



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

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

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

~ ~ MINUTES ~ ~
Tuesday, October 24, 2023

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:05p.m. and announcements by Chair Pohl

Staff in Attendance:	Holly Backus , Historic Planner; Esmeralda Martinez , Land Use Specialist, Adrian Rodriguez , Administrative Specialist & Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist
Attending Members:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill
Remote Participants:	Coombs
Absent Members:	Paul
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	Oliver left at 7:05p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to approve agenda. (Coombs)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

I. CONSENT

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Doodles Run LLC 10-9260	32 Morey Ln	Window dormer change	73.3.2/611	Christopher Helle
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	-			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Welch)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

2. Elizabeth Holby **09-9194** 19 Low Beach Rd. Rooftop Solar MH 74/83 Ack Smart

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	Patten, Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	-			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Welch)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye) // Camp (Nay)			

II. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Elizabeth Holby	19 Low Beach Rd.	Rooftop Solar Cottage	74/83	Ack Smart
as submitted except omit (4) panels shown on the southeast (front) elevation facing porch.				
2. Pixie Hollow LLC	109 Tom Nevers rd.	Move off/ demo	91/27	Mark Cutone Architect
Prior to advertising, include Town of Nantucket Property Record Card information as follows: Building Photo, Building Layout, Building Sub-Areas (sq ft).				

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill
Alternates:	None
Recused:	Patten, Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	-
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Welch)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye) // Camp (Nay)

3. Rhoda Weinman	36 Center St	Color change	42.3.1/67	Rhoda Weinman
As submitted except, i) clapboard gray to be Benjamin Moore HC-169 Coventry Gray, ii) sash and all trim (originally proposed as black) to be contrasting Benjamin Moore 2126-40 Sweatshirt Gray—this includes sash, window casings & sills, corner boards, fascia and soffit. No white. Any questions, reference page 37 of the 43-page packet, which shows 4 Darling St. c. 1870s (a remarkably similar color application).				

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates:	Thornewill
Recused:	-
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Rhoda Weinman Both the speaker and Holly Backus engaged in lengthy discussions with Brian Feifer, and the application was subsequently submitted, taking into account the insights gained from these conversations.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Explained that this is a Circa 1847 Greek Revival building built by Valentine Swain. - Emphasized the importance of photographs in understanding historical color palettes and mentioned speaking to Brian Feifer for his expertise. - Pointed out that historically, white was not the only color used, and darker colors were also common, referencing a photo from the 1870s of a Greek Revival on Darling Street with contrasting colors. - Recommends the application with conditions, suggesting a darker trim package based on historical evidence and Mr. Feifer's recommendations.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group Expressed their agreement with the selected colors and suggested by Mr. Feifer.
Questions/Concerns/Comments:	Camp - Expressed disagreement with the proposed color change for 36 Center Street. - Opposes this change, citing the Greek Revival building's architectural style and expressing concern about using gray for pilasters. Welch - Stated that after re-reviewing the proposal and anticipating that the majority of Commissioners would vote in favor, decided to put it on consent with conditions. - Acknowledged that there might be some discussion about specific shades of dark gray and light gray but believe that, overall, the proposal would likely be approved. Coombs - Questioned the names of the colors of grey. Welch - Clarified that there will be two grays (number one and number two as shown in the photos provided) and a black. The black will be used for the door and foundation, while everything else, excluding the door and foundation, will be in either gray number one or gray number two. Coombs - Suggested that the brick foundation should not be black and proposes using a really dark gray instead.

	- Expressed the desire to move away from a black foundation, emphasizing that a lighter color or a darker gray, lighter than black, would be preferable. - Concerned that a black foundation might draw too much attention to the foundation rather than the building. Welch - To Coombs's point, shared his initial concern about the black foundation but mentions that upon further observation of other structures downtown, the combination of different clabber colors with the black foundation actually toned it down and simplified the overall appearance.
Motion:	Motion to approve as listed under Consent with Conditions. (Oliver)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye) Camp (Nay)

III. NEW BUSINESS 10/17/2023

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. NIR Retail LLC	4 Harbor Sq.	Structure rev 03-8063	42.2.4/1	WAPD

Hold for representation.**Concerns:** Application not opened.**Motion:** No action.

