



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, November 28, 2023

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:20p.m. and announcements by Chair Pohl	
Staff in Attendance:	Esmeralda Martinez , Land Use Specialist, Adrian Rodriguez , Administrative Specialist & Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist, Holly Backus , Preservation Planner, Billy Saad , Zoning Administrator & Land Use Specialist
Attending Members:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul Thornewill
Remote Participants:	Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Absent Members:	-
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	Welch left the meeting at 8:15pm and Pohl left the meeting at 8:38 pm.

ADOPTION OF AMENDED AGENDA	
Discussion:	Welch - Requested to move Commissioner discussion digital file submission requirements to just prior to Old Business of 11/7 and move New Business Item 28 – 11/28/23 (8 Bayberry Ln) to the Consent Agenda.
Motion:	Motion to approve amended agenda. (Coombs) (4:17)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs Oliver (Aye)

I. CONSENTS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	Esmeralda Martinez ETAL	6 Larrabee Lane	New fence	55/102.6	J. Martinez	rp
2.	Matthew & Caroline Manera	15 Morey Ln	New dwelling	73.3.1/38	EMDA	rp
3.	Silver Fox Partners	2 Horn Beam Rd	Pool house	21/118.5	EMDA	rp
4.	Zais Realty Trst	57 Eel Point Rd	New Shed	32/46	WAPD	rp
5.	Zais Realty Trst	57 Eel Point Rd	Move off /demo shed	32/46	WAPD	rp
6.	Pixie Hollow LLC	109 Tom Nevers Rd	Addition	91/27	MCA+	rp
7.	Michael Muldowney	144 Surfside rd.	Alteration cottage door	80/99	William White	vo
8.	Bradley Brewster	29 Walsh St	Expand deck	29/81	Ben Normand	vo
9.	Tom Pearson/Tiffany Lamb	5 Polliwog Rd	Driveway	55 423.3	Tom Pearson	sw
10.	Manny Sylvia	6 Nobska Way	Windows & add dormer	66/21	NAG	sw
11.	Ruth Klink	301 Madaket rd	Dormer	60.2.1/55	NAG	sw
12.	Eloise Nominee Trst	1 Sandy Dr	Garage	29/73 & 74	Thornewill Designs	sw
13.	Island Gas	11 Industry Rd	New dwelling/structure	69/295	Val Oliver	dc
14.	Phil Garufi	6 West Wy	Decks 1 st floor	38/134	Val Oliver	dc
15.	Elizabeth Goulet	51 Miacomet rd	Cabana	67/196	Brook Meerbergen	dc
16.	Dave Angelastro	36 Somerset Rd	Cabana	56/106	Brook Meerbergen	sw
17.	Nikolay Atanasov	12 Appleton Rd	Walkout window well	67/477	DTA	cp
18.	Kelly Burke Trust	11 Spring St	Revision	55.1.4/108	BPC	cp
19.	Steven Jemison	4 Lavendar Ln	Main house fenestration	33/24	JB Studio	jp
20.	Town of Nantucket	9 Waitt Dr	New Dwelling	67/922	Gryphon Architects	jp
21.	Town of Nantucket	9 Waitt Dr	New 2 nd Dwelling	67/922	Gryphon Architects	jp
22.	Town of Nantucket	5 Waitt Dr	New Dwelling	67/920	Gryphon Architects	jp
23.	Town of Nantucket	5 Waitt Dr	New 2 nd Dwelling	67/920	Gryphon Architects	jp
24.	Bitter North LLC	5 Mattapoisett Lane	Exterior Stairs	82/371	Val Oliver	jp
25.	Gallagher/Aguiar	4 Pond Rd	Garage door change	56/158	Val Oliver	jp
26.	Richard Meagner	6 Green Ln	Roof replacement	42.3.3/167	Peter F	jp
27.	Julie Meade	8 Bayberry Ln	As-built Front	49/92.1	Michael Humphreys	
Voting:		Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten				
Alternates:		None				
Recused:		Oliver, Paul, Thornewill				
Documentation:		Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:		-				
Public Comments:		-				
Concerns:		-				
Motion:		Motion to approve. (Coombs) (6:52)				
Roll-Call Vote:		Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)				

II. 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.	Town of Nantucket	7 Waitt Dr	New Duplex	67/921	Gryphon Architects	jp
	• Connect the two porches to make them a single porch across the front of the building.					
2.	Elizabeth Goulet	51 Miacomet Rd	Pool & Hardscape	67/196	Brook Meerbergen	dc
	• pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
3.	30 Tashama LLC	30 Tashama Ln	Porch	55/455	EMDA	rp
	• porch should be reduced to 8'.					
Voting:		Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates:		Patten, Paul, Thornewill				
Recused:						
Documentation:		Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:		-				
Public Comments:		-				
Concerns:		-				
Motion:		Motion to approve. (Coombs) (7:37)				
Roll-Call Vote:		Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)				

III. OLD BUSINESS 11/07/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	-------------------	--------------

1. Jonathan Nyland	93 Sankaty Rd	Rooftop solar	49/182	Ack Smart
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Thornewill, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Tobias Glidden			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Expressed appreciation for the provided photos, noting their helpfulness. - Believed that solar panels won't be directly visible from Sankaty Rd., but potential visibility from Sankaty Rd. towards Sconset on dormers. - Found the photo from Baxter informative, indicating the solar panels' distance from the road and emphasizing their placement as a mitigation factor for visibility concerns.			
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley, Sconset Advisory Group - Reviewed the matter a few weeks ago and initially had concerns about visibility. - Acknowledged and agreed with Holly's observation that the views are limited, alleviating previous concerns. - Concluded that the situation is now satisfactory.			
Concerns:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted with Exhibit A, to include filling in the space where the chimney was. (Oliver) (19:03)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye) Camp (Nay)			
			Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

