the need of 3.5" caliper minimum tree; suggested moving this structure forward and putting the parking in the rear such as along Amelia Drive; as designed, it takes away from a suburban vocabulary. Camp – Agrees. She's concerned with how it will look from Old South Road; would like the building and parking switched to allow more landscaping along the roads. Okay with the architecture. North elevation fenestration doesn't bind the structure. Pohl – Agrees with what's been said.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and hardscape plan. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

12. Twenty-One Milk St Tr 09-7033	21 Milk Street	Main House parking	42.3.3/87	David Troast
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Dutra, Patten			
Alternates	(Camp & Oliver sitting off)			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	David Troast			
	Linda Williams			
Public	None			
Concerns (time)	Troast – presented project. The existing brick is glengarry. Williams - It's a 41-81L lot with no parking; the sycamore maple is not a Town tree and will come out. Backus – Circa 1780 attributed to Silas Gardner; it's a significant example of transitioning architecture; the proposed drive will provide 2 spaces. The plans should show how the location meets the 25' interval off Green Lane and show the dimensions of the drive and apron. The herringbone brick pattern might be too much; cobblestone is better. The site plan should include existing retainage and question if the gate will remain. Read advisory group comments: Cobblestone would be preferred for a less formal appearance. Dutra – No concerns; suggested the apron be running bond turned on edge. Coombs – She'd prefer cobblestone. Patten – She's okay with the proposed parking. Welch – It says Glengarry, asked why; he'd prefer S&H due to such an expanse along the street. He can go with the Glengarry brick. Pohl – No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Patten, Dutra, Welch, and Pohl-aye; Coombs-nay		Certificate #	HDC2022-09-7033

X. OLD BUSINESS 09/20/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Brandon Casement 07-6722	6 New Street	Dormer	55.4.1/34	Brandon Casement
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, advisory comments, and <i>BWNIM</i> .			
Representing	Brandon Casement, owner			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:15)	Casement – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; last heard in August. Backus – Circa 1840s, the dormer is circa 1957; adding a hipped roof this isn't appropriate. The dormer should be 3' off the sides and 1' off the wall plane as stated in the guidelines. Read advisory group comments: Changing the front dormer to a hipped roof is not necessary and the style is inappropriate; the example provided illustrates how this proposed roof won't work without a very shallow roof pitch or the dormer ridge projecting above the main ridge as the photo shows; just because there are examples of what the applicant is trying to accomplish, it doesn't make it appropriate. The new dormer on the back should meet the guidelines in <i>BWNIM</i> – 3' from the sides and one foot back from the rear wall plane. Camp – She thinks the solution is good; one more window in the north elevation dormer would help. Welch – Appreciates the changes; he agrees with Ms. Backus but they are mitigated by the changes being a net improvement. The rear elevation dormer looks like it has a shallower pitch. Dropping the windows will allow for the eave to be dropped and still have the requisite headroom on the 2nd floor. Coombs – She agrees with Ms. Camp. Pohl – He appreciates the use of the hipped roof over the shed; however, the front is what it is and you bought into it; he was looking for the rebate in the rear dormer, which we have.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with keeping the front dormer a shed and the rear having a 2' rebated shed. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-1//Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye; Welch-nay		Certificate #	HDC2022-07-6722

