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, December 5, 2023

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:04p.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.
Attending Members:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul
Remote Participants:	Coombs, Thornewill
Absent Members:	-
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	-
ADOPTION OF AMENDED AGENDA	
Motion:	**Motion to approve amended agenda. (Welch) (1:36)**
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs Oliver (Aye)

I. SIGNS

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	David Fredericks	31 Old South rd.	Wall sign	68/3	Lauriane Araujo Lima
3.	VTT LLC	48 Center St.	Projecting sign	42.3.1/1	Hannah Poindexter

Emeralda Martinez explained that due to a lack of a quorum, the Sign Committee was not able to take any action on the two above items. These items will be continued, and no action taken.

2.	Richard Valero	62 Old South rd.	Wall sign	68/58.2	Mac Davis

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Esmeralda Martinez** - Explained that Chris Young, Chair of the Sign Committee did review this request and recommended approval with their conditions since there are two separate businesses.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	-
Motion:	**Motion to approve, subject to the recommendations of Sign Committee Chairperson. (Welch) (3:58)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

II. CONSENTS

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent	
1.	Christopher Emery	7 West Way	Apron & driveway	38/135	Chris Emery	em

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. (Welch) (4:51)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

III. 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**

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill
Alternates:	None
Recused:	None
Representative:	Linda Williams
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Explained that the main historic dwelling, dating back to 1906 and located outside the Sconset Old Historic District, underwent its last review in December 2022. - Stated that the HDC expressed concerns about its height and proximity to the 19 ft tall historic main house. - Stated that the garage, currently under review, stands at 22 ft 6 inches to the ridge. - Mentioned that the Commissioners raised concerns about the second-floor plate height, echoing previous worries for a reduction in height. - Pointed out that the main dwelling was not part of the prior review. - Recommended that the garage's height should not exceed that of the existing historic structure (19 ft) or the previously approved main dwelling in the rear. - Suggested that a height in between these two structures would be more appropriate.
Public Comments:	**Rob Benchley**, Sconset Advisory Group - Noted that the Board had requested lower eaves. - Emphasized the reinforcement of the request. - Acknowledged the size difference, recognizing that the main house is much bigger than the structure in the back.
Concerns/Comments:	**Pohl** - Noted the absence of addressing the actual revision. - Stated the revision involves lowering the building, specifically dropping the Eve. - Mentioned the previous height was 23 feet. - Highlighted that the current submission is at 22 feet. - Recalled concerns from several members about the height of the eve above the first-floor windows and doors. **Williams** - Explained that the revision involved dropping a foot but bringing it back due to the lack of visibility and the presence of the same detail in the other two proposals. **Camp** - Expressed agreement with the design, considering it appropriate for the house. - Suggested a minor adjustment, proposing that the height of the house (which is currently 2 ft 8) be brought down minimally. **Coombs** - Concurred with Holly's and Abby's statements. - Advocated for bringing down the height, emphasizing that the concern is not about the height relative to the one in the back. - Recommended aligning the two structures behind each other, particularly focusing on the one in the front. **Thornewill** - Concurred with previous statements. **Pohl** - Pointed out the impact of perspective and the considerable distance behind the other building. - Downplayed the significance of an 4-inch discrepancy. - Conveyed satisfaction with the current application and expressed acceptance of it in its current state.
Motion:	**Motion to approve, as submitted. (Coombs) (14:59)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye) — Certificate # HDC2023 – **10-7351**

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

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	None
Representative:	Jonathan Raith
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments: **Holly Backus**	- Stated that the structure is a circa 1950 contributing building, likely built by Fletcher Ross, known for constructing houses on Gold Star Drive in the 50s. - Mentioned that the dormers originally overwhelmed the simple 1950s dwelling, deeming the north side inappropriate with a "peekaboo" effect from the dormers. - Described the addition as atypical in size, incongruent with design guidelines and Secretary of the Interior standards. - Emphasized that the new addition, being more than double the size of the existing small dwelling, does not align with the guidelines that suggest new additions should be smaller and subordinate to the historic dwelling.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	**Oliver** - Expressed appreciation for utilizing the existing structure instead of considering demolition or relocation. - Acknowledged the increase in size, with the highest point at 20 feet, but personally believed that a separate structure would be more invasive on the lot. - Recognized positive changes, stating the belief that they are enhancing the structure. - Initially found the structure acceptable and raised a request for a little window in the lower gable on the east side. **Coombs** - Expressed uncertainty about whether it's true or a perception from the drawings, but pointed out that both shed dormers appear right up to the roof. - Described the desire to bring down the dormers a bit, considering them too high as observed from the perspective of the windows below. - Recalled a previous approved proposal where both gables were almost the same height without leaning to one side. - Noted the overall height of 20 ft, indicating no real objection to it. - Shared a preference for the previously approved double gable but suggested reducing the size of the gables on both sides, potentially to two windows, and bringing them in to align better with the size of the windows below. **Welch** - Expressed concern that a separate structure might be more appropriate due to the front-facing west elevation being only 20 feet high on a ranch-style structure. - Suggested shifting the structure back on its axis as an alternative to a separate dwelling. - Pointed out the potential impact on future plans for the property, emphasizing that creating a separate dwelling, even if connected underground, could affect future considerations. - Raised specific concern about the west elevation, considering it the front of the house. - Noted the unconventional features for a ranch-style dwelling, such as the height and the presence of gables, dormers, and forward windows. **Camp** - Expressed agreement with Diane's suggestion of bringing the dormers down a little off the ridge line. - Estimated a potential correction of around six inches, viewing it as a positive adjustment. - Appreciated the effort of renovating the contributing structure from 1950. **Pohl** - Expressed admiration for the scale of the buildings, particularly the ranch houses built for Korean War veterans. - Acknowledged the diversity in height among some buildings, noting exceptions like the speaker's office, which is taller but not two stories. - Appreciated the respect shown to the existing structure by the proposed addition. - Recognized the value of the addition for additional program needs without overwhelming the original structure.
Motion:	**Motion to approve through staff, with Exhibit A dropping the dormers down slightly and adding a small window on the east side in the blank gable. (Oliver) (28:12)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye) //Welch (Nay) | Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted

IV. NEW BUSINESS 11/28/2023

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Elizabeth Singer 11-9430	**63 Baxter Rd**	**Pool**	**49/22**	**Jeffrey Lee**

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	None
Representative:	Jeffrey Lee
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Noted that the existing dwelling on the lot is the Circa 1890 Mitchell house, recognized as a contributing structure in the Sconset neighborhood. - Mentioned the location on the bluff side of Baxter Road. - Described the proposed size as highly inappropriate and expressed concern, particularly regarding visibility from both the bluff and Baxter Road. - Criticized the lack of screening in the application, deeming it inappropriate. - Acknowledged the Conservation Commission's approval mentioned in the application but emphasized that the approval of one regulatory board does not supersede another regulatory board.
Public Comments:	**Rob Benchley**, Sconset Advisory Group - Highlighted the presence of a public way on three sides, in addition to Baxter Road and the footpath. - Expressed concern about the proposed swimming pool being a "record breaker" on that side of Baxter Road. - Voiced apprehension about setting a precedent and suggested it might not align with public preferences. - Asserted disagreement with the proposal, stating that it should not be considered for the neighborhood's next move.
Concerns:	**Camp** - Shared information from a Google search about the history of the Sconset Walk path. - Noted that the public way was created in 1892 by developer William Flag, who emphasized protecting coastal views for public enjoyment. - Mentioned the permanent easement deeded into lots along Baxter Road to preserve the path. - Cited concerns raised by others about the proposal's visibility, particularly given the historical importance and lack of screening. - Echoed concerns about the potential negative impact on the path's openness and the enjoyment it brings to the public. **Coombs** - Deemed the proposal totally inappropriate. - Emphasized that it negatively impacts people's feelings about the surroundings. - Highlighted the impracticality of blocking it off with vegetation due to the land's characteristics and the bank's slope. - Concluded by stating a clear objection to the proposal for 63 Baxter Road. **Oliver** - Observed a small structure on the plot plan for the proposed pool, not evident in supplied photos. - Mentioned the note about a "relocated story" and raised the possibility of using it for mitigation. - Proposed downsizing and relocating the structure behind the one with four French doors along the street. - Called for a different type of screening, acknowledging uncertainty about the specifics. - Noted visibility concerns from the driveway and the bluff walk, echoing Abby's previous comment. **Welch** - Acknowledged the challenge of installing a pool with suitable screening while preserving the historic character and setting of the bluff walk. - Conveyed an awareness of the complex balance required in addressing the issue. **Pohl** - Highlighted challenges in the screening process, pointing out potential gaps. - Identified specific areas of concern, including the driveway opening. - Noted the visibility issue even if a proposed privet were solid, emphasizing the need for an effective solution. - Stressed the importance of choosing an appropriately opaque material for screening.
Motion:	**Motion to hold for revisions. (Oliver) (40:48)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye) — Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9430**

2. Old North Wharf Coop Inc 11-9541 20 Old North Wharf Lk Deck & patio repair 42.3.1/255 EMDA

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul	
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill	
Recused:	Welch	
Representative:	Linda Williams	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Identified the building as the Warf Rat Club, acknowledging its longstanding presence. - Initially viewed it as an appropriate like-kind application. - Mentioned that concerns would arise if it wasn't truly like-kind, referencing Linda's answer about the heavy timber proposed. - Clarified that heavy timber might differ from the original construction. - Stated no concerns aside from the potential difference in materials, pending clarification.	
Public Comments:	**Mickey Rowland** - No concerns.	
Concerns:	Commissioners had stated no concerns.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver) (44:20)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9541**

3. Old North Wharf Coop Inc 11-9540 22 Old North Wharf Lk Deck & patio repair 43.3.1/256 EMDA

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul	
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill	
Recused:	- Welch	
Representative:	Linda Williams	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** -	
Public Comments:	**Mickey Rowland** - No concerns.	
Concerns:	Commissioners had stated no concerns.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver) (44:20)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9540**

