



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 November 8, 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, Thornewill, Patten

Remote participant: Coombs

Absent Members: None

Late Arrivals: Dutra, 4:11 pm

Early Departures: Welch, 7:13 pm

Adoption of Agenda:

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

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

I. DISCUSSION & VOTE

1. Matters pertaining to reinstating Advisory Boards

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver

Alternates Dutra, Thornewill, Patten

Documentation Letter to Select Board

Concerns **Pohl** – The letter went to the Select Board and is up for discussion November 16.

Camp – She watched the meeting on YouTube and felt it was handled very well.

2. HDC-OFC Best Practice recommendations

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver

Alternates Thornewill, Patten

Documentation None

Concerns **Welch** – The Organizational Focus Committee has been discussing Best Practices for a while. They are as follows: grade changes of greater than 2' require a cross section of the affected area; incomplete applications are not accepted by staff; and all applications get posted for preview.

Camp – We would want a cross section of existing conditions and the proposed change.

Welch – Existing conditions should be from more than 12 months ago to preclude use of recent grade changes. Regarding applications being held, we need to know well in advance if a project isn't going to be heard; if the representative calls in just before the meeting, it goes to the end of the agenda. Pointed out that the agendas are being shortened by not showing the most recent weeks of submittals.

Pohl – People are going to have to get used to the fact that a 3-page agenda isn't the total of what projects are waiting to be heard. If a project is moved to the end of the agenda, it's to the end of the long agenda.

Coombs – We have to be a little flexible, especially for people new before the board. If someone knows the day before a project is being held, that should be handled one way.

Martinez – The dates shown on agendas are the dates those projects were supposed to be heard.

Pohl – If someone earnestly wants to hold to the next meeting, they go to the end of that week's list the 1st time.

Welch – It will be difficult to monitor legitimate reasons to delay and those that don't. The idea is to establish performance criteria. First delay is to the end of the date it's under; the 2nd time, it goes to the end of the long agenda. When there is a 3rd delay, that is an abuse of the system. Any legitimate reason can be brought to the commission.

Dutra – Asked about when someone's name is called, and they aren't there.

Welch – We will have a meeting where we discuss these items and vote on them; at that time, the Chair can take public comments. We are talking about when someone doesn't show for a meeting or holds an application 3 times. We are 6 weeks behind and some of that has to do with hearing an application up to 10 times; this leads to the concept of 3 strikes you're out, in which if the applicant can't make sufficient material changes acceptable to the Board within 3 meetings, their project faces a denial.

Pohl – Notice a vote on these Best Practices for the next meeting.

Motion No action at this time.

Roll-call vote N/A

II. COMMISSION COMMENTS

1. **Coombs** – The HDC is the busiest commission on Nantucket, but the role of Administrator has been vacant since 2016; proposes we request the Select Board, Town Manager, and PLUS Director to support taking action to hire a qualified HDC Administrator to manage the HDC and current staff. She created a citizen's article, and sent it to John Giorgio, asking the Town to budget for an Administrator.
Pohl – We can't comment or discuss this; suggested Ms. Coombs submit a letter outlining her proposal to be distributed to members. Any information from Town Counsel would be helpful.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. **Williams** – She has heard people, i.e., Board members denigrate the staff - they can't do the work, they don't have enough expertise, they don't have the training to deal with historic structures. Ms. Backus has more expertise than almost anyone in the room when it comes to historic preservation.

IV. VIOLATIONS & ENFORCEMENTS**Street Address**

34 Kendrick Avenue

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Dutra, Thornewill, Patten

Documentation Video; planning plan.

Representative Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law P.C

Concerns **Saad** – He sent a video of 43 Kendrick. The owner submitted a planting plan, but he feels the plantings need to be expanded upon. This application was a revision placed on consent a year after the original approval.**Pohl** – We need to get this on the agenda for discussion. Mr. Saad should let the people know their plantings are inadequate.**Oliver** – The planting plan addresses Kendrick but not the paper road (Lancaster Avenue).**Camp** – Feels that any plantings needed to accomplish the screening would be too tall and therefore inappropriate.**Welch** – Reviewed what is needed to clean up the planting plan. It was mis-represented as “not being visible”; a misrepresentation does not constitute an approval.**Cohen** – He represents the owner. He objects to the suggestion his client made a misrepresentation and that an approval was attained through falsification.**Welch** – The video indicates that the structure is clearly visible; therefore, it was a misrepresentation, whether or not it was intentional; that needs to be addressed.**Pohl** – Mr. Saad should have the owner submit for our review a more detailed planting plan: size, type, etc.