2. Robert Stock 08-9002	50 Squam Rd	As-built fence	13/31	Robert Stock
Voting:	Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Steven Cohen			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	Rick Atherton – Abutter - Raised concerns about the applicability of stockade fences in rural Nantucket, suggesting a potential impact on the area's character. - Emphasized the importance of considering the broader implications of approving such fences, anticipating a potential proliferation of various deer protection devices. - Commended the helpfulness of the minutes from the last meeting, highlighting that the application didn't adequately address the questions raised during the previous discussion. - Expressed unease as an abutter to the South due to a portion of the wire fence encroaching on their property, urging the Commission to address this issue. - Stressed the inappropriateness of building a fence on a neighbor's property and urged the Commission to consider the fence as a whole, cautioning against setting a precedent that could lead to future issues. Robin Winter – Abutter - Previously submitted photos and an email, offering to refrain from reiteration unless requested. - Aligned with Mr. Atherton's concerns and emphasized additional issues with the fence: not consistently at seven feet, with panels reaching up to 7 feet 3 inches and posts measuring 88.5 feet. - Pointed out the visual discrepancy in the fence's height across different sections, contradicting the claim of a consistent fence. - Highlighted the potential violation of Massachusetts state code, noting that a fence over 6 feet typically requires a building permit. Disputed the applicant's assertion that it's seven feet, stating it would still necessitate a building permit. Deanne Atherton – Abutter - Pointed out a section of the fence along their properties, indicating the wire fence encroaching onto their land. - Referenced the submitted schematic after the August meeting, noting that it doesn't constitute an official site plan but highlights the additional complexity with another length of board fence. - Expressed concern about the disarray caused by different fence sections and emphasized the need for a comprehensive site plan to facilitate a fully informed decision, referencing a Commissioner's statement from the August meeting. - Stressed that Mr. Cohen represents the applicant, prompting consideration of seeking independent counsel for the Commission. - Suggested that seeking legal advice would be wise to determine if the Commission has any actionable options within its legal purview, especially given the unique circumstances of the application.			

Concerns:	Camp - Voiced concerns about the overall length and height of the fence, highlighting the absence of vegetation interruption for mitigation. - Disapproved of the numerous styles, considering them unsuitable for the rural setting. - Expressed reservations that approving such a fence could establish an undesirable precedent. Oliver - Concurred with Abby's perspective, citing the example as representative of a broader trend on the island where individuals build with personal preferences rather than considering the island's character. - Acknowledged the difficulty in taking a strong stance since the fence isn't visible from the road, which is the Commission's purview. - Expressed a desire to address the issue by asking the owner to consider the impact on neighbors, especially given the unconventional appearance of the fence and the inadequacy of the submitted photos. Paul - Shared concern about the application, expressing unease due to the limited control the HDC has in such situations. - Sympathized with the neighbors, acknowledging the challenges they face. - Acknowledged that Steve Cohen had explained his position clearly, leaving little room for HDC action. - Expressed a desire to deny the application and impose fines but recognized the jurisdictional limitations. - Noted gratitude that the island has not been extensively marked by haphazard fences dividing properties. Patten - Expressed agreement regarding the unfavorable appearance of the fence. - Voiced uncertainty about the commission's jurisdiction in this matter. - Shared concerns about setting precedents and expressed hope that the applicant might reconsider and make efforts to improve the situation. Coombs - Emphasized the need for specific action, echoing Val and Joe's concerns. - Suggested exploring potential measures, possibly through another article in Town meeting, focusing on how a property integrates with its surroundings. - Contemplated the visibility and appropriateness of structures, including fences, in relation to the overall landscape. - Highlighted the severity of the current fence situation, labeling it among the worst seen and urged consideration for the broader surrounding area. - Highlighted that the submitted documentation lacks the two specific elements requested. - Emphasized the absence of a proper site plan, noting the absence of neighboring houses and the surrounding area. - Criticized the provided pictures for being in black and white and not meeting the specified requirements, expressing dissatisfaction with the submission.	
Motion:	Motion to hold for more clarification, specifically to include an updated site plan keyed to photos along both crop lines. (Paul)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 –08-9002

3. Adam Glick

31 Eel Point Rd

New dwelling

39/52

WAPD

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten	
Alternates:	Pohl, Paul	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen- WAPD	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	Oliver- No concerns Coombs- No concerns. Camp- Expressed minor concerns about the design, particularly with the two masses. - Noted that the gable came forward seems secondary but appeared as the main mass. - Desired a reversal where the massing to the left, with the smaller gable and hip roofs, seemed more prominent. Welch- Commented that his feedback aligns with Abby's. - Suggested toning down some elements in relation to the prior existing structure, particularly in height and roof lines. - Emphasized the ongoing concern about the overall massing.	
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted and the existing vegetation will remain in perpetuity. (Oliver) (45:30)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)

4. WSH Holding LLC 10-9288	1 Sconset Ave	Pool & patio	73.4.1/8	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Welch, Thornewill			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Lindsey Congelton- Atlantic Landscaping			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Clarified for the record that the dwelling on the lot is a circa 1982 non-contributing structure. - Expressed appreciation for the adjustments made, including shifting the pool location and introducing plantings between the driveway and the fence. - Suggested additional vegetation along the right side of the driveway, proposing a gate for an improved streetscape on Sconset Ave. - Emphasized the need for continued vegetation along the new Type 2 picket fence for privacy, especially considering the corner lot's potential visibility from another street.			
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley – Historic Structure Advisory Group - Acknowledged appreciation for relocating the pool to the corner, but expressed concern that it still appears to overlap the front of the house towards Sconset Ave. - Echoed Holly's point about the need for screening between the shed and the house. - Emphasized the significance of the corner lot's visibility in a highly traveled and densely populated neighborhood, underlining the importance of addressing these concerns.			
Concerns:	Oliver - Stated that she would prefer not to vote on the pool until the shed gets approval. Camp - Concurred with Val's observation, describing it as a situation of "cart before the horse" with the shed not yet approved for screening. - Voiced agreement that the setting is highly visible, given the small lot size and two driveways. - Expressed the opinion that the current proposal may not be appropriate for the location. Coombs - Questioned the visibility of the proposed structure, expressing doubts that it won't be seen, and sought assurance that the vegetation will adequately screen it throughout the year. - Requested that the edge along the Sconset Ave driveway entrance extends up to the driveway on both sides. - Suggested augmenting the picket fence with privacy measures to address potential issues, particularly in winter, on the windy open corner where the pool will be located. - Emphasized the importance of ensuring that the chosen vegetation effectively covers the pool in all seasons. Patten - Inquired about the possibility of placing the proposal on hold to synchronize with the shed's progress and to incorporate revisions in the vegetation plan. Pohl - Clarified the absence of a shed application at the moment. - Stressed the importance of having a shed application as a critical component of the overall approval process.			
Motion:	Motion to delay the approval until revisions are made based on board members' requests, and an official submission for the shed is provided to ensure clarity on its appearance. (Patten) (53:42)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)		Certificate #	HDC2023 – 10-9288