4. 9B Crow's Nest LLC 11-9497 9B Crow's Nest Wy #2 Fenestration Revs-8712 12/20.2 Botticelli + Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	Pohl
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli - Proposed adding two half six-light awnings on the North elevation above the outdoor shower to enhance character. - Suggested the possibility of reducing the number of windows on the west side from two to one, while maintaining two on the east side due to floor plan considerations. - Explained the rationale behind keeping two windows on the east side, emphasizing the modern architecture consistency in the living room. – Clarified that the north-facing window is under a porch, providing additional context about its placement.
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Noted the existence of an old HDC survey on file. - Expressed concern about the nano doors on the south and north sides being visible from the public beach, deeming it inappropriate. - Recommended keeping the lights in the doors as proposed but suggested not having nano doors with just one light.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	**Camp** - Suggested separating the two gang windows on the west elevation to balance the design. - Proposed that the sliders be paneled with a kick plate as a nod to the structure's history. - Acknowledged the presence of modern picture windows and noted that the existing features seem more appropriate for the house than plain sliders. - Concluded with the provided suggestions for design adjustments. **Coombs**

	- Concurred with the suggestion that the windows on the east side should have additional elements like kick panels, muttons, or other design features. - Expressed concerns about the number of mold windows on the east elevation, particularly on both ends, and recommended separating the windows. - Addressed the disappearance of two windows that Abby mentioned, advocating for them to be separated. - Critiqued the arrangement of windows on the north elevation, emphasizing the need to reconsider the placement of windows in the lower gable, especially in comparison to the previously approved design with three windows. **Welch** - Indicated agreement and satisfaction with the proposed changes if consistent with the suggestions made by other members.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve through staff with Exhibit A, to add two six light windows on the north side, ganged together and separate the windows on the first floor on the west. (Oliver) (55:57)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9497**

5. 42/44 ARB Way LLC 11-9503 9 Arbour Way Add Window 29/137 Botticelli + Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill	
Alternates:	Paul, Patten	
Recused:	Pohl	
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	-	
Motion:	**Motion to approve as submitted. (Coombs) (57:38)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9503**

6. Stark Point LLC 11-9476 16 Easton St MH Color change 42.1.4/11 Botticelli + Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul	
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill	
Recused:	Pohl	
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	**Camp** - Expressed concern about the perceived harshness of the chosen black color for the shutters, particularly those over the front door. - Recalled the earlier decision or agreement to have the shutters in a gray-blue shade. **Coombs** - Conveyed a personal dislike for the chosen color. **Welch** - Voiced concern specifically about the color contrast in this particular instance.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve, as submitted. (Oliver) (1:00:08)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:2 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) // Welch, Camp (Nay)	Certificate # HDC2023 –**11-9476**

7. Stark Point LLC 11-9490 16 Easton St Guest house Add Shutters 42.1.4/11 Botticelli + Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	Pohl
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Acknowledged the uniqueness of the situation, describing it as an infill in the OHD section of Brant Point. - Pointed out the oddness of adding shutters on one elevation, possibly due to it facing inward and the specific relationship with property lines. - Recognized the unusual nature of the arrangement, taking into consideration the building's context and orientation.
Public Comments:	**Mickey Rowland** - Agreed with Holly's perspective that if shutters are added to one side, which is not the front of the house, it would make sense to put them on the other side for consistency.

Concerns:	**Camp** - Questioned the decision to put shutters on only one side, particularly on the first floor facing Easton, which is considered the front door side. - Described the arrangement as odd, expressing confusion about the asymmetry in shutter placement. **Coombs** - Observed the inconsistency in the presence of shutters, noting that some windows have them while others do not. - Commented that if it were a genuinely old house, such a mix might be expected, but suggested that for consistency, if shutters are added on the East Side, they should also be present on the West Side, especially when the windows differ. - Proposed maintaining a consistent approach or omitting shutters altogether to avoid a haphazard appearance. **Oliver** - Concurred with Diane's viewpoint, supporting the idea that if shutters are on the East, they should also be added on the West for consistency on the first and second floors. - Suggested considering shutters on the North side as well, while noting that visibility from the South is not a concern. **Paul** - Concurred with the opinions expressed, stating agreement with the notion that the East and West sides should match in the front Gambrel portion. - Expressing less concern about shutters under the porch due to the protection offered by the porch itself. **Welch** - Expressed concern about the potential overwhelming effect on the North elevation when adding posts and columns. **Camp** - Commended the overall design, describing it as really good and standing well on its own. - Shared the perspective that the addition of shutters, especially if they are black, are confusing and detract from the design.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve through staff, with Exhibit A shutters, as shown on the west and with the addition of the three windows in the primary mass on the west elevation. (Paul) (1:04:57)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:2 // Welch, Oliver, Paul (Aye) //Camp, Coombs	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9490**

8. Kathleen Krall 11-9525 15 Masaquet Ave New shed 80/141 Botticelli + Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten	
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill	
Recused:	Pohl	
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	-	
Motion:	**Motion to approve, as submitted. (Oliver) (1:07:39)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9525**

9. Eleven Lincoln Ave Trust 11-9525 32 Jefferson Ave Revs to 10-9274 30/132 Botticelli + Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill
Alternates:	Paul, Patten
Recused:	Pohl
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Noted that the structure is a rebuild of a non-contributing structure from 1980. - Expressed no concerns about the reduced height or fenestration changes. - Raised a concern about the proposed color change, noting that the online scan may not accurately represent the brightness of the color chips in person. - Suggested having a discussion to address this concern.
Public Comments:	**Mickey Rowland** - Stated no concerns about the roof pitch. - Addressed the dormer extension, acknowledging that visibility might be limited. - Cited "Building with Nantucket in Mind" and pointed out a deviation from the guideline, noting that the shed dormer should ideally be set back 3 feet from the gable end, which the proposal does not meet.