2.	Frank Twarog	05-6231	18B Atlantic Avenue	Patio, fence, arbor & drive	55/24.2	Todd Farrell
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver					
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.					
Representing	Frank Twarog, owner					
Public	None					
Concerns (7:30)	Twarog – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Backus – this is circa 1925 bungalow contributing to OHD; the proposed patio is 320sf; that's a lot of impervious brick on the lot; asked what mitigation is proposed and what bond is going to be used. Read advisory group comments: Asked what the proposed changes are. This should be held for clarification. Welch – Visibility will be on an angle but running bond parallel to the street is better. They will have to work out drainage on their street. He wants to note that the parking configuration is not part of this application. Oliver – She has no concerns with option 1 now that she understands it. Coombs – She also likes option 1.					
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff showing running-bond brick on site plan #1. Welch)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye				Certificate #	HDC2022-05-6231
3.	Sandy Aek	04-6147	6 Sandy Drive	New dwelling	29/76	NAG
4.	Patience Killen	06-6585	1 Old North Wharf	Demo/move off	42.3.1/80.1	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch Coombs, Camp, Dutra					
Alternates	None					
Recused	Oliver					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.					
Representing	Linda Williams					
	Patience Killen, owner					
Public	Stephanie Bradford, 128 Main Street					
Concerns (7:37)	Williams – She could not find much historic documentation on this since it's relatively new. It first shows up in the 1935 aerial without the lean-to; 1949 shows the chimney where it is. There's nothing architecturally significant about it; everything around it is 1.5 to 2 stories. Would prefer to move off; she's certain someone will want it. Objects to the introduction of the HSAG comments. Killen – She's seen all the changes along Easy Street; significant buildings have been moved off in favor of becoming a commercial area. A precedent has been set by allowing more significant buildings to be moved off or demolished. HDC will have control of what will go in its place. Sea rise is an increasing issue, and this could be lost in a storm surge. Bradford – Her aunt ran the shop next door; she was very fond of this little structure. It not only was used as a tool shed, but it was used as a small shop. Backus – This is a contributing structure; it's helpful pinpointing the date between 1928 and 1935. One wrong doesn't make a right regarding moving. Historic structures are allowed to adapt within the OHD to meet sea-level requirements. Read advisory group comments: It is possible that this building was moved to this location from elsewhere on the wharf which would make it older than 1930; nevertheless, it is almost 100 years old and should not be moved off-site; removing this classic cottage would drastically change the character of the existing historic streetscape; this cottage should remain in place to maintain the simple pedestrian scale of Still Dock. Camp – It's a charming old broken-back shack. Everyone is concerned about what would take its place and we could lose its pedestrian scale. If nothing is being planned to go in there, she sees no reason to remove it. Coombs – This should remain; it's a classic building regardless of being a shed; it's been in this location for a long time and feels it contributes to the area streetscape. Dutra – It is totally charming and iconic and a throwback to the era. It's heartbreaking to think of it going but there is a precedence and would be hard put to say it can't be moved. Welch – He agrees it would look stupid if it were raised or made tall; he agrees with the pedestrian scale this represents. Moving forward with a move-off demo is difficult without knowing what will take its place; once it's gone, it's gone and maintaining its scale would be hard; he's opposed without that information. We have a discussion about move-off/demos of historic structures under other business. If we make a motion to deny, we have to clearly state the reasons for the record. Pohl – You can't "ransom" one application for another; but he understands Mr. Welch's concerns. No one would dispute this is a tremendously cute building. It's one of the smallest in the downtown area, and he can understand why someone would want to move it. He supports a move off/demo but doesn't think that would carry. Discussion about a denial versus a hold and the pros and cons for each.					
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions or additional information including the replacement structure. (Welch)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Dutra, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye				Certificate #	

5. High Tide Ptnrs, LLC 04-6196	26 Douglas Way	Main House	39/41	BPC
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Joe Paul, BPC			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:13)	Paul – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; north faces the ocean. Given that he’s got a 4-person board and we’re starting to delve back into issues discussed at the 1st meeting, asked to be heard at the beginning of the next meeting with a 5-person board. Sash and dove grey, white trim, and blue doors. Oliver – Appreciates the changes made. Her main concern is that it’s significantly bigger than other structures and is sitting on a wide-open hill. The middle mass is taller than the front main mass with the roof walk; that is out of whack. The south dormer windows should be separated a little. The 1st-floor height seems tall and feels it could be reduced. Welch – Appreciates the changes. Agrees about the primary massing being secondary in height and stature and looks like the roof walk is on the secondary mass; thinks the roof walk should be eliminated. Not as concerned about the size because it’s spread out and undulates and changes. The kitchen/living room seems large. No concerns with the west, east and north elevations. Doesn’t think the south elevation, despite atypical elements, is inappropriate. He’d be concerned with white trim. Camp – We’ve spent so much time on the length and little time on the front; it doesn’t seem to go with all the work we’ve done elsewhere. This is a hard one to read. Asked the height of the middle mass versus front (23’7” versus 27’7”). Pohl – The issue of the main mass, which is 2 stories, being lower than the middle mass; the roof walk is on the lower main mass; it’s sad they are coming up now. Suggested choosing a different main mass that is the main mass. He would be in favor of grey trim and sash. As measured from the low grade, the middle mass is 28’.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with all trim to be platinum grey and increase the main mass pitch to 10/12 and add 1’ to each side of the length of the roof walk. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-1//Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye; Oliver-nay		Certificate #	HDC2022-04-6196