5. SeaHero LLC 05-8447

12 Pilgrim Rd

New dwelling

41/476

LFW

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Thornewill
Alternates:	None
Recused:	None
Representative:	Linda Williams
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Identified the West elevation as the most problematic, likening its appearance to a rocket ship despite the change to a shed roof. - Suggested that the shed roof pitch appears disconnected and recommended its removal or creating a one-story element for better additive massing when viewed from the North. - Acknowledged that Option A with the hip front porch is more successful but raised concerns about the two front doors, an issue discussed in previous meetings. - Maintained the recommendation for 6/6 windows and the addition of a chimney.
Public Comments:	Kristen Graham – Abutter - Expressed gratitude to the Commissioners for their oversight of this project. - Appreciated the efforts of the architects and developer for implementing significant changes. - Recognized the progress made while acknowledging that, despite personal reservations about the height, compromises are necessary to balance the old and the new. - Expressed appreciation for the addition of the site building cross sections. - Recalled seeking clarification during a previous inquiry about whether the fence and retaining wall would be voted on with the house. - Noted the details about the retaining wall in the cross section. - Sought confirmation that questions regarding the fence and retaining wall could be addressed at a later point, avoiding the need to discuss them presently.
Concerns:	Pohl - Clarified that the retaining walls are not officially part of the current application. - Acknowledged that the grade change, as addressed in the sections, implicitly involves considerations such as retaining walls and berms. - Indicated that discussions related to the specifics of retaining walls and related elements would be a topic for a future discussion. Camp - Proposed a solution for the issue of the two doors, suggesting that the secondary door should look significantly different from the front door, possibly resembling an old 6-panel door. - Recommended the addition of a chimney to address the perceived chaos in the design, providing more symmetry. - Suggested dropping the west appendage by a story and a half for better balance and proportion, particularly when viewed from the front elevation. Thornewill - Expressed a perspective on the sighting of the house, predicting that the shed mass won't be dominant. - Shared thoughts on the two-story shed, but not fully supportive of Abby's suggestion to bring it to a story and a half due to potential design awkwardness. - Proposed alternatives for the shed, suggesting either eliminating the second floor or keeping it as is, considering its narrow width of 14 feet. - Believed that the shed won't be prominently viewed due to the property's orientation and the orthogonal alignment of the house to the street. - Appreciated the porch options, favoring Option A with a hip roof. - Supported the idea of having a front door with a 6-panel design for prominence and suggested that the secondary door should read as a back door. - Raised concerns about the abundance of retaining walls and fences on the small property, finding it excessive. - Criticized the site plan's depiction of the pool size as misleading and not true to scale. Welch - Concurred Thornewill's comments. Pohl - Acknowledged the previous criticism of the west-facing gable's height and narrowness. - Contended that a shed roof is typically an appendage rather than an extension, highlighting its function of housing a bathroom. - Proposed a return to a gable for the west-facing structure, suggesting a configuration that maintains legality

	and comfort without matching the same plate height as the rest of the second floor.
	- Concurred with comments about the front door and appreciated Holly for bringing it up as an issue.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to drop the western appendage, transforming it into a gable with its eave subordinate to the main mass. Specified the change of the front door to a six-panel door and opted for the porch design presented in Option A. (Welch) (1:12:57)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Thornewill (Aye) Certificate # HDC2023 – 05-8447

6. SeaHero LLC **05-8450**

12 Pilgrim Rd

New shed

41/476

LFW

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Thornewill
Alternates:	None
Recused:	None
Representative:	Linda Williams
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Commissioners had no concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Welch) (1:15:22)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Thornewill (Aye) Certificate # HDC2023 – 05-8450

Pohl

- Acknowledged the clarification received from the Ethics Board regarding permissible and impermissible actions related to sitting on the **Ack Midisland LLC 08-8888 – 18-26 Sparks Ave** application.
- Expressed appreciation to Coombs and Oliver for contacting the Ethics Board, leading to the resolution of a previous difference of opinion that occurred weeks ago.
- Requested respect for the established board, emphasizing the desire for continuity throughout the project.
- Indicated a willingness to allow discussion from both Coombs and Oliver as members of the public.

Williams

- Asserted an objection on the record to Coombs and Oliver speaking in a position, citing a different interpretation than what has been stated by Town Council in the past.

7. Ack Midisland LLC **08-8888**

18-26 Sparks Ave

New mixed used building

55/231.1

LFW

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul
Alternates:	None
Recused:	Oliver, Coombs
Representative:	Linda Williams / Mark Coughlin
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Clarified that the existing structures on the property are 1950s contributing structures, expressing hope for their relocation instead of demolition. - Appreciated the proposed front courtyard, noting that it helps ground the structure and makes it relatable to neighboring commercial structures. - Acknowledged the helpful change to make the masses separate and not mirrored images, as well as the ridge being lowered to 38 feet, 10 inches. - Raised a significant concern about the lack of addressing the amount of fenestration, emphasizing that this issue was previously brought up during preliminary and last reviews. - Called for a review of the fenestration percentages, referencing "Building with Nantucket in Mind" on pages 112 and 113. - Noted an apparent increase in glazing without corresponding adjustments to meet the Commission's recommendations. - Emphasized the importance of fenestration in maintaining Nantucket's visual character, as outlined in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Encouraged adjustments to the massing to bring it down while still meeting program requirements. - Expressed gratitude for the removal of transoms and appreciation for helpful renderings.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Highlighted the project's lack of historical precedent on the island, particularly its size and extremely symmetrical format. - Expressed concern that the design resembles an off-island strip mall. - Recommended that the project should aim for success by adopting a look that resembles a collection of unique connected buildings.