2. 2 Eastin St LLC 09-9149	2 & 6 Easton St	Hardscape	42.1.4/8 9	Coastal Engineering
-----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------	------------	---------------------

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Cole Bateman
Staff Comments:	Backus - Stated that this project involves two properties, one at 2 Easton Street associated with a Circa 1893 structure (the Gayer House) and the other at 6 East Street, the former Brent Point Light Boat House dating back to circa 1915 (the Adolf Kors House). - Expressed appreciation for the revised sections that illustrate the heights of the existing pier compared to the proposed three-foot height increase, with a mention of the wall crossing over both properties. - Noted that the wall will be constructed with natural-to-weather timber and will have a one-foot increase, maintaining the material consistency with existing conditions. - Mentioned the ConCom approval and offer a suggestion for a more detailed site plan than the one provided on page 31 of the packet.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland Had no concerns.
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Welch - Expressed concerns about the proposed project at Children's Beach boat ramp, specifically regarding the elevation changes. - Noted that the area not prone to flooding is at a 4-foot above sea level elevation and the grade is already close to 4 feet, and there is a proposed three-foot raise for the dock. - Concerned that the three-foot elevation increase may be too tall and sought clarification on what is driving this particular height compared to a potential foot or foot and a half increase. Bateman - Explained that there are two aspects to the proposed project. - First, there's the consideration of coastal resiliency, anticipating upgrades due to the Coastal Resiliency Plan. - Stated that the existing dock's usability is a factor in the proposed three-foot raise. Additionally, there is a state regulation aiming to increase public access along the beach. - The raised pier would include a 5-foot-high access way (a DEP standard), allowing people to walk along the beach.
Motion:	Motion to approve based on the information presented and additionally to also include an improved site plan that includes the dimensions. (Welch) (28:46)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch (Aye)
	Certificate # HDC2023 – 09-9149

3. McCormick Rev Trust 10-9267 3 Birdsong Ln Remove chimney rev COA 55.4.4/80.3 Brook Meerbergen				
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Brook Meerbergen			
Staff Comments:	Backus - Emphasized the importance of chimneys as character-defining features in Nantucket's historic district. They highlight the Quaker architectural tradition of having functional, utilitarian central chimneys, citing an example at 11 Milk Street built in 1790 by Joe Macy. - Stated that Quaker principles and traditions, including the presence of chimneys, have contributed significantly to the cohesiveness of the town and its indigenous house types. - Recommends to retain these chimneys in the proposed infill structure.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Echoed Holly's sentiments, expressing agreement with the importance of the chimney as a character-defining element. - Emphasized that retaining the chimney is crucial for preserving the historic character of the structure, suggesting that the absence of a chimney would result in a loss of historic authenticity. Ann Dewez, 5 Mill Street - Expressed strong agreement with Holly's stance on the importance of chimneys in preserving the historic character of structures. - Expressed perplexity and concern about the current request. - Stated that the design for the property originally included chimneys, and despite earlier HDC recommendations for chimneys, the owners proceeded to construct the houses without them. - Expressed frustration at what she perceived as a lack of respect for the HDC's efforts to maintain the historical integrity of the area.			
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Oliver - Agreed that both houses need chimneys to look authentic. Coombs - Strongly emphasizes the importance of having a chimney, expressing a clear position that it doesn't matter what material the roof is made of, the original request was for a chimney, and it should be included. - Asserted that applicants should not be able to deviate from the agreed-upon design and then request approval after the fact. - Supported the replacement of the chimney and is open to whatever adjustments may be necessary to the roof to accommodate it. Camp - Stressed the significance of having a chimney in a historic area, stating that it is crucial for maintaining the historical context of the neighborhood. - Expressed dissatisfaction with the "as built" status of the structure, particularly considering the visibility and importance of the site. Welch - Clarified on the status of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA), stating that it hasn't been closed out yet. - Emphasized that the situation is not an "as-built" in the traditional sense, where something is constructed without approval and then seeks approval afterward. - Mentioned the implications of an "as-built" designation, such as increased fees. - Agreed with Backus' comments. Pohl - Conveyed that the applicant understands there won't be support for the new chimney or the removal of the approved chimney. As a result, Pohl stated that the applicant intends to withdraw both applications. (38:45)			
Motion:	No action due to withdraw of application at the applicant's request.			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch (Aye)		Certificate #	HDC2023 – 10-9267