	- Acknowledged a previous oversight regarding the color change. - Expressing a stance against the proposed black or very dark color for the changed sash.	
Concerns:	**Camp** - Commented on the existing color scheme in the area, noting mostly white structures with a blue that is considered perfect. - Expressed openness to Platinum Gray but raised concerns that the proposed black or very dark color might look out of place and potentially compromise the overall design. **Coombs** - Expressed agreement with the preference for blue and lighter colors. - Shared the view that black might not be suitable in the location, especially given the prevalence of black in other elements, and opted for lighter colors. **Thornewill** - Concurred with others, expressing agreement that black would be excessive or too much in this context. **Welch** - Expressed a differing opinion, stating comfort with the color change but finding the dormer overwhelming. **Camp** - Shared agreement regarding the dormer, emphasizing the need for it to be pulled in a bit from the eve line.	
Motion:	**Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Camp) (1:15:27)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9526**

10. 43 W Miacomet LLC 11-9482 43 W Miacomet New shed 86/13.2 Emeritus LTD

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver	
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill	
Recused:	-	
Representative:		
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:		
Public Comments:		
Concerns:	Application not opened.	
Motion:	**Held for representation.**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9482**

11. Nancy Holmes 11-9486 3 Eagles Wing Wy Solar Roof array 80/229 Empower energy

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	None
Representative:	Fritz McClure
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**-**
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	**Camp** - Struggled to read the plan and indicated difficulty in discerning which panels to support or oppose. - Voiced uncertainty about having all the necessary information to make a judgment. - Expressed a general preference for systematic grouping of panels over a perceived haphazard arrangement. **Welch** - Provided clarification on the cross-hatched areas in yellow on the roof plans, indicating areas without solar panels. - Expressed confusion due to the muted contrast caused by the roof color and suggested a need for clearer visual representation. - Proposed the use of images without colored roofs, possibly in gray, and suggested using a modeled orange or black for the panels. - Requested the additional information be provided by Friday to facilitate discussion at the upcoming meeting. **Pohl** - Found it challenging to comprehend the arrangement of solar panels on the roof, observing a seemingly scattered distribution. - Emphasized the importance of visibility from public ways in their assessment. - Requested the submission of a photograph of the house taken from any public way, with highlighted or circled roof planes where solar panels are planned, to aid in their discussion. **Coombs**

	- Shared local knowledge about the property's topography, noting a drop from the road down to Surfside Road. - Mentioned a direct view from Surfside Road to Eagle's Wing, highlighting the visibility of the house and its panels. - Requested a topographical map indicating the land's heights to better understand the context of the proposed solar panels. **Oliver** - Suggested that the applicant review the solar guidelines. - Mentioned the importance of consistency in panel placement and avoiding the primary front mass. - Emphasized the need for additional information, especially photographs, to better assess the proposal.	
Motion:	**Motion to hold for review. In addition, requested additional images to better discern the location of panels on the roof and referred the applicant to review the Sustainable Preservation Guidelines on the Town of Nantucket HDC webpage. (Welch) (1:25:14)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9486**

12. 6 Todd Cir LLC 11-9546 12 Willard St Alterations 42.4.1/53 Olson Twombly

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill, Welch
Recused:	None
Representative:	Joseph Olson
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments: **Holly Backus**	- Noted that this is an infill structure dating back to 1980 in Brant Point with an HDC survey from 1989. - Highlighted that proposed hardscape, including the patio, requires a separate COA and should be removed from the current application. - Recommended a 12-light door with a kick panel for the new door on the north side to align with HDC standards in the Historic District. - Advised against using a nine-light door for the front door on the east side, considering it informal for such a location. - Suggested reducing the size and scale of the second-floor deck and post, as it conflicts with the principles outlined in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Acknowledged and appreciated the changes made to the roof walk skirt for compliance with the guidelines, recommending revisions and a separate COA for the hardscaping.
Public Comments:	**Mickey Rowland** - Concurred with Holly about the front door, expressing that the nine-light style is too informal. Suggested a more traditional front door style. - Noted that while matching the existing door surround trim, it may not be appropriate, and recommended a door casing with a taller head casing for a more traditional look, especially since it is being rebuilt.
Concerns:	**Oliver** - Expressed appreciation for the change in the roof walk and inquired about leaving it as it is due to existing conditions, specifically questioning whether the posts usually run all the way through traditionally. - Concurred on the recommendation for a more substantial trim for the front door, suggesting something other than a nine-light design. - Stated no objection to matching the 15-light doors existing in the rear of the house. - Expressed no issue with the second-floor deck and post, especially since it is in the rear of the building. **Patten** - Agreed with Holly's comments regarding the front door. **Coombs** - Acknowledged the presence of proposed second-floor sliders and raised the question of whether kick panels might be needed for balance. - Sought clarification about the shower's placement on the new deck, ensuring it is not easily visible. - Expressed appreciation for the removal of circles from the roof walk. **Camp** - Expressed appreciation for the change in the roof walk style. - Supported the consensus on the front door style, suggesting a panel door with simple embellishments. - Suggested considering a simpler Juliet balcony instead of an extended deck, especially if not necessary. - Acknowledged Val's point about the 15-light doors and suggested a kick panel for the French doors if deemed appropriate. **Pohl** - Emphasized the importance of revising the roof walk detail to ensure continuous posts from top to bottom.