	- Suggested introducing more variation in massing, height, fenestration, and rooflines to create a more diverse and visually interesting appearance. Val Oliver - Echoed the sentiment expressed by Mickey, emphasizing the initial suggestion to make the project resemble a collection of individual buildings like those in town. - Expressed concern that the project has grown in size rather than becoming smaller in footprint. - Stated that the design lacks relation to anything on the island or in the area. - Emphasized the importance of large buildings adhering to guidelines and adapting to the scale of their surroundings rather than dominating it. - Highlighted the continued concern about the project's height, which is closer to 40 feet than 30 feet, a departure from typical approvals. Diane Coombs - Concurred with Mickey's perspective, emphasizing the need for the project to align with the surrounding area. - Cited the example of the Stop and Shop, which successfully worked with the HDC to bring its height down to 30 feet. - Highlighted the uniqueness of the Boys and Girls Club building, which is set back and doesn't take up as much visual space. - Stressed the importance of the HDC, rather than the Planning Board, determining the height of buildings. - Noted that the proposed building will be visible to residents in the area, affecting those on Alexandria Drive and the other side. - Highlighted the significance of Nantucket's historic character and expressed concern that the proposed building does not align with the island's historic identity. - Emphasized the economic value of preserving Nantucket's historic status.
Concerns:	Welch - Clarified a shift in focus from prior comments about parking, parking management, and density to addressing architectural elements, character, and setting. - Expressed ongoing concern about the overall massing and percentage of fenestration. - Pointed out that the illustration indicates that the middle ground structure is part of the same overall structure, emphasizing the problematic overall massing. - Stressed that the massing is out of character for the area and likened it to municipal structures like the school and Boys and Girls Club, which are not suitable benchmarks for retail space. - Reiterated the suggestion made in a previous commission meeting to look to downtown Nantucket as a model, emphasizing the success of a collection of varied buildings with additive massing and fenestration. - Mentioned the Stop and Shop as another potentially successful model that achieved its goals. - Encouraged a solution that aligns with the character and setting of the area. - Emphasized the long-term impact of the architecture on the area, suggesting that it will establish the architectural vocabulary for the next 50 to 75 years. - Stressed the importance of achieving a balance between density and massing while still adhering to timeless design principles. - Expressed concern about the amount of fenestration and the overall design. - Indicated a preference for changes to the overall massing, a decrease in the percentage of fenestration, and a design that reflects a collection of buildings with varied additive massing and fenestration. - Mentioned the HDC's established best practices, highlighting the expectation of receiving material changes in subsequent applications and the potential for a motion of denial if such changes are not presented. - Clarified that the comments are not meant to be pointed but to underscore the importance of adhering to the established best practices. Patten - Commended the multifunctionality of the building, recognizing the need for recreation and restaurants in the area. - Shared concerns about the overall massing and fenestration of the building. - Appreciated the addition of the porch and walkway to the design. - Acknowledged the potential for setting a precedent that could have future implications. Camp - Expressed surprise at the lack of significant revisions since the project's return from the Planning Board. - Emphasized the need for scaling down the building in terms of height, massing, and architectural styles to fit into the neighborhood. - Suggested individual buildings for different uses, potentially connected by breezeways, each with a story

	and a half. - Advocated for more consideration of public areas, especially on the south and west sides, and expressed concern about the shadow cast on the north side. - Praised the proportions of the east and west elevations and encouraged aiming for a design that fits more into the neighborhood. - Critiqued the back of the building for lacking architectural articulation and appearing too uniform. Paul - Appreciated the improvements in the design, particularly the pushing back of the center mass, and found it intriguing. - Considered the project positively when viewed as a series of vignettes, suggesting it would work well from various perspectives. - Acknowledged the attractiveness of elements like the courtyard and porches and saw less concern about the parking lot side. - Raised concerns about the perceived scale from Sparks Ave. and suggested it should read as a two-story building from that side, potentially by eliminating third-floor dormers. - Proposed eliminating the links between center and side masses to create three distinct buildings with a common language, expressing caution about a haphazard architectural approach. - Questioned the appropriateness of the current design for the area, referencing the scale of the Stop and Shop building on Sparks Ave. as a potentially helpful reference. Pohl - Expressed appreciation for the courtyard but emphasized the critical importance of getting the Sparks Ave. elevation right. - Found the building, including the north elevation, to be grossly over-fenestrated and highlighted the problematic run-on dormer on the left side of the north elevation, making it appear as a three-story mass. - Raised concerns about the back elevation (south elevation), describing it as resembling a Grand Hotel with a full three-story effect and uniformity, considering the public visibility of this side. - Challenged the comparison of size with other buildings in the neighborhood, emphasizing that the perceived size of this project is influenced by a combination of height, width, and massing, making it larger in perception than other large-footprint buildings like the adjacent stop and shop. - Advocated for a reduction in scale, including width, height, and massing, and suggested exploring a story and a half massing as part of the design. Welch - Acknowledged the complexity of making substantial modifications considering the business model but emphasized the need for changes in scale and massing. - Compared the proposed structures' architectural massing to nearby structures like Cumberland Farms, the consignment shop, the portion of Stop and Shop, and the fire department, expressing concerns about the tremendous massing in comparison. - Encouraged replicating or transitioning massing in line with neighboring structures or introducing a transition area. - Noted that while elements like the courtyard show progress, the overall massing hasn't changed enough for fine-tuning discussions.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Welch) (2:00:11)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul (Aye) Certificate # HDC2023 – 08-8888

IV. NEW BUSINESS 11/14/2023

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
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Thornewill, Paul, Patten			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Provided information about the former Straight Wharf Fish Market and Stars Ice Cream Shop, noting that it is a contributing structure built between 1966 and 1968 as part of the Walter Beinecke revitalization of the Harbor Waterfront. - Raised concerns about the color of the awning and sought clarification on the specific shade of gray for both the metal and canvas parts. - Emphasized the importance of clarity in the color specifications. - Addressed the visibility of the awning, noting that it is primarily visible from the harbor and obliquely			

	visible from land when walking up Straight Wharf. - Inquired about requests related to shingling and fenestration, seeking clarification on whether any new work had been done or if it was part of previous approvals. Kotchen - Clarified that the shingling mentioned in the previous communication was not applicable to the current application and was from a previous approval. - Provided information about the color of the awning, stating that it is Sunbrella Sailcloth Seagull, and expressed a willingness to provide a sample. - Mentioned that the color is intended to match the gray trim on the structure, referred to as "Nantucket Gray."		
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed concern about the visibility of the existing screening structure and suggested that the new structure might feel larger due to its proximity to the building. - Asked whether the new structure could be pushed further away from the gable end to minimize its impact. Kotchen - Acknowledged the complexity of the situation. - Described it as an "IR" (Impact Review) situation. - Emphasized the need to redistribute noise from air handlers and condensers on the adjacent property. - Discussed the challenge of spatial requirements not fitting below the existing screening element along the eve on the west elevation. - Stated that the current location is the only viable option, considering the spatial requirements. - Expressed a willingness to explore options, including pulling the structure back if possible. - Highlighted the difficulty of the process, indicating that finding a suitable solution has not been easy.		
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed understanding and acceptance of the challenges the project faces. - Stated that there is no problem with the proposed solution. - Indicated satisfaction with the project's success in addressing the necessary considerations. Welch - Concurred with Camp. Coombs - Acknowledged that there may have been challenges in the process. - Recognized the effort and hard work put into fitting the project together. - Expressed appreciation for the project team's cooperation and understanding. Oliver - Had no comments. Pohl - Acknowledged that certain matters may fall outside the HDC's purview. - Emphasized the importance of neighborly considerations. Welch - Questioned if the pitch could be shallowed up a little. - Clarified the distinction between a temporary and seasonal awning structure. - Emphasized that a temporary structure implies a finite period of use, while a seasonal structure suggests recurring use during specific periods. Kotchen - Discussed challenges with adjusting the pitch due to existing fascia conditions. - Acknowledged the limitations in altering the pitch to maintain a proper seal. - Addressed the anticipated seasonal use, intending to have the awning up while the restaurant is operational. - Clarified that the metal frame would remain in place after the seasonal usage.		
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted, noting the awning will be up seasonally and that it will be Sunbrella Sailcloth Seagull in color. (Camp) (2:29:07)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