4. Darlene DeMichael 10-9269		2 Birdsong Ln	Remove chimney rev COA	55.4.4/80.3	Brook Meerbergen
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Brook Meerbergen				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	-				
Motion:	NO Action application withdrawn w/ out prejudice.			Certificate #	HDC2023 – 10-9269

5. WSTT Holdings LLC 10-9288		1 Sconset Ave	Pool & hardscape	73.4.1/8	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten				
Alternates:	Welch, Thornewill				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Lindsay Congleton				
Staff Comments:	Backus - Stated this is a circa 1982 non-contributing dwelling, converted from a garage. - Expressed the opinion that retaining the second curb cut off Sconset Ave. for the pool and shed is odd. - Suggested to remove the curb and plant native plants to block the pool equipment in perpetuity.				
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley , Former Chair of the Sconset Advisory Group - Expressed concerns about proposed additions to a property, particularly highlighting that these additions are essentially in the front yard of the existing house on a visible corner lot. - Stated that neither addition is appropriately cited within the guidelines of "Building with Nantucket in Mind" and "Building with Sconset in Mind." - Suggested that sheds and pools should be placed behind the facade. - Mentioned concerns about proximity to neighbors, potential removal of mature trees, and the impact on the small parcel.				
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Camp - Expressed that the proposed shed is highly visible, especially since it is located on Sconset Avenue. - Mentioned that the shed seems to be primarily intended to screen the property from Sconset Avenue and stated that it is not an appropriate application due to its visibility, especially considering its location on a corner. Oliver - Described the corner as very open and mentioned that the existing privet hedge is not effective in providing screening. - Suggested that the proposed picket fence may not hide much and recommended moving the pool to the other side of the house with possible downsizing. - Agreed with Holly's suggestion of eliminating the second curb cut and expressed the need for a reevaluation of the shed proposal. Coombs - Agreed with the previous comments and emphasizes that the pool should be downsized and moved to a different location. - Expressed the opinion that the pool area should be simple without additional sitting elements. - Questioned the necessity of the proposed type two picket fence with privet, suggesting a reconsideration of the entire plan. - Mentioned the importance of preserving the existing tree on the property and expressed a desire to know more about the overall control of the property. Patten - Expressed concerns about the visibility of the proposed project, echoing the sentiments of others who have raised similar concerns. Discussion ensued during which suggestions were made to include moving the pool to the right side of the building, closer to the back corner, and considering the placement of the shed. There was also a mention of addressing the second curb cut, potentially closing it out, and landscaping around the shed to address visibility concerns.				
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Oliver) (48:42)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)			Certificate #	HDC2023 – 10-9288

6. WSTT Holdings LLC 10-9286	1 Sconset Ave	New shed	73.4.1/8	Atlantic Landscaping
------------------------------	---------------	----------	----------	----------------------

Hold to track.**Concerns:** Application not opened.**Motion:** No action.**IV. OLD BUSINESS 10/24/2023**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Irene Greenberg 08-8988	18 Midland Ave	Addition	59.3/165	Hall Architects Inc.
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Christopher Hall			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Oliver - No concerns. Camp - Expressed concerns about the "rocket ship effect" on the North elevation and suggested that the ganged windows may be contributing to that effect. - Recommended that the secondary mass coming off the main gable could be lowered further to improve the overall appearance and reduce the boxy and tall feel. Coombs - Suggested that the four windows should be the same size on the structure, expressing confusion about the current variation in window sizes. - Recommended making all the windows the same size or adjusting their arrangement for better consistency. - Questioned the choice of using smaller windows on the structure instead of larger ones, especially considering the available space to the left. Welch - Requested to have a window schedule with alpha-numeric references on the elevations. This would allow for easier reference and clarification if there are questions about specific windows. Coombs - Expressed appreciation for the presence of the chimney, stating that it complements the house and is of a suitable height. Patten - No concerns. Welch - Discussed the need for elevations to be labeled with window and door codes. - Agreed on the appropriateness of the chimney's height. - Stated a preference for a two-bay roof walk instead of the existing one.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver) (1:03:02)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-2 // Welch, Oliver, Patten (Aye) // Camp, Coombs (Nay)		Certificate #	HDC2023 – 08-8988

2. Rud1250 W Nom Trust	19 W Chester St.	Fenestration revs	42.4.3/7.1	Botticelli + Pohl
------------------------	------------------	-------------------	------------	-------------------

• *Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: Pohl.*

Hold without prejudice noting that a complete site plan needs to be included. (1:05:51)**Concerns:** Application not opened.**Motion:** No action.