21 Pleasant Street

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Dutra, Thornewill, Patten

Documentation HDC approval dated July 14, 2022

Representative Victoria Ewing, LINK

Concerns **Saad** – There was an initial violation sent out September 28 in which the applicant was asked to submit something for October 17. Foundation work has been done without approval.**Ewing** – We are looking to resolve all issues with the HDC. We understood that all permits were in place. The HDC approved all the work; upon getting the approval and applying for preliminary work, we applied to replace the foundation. We felt the work we were asking for included the foundation as part of the HDC approval of July 14, 2022 – replacing the foundation in kind.**Welch** – A Cease and Desist Letter was sent out requesting they bring the information in for complete review; there is no record of a request to replace the application. At no time under the current approval was a house lift and foundation replacement deliberated on; there was discussion of grade as it relates to the existing foundation. A building permit requires HDC approval. They should put in an application as requested on September 28th. At the very least, a like-kind application is required. This is an individually significant historic structure; he doesn't see how changing windows and doors would rely on the state foundation. That decision is wholly HDC's to make. A complete application needs to be submitted for review and approval.

V. 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
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, advisory comments, and Sign Guidelines.			
Representing	Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law P.C			
	Lee Milazo			
Public	Hillary Rayport, 89 Main Street			
Concerns	Saad – SAC wants the projecting sign held for revisions to lettering and graphics. Read the Sign Guidelines regarding non-historical font. The menu box was recommended for approval with reduction in size. Oliver – This is an as-built situation; if they had applied, they would have been told what is considered historic font. Welch – His question is the basis for use as a historic font. That term seems to be muddy. Cohen – His understanding is that SAC thinks the colors are too loud, the font too modern, and the logo takes up too much of the sign. There are dozens of signs that don’t follow the guidelines; we presented a list of those approved signs. His client feels the guidelines are “made of whole cloth, and that quite muted signs are not historically accurate. The sign is painted wood. Oliver – She looked at all the information regarding this. Having an awning or a sign isn’t the issue for her; the provided examples perfectly illustrate what’s correct. None of them have over-saturated, vibrant colors and most have a white background; on this sign that should be toned down. It’s too dynamic and animated for downtown. Regarding the awning, the colors of other awnings in Town are muted. Camp – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; however, the design is fine and she’s okay with the font. The problem is the oversaturated colors; if those were muted, we wouldn’t be having this discussion. It needs a frame (border). Coombs – Agrees it’s the color; suggested a softer barn red; colors of a sign don’t necessarily draw people in. A black or white boarder would make a finish to the sign. Welch – He agrees about the colors. However, he disagrees about the visual weight of the colors; when he walked down there, the colors of the Rose and Crown umbrellas were much more blinding. Suggested rounding the top matching the rays of the sun to cut down on the background color field. Feels the awning should be a more toned down, darker shade; a trim piece along the seam tying it to the sign would be appropriate. Pohl – The size of the recessed awning takes away his concern. Suggested for the sign a muted red background with a border. Rayport – Feels the Sign Guidelines are very easy to follow and clear about how to make an appropriate sign. Feels focusing on just the color gives people the idea they can have trendy, modern signs regarding font and the logo. The understated signs are beautiful and contribute to the unique quality of Nantucket. Asked that they uphold the SAC recommendations. Cohen – Noted that a 2 nd door will be applied for where the menu box is currently located; the wall sign would then be removed.			
Motion	Motion to Hold the projecting sign for revisions. (Welch)			
Roll-call vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
Motion	Motion to Approve the menu/wall sign through staff per SAC recommendation. (Welch)			
Roll-call vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2022-09-7150
3. Union Lodge F&A.M. 10-7287	30 Mains Street (Unit C)	Projecting sign	42.3.1/215	Laurie Herman
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	None			
Concerns	Williams – We don’t agree with the SAC recommendation to change the bracket to raise the sign. She will be submitting a formal application with a Master Sign plan.			
Motion	No action at this time.			
Roll-call vote	N/A		Certificate #	

4. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7205	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp
5. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7204	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp
6. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7203	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp
7. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7202	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp
8. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7201	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp
9. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7200	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp
10. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7199	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp
11. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7198	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp
12. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7197	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp
13. Signal Invstmnt Prtn 10-7196	2 Chestnut Street	Wall Sign	42.3.1/69	Plymouth Sign Comp

Voting Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornehill

Alternates Dutra, Patten

Recused Pohl

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

Representing None

Public None

Concerns **Saad** – Recommend approval with submission of the master plan.

Coombs – This would be 10 signs hanging outside the building; she wants to know what it will look like.

Welch – We have a sign committee; he trusts their recommendations.

Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with submission of a Master Sign Plan. (Camp)**

Roll-call vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, Thornehill, Welch-aye Certificate # **HDC2022-(as noted)**

14. Nantucket Land Bank **11-7386** 29 North Cambridge St Trail sign 38/22 Jesse Bell

15. Nantucket Land Bank **11-7385** Houick Hollow Road Trail sign 23/9 Jesse Bell

Voting Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornehill

Alternates Dutra, Patten

Recused Pohl

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

Representing None

Public None

Concerns SAC recommend approval

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

Roll-call vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, Thornehill, Welch-aye Certificate # **HDC2022-(as noted)**