Rest held for October 25

6. High Tide Ptnrs, LLC 04-6198	26 Douglas Way	Garage	39/41	BPC
7. High Tide Ptnrs, LLC 04-6193	26 Douglas Way	Gazebo	39/41	BPC
8. High Tide Ptnrs, LLC 04-6197	26 Douglas Way	Pool	39/41	BPC
9. High Tide Ptnrs, LLC 04-6172	26 Douglas Way	Shed	39/41	BPC
10. Petrillo & Thomas Tr 07-6598	92 Washington Street	Rev. 02-0589: small addition	42.4.1/22	Smith & Hutton LLC
11. Petrillo & Ripley	92 Washington Street	Hardscape	42.4.1/22	Studio 2112
12. Mike Romano 05-6245	55 Easton Street	Addition & move on site	42.4.1/68	Shelter 7
13. Ack N Back, LLC 06-6502	33 Quidnet Road	New dwelling	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
14. Ack N Back, LLC 06-6503	33 Quidnet Road	Garage & studio	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
15. Ack N Back, LLC 06-6504	33 Quidnet Road	Pool cabana	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
16. Ack N Back, LLC 08-6785	33 Quidnet Road	Pool & hardscape	21/27.2-27.4	Ahern Design
17. 4 The Kids Realty Tr 07-6708	79 Pocomo Road	Rev. 10-4971: add roof walk	15/5	CWA
18. Brandon Lower 08-6790	146 Main Street	New garage, patio & perg	41/518	Matthew Rider
19. Brandon Lower 08-6781	146 Main Street	MH clapbrd, perg, trim clr	41/518	Matthew Rider
20. Not so Easy, LLC 06-5679	26 Easy Street	New mixed-use structure	42.4.2/23	Emeritus

XI. NEW BUSINESS 09/27/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Valentine Hussey, LLC	31 Main Street	Roof replacement	42.3.1/212	Jim Lydon
2. McGovern Moriarty	26 Lincoln Avenue	Rev. 07-6633: rear doors	73.4.2/3	Thornewill Design
3. Jayne Culkins	20 West York Street	Window replacement	55/7.1	Ernie Culkins
4. Tom Forman	6 Coffin Street Sias	Rev. 12-5323: hardscape	73.1.4/19	Waterscapes
5. Richard Holt	121 Madaket Road	Barn addition	40/60.1	Botticelli + Pohl
6. Ron Lefevre	7a Maryann Drive	New 2 nd dwelling	68/216	SCI
7. Brian Wright	2A Copper Lane	Hardscape	42.3.3/191	SCI
8. Hillary Cunniff	37 York Street	Roof replacement	55.4.1/104	SCI
9. Hillary Cunniff	37 York Street	New garage	55.4.1/104	SCI
10. Margaret Zarcone	16 Cherry Street	Roof replacement	55/379	Stegra Corp
11. Lisa Linton	2 Creek Lane	New pool & hardscape	38/93	Andrew Falkenstein
12. Dipak Thapa	37 Beachgrass Road	Solar roof array- house	68/369	ACK Smart
13. Dipak Thapa	37 Beachgrass Road	Solar roof array- shed	68/369	ACK Smart
14. KMS126 NT	126R Main Street	Demo Garage	42.3.3/98.1	Linda Williams
15. KMS126 NT 08-6893	126R Main Street	New dwelling	42.3.3/98.1	Linda Williams
16. Catherine Sperry	4 Chapel Street	Roof replacement	73.4.2/19	Jim Lydon
17. Cary Ahl	5 Pochick Street Sias	Add door & projecting roof	73.3.1/23	DTA
18. Ocean Heath, LLC	9 Falmouth Avenue	Window revision	82/423	JN Design
19. Dan Conley	91 Hummock Pond Rd	New pool	56/118	Craig Taylor