2. Richmond Meadows II	20 Nancy Ann Ln	Commercial dwelling revs	68/339.1	KOH
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Thornewill, Paul, Patten			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Dinah Klamart			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver, Coombs, Welch - No concerns. Camp - Observed that the four garage doors appear a bit odd. - Speculated that it would be ideal if they were constructed of wood and left to weather naturally. - Indicated that using wood could potentially diminish the commercial appearance of the doors. Pohl - Affirmed that the structure is a simple and utilitarian one. - Stated that, within its context, the structure appears to be appropriate. - Expressed overall agreement with the proposal.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver) (2:37:15)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	

3. f 15 CHR LLC	8 Chuck Hollow Rd	Addition & Porch	72/31	Val Oliver
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates:	Thornewill, Paul			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Val Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Coombs - Appreciated the appearance of the structure, particularly liking the gable on the front. - Mentioned satisfaction with the use of two-over-two windows. - Expressed approval of the chimney. - Conveyed an overall positive stance on the proposal, with no major issues identified. Pohl, Welch, Camp, Patten - No concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Welch) (2:41:32)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	

4. 44 Monomoy LLC	44 Monomoy Rd	Patio, pergola, walkways	54/72	David Champoux
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Thornewill, Patten, Paul			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Ben Champoux			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Mentioned the main dwelling on the lot as a circa 1920 Colonial Revival called Windy Way. - Stated that brick is more appropriate for the hardscape of the existing historic structure. - Noted that the pergola should be natural to weather. - Posed a question to the Commission regarding the appropriateness of an IPE deck.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Welch, Oliver- No concerns. Camp - Voiced concern that freestanding pergolas, when not attached, may not look great and feel less architectural. Coombs - Supports the freestanding pergola, especially with the expectation that plants will grow on it.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver) (2:47:26)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	

5.	Elizabeth Singer	63 Baxter Rd	Pool	49/22	Jeffrey Lee
Concerns:	Application not opened.				
Motion:	No action.				
6.	89 Easton St	89 Easton St	Fenestration change & sm addition	41/351	BPC
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill				
Alternates:	Pohl				
Recused:	Paul				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Noted that the property is the circa 1897 Lena Gerrard house with a Form B in the process for historic tax credits. - Requested the submission of a historic determination application. - Expressed concerns about the proposed changes, particularly the gang windows and the addition of another skylight, deeming them inappropriate. - Appreciated the use of real brick for the foundation instead of Nantucket veneer. - Recommended the removal of the gang windows in favor of one or two single double-hung windows.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Regarding the skylight proposal, mentioned that skylights are typically preferred in main roof planes resembling roof hatches, and the proposed location is not considered appropriate. - Acknowledged the improvement with a smaller skylight but reiterated the unsuitability of the location. - Suggested reconfiguring the windows on the new East side dormer for a more even distribution and avoiding a concentrated shingle area. - On the West elevation, expressed concerns about the new dormer in the third floor, considering its impact on the overall organized roof plan.				
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed overall satisfaction with the proposed changes. - Noted that the windows on the east side are likely the least visible as they are at the rear of the building. - Mentioned no issues with the skylight on that roof plane. - Suggested removing the skylight on the front (South) as a good compromise, considering the presence of another skylight on the opposite side of the tower. Patten - Agreed with the suggestion to remove the skylight from the south elevation. - Expressed acceptance of the proposed windows but suggested improving their alignment for better centering on the dormer. Thornewill - Agreed with previous comments regarding the skylight in the turret facing the south. - Express concern about the new dormer on the west elevation, suggesting a single window width and potential placement on either side of the chimney. Coombs - Expressed dissatisfaction with the skylight under the chimney, finding it inappropriate. - Questioned the dormer next to the chimney with triangular windows, suggesting it made the area too busy. - Questioned the number of skylights on the house, considering it might be excessive for the historic context. Welch - Voiced support for the skylight, suggesting the addition of a muntin to divide the glass externally. - Concurred with the removal of the skylight on the south elevation.				
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff), to include the removal of the skylight on the south side, while maintaining the proposed plans for the west and north sides. Additionally, enhancing the window fenestration on the east rear portion and specifying the use of wood framing for the skylights, with the inclusion of a muntin down the middle. (Oliver) (3:06:41)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)				
				Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

7. 23 Sankaty Trust

21 Sankaty Head Rd

Sm addition & remove dormers

48/4.1

BPC

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates:	Welch
Recused:	Paul
Representative:	Joe Paul
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Expressed appreciation for the sensitivity to the mid-century dwelling. - Mentioned that moving the entrance to the center is appropriate, but the center is missing after the removal of the central chimney. - Appreciated the changes on the north side, finding them appropriate. - Liked the addition of the 2nd floor with the exterior gable and dormer. - Expressed concern about the overall issue of the removal of the central chimney, feeling that it is a loss. - Suggested going for a darker gray trim instead of white. - Noted that the date of the structure wasn't indicated on the COA. Paul - Mentioned a discussion with his client regarding the chimney as a potential issue and confirmed that the client has decided to keep it.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Camp - Mentioned familiarity with the house's location on the 5th hole's tee box. - Described the current gray color as settling well on the hill and contributing to the house's charm. - Expressed concern that changing to white might make it too modern or take away from its magical and charming quality. - Appreciated the proposed changes, noting that they are sensitively done. Oliver - No concerns and agreed with the darker color trim. Coombs, Patten and Pohl - Concurred with the previous comments by Commissioners.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) using the darker color on the trim and retaining the existing chimney. (Oliver) (3:19:40)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

V. OLD BUSINESS 11/21/2023

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Carolyn Manera 10-7351	15 Morey Lane	Garage		EMDA

- *Commissioners: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill; Alternates: None; Recused: None. -last heard 12/20/23.*

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

2. 43. W Miacomet LLC

43 W. Miacomet rd.

New dwelling

42.4./3

Emeritus LTD

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten
Alternates:	None
Recused:	None
Representative:	Matthew McEachern
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Thornewill - Specifically addressed concerns with the four windows on the 2nd floor of the west elevation. - Suggested reducing the number of windows by one and separating them, similar to the dormer on the north elevation. Camp - Concurred with Thornewill regarding the four windows on the 2nd floor of the west elevation. - Expressed agreement that the third proposed set of French doors seems excessive.