3. More than Enough LLC 30 Russell's Way New dwelling 77/8.1 CWA

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver		
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill		
Recused:	None		
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.		
Representing:	Lucas Velle (1:06:27)		
Staff Comments:	-		
Public Comments:	None		
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Coombs - Suggested simplifying the design of the chimney, expressing a preference for a less ornate style. - Recommended reducing the number of glass panels on the front door and using wood instead for a specific configuration. - The comments specifically pertain to the front elevation, and it's mentioned that other elevations are not currently visible for assessment. Camp - Expressed concerns about the building's height, suggesting it's almost 30 feet tall. - Found the second floor decking excessive and recommend bringing down the height of the secondary mass. - Mentioned the chimney being overly large and suggests subduing and bringing down the scale of the French doors on the South elevation. Welch - Concerned that there was no application or clear information about the proposed grade change. - Emphasized the need for a site plan showing existing conditions relative to GIS data, noting any discrepancies. - Expressed concern about the extensive connected second-floor deck. - Reminded the applicant's agent about the requirement for material changes to be honored by the third hearing to avoid denial. - These comments reflect a thorough evaluation of various aspects of the project, emphasizing the importance of clear documentation and addressing concerns raised in previous discussions. Coombs - Drew attention to a potential issue with the west elevation, specifically mentioning the presence of large French doors. - Referenced a past case at 43 Kendrick Street where big windows facing the west elevation were considered overpowering. - Suggested that this previous case may provide insights or lessons relevant to the current project. Oliver - Noted that what's on the first floor may not be visible, but the second level is of concern. - Expressed the need to make further revisions to address these concerns. Welch - Aligns with Oliver's perspective, acknowledging that major issues have been addressed. - Emphasized concerns related to the size of the chimney, the lack of differentiation between the main and secondary masses, the excessive second-floor decks, and the need for a comprehensive site plan that includes existing and proposed grades. - Requested a copy of the application for clarity on grading-related details. Lucas Velle - Confirmed that they will provide and incorporate existing topography on the site plan and ensure it aligns with GIS data or will specify any variations if present.		
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Welch) (1:22:37)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

4. Dan Stobie		60 Hulbert Ave	Stair dormer roof	29/58 58.1	Thornewill Design
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Luke Thornewill				
Staff Comments:	Backus - Stated this is a Circa 1888 shingle-style property and in November 1888, George Henry hired a local contractor and builder named Edwin Rutherford Smith to erect a dwelling on the property. - Expressed appreciation for the removal of the proposed roof walk. - Suggested that the windows and dormers should be pushed back up into the fascia, emphasizing architectural consideration. - Expressed a preference for retaining the original chimneys rather than using faux ones. - Mentioned that based on the survey, there haven't been any major additions to the historic structure, except for a character-defining cross gable addition to the main block in the 1940s. - Stated uncertainty about whether the shingle deck half-wall with the railing is appropriate or not, suggesting a consideration of its architectural suitability. - Expressed appreciation for the window schedule, mentioning that it is helpful but still challenging to discern the existing windows to be retained with the new ones altogether. - Acknowledged that there are windows being saved and relocated and suggested that a window survey would be helpful for better visualization. - Emphasized the importance of depicting the as-built elevations of the existing structure in larger detail on the plans prior to approval.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Expressed overall acceptance of the revisions for the discussed project. - Agreed with Holly's point regarding the windows and dormers should be tucked up under the fascia for enhancement. - Recommended changing the double window dormers on the east and west to single windows, stating that it would be more appropriate and provide sufficient light for the bedroom.				
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Welch - Suggested a solution for addressing the concern about the East and West elevations. - Recommended lowering the eaves by creating a header and burying it into the fascia. This adjustment is expected to lower the roof lines, both the eave and the ridge, by four or five inches. - Stated that this modification would help mitigate the atypical appearance of the South elevation dormer, making it look less like an extension of the clipped gable. - Clarified that the concerns about the East and West views are unlikely to be noticeable, as they will be seen at an oblique angle looking upward, and the proximity of the ridge heights may not be as prominent in reality. Oliver - Expressed concern about the East and West double dormers on the main gable, which is located forward on the North elevation (street side). - Stated that these dormers overwhelm the smaller bump of the structure and suggest downsizing them to prevent this effect. - Suggested to drop down the dormers as much as possible in size. This concern is specific to the North elevation. Camp - Agreed with Oliver regarding the North elevation, expressing concern about the second floor's appearance with one French door, two windows, and a shed-like feature. - Suggested that the existing plane looks out of place. - Regarding the proposed fenestration, desires more consistency in the window placement, particularly on the South elevation, where ganged windows on the second floor are mentioned. - Recommended evenly spacing those windows for a more grounded appearance. - Additionally, on the third floor of the East elevation, emphasized the need for a single window in the dormer to avoid it appearing crowded against the adjacent hip. - Expressed appreciation for retaining the chimneys but notes the disappointment in bringing them down and rebuilding them. Coombs - Suggested changes to the west elevation, recommending that the two sets of windows on the third floor be consolidated into one larger window and separated. - Stated that the current arrangement appears to be excessive for the upper level.				