	- Expressed concern about the front door being a nine-light, suggesting a switch to a six-panel or four-panel door for a more formal appearance. - Noted that other elements like the balcony, French doors, etc., are not a concern due to the dense vegetation behind the house as seen in the aerial photo.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve through staff with Exhibit A to correct the roof walk and change the front door. (Oliver) (1:42:24)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9546**

13. Melissa Emery 11-9484 67 Starbuck rd New Shed 59.4/67.1 Devon Murphy

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill, Welch
Recused:	None
Representative:	Devon Murphy
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Noted that the provided site plan does not match the indicated survey plan. - Highlighted that the architectural plans match the existing shed, expressing hope that the shed will remain. - Pointed out the potential incongruence in trim color if the new structure's trim is natural to weather while the existing house and shed have white trim. - Mentioned the presence of old roads, Mississippi Avenue and Utah Avenue, flanking the property.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	**Oliver** - Noted that the lack of information, including trim color, roof color, and site plan details, contributed to the application not being considered for consent, and expressed that there doesn't appear to be anything inappropriate about the project. **Camp** - Expressed a preference not to have baton board and recommended regular shingling for uniformity, including white trim and the same roof shingle as the main house. **Coombs** - Agreed with Abby, expressing approval for the shed but preferring not to have barn boards and recommending white trim to match the main house. **Paul** - Concurred with Diane and Abby. **Pohl** - Suggested that the barn board elevation may not be visible and proposed approval with the condition of using white cedar shingle siding on all four sides and white trim to match the house and the existing barn.
Motion:	**Motion to approve through staff with Exhibit A with the siding being white cedar shingles and the trim painted white to match the main house. (Oliver) (1:55:19)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) / Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9484**

14. Naomi & Scott Smith 11-9498 248 Madaket Rd Barn/Garage 59.4/16.1 Val Oliver

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill
Alternates:	Welch, Paul
Recused:	Oliver
Representative:	Val Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments: **Holly Backus**	- Noted the main house as a non-contributor from 1986 and acknowledged the barn as an appropriate feature for the area. - Suggested that the design of the barn needs some tweaking, specifically mentioning the steep roof pitch and the atypical doors with transoms above. - Pointed out that the fenestration in the dormers seems to be floating and recommended aligning them with the soffit. - Appreciated the dormers' compliance with "Building with Nantucket in Mind" and not being on the ridge and that the trim is to match the main dwelling.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	**Camp** - Suggested having the dormers set back from the eaves rather than flush, especially after noting the drawings. - Mentioned that the transoms on the east elevation seem excessive, and recommended adjusting the proportion of the garage doors, especially their distance from the corner. **Thornewill**

	- Expressed agreement with concerns about the north elevation, particularly the size of the doors and windows above. - Suggested adjusting the proportions, possibly making the doors 8 by 7 or 8 by 8 and agreed on the need to set back the dormers. - Noted that the east elevation may not be very visible from Madaket Road. **Coombs** - Agreed with concerns about the north garage doors being too wide and not tall enough. Suggested making the doors eight feet wide. - Expressed concerns about the dormers on the east elevation, finding the three windows in a row too busy. - Recommended adjusting the proportions of the windows on the first floor to better match the doors. - Mentioned the need for larger windows on the second floor of the barn, emphasizing that there is enough facade to accommodate them. - Suggested reconsidering the necessity of the small windows over the barn on the east side. **Patten** - Agreed with the concerns about the north garage doors, suggesting they be made smaller or repositioned. **Pohl** - Suggested reducing the width of the garage doors to eight and a half feet and considering 6 over 6 double-hung windows on the front North elevation for a more balanced look. - Supported the idea of pushing back the plane of the dormers from the face of the wall below.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve through staff with Exhibit A reducing the garage doors from 9 ft wide to 8 and a half feet wide, change the three over three windows to six over six, fix the rebate on the dormers and eliminate the beehive vent. (Camp) (2:17:16)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9498**

15. Rita Nakarmi 11-9518 5 Dennis Dr New Dwelling 67/368 Val Oliver

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill	
Alternates:	Welch, Patten	
Recused:	Oliver	
Representative:	Val Oliver	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	**Paul** - Mentioned that the existing house's front door is blue, while the new house's main door is proposed to be white. - Raised a question about whether the new front door needs to match the roof color. **Thornewill** - Expressed agreement with the design and stated flexibility regarding the color choice for the front door, suggesting that it could be white or any other color. **Coombs and Camp** - No concerns.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve with the front door being blue to match the existing house on the property. (Camp) (2:23:41)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9518**

16. NT Conservation Foundation **11-9489** 165 Cliff Rd New Dwelling 41/65 Val Oliver

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill	
Alternates:	Paul	
Recused:	Oliver	
Representative:	Val Oliver	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Expressed concerns about the lack of differential in size between the duplex units. - Suggested that the smaller unit should be shorter to achieve additive massing. - Mentioned the need for more harmony with the existing 30-year-old structure on the lot, particularly with regard to dormers, chimney, and eve lines.	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	**Thornewill** - Expressed concerns about the lack of character and sensitivity in the design of the modular house, particularly its size and placement in a location with existing rural buildings.	