VI. CONSENTS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Tom Garrette 11-7417	1 Spindrift	Addition rev 07-6717	66/313	Studio Perk
2. Family Ties Ack LLC 11-7418	11 Alliance Way	Color change rev 11-5159		Studio PPark
3. Alex Boyce 11-7373	7 Van fleet Circle	New shed	91/1416	Alex Boyce
4. Nantucket Public School 10-7344	10 Surfside Road	Patio & Pergola	55/137	Diane O'Neil
5. Conscious Living, LLC 11-7355	49 Fairgrounds Road	Color chng -cottage	67/306	Gryphon Architects
6. Conscious Living, LLC 11-7356	49 Fairgrounds Road	Color chng -yoga studio	67/306	Gryphon Architects
7. Conscious Living, LLC 11-7357	49 Fairgrounds Road	Color chng -main house	67/306	Gryphon Architects
8. Nantucket Land Bank 11-7358	30 Mizzenmast Ext.	Addition	66/433	Gryphon Architects
9. The Richmond Co. 11-7419	9 Nancy Ann Lane	Roof slope change	68/135	Tyler Wild
10. Partners Health Care 11-7420	60 Meadow View Dive	3 rd dwelling reduce size rev.	56/167	Dennis Patnaude

Voting Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten

Alternates Dutra, Thornehill

Recused Pohl

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns No concerns.

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

Roll-call vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Patten, and Welch-aye Certificate # **HDC2022-(as noted)**

VII. 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. Karen Bopp 10-7325	61 Lover Lane	Pool & hardscape	80/215.1	Karen Bopp
• 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. Jill Werner 10-7254	25 Sankaty Head	Pool & hardscape	48/3	David Troast
• 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, Thornewill, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No additional concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Welch)			
Roll-call vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2022-(as noted)

VIII. NEW BUSINESS 09/13/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Town of Nantucket 09-7049	16 Broad Street	Alterations	42.4.2/30	Rick Sears
2. Town of Nantucket 09-7057	20 South Water Street	Alterations Bldg 1	42.4.2/29	Rick Sears
3. Town of Nantucket 09-7058	20 South Water Street	Alterations Bldg 2	42.4.2/29	Rick Sears

IX. 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. Gail Johnson 08-6865	21 South Water Street	As-built awning	42.4.2/102	Lee Milazzo
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Lee Milazzo			
	Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law P.C			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:38)	See 21 South Water Street sign applications discussion.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions having to do with its color. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
2. Mike Romano 05-6245	55 Easton Street	Addition & move on site	42.4.1/68	Shelter 7
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Jason Olbres, Shelter 7			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:39)	Olbres – Reviewed the original and subsequent commissioner comments and changes made in response. Provided 2 options for the railings: shingled and cross-bucks; we prefer the shingled railing. Backus – Circa 1912 Radford bungalow kit house and contributing to old historic district (OHD); will need to comply with Resilient Nantucket; we received the Elevation Certificate from Don Bracken, Bracken Engineering. Still pending a historic determination. The existing brick piers are character-defining features of the Radford kit plan; shingled piers are not character-defining and leave questions regarding resilient construction. The proposed deck isn't a character-defining feature nor is the chimney; the appropriate location for the chimney is inside. Solid shingle rail is reminiscent at boat 1st and 2nd floor. Resilient Nantucket recommends foundations to be compatible with the historic structure. Moving the structure is still not an option. Her staff recommendation would be the cross-buck railing, which was on the original structure. Read advisory group comments: Solid railing is ok, but the details should match the original "Radford bungalow" design with a lower rail. To be true to the original style, the porch posts should sit on stone or brick columns. The side deck is still too large for an exposed deck facing Easton Street; there is no other precedent for a visible deck of that size facing the street. Moving the house changes the historic streetscape and crowds the house to the left. It should remain in its original location. Camp – She likes Option B with the crossbuck rails; it eliminates the far-right door. The chimney should be interior. Thornewill – She thinks the shingled wall railing on the main mass is good; we saw historic photos of a shingled wall; it also grounds the building. Agrees the posts should be brick or stone. Likes the hipped roof piece over the back deck with the open rail; it's different from the main mass, which is a typical treatment. The deck is large but set back; could plant hedges and plants in front of the deck to mitigate the visibility.			

Welch – Agrees in part with Ms. Thornewill. The overall size of the deck is too large and should be reduced 10' or 12'. If the structure remains *in situ*, the deck would be toned down. Agrees about a small hipped roof; the deck should come in with a window instead of a door. Alternatively, the deck could be lowered as there is no FEMA requirement for the deck to be that tall. The shingled rail is appropriate. Brick posts running from the fascia to grade would be okay. West elevation, the 2ndary mass ridge height is too tall; the 12/12 roof pitch could be changed to lower it.

Pohl – All his concerns were satisfied. He prefers shingled walls and okay with the plinths being shingled. Because of its scale and proportions, he thinks the exterior chimney is fine.

Discussion of the motion to approve option A.

Welch – Suggested an amendment that the max height of the finished floor doesn't exceed the flood elevation.

Motion **Motion to Approve Option A with the plinths to be shingled and the maximum of the floor structure doesn't exceed the minimum code required design flood elevation. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Thornewill, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2022-05-6245**

3. 4 The Kids Realty Tr **07-6708** 79 Pocomo Road Rev. 10-4971: add roof walk 15/5 CWA

Voting Camp (acting chair), Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates

Public None

Concerns (6:03) **Webster** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. We can reduce the roof walk by reducing the bay size.