	- Proposed making the windows larger and having a single window instead. - On the south elevation, suggested separating the third-floor windows or bringing in the dormer to create a more cohesive appearance. - Agrees to separating the window on the left and extending it straight across the front of the building. Pohl - Acknowledges that when looking at the East Elevation, there might be an impression that the dormers are close together and crowded. However, they point out that there is actually a fair amount of space between the dormers when reviewing the third-floor plan. - Expressed personal comfort with having two windows but suggests reducing the overall width of the dormer to minimize the shingle space. - Proposed considering a queen-sized bed for a more suitable fit within the space. Welch - Outlined two separate points for discussion. The first point involved a reduction in width by 12 to 13 inches for all third-floor dormers, with a specific focus on the East, West, and North elevations. - The second point addressed the treatment of corners, proposing the removal of corner boards for a consistent approach on the East, West, and North dormers. Regarding the South dormer, there was concern that removing corner boards might make the dormer look larger, so the suggestion is to keep the corner boards on the outside and bring the headers down by burying them into the fascia, essentially creating a top plate header for all dormers. Pohl - Suggested to keep all the roof pitches steeper by keeping the ridge down in relation to the main ridge is to bring the eave down so that the windows are essentially hanging off the eave. This change would apply to all the third-floor dormers. Backus - Re-stated that the blue-coded windows represent existing windows that will be salvaged and relocated to new locations due to the proposed addition. Specifically, on the south elevation, the second-floor windows are all existing, and the ones coded in blue around them are those that will be salvaged and placed in that location. - Mentioned that the existing elevation already has a double window in that area. - Recommended that the motion should include a request for a more detailed “as-built”, acknowledging that the existing information is on the plans but emphasizes the importance of having a more detailed representation, especially for a contributing historic structure. Welch - Explained to Luke that as a helpful practice for understanding alterations over time in the historic district to include the inclusion of smaller corner board lettering on the plans, specifying the date of the structure being retained. - Proposed adding the year 2023 on the dormers to indicate when changes occurred.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) that North, East, and West dormers will reduce 12 inches; Corner boards removed, replaced with Cottage Corners; Window headers will become top plate headers, allowing and requiring the lowering of the eaves and ridges, window survey to be included; In-scale existing elevations and floor plans for the as-builts; the chimneys are approved as proposed. (Welch) (1:48:48)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch (Aye)
	Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)