	- Suggested that the house could be hidden behind other structures on the site to be less prominent on the street. - Concerned about the massiveness and plainness of the design, expressing that it may not be appropriate for the location. **Camp** - Shared concerns about the visibility and impact of the proposed modular house on the site, particularly in contrast to the existing rural character. - Suggested that the height is overwhelming and recommended exploring options such as reducing it to a story and a half for better additive massing. **Patten** - Expressed a desire to see the proposed location of the house on the site, considering the potential advantages. - Mentioned the idea of adding dormers to enhance the design and expressed interest in conducting a view to further assess the proposal. **Coombs** - Agreed with concerns about the proposed location, suggesting a view to assess how the house fits within the context of Cliff Road. Mentioned the need for enhancements such as possibly changing the window style to six over six for better integration with the surroundings. **Pohl** - Raised concerns about the topographical integration of the proposed house into the landscape, specifically regarding how it is being built into the side of a hill and the grading plans. - Requested more information on the grading and the relationship of the structure to the hill, emphasizing the importance of avoiding a flat appearance. **Camp** - Suggested considering a more barn-like style for the proposed structure, given its location on a farm and the rural surroundings.	
Motion:	**Motion for a view and revisions. (Camp) (2:35:13)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9489**

17. 43 Fairgrounds Rd LLC 11-9545 43 Fairgrounds rd. Move on structure 67/288 Val Oliver

Voting:	Pohl, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill	
Alternates:	-	
Recused:	Oliver	
Representative:	Val Oliver	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Acknowledged that the commission had previously approved the structure a few years ago, noting its circa 1950 status and expressing satisfaction in seeing it saved.	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	No concerns from the Commissioners.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve as submitted. (Paul) (2:40:25)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9545**

18. Nantucket Golf Club Inc 11-9483 21 Waydale Rd Sidewall/Roof 55/430 Robert O'Day

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul	
Alternates:	Thornewill	
Recused:	Welch	
Representative:	Robert O'Day	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	No concerns from the Commissioners.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver) (2:45:55)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9483**

19. Elizabeth Goulet 11-9533 51 Miacomet rd. 2nd Dwelling 67/196 Brook Meerbergen

Voting:	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten	
Alternates:	Welch, Paul, Thornewill	
Recused:	-	
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	**Coombs** - Expressed the belief that the new structure will fit in well with the existing collection of houses, noting that it appears less open than in one of the photographs. **Oliver, Patten, Pohl** - No concerns.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver) (2:52:21)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9533**

20. Matt & Alison Smith 11-9537 232 Madaket Rd Main House Porch Fens/ mod 59.4/120.1 Brook Meerbergen

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates:	Welch, Oliver, Patten
Recused:	None
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen - Explained that the existing structure has an inside head height of five and a half feet, necessitating adjustments to the eve line for windows with the correct head height. - Mentioned the use of shed dormers to accommodate this requirement. - Suggested the possibility of removing a row of glass from the bottom to improve the visual appearance.
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Stated that the existing structure is non-contributing, with the original building dating back to 1986. - Mentioned that the current structure, as it stands, resembles a 4 Bay typical Nantucket design.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	**Camp** - Expressed confusion about the design, particularly regarding three dormers on the west elevation that appear below the eave with shallow shed dormers above. - Raised questions about the oddness of this design and expressed concerns about the third dormer on the third floor, suggesting it might detract from the overall design. - Noted that something seems off with the two windows and the French door on the west elevation. - Suggested the idea of creating a shed dormer across the entire section, eliminating the French door, and adjusting the placement of windows to fit within the eve for a more normal appearance. **Paul** - Suggested raising the window plate height to eight feet, making the center door eight feet, and adjusting the placement of elements for a more balanced appearance. - Mentioned the possibility of eliminating corner boards on dormers and proposed a continuous shed dormer option for the west elevation. - Recommended lifting the first-floor porch to enhance the west elevation and consider incorporating more whimsical elements, particularly with the front door. - Noted that the dormer on the east elevation might not be visible. **Thornewill** - Expressed agreement on raising the window heights in the dormers and emphasized the need for more significant dormers. - Opposed the idea of a second-floor deck on the west elevation. - Recommended adjusting the pitch of the porch roof and raising it to align with the windowsills. - Mentioned no concerns about the rear elevation. **Coombs** - Agreed with the suggestion about removing the dormer next to the chimney. - Suggested spreading out the windows on all three sides and avoiding a concentration on the right side to reduce visual busyness. **Pohl** - Suggested raising the dormers and windowsills to achieve a proper 4 and 12 porch roof and improve the overall appearance of the building. Also, mentioned not being concerned about the visibility of the third-floor dormer on the east elevation.
Motion:	**Motion to hold for revisions. (Coombs) (3:05:40)**

Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9537**

21. Matt & Alison Smith 11-9536 232 Madaket Rd 2nd Dwelling 59.4/120.1 Brook Meerbergen

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates:	Welch, Oliver, Patten
Recused:	None
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	**Camp** - Expressed a preference for the more formal appearance of the south side facing Madaket Road and suggested that the sides with more formal features be oriented toward Madaket Road. - Mentioned that the unique embellishments, such as the diamond doors, are acceptable. **Thornewill** - Concurred with Abby. **Paul** - Suggested enhancing the north elevation to give it a more front-like appearance, such as adding a diamond window to the plank door and modifying the double doors over the balcony to a single door with wider windows. - Expressed appreciation for the attractive single-story shed roof mass on the north elevation facing the street, which helps diminish the overall height. - Suggested considering the possibility of flipping the orientation of the building, creating a softer elevation with a story and a half vertical presence along the road. **Coombs** - Suggested changing the front door on the south elevation to a more appropriate and formal design, as the existing one looks like it leads to the basement or kitchen. - Recommended adjusting the windows on that elevation to better match the overall design. - Supported the idea of rotating the house to position the more favorable south elevation in a prominent location. **Pohl** - Suggested addressing the issue of the north elevation feeling like the "back of the house" facing Madaket Road. - Advised considering whether to flip the orientation of the building or reconfigure the north elevation to better align with the feedback provided by the board.
Motion:	**Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Paul) (3:13:02)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Paul, Thornewill (Aye) — Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9536**

22. Matt & Alison Smith 11-9535 232 Madaket Rd New shed 59.4/120.1 Brook Meerbergen

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates:	Welch, Oliver, Patten
Recused:	None
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	**Camp** - Expressed the opinion that the building might be too small to effectively embody the gambrel style and suggested that a simple gable could be a more suitable design choice. **Coombs** - Expressed a preference for a simpler design, suggesting that a gable would be more suitable for the house, emphasizing the simplicity of the structure. **Paul** - Expressed a desire to approve the building but suggested incorporating elements from the guest house, such as the door with the diamond detail, into the shed element. - Mentioned reservations about the gambrel design and suggested considering changes to the cupola, including making it taller and adjusting the corners. **Thornewill** - Expressed a preference for keeping the architecture simple on the property and not introducing another style. **Pohl** - Expressed agreement with the idea of maintaining cohesion and simplicity in the architecture of the property.

Motion:	**Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp) (3:17:33)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9535**

23. Matt & Alison Smith 11-9534 232 Madaket Rd Hardscape driveway/apron 59.4/120.1 Brook Meerbergen

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates:	Welch, Oliver, Patten
Recused:	None
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Highlighting the importance of compliance with zoning bylaw section 139-20.1, which pertains to driveways.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	**Camp** - Suggested the possibility of adjusting the driveway layout to create a more curved and visually appealing approach to the property. - Expressed the view that the driveway going right up to the corner of the house seems awkward and suggested it might be improved by being positioned on the other side of the structure. **Paul** - Suggested creating a more buffered and visually appealing approach to the property while considering the need for a straight shot to the first structure, which serves as a garage. **Thornewill** - Suggested going from Belgian block to pavement across the bike path and then transitioning to shell as needed. **Coombs** - Emphasized the preference for a consistent design for the aprons, suggesting the use of cobble or Belgian block throughout, with uniform size and flow across the bike path. **Pohl** - Agreed with Holly's suggestion to align with the prevailing theme on the road and adhere to what is approvable at the Department of Public Works (DPW).
Motion:	**Motion to hold for more information and revisions. (Camp) (3:27:07)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Paul, Thornewill (Aye) — Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9534**

24. Nantucket Boat Basin LLC 11-9542 29 Commercial Wf Demo structure 42.2.4/3 Dennis Patnaude

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Dennis Patnaude/Paul Beaulieu
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Stated that the commission had previously approved a move-off only for Meridian Cottage. - Provided historical information about the cottage, dating back to the late 1960s when it was built by Sherburne Associates and owned by Walter Beinecke Jr. since 1963. - Mentioned that the cottage is part of the historic wharf cottages. - Expressed the view that, despite potential issues with the existing structure, retaining and possibly rebuilding the cottage is more appropriate than demolition. - Noted that a letter from the Nantucket Preservation Trust was received, urging the commission to deny the demolition and emphasizing the historic significance of Meridian Cottage. - Recommended a move-off only as an alternative to demolition, highlighting its potential to alter the streetscape while promoting salvage and adaptive reuse. - Acknowledged the commission's previous vote in favor of a move-off and suggested fixing the cottage in situ as another option. - Identified oneself as a professional preservation planner with credentials under the Secretary of the Interior Standards. - Stressed the importance of considering contributing characteristics beyond just the date of the structure. - Referenced the contributions made by Walter Beinecke's to the historic district, emphasizing the basis for the National Historic Landmark (NHL) update. - Mentioned Walter Beinecke's awards through the Nantucket Historical Trust and his involvement in significant preservation projects, including the Jared Coffin House and the Historic American Building Survey of Nantucket. - Highlighted the preservationist role of Walter Beinecke's in the town's history.
Public Comments:	**Mickey Rowland**