Welch – The chimneys aren't drawn accurately; should be 2' above anything within 10'. Suggest considering that regarding the roof walk. The roof walk with a skirt is inappropriate and is too wide.

Thornewill – Agrees with Mr. Welch, the roof walk skirt is now taller than the its railing; the skirt needs to be smaller. Eliminate one of the chimneys.

Oliver – Regarding the chimneys, the height was fine given the size of the previous roof walk; now they have to be 2' taller. The chimney would look nicer with corbelling at the top. There are some window changes.

Coombs – Agrees with what's been said and with eliminating one of the chimneys. The chimney(s) should have corbelling.

Motion **Motion to Hold fore revisions with the windows bubbled, the (6;15) (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, Coombs, and Camp-aye Certificate #

4. Brandon Lower **08-6790** 146 Main Street New garage, patio & pergola 41/518 Matthew Rider

5. Brandon Lower **08-6781** 146 Main Street MH clapbrd, perg, trim clr 41/518 Matthew Rider

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Thornewill

Alternates None

Recused Oliver

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

Representing Matthew Rider

Public None

Concerns (6:15) Discussion about who is sitting on this application; the board is now 3 people.

Backus – Ms. Camp and Mr. Dutra were not here last week and though Ms. Camp read back in, but the documentation couldn't be stamped by the Town Clerks.

Not opened at this time.

Motion **Motion to Hold for the beginning of next Tuesday. (Thornewill)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Coombs, Thornewill, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

6.	450 Green Park 11-5272	2 Stone Alley	Addition	42.3.1/103	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, advisory comments, and <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind (BWNIM)</i> .				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law P.C				
Public	Linda Williams, for Virginia Andrews Virginia Andrews, 1 & 3 Stone Alley Sarah Alger, Sarah F. Alger P.C Nina King, 14R Orange Street Karen Mehra, 10 Orange Street				
Concerns (6:26)	MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Backus – Circa 1858-1871 Individually significant by Eliza Codd. Additions should be smaller than the original and smaller and subordinate in size and design. This addition has increased in footprint; that is not appropriate. Ms. Codd's sunroom is a character defining feature. Received a window survey. Read letter from Mary Bergman, Nantucket Preservation Trust (NPT) Executive Director, into the record. We do have some letters of support. Read advisory group: The middle roof line is an improvement, but the additions are still too long; both the middle and rear additions need to be reduced several feet each, or better yet, remove the entire rear wing. The proposed dormer facing Stone Alley has a 3/12 roof; dropping this to a 4/12 would reduce the verticality of that dormer face and bring the windowsill closer to the main roof. The disproportionate size of the addition relative to the existing house is still the overriding concern; the addition needs to be significantly reduced in size. Williams – Agrees with Ms. Backus and Ms. Bergman. The advisory group has asked this be denied. Despite revision, there are still major objections to the size of the addition. The 16X21 flat roof element is visible from 2 public ways and not appropriate; it will loom over Union Street. The interior is driving the exterior. They have been repeatedly asked to have the addition go south. The addition doesn't look like additive massing. At one point, it was asked that the structure follows the grade; the floor levels are still all at one height. This is significant because of its place and time in history. Secretary of Interior standards are not being met. Quantity Bank goes down to the harbor; it will be destroyed with the addition to this house, which doesn't front on Orange Street. Andrews – She spent time looking at the plans; she has concerns with the demolition, particularly of the foundation. Questions the number of stairs from the basement to reach Stone Alley because the Alley isn't at the grade of the berm. The distance the section was pulled off the Alley should be measured from the property line. This is better than the previous submission; however, there were some ideas floated that called for a change in concept which hasn't happened. It looks good on paper but ignores the context. This is also visible from Gardner Court and Washington Street. Alger – This structure is individually significant. None of the changes have been fully responsive to requests, such as not coming down the hill. We're still up against Stone Alley which changes the streetscape of this history way. Ms. Cobb's sunroom and design is being obliterated by the proposed mass. King – The footprint of this structure goes from 556 square feet (sf) to 1500 sf, which is more than 3X its size; it cascades down the hill. View poles would really help. Cohen – This applicant has been through dozens of meetings and made substantial changes in line with the Board comments. Feels the notes and comments are going back to the beginning. He feels the additions is responsible and sensitive. Mehra – Surprised that a historic house could increase 3X in size within the OHD. This is a big mass of a building. Welch – There have been substantial changes over time; though, he would prefer it went to the south. Asked that on the window schedule the windows to be demolished be labeled with an alpha-numeric code. East elevation, the deck as it presents is more appropriate below the fascia water table of the section to its right. South elevation, this is over fenestrated but not visible; looking at the profile of the existing grade from the segment of the 1 story going down the hill, it would be appropriate to keep and work with the existing grade and use wells at the windows; the dormer should be 4/12 pitch and moved back 6" from Stone Alley. East elevation, with existing grade, would have step downs to the doors and also decrease the brick face. It would be most appropriate to reduce the north and south elevations of the sunroom down to a 3 bay and decrease the east-west by 1 bay or shift it to the side away from Stone Alley. Camp – Appreciates the middle mass dropping an additional 8". For the sunporch, feels they succeeded with the historic scale of the windows. Asked if the flat roof could have a slight hipped-roof pitch. In the original sunporch, the sashes were dark; that should be done here. Height poles would help to understand how big it will look. Oliver – Agrees with the Board members. The sunroom doesn't look significantly different from the photo from the Alley. Agrees with Mr. Welch about keeping the existing grade and taking off the extra 3' feet from the sunroom. Pohl – Regarding the grading, the building will look shorter with the existing grade; also, it would make the perceived size of the east elevation shorter and ground the south elevation. Likes the idea of removing 1 bay off the sunroom thus shifting it away from Stone Alley. Though we don't normally approve flat roofs, that doesn't mean it's not a historic detail; cited an example of a flat-roof sunroom.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and a full window survey and to be heard at the next meeting at which the applicant can present. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Camp, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