5. George Metri 05-8496	12 Angola St.	New dwelling	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Joseph Topham			
Staff Comments:	Backus - Appreciation was expressed for the revision making the proposed garage a separate structure. - Acknowledgment and approval were given for pushing the garage back off the facade of the proposed dwelling. - Further suggestions were made to push the garage down a bit more. - Appreciation was expressed for the new door surrounded with a simple and taupe six-panel door, without side lights. - Gratitude was expressed for removing the out-of-place Portico. - The design was noted to emulate the Circa 1724 major Josiah coffin house, adding historical significance. - Comparisons were made with other period-appropriate structures in the neighborhood for architectural guidance. - A suggestion was made for a simpler front door, taking inspiration from neighboring houses. - Acknowledgment of the improvements, including the elimination of the retaining wall and working with the existing grade. - Concerns were raised about the atypical length of the additive mass shown from the West. - The size of the rear second-floor deck was noted as large and potentially inappropriate. - Recommendations were made for French doors within the old historic district to have a 12-light design with a kick panel. - The importance of considering the streetscape, especially on the corner of Engle, was emphasized. - Acknowledgment of the helpfulness of having the two properties not next to each other in the streetscape.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Stated that during the last hearing, several Commissioner's expressed concerns about the size and massiveness of the building. - Noted that it appeared that no steps have been taken to mitigate the scale of the house relative to the neighborhood. - Suggested reducing the width and height of the building, and potentially adjusting the program to make it more fitting for the scale of Angola Street. - Specific concerns raised include: - The five-bay design is considered too grand and formal for the neighborhood's character. - The west elevation still shows a retaining wall, though it was mentioned that it has been eliminated. - The length of the rear Gable is seen as awkwardly long and should be shortened. - The west elevation is noted as being under-fenestrated, and there are concerns about the visibility of multi-level retaining walls, which are considered inappropriate. - Suggested to design the project to work with the existing terrain rather than excavating into the hill to retain it. Joan Taylor, 16 Mill Street - Summarized the neighborhood group's (Ann Davis, David, abutter Pam and Warren) concerns in four main points: - Inadequate Changes: While there have been changes requested by the commission, they are perceived as not substantial enough to address the objections and concerns previously expressed by the community. - Site Design and Size: The fundamental issue is that the design is still fighting the natural slope of the site to accommodate a house that is considered too big for the specific neighborhood. The design is viewed as too complex and not in harmony with the historic New England architecture prevalent in the area. - Retaining Walls: The strategy of using repeating concrete retaining walls to sculpt the lot for accommodating structures is seen as unprecedented and inappropriate for the neighborhood. Concerns are raised about the difficulty of mitigating the visual impact of these walls, even with future landscape plans. - Mature Trees: The existing mature trees on the lot, which are considered an asset, have not been adequately noted on the plans. The group suggests that these trees could be valuable in mitigating the size of the proposed buildings and structures. Ann (2:18:09) - Emphasized the importance of maintaining simplicity and harmony with the three houses surrounding the Garden of the Sea.			

	- Expressed a strong belief that the proposed 12 Angola, despite being designed in a Georgian Colonial style, does not adequately relate to the scale and character of the three smaller buildings surrounding the unique location. - Concerned that the proposed structure may appear out of proportion next to the smaller, existing buildings. David (2:19:56) - Stated that, despite clear guidance from the commission in multiple meetings, the proposed changes still do not reflect the spirit of what has been asked for, particularly in areas such as fenestration, garage door design, grading, and retaining walls. Pam (2:21:15) - Echoed the sentiments of previous speakers, emphasizing the importance of the unique and beautiful ambiance of the neighborhood, especially around the Garden of the Sea. - Highlighted the frequent visitors to the garden, including children's groups and couples, and stress the significance of the balance, scale, and simplicity of the existing structures. - Stated that the proposed house is seen as not representative of this balance and is expected to be lost. - Raised concerns about drainage and runoff issues on Angola Street, particularly on their property, which they believe will worsen with the proposed plan. Warren Feldberg, 5 Angola (2:23:49) - Emphasized the significant issue of water runoff on the street, highlighting how it has worsened over the years with property development and the removal of foliage that used to absorb runoff. - Requested a focus on resolving the water management issue on Warren Street as part of the exploration of the proposed project. Pohl - Explained that the HDC does not have the jurisdiction to discuss rain and runoff. Warren Feldberg - Agreed with his colleagues regarding the significance of the water runoff issue. - Emphasized the importance of considering how the architecture contributes to consolidating water runoff. Anne Dewez - Expressed frustration with the repetitive nature of the hearings and the lack of significant changes in the drawings despite repeated requests to shrink the structure and scale back the retaining situation. - Suggested a specific modification related to a bump-out at the back of the house. - Stressed the importance of addressing the fundamental comments about size and retainage and hope the commission maintains their resolve on these issues.
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Welch - Stated that his initial concerns noted in previous minutes were about the overall size of the. - Noted that disconnecting the garage and removing the porch addresses some of the concerns about the size of the structure. - Concerned about the perception of the length of the L-shaped structure, especially when viewed from the side. - Proposed removing a bump-out and changing the end of the L to a hip roof to not only alter the visual perception but also reduce the actual length of that portion of the structure. - Suggested that, to improve the perception of the size of the main structure when viewed from Angola Street, it would be appropriate to move the structure back a few feet, particularly the portion where the bump-out was removed. - Suggested that incorporating a top plate header on the second floor, which would pull a few inches out of the height, should not be detrimental to the program. - Expressed a preference for seeing the chimney height, both existing and proposed, remain the same even though the ridge is planned to come down. Thornewill - Suggested that while they are not opposed to a five-bay structure, the chosen design appears more fitting for a town setting than a rural area. - Recommended reducing the width, adjusting window spacing, and addressing the height to better match the surrounding context. - Expressed concerns about the equally spaced windows, proposing a more historically accurate arrangement with the two flanking the center closer together. - Mentioned the issue of the height, noting that contemporary high ceilings contribute to the structure appearing overly massive. - Supported the idea of reducing the scale of the five-bay structure and consider adjustments to the secondary mass. - Endorsed the suggestion of a hip roof on the rear to address the length of the structure.