20.	79 Polpis Rd RE, LLC	79 Polpis Road	New Dwelling	44/23.3	Dustin Maury
21.	79 Polpis Rd RE, LLC	79 Polpis Road	New garage	44/23.3	Dustin Maury
22.	79 Polpis Rd RE, LLC	79 Polpis Road	New pool	44/23.3	Dustin Maury
23.	79 Polpis Rd RE, LLC	79 Polpis Road	New cabana	44/23.3	Dustin Maury
24.	Rosalie & Grennan Maloney	15 Old North Wharf	Renewal of COA w/ revs	42.3.1/26	McMullen & Assoc.
25.	Michael Altman Trst Et al.	37 Sankaty Head Road	Main house revision	48/2	BPC
26.	Michael Altman Trst Et al.	37 Sankaty Head Road	Guest house revision	48/2	BPC
27.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	6 Fawn Lane	New dwelling	68/974	Meerbergen Design
28.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	6 Fawn Lane	Pool & Hardscape	68/974	Meerbergen Design
29.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	7 Fawn Lane	New dwelling	68/979	Meerbergen Design
30.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	7 Fawn Lane	Pool & Hardscape	68/979	Meerbergen Design
31.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	9 Fawn Lane	New dwelling	68/978	Meerbergen Design
32.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	9 Fawn Lane	Pool & Hardscape	68/978	Meerbergen Design
33.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	13 Fawn Lane	New dwelling	68/976	Meerbergen Design
34.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	13 Fawn Lane	Pool & Hardscape	68/976	Meerbergen Design
35.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	15 Fawn Lane	New dwelling	68/975	Meerbergen Design
36.	Tic T'Ack Toe, LLC	15 Fawn Lane	Pool & Hardscape	68/975	Meerbergen Design
37.	L.Iannetta & D.Fisher	7 Paul Jones	Addition	30/68.12	Emeritus LTD
38.	Little Nauti, LLC	1 Smooth Hummock Wy	New dwelling	66/177	JB Studio
39.	Little Nauti, LLC	1 Smooth Hummock Wy	New pool	66/177	JB Studio
40.	Alan & Mary Raul	109 Main Street	Fenestration chngs	42.3.3/150	JB Studio
41.	Rufio ACK Holdings	93 Main Street	New shed	42.3.3/17	JB Studio
42.	Berry Pleasant, LLC	15 Pleasant Street	MH Alterations	42.3.3/123	Patrick Ahern
43.	Berry Pleasant, LLC	15 Pleasant Street	New carriage house	42.3.3/123	Patrick Ahern
44.	Berry Pleasant, LLC	15 Pleasant Street	Hardscape	42.3.3/123	Patrick Ahern
46.	Jay Harmon	Lot 2 Maple Lane	Porch addition	67/303	LINK
47.	Jay Harmon	Lot 2 Maple Lane	Porch addition	67/303	LINK
48.	Nantucket Lifesaving Museum	158 Polpis Road	Replace windows	27/28	LINK

XII. OLD BUSINESS 10/04/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Fair City, LLC 08-6886	115 Old South Road	New building	68/112	Emeritus
2. Fair City, LLC 08-6887	115 Old South Road	New building	68/112	Emeritus
3. 39 Monomoy Road, LLC 08-6851	39 Monomoy Road	Addition, reno, & move	54/79	Emeritus
4. Lindsley Matthews 03-5955	37 West Chester Street	Dormer & roof height rev	41/150	NAG
5. Scott Dehm 08-6841	8 Ash Street	Hardscape & pergola	42.4.2/94	Jardins International
6. Matthew Stone 07-6659	47 Milk Street	Main house rev.	56/201	Linda Williams
7. Matthew Stone 07-6660	47 Milk Street	Garage Revisions	56/201	Linda Williams
8. Auburn Cottage, LLC 08-6857	46 Easton Street	Addition, raise, & reno	42.1.4/22	Botticelli & Pohl
9. Shenandoah Trust 08-6925	40 Easton Street	Fenestration rev	42.1.4/20	Botticelli & Pohl
10. Sheep Pond Property 08-6852	14-16 Sheep Pond Road	New dwelling	63/29&30	Emeritus
11. Amanda&Kevin Jacobs 04-6226	4 Ray's Court	Addition & historical info	42.3.2/3	Design Assoc.