X. 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. Verizon NE Inc. 10-7295	3 Union Street	Door Replacement	43.3.1/187	Anthony Oakman
Voting	Camp (acting chair), Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten			
Alternates	Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Anthony Oakman			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:14)	Oakman – Presented project; currently it's a metal door and frame; the fiberglass is a protective coating. The shelf in front of the transom windows is causing the deterioration. Backus – This is the Old Telephone Company within OHD, circa 1924. A fiberglass door is not appropriate in the OHD; the current door looks metal. The door should be wood true-divided-light windows (TDL). Coombs – We all live with a wooden front door in the OHD; it should be a wood door. Fiberglass would be too prominent. Okay with moving the transom forward. Oliver – The current door and window frames are metal; she's not sure wood is an appropriate replacement. Asked if they could push the door back under the transom. The door in the historic photo is not the same as the existing door; it has TDL windows, and the new door should go back to that. Patten – Appreciates keeping the transom but agrees it should be a TDL door. Thornewill – The transom shelf is the problem, which needs to be eliminated. Agrees with Ms. Oliver. Suggested taking the shutters off so the arched profile of the windows will be prominent. Camp – Should go back to a wooden door with TDL.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with a wooden 12-light door with TDL windows and moving the transom forward. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Patten, Thornewill, Camp, and Coombs-aye		Certificate #	HDC2022-10-7295
2. KMS126 NT 09-7073	126R Main Street	Demo Garage	42.3.3/98.1	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra			
Alternates	Thornewill, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	Chip Stahl, owner-builder Hillary Rayport, 86 Main Street Andrea Bradford, 128 Main Street Sarah Alger, Sarah F. Alger P.C for 124 Main Street Mary Bergman, Executive Director Nantucket Preservation Trust (NPT) Robert Gillispie, 9 Vestal Street			
Concerns (7:29)	Williams – Presented project; circa 1915-1923 and was built for a car and listed as contributing in HDC 1980s survey. Stahl – It's dilapidated and rotted through. He bought it in 2021; there's no maintenance to be done on it. Backus – HDC survey on file circa 1915 garage and indicates significance from transportation perspective. It would be sad to lose a building of this era. It would be nice to see it restored. Read into the record comments from NPT. Also received abutter comments about the garage which are in the file. Pointed out that 41-81L is State law. Read advisory group comments: This building is dated to 1915 and should be preserved. It would be helpful to know how old the framing is. Rayport – Agrees with Ms. Backus and NPT; this should be allowed to remain. The structure is vernacular and shows what a garage of that era was. This is a 41-81L subdivision; that can only happen because the garage is considered substantial and existed before 1985. The HDC should be wary of permitting a demolition without knowing what's replacing it, especially if the lot is being cleared for transfer. This is part of a complex application with a lot of moving pieces. All these parts should be considered together. Bradford – We request the HDC deny the demolition of this saltbox-style structure, which is over 100 years old. It's part of the old-time streetscape. Since purchasing the property, the developer has done no maintenance on this garage and left the ivy, which makes it look worse than it is. Nantucket's small historic structures are in jeopardy; its scale and setting are important and visible from all sides. This has become an important part of the historical character and is considered contributing to its setting. Its removal would permanently damage this historic streetscape. Alger – Agree with Ms. Bradford; you shouldn't be seeing applications on a lot piecemeal; the Supreme Court found piecemeal presentations have a negative impact on development. They shouldn't be able to use their lack of maintenance as a reason for demolition. This was built about the time automobiles were first brought to Nantucket; it's an intrinsically historic structure visible from various streets. In the past, the HDC has recognized the need to maintain outbuildings in the OHD because they tell the story of Nantucket. HDC has authority to not allow demolition by neglect. Bergman – There is a listing for this on the market with the note pending removal of this garage. Gillispie – You need to look at all the work together, not piecemeal.			

Dutra – After listening to the staff and the abutters, he feels their concerns and understands them. He would disagree that this building isn't worth demolishing; if you sneeze on it, it will fall down. The property should be studied before we move forward on this application. He would want to hold for information of what else is happening.