	- Recommended reducing the number of doors from four to three and adding a window in place of the proposed French door. Coombs - Recommended reducing the four windows to three on the west elevation. - Suggested converting one of the double set of French doors into a window, maintaining one as a door. Patten - Echoed concern about the four windows on the west elevation. - Suggested reducing the grouping to three for better consistency with other elevations. Welch - Acknowledged an “optical illusion” on the west elevation, where the bubble on the 2nd floor overlaps with the gable and makes it look like all one plane. - Mentioned that the doors on the right are set back approximately 30 feet and expressed understanding that it will appear more subtle in reality.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to replace the four 2nd floor windows on the west elevation with three evenly spaced windows, similar to the north elevation. (Thornewill) (3:29:18)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

3.	NT Island Resorts	19 N. Water Lot 11	New Dwelling	42.4.2/3	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul				
Alternates:	Welch				
Recused:	None				
Representative:	Matthew McEachern				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Acknowledged the location of the structures in the E8 flood zones and the need for compliance with Resilient Nantucket Design Regulations. - Highlighted the importance of obtaining elevation certificates through the review process. - Appreciated the shift off White Elephant Way, emphasizing the significance of the corner lot's design and citing in relation to its history as part of the Harbor House entry complex. - Referenced Building with Nantucket in Mind, emphasizing the value of sighting and respect for architectural tradition in the area. - Mentioned the commercial structures at 12 Easton and the former location of Mad Hatter as points of reference. - Appreciated the project's streetscape and noted the importance of how the new structures relate to existing and historic infill structures in the vicinity. - Encouraged the submission of elevation certificates.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed appreciation for providing room for a sidewalk and suggested that an additional foot might make it more comfortable. - Critiqued the front door (9 light door) as being too informal and suggested considering a six-light Craftsman-style door for more formality. - Raised concerns about the side lights, indicating they may be questionable in the design.				
Concerns:	Thornewill - Expressed appreciation for leaving space for a sidewalk, considering it highly important. - Appreciated the changes made but suggested that the front door, currently a nine-light, might be more suitable as a six-panel door. - Mentioned concerns about the width of the side lights. - Critiqued the small dormers on the one-story mass, particularly on the west and east sides, finding them inappropriate and suggesting their removal. - Described the dormers as introducing a modern element that doesn't align with the overall design of the house. Oliver - Concurred with Thornewill's comments. Paul - Expressed overall approval for the house design and improvements.				

	- Initially didn't have concerns about the front door but later suggested that a six-light door might be preferable. - Indicated that the side lights could remain as they are. - Addressed the dormers on the back, recommending potentially using a single window as a skylight instead of having dormers to simplify the design. - Acknowledged the positive aspects of the project, especially the cascading rooflines on the south elevation. - Suggested adding light above the French doors with a small window if necessary. Patten - Concurs with previous comments. Camp - Mentioned the possibility of adding a small dormer, possibly a triangular hat dormer. - Expressed concern about the shed dormer over the two little windows, considering it might appear too modern.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to make the front door a 6 light and omit the dormers on the rear one-story mass, which is the south elevation and to include the elevation certificate. (Oliver) (3:41:13)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

4. NIR, LLC 09-9203		19 N Water lot 11	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern, LLC
Voting:	Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul				
Alternates:	Welch				
Recused:	None				
Representative:	Miroslava Ahern				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Noted the location within the E8 flood zone and the recommendation for fewer impervious surfaces. - Appreciated the use of pea stone in the parking area and suggested using either brick or Belgian block to create a cohesive look.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Emphasized the importance of including the sidewalk, suggesting it should be added to the plan or incorporated into the motion. - Recommended reconsidering the stone posts at the entrance of the back driveway, proposing that they may not be necessary and could be eliminated.				
Concerns:	Thornewill - Concurred with the importance of including the sidewalk. - Expressed agreement regarding the inappropriateness of the stone posts, suggesting their removal. - Questioned the purpose of the Goshen Stone patio on the South Beach St. side, expressing confusion and a preference for a sidewalk extending around rather than a patio behind a fence. Oliver - Expressed concern about the absence of a sidewalk, referencing a close-up 3D view from a previous application that showed no sidewalk. Patten- Paul - No comments - Emphasized the importance of including a sidewalk in the front, and showing that it wraps around the curve and connects to the sidewalk in front of the buildings. - Advocated for maintaining the existing plant buffer and fence. - Expressed appreciation for the Goshen stone patio. - Highlighted the potential utility of the patio, suggesting that it could serve as a space for outdoor activities. - Proposed the addition of a brick sidewalk in the front, specifically mentioning its connection with neighboring homes. Camp - Echoed the Commissioner's sentiments about the importance of having a consistent sidewalk, emphasizing its continuity with neighboring buildings, particularly the White Elephant. - Expressed confusion and questioned the purpose of the small patio on South Beach Street, deeming it potentially impractical or incongruous.				
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions specifically with the concerns regarding the sidewalk. (Thornewill) (3:51:39)				

Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 –09-9203
5. NT Island Resorts 09-9216 19 N. Water Lot 7 New Dwelling 42.4.2/3 Emeritus LTD			
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten		
Alternates:	Paul		
Recused:	None		
Representative:	Matthew McEachern		
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.		
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Acknowledged the changes in trim color and the addition of a chimney based on the Commission's request but pointed out historical placement of chimneys next to roof walks rather than solely at gable ends. - Described the proposed dwelling as giving a Victorian eclectic feel, drawing parallels with a circa 1910 structure on Lincoln Circle. - Suggested that, given the Victorian eclectic style, referencing historical examples like the one on Lincoln Circle could be appropriate if they are not a four bay. - Recommended adjustments for a more symmetrical facade on the first floor, including replacing three gang windows with two single double-hung windows with shutters. - Expressed concern about the hipped roof over the entry and the presence of two sets of friendship stairs, indicating a need for further refinement in these areas.		
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Pointed out that changing the roof pitch of the dormers and the main roof has affected the meeting rail connection to the eave, suggesting a solution by lowering the entire roof system by 6 to 8 inches. - Mentioned that lowering the roof system would also address an issue on another elevation where there's a single course above the windows, eliminating the need for that shingle course. - Expressed concern about the front door feeling informal and under-detailed, suggesting potential adjustments such as eliminating the fireplace and making the door more formal. - Recommended adding kick panels to the east and rear doors for better detailing. - Noted discrepancies in porch detailing, suggesting changing the clabbered treatment to either shingles or vertical boards for a more informal look.		
Concerns:	Thornewill - Agreed with the details mentioned by Mickey and Holly, particularly about the symmetry on the front elevation. - Expressed concern about the lack of subordination of the rear mass, finding it awkward in relation to the main mass. - Noted the deeper front-to-back dimension of the main mass and appreciated the lower plates, contrasting with the higher plate of the rear L. Oliver - Agreed with previous comments about the dormer plate height, suggesting it should come down further to avoid floating above the windows. - Acknowledged that the pitch on the front elevation might be acceptable despite personal reservations. - Stated agreement with other comments and added that windows on the east and west should match those on the front facade, avoiding the introduction of a new window style. - Inquired about the color, clarifying that the doors and windows are grey. Patten - Agreed with previous comments, particularly regarding the north elevation. - Expressed a preference for two windows with shutters instead of three on the north. - Suggested that adding three windows on the east where one is currently missing might enhance the overall look. Camp - Expressed uncertainty about the front door's placement on the hipped mask. - Suggested a preference for a real open porch on the front. - Mentioned a desire for a more appropriate front door. Welch - No concerns.		
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Oliver) (4:06:01)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

6.	NIR, LLC	19 N Water lot 7	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern, LLC
	Concerns:	Application not opened.			
	Motion:	No action.			
7.	John Hendricks	1 Jefferson St	Fenestration Rev	554.1/158.1	Emeritus LTD
	Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs			
	Alternates:	None			
	Recused:	None			
	Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
	Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
	Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Described the dwelling as an infill circa 2018 within the fish lots in the Old Historic District (OHD). - Expressed the opinion that the two sets of triple gang windows are out of scale and inappropriate. - Recommended keeping the dwelling as it is built.			
	Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Suggested that typically, windows on the sides should match the same size as the front of the building. - Recommended changing the triple windows to a pair of separated 6-over-6 windows that are the same size as the front window.			
	Concerns:	Welch - No concerns Coombs - Preferred to see two separate windows or some modification to address the abundance of windows on that elevation. Pohl - Appreciated the front design. - Considered the six over nines, suggesting they be split into two to avoid 2 triple units. Camp - Noted her concerns were not so much about 6/9, but rather that they're all ganged together.			
	Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Welch) (4:13:07)			
	Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	
8.	63 Hulbert LLC 09-9214	63 Hulbert Ave	Main House Revisions	29/9	Emeritus LTD
	Voting:	Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul			
	Alternates:	None			
	Recused:	None			
	Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
	Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
	Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Stated this is a contributing house from circa 1915-1923. - Noted a historic termination letter was approved July of this year. - Updated Form B with the survey has been provided, acknowledging the changes. - Expressed appreciation for the adjustments made. - Pointed out the additional additions may exceed the appropriateness limit per the Secretary of Interiors. - Highlighted the 100-year-old Colonial Revival has undergone significant alterations, especially with the left-side addition that still appears somewhat displaced even with the reduction of height. - Mentioned the entire south side, noting that previously approved plans were more successful. - Appreciated removal of east and west flanking dormers, reduction of the waterside deck, and the reduced north dormer. - Emphasized the right-side (harbor side) addition removes the symmetrical facade, and while changes were previously approved, maintaining symmetry on the harbor side is crucial as it is a character-defining feature of the structure.			
	Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Acknowledged completely agree with Backus' comments regarding the addition to the west. - Stated changes in symmetry and added length to the building are concerning.			

	- Noted various town area plans are part of the master plan, providing guidance to boards and decision-making. - Pointed out the Brandt Point Area Plan is clear about protecting views of the harbor from public ways. - Emphasized widening the house by a significant amount restricts the view further. - Suggested if considering the addition, recommend lowering the mass considerably, possibly even opting for a hip roof to reduce its visual impact. - Reiterated that the addition is not appropriate at all. Caroline Baltzer - Appreciated the input from staff.
Concerns:	Oliver - Proposed lowering the left side, considering a shed or hip roof as suggested by Mickey. - Explained that such adjustments would create a porch-like appearance and effectively reduce the overall height. Paul - Concurred with the previous comments, including the hip roof suggestion. Patten and Thornewill - Concurred with previous comments.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) the farthest one-story addition on the south to become a hip roof. (Oliver) (4:22:35)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul (Aye) Certificate # HDC2023 – 09-9214

9. 63 Hulbert LLC 10-9290		63A Hulbert Ave	Revisions to COA	29/9	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Representative:	Matthew McEachern				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Identified this is a guest house with a vintage feel, circa 1915-1923. - Confirmed a historic determination is on file. - Updated Form B with the survey effort has been provided. - Stated changes don't seem substantial enough to address the commissioners' concerns from the last review. - Noted the street elevation on the south is overwhelming, particularly with the dormer on the garage. - Highlighted the dormer on the garage, although part of the original structure, has altered the characteristic of the building in that regard.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Agreed with Holly's point; it is still pretty massive. - Acknowledged that it's better lower than initially presented. - Suggested going even lower. - Noted the prominence of dormers on the main part of the house. - Disagreed with using the exact same dormer. - Proposed a smaller dormer, emphasizing subordination to the main house. Caroline Baltzer - Noted concerns regarding the addition of bedrooms to the yard side instead of the east elevation of the boathouse cottage. - Highlighted the impact on the water vista, including the beach and Brant Point Lighthouse from a public perspective. - Emphasized the importance of preserving the sweeping view characteristic of Hulbert Ave. outlined in the Brant Point area plan. - Stressed the significance of water districts in connecting to the harbor and maintaining openness along Hulbert Ave. - Discussed the historical changes in the Easton St. area due to flooding and the opportunity to preserve the historic flavor of Hulbert Ave. - Referred to the area plan's recommendations on density increase concerns, especially along the harbor side of Hulbert Ave., to preserve the historic character. - Appreciated collaborative efforts in preserving the iconic and historically recognized features of the area.				