	- Expressed concerns about the large second-floor deck on the rear, considering it more suitable for a beachside setting and pointing out potential visibility issues from the street above due to elevation changes. - Expressed uncertainty about the current plan for the retaining wall, mentioning that it appears too regular and industrial. - Recommended a more naturalistic approach with varying heights, similar to the examples of three-tiered walls provided. - Noted that the windows on the structure are large but acknowledge that the multi-divided lights help them read well. Camp - Recommend a three or four-bay design, stating that the current structure looks more appropriate for Main Street rather than the specific neighborhood. - Suggested reducing the wing going back towards the bank to mitigate landscaping issues. - Find the light wells on the front of the building to be modern and inappropriate for a historic area. - Expressed the view that the development of the small site overwhelms the size of the lot and advocate for serious revisions. Coombs - Reiterated that the building is too big and emphasizes the need for reduction, stating that a five-bay design is still too large for the area. - Expressed a desire for a shorter L shape and suggest separating the garage, which they find acceptable. - Requested cross-cuts to understand the placement of walls and elevation changes more clearly. - Noted concerns about the length of the building on the west elevation, suggested adjustments to the window placement and shortening the eave to reduce the overall size of the structure. Pohl - Suggested that if a five-bay design is maintained, it should be narrowed and reduced in height. - Proposed allocating more space on the front facade for side windows and supporting the suggestion of lowering the eave. - Recommended converting the single-story rear L into a story-and-a-half structure to distribute the mass more effectively. - Emphasized the need to step up the rear L and increase setbacks from the property line to minimize retaining walls and enhance the slope. - Expressed a preference for a smaller five-bay or even a four-bay design. Welch - Emphasized agreement, particularly regarding the five-bay design. - Supported thinning and asymmetry in window layout for a more historically appropriate and characterful treatment. - Advocated for lowering the eave on the secondary mass beyond just the top plate header. Topham - Acknowledged the suggestions and expressed agreement with the proposed changes, including shortening the length of the rear rail and moving it back a few feet, as well as addressing concerns about the windows.		
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Welch) (2:43:42)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 05-8496

6.	George Metri	12 Angola St.	New Free-standing garage	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
----	--------------	---------------	--------------------------	-----------	---------------

- *New Business application to track OB- new dwelling.*

Hold to track.