Coombs – Suggested getting an independent engineer to do a structural review. We shouldn't be destroying a 100-year-old building to allow a new structure in the back. It's part of the streetscape, which HDC fights hard to maintain. She would not approve removal of this structure.

Camp – Agrees the site should be taken as a whole. This is part of the streetscape and might be renovated; we are losing these old secondary and tertiary buildings.

Oliver – It's unfortunate that the paradigm of subdivided properties gets argued at our level; the regulation should be changed because it creates an anomaly. If the building is beyond repair, it should be rebuilt as is.

Pohl – "Substantial" only has to do with its size, not its historic status. What he sees in the photos predates 2021 by 10 or more years; the south elevation and eaves are almost completely gone and there is an almost non-existent windowsill. The building was in a state of disrepair 1 year ago when it was purchased; to do maintenance on this would be futile. Interior photos would give us an idea of the level of rot. He doesn't think it's possible to fix or renovate this structure. He agrees 41-81L has been the bane of the HDC and probably other entities. He thinks it's fair to ask what's happening on this lot but doesn't think we can require we be shown what's happening on the other lot. He wants more information about the building and see what the inside looks like.

Motion	Motion to Hold for more information. (Dutra)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Dutra, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
3. KMS126 NT 08-6893	126R Main Street	New dwelling	42.3.3/98.1	Linda Williams	

4. Berry Pleasant, LLC 09-7154	15 Pleasant Street	New carriage house/gym	42.3.3/123	Patrick Ahern	
--------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------	------------	---------------	--

Voting Alternates Recused
Camp (acting chair), Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten
Dutra, Pohl

Documentation Representing Public
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.
Mike Tartamella, Patrick Ahern Architect

Concerns (8:04)
Public

Tartamella – Presented project.

Backus – This is a contemporary structure. She provided comments, which appear to have been implemented. The roof seems a little steep; asked the pitch.

Read advisory group comments: The new doors will be partially visible from Pleasant Street. The 4 ganged French doors are not appropriate in the OHD. The original glazing and panel proportions of the French doors was more appropriate than the proposed.

Oliver – Appreciates the simplification. Removing the dormers would make it even simpler; they aren't serving a purpose. Thinks the windows should be plank-framed to match the house.

Patten – West elevation, the bay element looks odd. Asked the roof pitch (8/12).

Thornewill – Nothing to add. The rear of the building won't be visible.

Coombs – West elevation is a concern with the bay window, which is very complicated; confirmed that it is interior to the property and won't be visible.

Camp – She has no concerns.

Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Thornewill)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Thornewill, Oliver, Patten, Coombs, and Camp-aye			Certificate #	HDC2022-09-7154
5. Berry Pleasant, LLC 09-7155	15 Pleasant Street	Hardscape	42.3.3/123	Patrick Ahern	

Voting Alternates Recused
Camp (acting chair), Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten
Dutra, Pohl

Documentation Representing Public
Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.
Mike Tartamella, Patrick Ahern Architect

Concerns (8:19)
Public

None

Tartamella – Presented project. We're not proposing any new fencing.

Backus – This is a circa 1801 Obed Macy house; significant within the OHD. Appreciates removing the 5X1 atypical white fence. There seems to be a lot of impervious surfaces, but the way it's proposed, it creates an encapsulated outdoor space.

Oliver – The images have more lattice at the top; that's not shown on the drawings. Doesn't think the hardscaping will be visible.

No concerns.

Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Patten, Thornewill, Oliver, Coombs, and Camp-aye			Certificate #	HDC2022-09-7155

6. Nantucket Lifesaving Museum	158 Polpis Road	Replace windows	27/28	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates	Dutra, Patten			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Victoria Ewing, LINK			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:26)	Ewing – Presented project. Asking for Andersen simulated-divided-light windows (SDL). Read into the record a letter from Chuck Allard, Museum Director and letter from Carlisle Jensen, Executive Director. The TDLs have deteriorated in an expedited fashion. Backus – This is on the National Historic Landmarks data states this is a circa 1950 replica of the Surfside Lifesaving Station and is contributing. She would support wood SDLs on this replica outside the OHD. Pohl – A lot of these windows are atypical shapes; doesn't think Andersen will be able to do that custom work. Agrees it should be wood windows with SDLs. Consensus agrees.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with wood SDL windows. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Thornewill, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2022-11-7450

Rest held for next Tuesday.

XI. OLD BUSINESS 10/04/2022

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
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. Matthew Stone 07-6662	47 Milk Street	Pool house/studio	56/201	Linda Williams
9. Matthew Stone 07-6661	47 Milk Street	Pool & hardscape	56/201	Linda Williams
10. Auburn Cottage, LLC 08-6857	46 Easton Street	Addition, raise, & reno	42.1.4/22	Botticelli & Pohl
11. Shenandoah Trust 08-6925	40 Easton Street	Fenestration rev	42.1.4/20	Botticelli & Pohl
12. Amanda&Kevin Jacobs 04-6226	4 Ray's Court	Addition & historical info	42.3.2/3	Design Assoc.