	Ruth Alter - Expressed appreciation for the numerous revisions made to the main house, expressing increased satisfaction. - Acknowledged the fortune in Brant Point and on Hulbert Ave., having some of the earliest summer cottage homes still intact, such as the Hulbert Johnson House. - Expressed contentment with changes made to the plans for the new house. - Thanked the board for prioritizing the Brant Point Master Plan, especially its emphasis on retaining open space. - Requested the consideration of relocating the garage addition to the east side instead of the west side, preserving a major vista of the harbor as per the master plan's emphasis.		
Concerns:	Oliver - Suggested eliminating the dormer facing south. - Encouraged lowering the roof to restore the original height, as it was significantly shorter at 17 feet. - Acknowledged the approved height increase to 21 feet and expressed a desire to explore options for adjustment. Paul - Observed that the presence of a dormer or not may not significantly impact the streetscape for pedestrians. - Proposed that reducing the overall width of the garage element, currently at 18 feet, to 16 feet could enhance the pedestrian corridor towards the view. - Expressed a preference for maintaining the current height of the garage. - Noted that the floor plan indicates potential room for a slight reduction in width, suggesting it might be beneficial for the overall streetscape. - Stated acceptance of the south-facing dormer. Thornewill - Supported Joe's suggestion to reduce the width of the garage, considering it a good idea. - Proposed a more simplistic treatment for the dormer above the garage, suggesting it shouldn't precisely match those on the main roof. - Advocated for a cooler and smaller design for the dormer, particularly because it is positioned above a garage door.		
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Oliver) (4:38:38)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – 10-9290

-Applications held to next meeting.

10. Jonathan Raith 2 Goldstar Dr MH partial demo & addition 55/196 Permit +

- *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver Alternates: Thornewill, Patten, Paul; Recused: None.*

VI. NEW BUSINESS 11/28/2023

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	Old North Wharf Coop Inc	20 Old North Wharf	Lk Deck/patio	42.3.1/255	EMDA
2.	Old North Wharf Coop Inc	22 Old North Wharf	Lk Deck/patio	43.3.1/256	EMDA
3.	9B Crow's Nest LLC	9B Crows Nest Wy #2	Revs 8712 Fenestration	12/20.2	Botticelli + Pohl
4.	42/44 ARB Way LLC	9 Arbour Way	Add Window	29/137	Botticelli + Pohl
5.	Stark Point LLC	16 Easton St	MH Color change	42.1.4/11	Botticelli + Pohl
6.	Stark Point LLC	16 Easton St	Add Shutters	42.1.4/11	Botticelli + Pohl
7.	Kathleen Krall	15 Masaquet Ave	New shed	80/141	Botticelli + Pohl
8.	Eleven Lincoln Ave Trust	32 Jefferson Ave	Revs to 10-9274	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
9.	43 W Miacomet LLC	43 W Miacomet	New shed	86/13.2	Emeritus LTD
10.	Nancy Holmes	3 Eagles Wing Wy	Solar Roof array	80/229	Empower energy
11.	6 Todd cir LLC	12 Willard St	Alterations	42.4.1/53	Olson Twombly
12.	Melissa Emery	67 Starbuck rd	New Shed	59.4/67.1	Devon Murphy
13.	Naomi & Scott Smith	248 Madaket Rd	Barn/Garage	59.4/16.1	Val Oliver
14.	Rita Nakarmi	5 Dennis Dr	New Dwelling	67/368	Val Oliver
15.	NT Conservation Foundation	165 Cliff Rd	New Dwelling	41/65	Val Oliver
16.	43 Fairgrounds Rd LLC	43 Fairgrounds rd.	Move on	67/288	Val Oliver
17.	Nantucket Golf Club Inc	21 Waydale Rd	Sidewall/Roof	55/430	Robert O'Day
18.	Elizabeth Goulet	51 Miacomet rd.	2 nd Dwelling	67/196	Brook Meerbergen
19.	Matt & Alison Smith	232 Madaket Rd	Main House Porch Fens/ mod	59.4/120.1	Brook Meerbergen
20.	Matt & Alison Smith	232 Madaket Rd	2 nd Dwelling	59.4/120.1	Brook Meerbergen

21. Matt & Alison Smith	232 Madaket Rd	New shed	59.4/120.1	Brook Meerbergen
22. Matt & Alison Smith	232 Madaket Rd	Hardscape driveway/apron	59.4/120.1	Brook Meerbergen
23. Nantucket Boat Basin LLC	29 Commercial Wf 12	Demo structure	42.2.4/3	Dennis Patnaude
24. John Lancaster	15 Burnell St	Addition	73.4.2/48	Greg Nichols
25. 146 Surfside Rd LLC	146 Surfside Rd	Pool/Hardscape	80/315	Atlantic Landscaping
26. Ach Ama Realty	1 Sparks Av	Alterations Windows	55/180.1	Eaghmon Banks
27. Ach Ama Realty	1 Sparks Av	New walk-in cooler	55/180.1	Eaghmon Banks
28. 40 OSR LLC	2 Forrest Ave	Rev Prev app 2023-08-8905	69/10	Emeritus
29. Shubin Yauheni	8 Gray Ave	Fenestration & roof	67/772	JB Studio
30. Margaret Connolly Trust	151 Surfside rd.	Roof walk covered porch	80/36.1	JB Studio
31. Christopher Tofalli Tr	122 Main St	Fens, 2 nd floor deck	42.3.3/100	JB Studio
32. 61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot D	Roof and fenestration	67/173.2	JB Studio
33. 61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot B	New pool	67/173	JB Studio
34. 61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot C	New pool	67/173.1	JB Studio
35. 61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot D	New pool	67/173.2	JB Studio
36. Steven Jemison	4 Lavendar Ln	New pool	33/24	JB Studio
37. Richard Dober Tr	10 Silver St	New MH dwelling	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
38. Richard Dober Tr	10 Silver St	New Gh/ cottage	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
39. Richard Dober Tr	10 Silver St	Cabana /Shed alterations	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
40. Richard Dober Tr- WITHDRAWN	10 Silver St	New pool	55.4.1/187	JB Studio

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- December 5th at 4pm ***HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:39pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 6-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Paul, Patten (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

Rumble Link: <https://rumble.com/v40o15p-nantuckethistoric-district-commission-november-28-2023.html>

Nantucket Old Historic District Sconset Old Historic District