XIII. NEW BUSINESS 10/11/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Emily Askin	103 Orange Street	Roof replacement	55/426.1	T & T Roofing
2. Peter Taylor	98 Main Street	Roof replacement	42.3.3/11	T & T Roofing
3. Kathryn Cook MTRS	85 Low Beach Road	New Main House	75/31.3	Michael Bard
4. Kathryn Cook MTRS	85 Low Beach Road	New Garage	75/31.3	Michael Bard
5. Laurie Richards	4 Woodlily Road	Rooftop Solar	67/836	Cotuit Solar
6. Jena & Terri Dion	24 Marion Street	Rooftop Solar	71.3./75	Cotuit Solar
7. Mark Fowler	11 Keel Lane	Roof replacement	66/318	Richard Prunier
8. Auburn Cottage	46 Easton Street	Historic Determination	42.4.1/22	Botticelli + Pohl
9. Alberta Urban	14 Jefferson Lane	Roof replacement	55.4.1/158.1	Stregra Corp.
10. Whale's End, LLC	43 Squam Road	New Dwelling	13/24+23	MCA+
11. Whale's End, LLC	43 Squam Road	New garage	13/24+23	MCA+
12. Whale's End, LLC	43 Squam Road	New Barn	13/24+23	MCA+
13. 51 Fair St, LLC	51 Fair Street	Exterior color change	42.3.2/40	Emeritus LTD
14. 18 Sherburne Tpk NT	18 Sherburne Turnpike	Rev. 06-6468: porch deck	30/196	S. Metz
15. James Koval	24 Pocomo Road	Roofwalk	14/73	Botticelli + Pohl
16. Jake Dwyer	11 Mississippi Avenue	Pool & hardscape	59.4/233	Waterscapes
17. Robert Jody Newman	6 Topping Lift	Solar array & dormer rev.	66/308	SCI
18. Erik Passanante	41 Long Pond Road	New Shed	59.4/109	Salt Spray Sheds
19. Sara Hazelwood-Yates	5 Beaver Street	Fenestration changes	55.1.4/98	Thornewill Design
20. Matthew Reinemo	55 Tennessee Avenue	Fenestration changes	59.4/363	Normand Residential
21. Elizabeth Bagley	123 Eel Point Road	New garage	33/15	SCI

22. Marcus Mignone	10 Angola Street	Rev. 01-5547	55.4.4/79	Val Oliver
23. Crampton	6 Lincoln Street	Rev. 12-5462	73.4.2/86	Val Oliver
24. Chris Holdgate	3 Rose Bud Lane	Demo Dwelling	68/782	Chris Holdgate
25. Scott O'Connor	2 Hussey Street	Enclosed 2nd floor	42.3.1/119	Emeritus LTD
26. 41 Monomoy, LLC	41 Monomoy Road	Add roofwalk & fenest chng	54/79.1	Emeritus LTD
27. The One 2744, LLC	47 Main Street	Add gable dormers	42.3.1/206	Emeritus LTD
28. Jill Werner	25 Sankaty Head	Pool & hardscape	48/3	David Troast
29. David Hagenstein	27 Cornwall Street	New 2nd dwelling	76.4.3/13	David Hagenstein
30. Gregory Cantone	11 Sconset Avenue	New shed addition	49.3.2/8	Gregory Cantone
31. Campana Ltd Prtshp	4 Cabot Lane	Addition	30/254	WAPD

XIV. OLD BUSINESS 10/18/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 13 Commercial Wharf, LLC	13 Commercial Wharf	Rev. shorten structure	42.2.4/10	NAG
2. Snowshoe Investment	1 Windsor Road	Rev. to previous COA	49/195	Val Oliver
3. Kim Glowacki	5 Meader Street	Changes & grade info	42.2.3/37.1	Val Oliver
4. Richmond Great Pt	6 Gooseberry Place	Rev. 08-6948: new dwelling	68/341	KOH
5. Richmond Great Pt	21 Beach Grass Road	Rev. new dwelling rev	68/387	KOH
6. Jean Moran	4 Washington Avenue	New pool	60.2.4/65	Linda Williams
7. Jean Moran	4 Washington Avenue	New Ggrage	60.2.4/65	Linda Williams

XV. OTHER BUSINESS

Approved Minutes	October 4, 2022
Motion	No action at this time.
Roll-call vote	N/A
Review Minutes	October 11 & 13, 2022
Other Business	• Next HDC Meeting: Tuesday, October 25th @ 4:00 pm Hybrid – Zoom & 4 Fairgrounds Road, Community Room • 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 demolitions • Discussion of options for house moves • Open enrollment seeking individuals interested in the Resiliently Integrating Sustainable Energy (RISE) Work Group Solar Installations Module • Discussion on 43 Kendrick – hardscape and dwellings

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Adjourned at 8:36 pm. (Welch)**

Roll-call vote Carried unanimously

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Nantucket Old Historic District

Sconset Old Historic District

Madaket Village District

Sign Advisory Group