XII. NEW BUSINESS 10/11/2022

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Obed Joy LLC 11-7412	4 North Water Street	Roof replacement	42.4.2/90	Wong Kyo
2. Jacqueline Welch 10-7323	38 Union Street	Change trim color	42.3.2/88	Gerge Wing
3. Emily Askin 10-7252	103 Orange Street	Roof replacement	55/426.1	T & T Roofing
4. Peter Taylor 10-7253	98 Main Street	Roof replacement	42.3.3/11	T & T Roofing
5. Kathryn Cook MTRS 10-7257	85 Low Beach Road	New Main House	75/31.3	Michael Bard
6. Kathryn Cook MTRS 10-7217	85 Low Beach Road	New Garage	75/31.3	Michael Bard
7. Laurie Richards 10-7215	4 Woodlily Road	Rooftop Solar	67/836	Cotuit Solar
8. Jena & Terri Dion 10-7216	24 Marion Street	Rooftop Solar	71.3./75	Cotuit Solar
9. James Koval 10-7256	24 Pocomo Road	Add roofwalk	14/73	Botticelli & Pohl
10. Auburn Cottage 10-7250	46 Easton Street	Historic Determination	42.4.1/22	Botticelli + Pohl
11. Alberta Urban 10-7213	14 Jefferson Lane	Roof replacement	55.4.1/158.1	Stegra Corp.
12. Whale's End LLC 10-7207	43 Squam Road	New Dwelling	13/24+23	MCA+
13. Whale's End LLC 10-7209	43 Squam Road	New garage	13/24+23	MCA+
14. Whale's End LLC 10-7208	43 Squam Road	New Barn	13/24+23	MCA+
15. Elizabeth Bagley 10-7191	123 Eel Point Rd	New garage	33/15	SCI
16. Robert & Jody Newman 10-7218	6 Topping Lift	Solar array & dormer rev.	66/308	SCI
17. Sara Hazelwood-Yates 10-7221	5 Beaver Street	Fenestration changes	55.1.4/98	Thornewill Design
18. Marcus Mignone 10-7238	10 Angola St.	Open porch Rev 01-5547	55.4.4/79	Val Oliver
19. Chris Holdgate 10-7248	3 Rose Bud Lane	Demo dwelling	68/782	Chris Holdgate
20. 41 Monomoy LLC 10-7246	41 Monomoy Rd	Add roofwalk & fenest chng	54/79.1	Emeritus LTD
21. The One 2744 LLC 10-7234	47 Main Street	Add gable dormers	42.3.1/206	Emeritus LTD
22. Tigerlily Nom. Tr 10-7289	7 Barnabus Lane	New Dwelling	41/563	Studio PPark
23. David Hall 10-7232	27 Cornwall Street	New 2nd dwelling	76.4.3/13	David Hagenstein
24. Gregory Cantone 10-7255	11 Sconset Avenue	New shed addition	49.3.2/8	Gregory Cantone
25. Campana Limited Prtn 10-7319	4 Cabot Lane	Addition	30/254	WAPD

XIII. OLD BUSINESS 10/18/2022

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. 13 Commercial Wharf, LLC 09-6996	13 Commercial Wharf	Rev. shorten structure	42.2.4/10	NAG
2. Snowshoe Investment 06-6569	1 Windsor Road	Rev. to previous COA	49/195	Val Oliver

3. Kim Glowacki 09-7011	5 Meader Street	Changes & grade info	42.2.3/37.1	Val Oliver
4. Richmond Great Pt 08-6948	6 Gooseberry Place	Rev. 08-6948: new dwelling	68/341	KOH
5. Richmond Great Pt 09-6783	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 garage	60.2.4/65	Linda Williams