Concerns: **Application not opened.**

Motion: **No action.**

7. Brandon Scimone **04-8324** 6 Sandpiper Way Addition 76/89 Sandcastle Const.

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill		
Alternates:	None		
Recused:	None		
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.		
Representing:	Robert Newman		
Staff Comments:	-		
Public Comments:	-		
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Oliver- Appreciated the improvements in the design, particularly the effort to make it look more like a one or one-and-a-half-story structure. - Expressed a concern about the perceived disconnect between the existing porch and a new roof, suggesting a need to streamline and enhance cohesion. - Mentioned the small size of the windows as a drawback. Camp- Agreed with a previous comment about bringing a roof across the front instead of having a hipped roof over the front door. - Suggested improving the three windows over the front door, possibly by resizing them for a more appropriate look. Coombs- Agreed with Camp's comments regarding the size of the windows. - Suggested that the building needs more elements to fit into its surroundings, mentioning that extending the porch across the front might help. - Noted that the windows on the second floor should be made larger. - Expressed concern about the proposed East Elevation, stating that there are too many windows and that the design looks more like a business than a house. - Recommended stretching out some windows on the Southwest side and emphasized that the East Elevation needs further work. Welch- Expressed concern about the existing windows on the proposed West Elevation, noting that they make the Gable look larger than necessary. - Suggested increasing the window sizes to alter the perception of scale. - Supported the idea of extending the porch roof as a shed roof and connecting it to the addition on the right at the rake. Recommended making it plainer and extending it over the full width of the Gable. - Acknowledged that much of this may only be visible on the first floor. - Proposed including a condition that the existing vegetation should be maintained from approval through inspection and beyond. - Stated that the consensus of the Commission is to clean up the front porch and extend the line all the way across to change the scale of the front. Suggested looking at the windows on the new addition to alter the perception of its size and address concerns about the oversized dormers. Oliver- Suggested the possibility of placing a door on the southwest elevation (labeled as Southwest) to make it appear as the front, with the new oversized gable as the primary view. This would relegate the less favorable gable to a side view rather than a front view. Welch- Stated that he does not see the merit in placing a door on the southwest elevation, emphasizing the importance of modifying the porch roof to change the overall perception of proportions.		
Motion:	Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Coombs) (3:00:22)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver // Thornewill (Abstain)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – 04-8324

8. QVT3 NT 05-8446	22 Vestal St	New dwelling	41/39	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Linda Williams and Nick DeMaio			
Staff Comments:	Backus - Appreciated the revisions and suggested relocating the door on the small, shed addition on the east, making comments about the drop in height of the second mass off the main ridge. - Suggested a single window for the flush dormers with aligned meeting rails, recommended a taller chimney with coring, and expressed appreciation for the usable chimney. - Stated that the application asked for SDLs within the OHD, which wouldn't be favored.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Expressed that the massing is better but would have preferred a story and a half and noted that the chimney should be taller, and the windows should be true divided lights (TDL).			
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Camp - Agreed about the chimney being bigger, especially when viewed from the north elevation. - Mentioned that the 10-foot shed should be taller and suggest embellishing the front door surrounded with trim detail or possibly adding sidelights for a more historic district-appropriate look. Welch - Stated that the chimney in the north elevation is drawn shorter than in the east elevation, and it needs to be corrected. - Emphasized the need for the chimney to be taller than the east elevation and suggested it needs to be a minimum of 3 feet taller for a real fireplace chimney. - Stated the overall size is a bit oversized given its proximity to the street. - Suggested modifying the small front door trim package to create an informal detailing that could change the perception of the front perspective. Coombs - Provided feedback on the east elevation, suggesting that the two dormers on the left side need to be brought down enough to align the meeting rail across the windows. - Reiterated the need to widen and make the front door more prominent. - Emphasized the importance of making the chimney taller as seen in the north elevation. - Appreciated that it is a 4-bay and suggested adding more detailing around the front door and making the chimney taller. Pohl - Explained that the meeting rail not lining up with the eve can occur in two ways: either the eve is above the meeting rail or below it. - Suggested that if there's a desire to have the eve line up with the meeting rail, the roof in the back should be raised by four to six inches. This adjustment would allow the shed mentioned by Abby to be taller. - Stated that the front door needs a little more ornamentation.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff). (Welch) (3:17:46)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Pohl (Aye) Certificate # HDC2023 – 05-8446			

9. Waterfalls Enterprises 11-7513	7 Union St	Lk siding & windows	42.3.1/146	Emeritus
-----------------------------------	------------	---------------------	------------	----------

- *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Dutra, Thornewill; Alternates: None; Recused: None.*

Applicant requested to hold this item.

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

MINUTES

Motion:	Motion to approve the minutes of September 26, 2023
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-1 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs (Aye) // Welch (Abstain)

POTENTIAL ITEMS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

- Discussion of Previously Approved Best Practices.
- 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
- Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new Historic dwellings
- Hardscaping
- Discussion of salvaging demos
- Discussion of options for house moves

OTHER BUSINESS

Next HDC Meeting- October 31st at 4pm *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 7:19pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZHIRK4lkqkk&t=160s>

Nantucket Old Historic District Sconset Old Historic District

Approved Minutes –	September 26, 2023
Review Minutes -	
Other Business -	• Next HDC Meeting- October 31st at 4pm *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. - COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid
Potential Items for Discussion-	• Discussion of Previously Approved Best Practices. • 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 • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new Historic dwellings • Hardscaping • Discussion of salvaging demos • Discussion of options for house moves