XIV. NEW BUSINESS 10/25/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 14 Bishops Rise, LLC	14 Bishop Rise	Pergola Carport	30/184	Emeritus LTD
2. 1010 Wins, LLC	10 Lincoln Avenue	New garage	30/184	Emeritus LTD
3. 1010 Wins, LLC	10 Lincoln Avenue	New cabana & o/d shwr	30/184	Emeritus LTD
4. 1010 Wins, LLC	10 Lincoln Avenue	Demolition	30/184	Emeritus LTD
5. 1010 Wins, LLC	10 Lincoln Avenue	Hardscap; gate, poolw/ spa	30/184	Jardins Intl.
6. Seth Gottlieb	6 Ridge Lane	Move on garage	38/126	Seth Gottlieb
7. Laura Anne Webber	5 Killdeer	Replace doors, wndw, trim	68/654	Seth Gottlieb
8. Eleven Lincoln Ave Trust	32 Jefferson Avenue	Hardscape	30/132	Ahern
9. 27 Fair St, LLC	27 Fair Street	Hardscape	42.3.2/193.1	Ahern
10. 27 Fair St, LLC	29 Fair Street	Hardscape	42.3.2/192	Ahern
11. Paul & Cecilie Horvath	200 Polpis Road	Pool Replacement	26/37	Ahern
12. Mid Century Modern, LLC	21 Vestal Street	New shed	41/175	Normand Residential
13. Mid Century Modern, LLC	21 Vestal Street	Cottage- deck & o/d shwr	41/175	Normand Residential
14. Mid Century Modern, LLC	21 Vestal Street	Main house – new stoop	41/175	Normand Residential
15. Joanne Tobin	33B Washington Street	New shed	42.3.2/191	G. Harrington
16. 14 North Road, LLC	14 North Road	Rev. 10-2058: dele chimney	43/83	Workshop/APD
17. Tigerlily Nom. Tr	7 Barnabas	New Dwelling	41/563	Studio Ppark
18. Marsha Shiff	20 Starbuck Road	Addition	60/117	Permit Plus
19. 87 EPR RT	87 Eel Point Road	Rev. 03-3283	32/11	MCA+
20. Whales Tale, LLC	15 Shimmo Pond Road	Shed move off/demo	43/95	Normand Residential
21. Whales Tale, LLC	15 Shimmo Pond Road	New shed	43/95	Normand Residential
22. Nantucket Land Bank	76 Millbrook Road	Move/ demo dwelling	57/24	Normand Residential
23. Al & Mary Novissimo	14 Deer Run	Mod garage & deck	57/14.1	SCI
24. ACKUIRE, LLC	29 Skyline Drive	Shed size rev	79/91	Structure Unlimited
25. Dean Darling	1 Twin Street	Paint foundation, + window	42.3.2/43	Normand Residential
26. Milton Rowland	18 Mt. Vernon Street	Hardscaping	55.4.4/32	Normand Residential
27. Michael Molinar	1 Chestnut Street	Roof Replacement	42.3.1/7	T & T Roofing
28. Gardner MacDonald	8 Priscilla Lane	New Dwelling	41/353	Val Oliver
29. Brett Fodiman	111 Surfside Road	Garage Shingle Revision	80/70	Emeritus LTD
30. Brett Fodiman	111 Surfside Road	Guesthouse shingle rev	80/70	Emeritus LTD
31. Brett Fodiman	111 Surfside Road	Main hse shingle rev	80/70	Emeritus LTD
32. Genthner	128 Surfside Road	New dwelling	80/229.1	Val Oliver
33. 46 Union NT	46 Union Street	Revision 02-2843	42.2.3/28	MCA+
34. Vilma Merlos	3 Celtic Drive	Window replacement	67/660	Vilma Merlos
35. Tyler Hammond	8 Sparks Avenue	Window replacement	55/201	Tyler Hammond
36. Stephen Alfeleri Trust	28 Gardner Avenue	Addition	43/132	EMDA
37. 55 Road, LLC	56 South Shore Road	New Shed	80/114	EMDA
38. Ken Ansin	6 Todd Circle	Roof replacement	66/294	EMDA
39. Ack Living, LLC	3 Winn Street	Rev 08-4335	41/593	EMDA
40. Holly Coburn	5 High Brush	Apron	56/388	KMLD
41. Helen Dubois	5 Stone Post Way	Revision 03-6070	14/70	KMLD
42. Decantur XIX, LLC	12 Westerwyck Way	New Shed	82/64	Val Oliver
43. Michael Jemison	195C Hummock Pd Rd	Rev 04-6108	65/2302	Botticelli +Pohl
44. 10 York St, LLC	10 York Street	New dwelling	55.4.1/142	Thornewill Design
45. Chris & Ashley Austin	Maple Lane Lot 7	New shed	67/303	Emeritus LTD
46. Chris & Ashley Austin	Maple Lane Lot 7	New 2 nd Dwelling	67/303	Emeritus LTD
47. Kevin & Katherine Davidson	4 Step Lane	Like Kind replacement	42.4.2/82	Emeritus LTD
48. Jason Mendelson	7a Sherburne Turnpike	New studio	31/112.1	Studio Ppark
49. Sherburne Tpk, LLC	7a Sherburne Turnpike	Pool & hardscape	31/112.1	Atlantic Landscape
50. Eloise NT	1 Sandy Drive	New Dwelling	29/73	Thornewill Design
51. C. Marshall Beale	278 Polpis Road	Solar roof array	25/2	ACK Smart
52. Leo Mullen	19 Brewster Road	Solar roof array	54/175.1	ACK Smart
53. Patricia & James Patterson	61 Meadow View Drive	Solar roof array	56/169.4	ACK Smart
54. Jeffrey Soros Trst	47 Baxter Road	Fenestration chngs	49/14	JB Studio
55. Brian Herlihy	3 Rudder Lane	Addition	66/361	JB Studio
56. Genadi Prokopov	80 Surfside Road	Grade change	67/194	DTA

XV. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approved Minutes	None
Review Minutes	October 25, 2022 & November 01, 2022
Other Business	• Next HDC Meeting: Tuesday, November 15th @ 4:00 pm Hybrid – Zoom & 4 Fairgrounds Road, Community Room
Future action items	• 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

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to adjourn at 8:31 pm. (Camp)**
 Roll-call vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Dutra, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:
 Terry L. Norton

Nantucket Old Historic District

Sconset Old Historic District

Madaket Village District

Sign Advisory Group