	- Stated that the group had nothing further to add to their previous comments. - Personally confirmed witnessing significant weathering and storm damage to the building over many years. - Mentioned the building's frequent flooding during winters. **Jessie Bell** - Described the efforts made to offer the Rowland building to affordable housing entities before considering other options. - Shared the challenges faced in moving the Rowland building outside the immediate vicinity. - Noted the contact with NIR (Nantucket Island Resorts) and the proposal to move the building to the other side of Petrel Landing. - Mentioned the construction year of the Rowland House (2010) and questioned the level of historic significance of a structure from the late 1960s. - Highlighted the proposal to move the building only 20 feet away and urged the commission to consider the broader goals of opening up the harbor to the public. - Expressed the need for the Historic District Commission to understand the full picture and the overarching public purposes involved.
Concerns:	**Coombs** - Expressed uncertainty about the importance of having every building in a historic area be perfect. - Shared the opinion that buildings with some imperfections and a history of standing are preferable. - Highlighted the building's slight dip in the ridge but emphasized the significance of keeping what has existed. - Stated a preference for holding and fixing the building rather than removing it due to its longevity and exposure to storms. - Emphasized the idea that older buildings need not be perfect but should reflect their history. **Oliver** - Recalled the initial proposal for the structure and mentioned information on Mr. Beinecke. - Shared information about Beinecke's actions, including taking down buildings from the 1800s to replace them with 1960s buildings. - Expressed a lack of outrage during that time. - Compared the height and context of the current building to the one next to it. - Stated the belief that the building's significance doesn't prevent it from being taken down and replaced with the neighboring structure. - Highlighted that it's not equivalent to demolishing a turn-of-the-century building. **Welch** - Expressed concern about using age alone as a criterion for determining historic status. - Mentioned personal age relative to the structure's construction and questioned the concept of contributing structures based solely on age. - Voiced disagreement with the idea of structures from the 1960s and 1970s being automatically considered contributing. - Agreed that the structure is not from the turn of the century or mid-century and lacks established historic value. - Pointed out the structure's poor condition as attested by others. - Acknowledged the regrettable nature of the situation but emphasized the need for removal, noting a replacement with a beautiful structure nearby. - Expressed the view that the mentioned accomplishments and legacy of Walter Beinecke are not directly relevant to the discussion about the specific structure in question. - Acknowledged that Walter Beinecke was involved in the construction of the structure. - Emphasized the need to focus on whether the structure itself possesses historic characteristics that justify its retention and its current condition for potential rehabilitation. - Expressed a preference for renovating structures. - Acknowledged the architect's professional opinion that renovation might not be feasible or sensible. - Highlighted the dilemma of trying to preserve a historic structure when significant portions may need replacement, questioning the true preservation of historic elements in such cases. - Shared discomfort with the decision-making process but recognized the need to make a decision based on the presented evidence. **Pohl** - Acknowledged the charm of sagging roofs and windows with broken panes. - Recognized practical considerations, such as the need for bulkhead repair and lifting the building. - Expressed support for the previous proposal to replace the structure with the Rolland house, considering it head and shoulders above other alternatives. - Emphasized the importance of understanding the sequence of events, specifically the approval for demolition and subsequent replacement with another building.

	- Linked the progression of the Nantucket built landscape to the proposed actions. **Camp** - Expressed a desire to see the structure renovated. - Pointed out that any renovation would need to address sea level rise concerns by raising the structure. - Mentioned doubts about the structure's eligibility for historic status due to its construction date in the mid-1960s (1963). - Mentioned that information is sourced from both applicants and the historic staff person. - Indicated a need to consider the perspectives of both parties in the decision-making process.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve as submitted, with the condition that salvageable parts will be reused and will be based on the previous approval for moving the Rowland building to this location.** **(Oliver) (3:56:21)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:2 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver (Aye) //Camp, Coombs	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9542**

25. John Lancaster 11-9501 15 Burnell St Addition 73.4.2/48 Greg Nichols

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver	
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Greg Nichols	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	-	
Motion:	**Motion to approve as submitted. (Welch) (3:59:47)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9501**

26. 146 Surfside Rd LLC 11-9493 146 Surfside Rd Pool & Hardscape 80/315 Atlantic Landscaping

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver	
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Lindsay Congelton	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	**Oliver** - Expressed discomfort with the patio and pool encroaching into the setback. - Suggested that it would be better if the patio went closer to the house and did not encroach into the setback. **Camp** - Concurred with the concern about the pool and its location. - Mentioned the existing vegetation and expressed that, even with the hedge, the proposed pool location is not suitable for Surfside Road. **Welch** - Highlighted concern about the pool wall being in the setback, stating it is not zoning approvable. - Recommended moving the pool at least two feet closer to the house. - Expressed discomfort with the concept of having structures right against the setback. - Suggested that a vegetative buffer of at least five feet from the property line be implemented. - Mentioned the importance of the buffer running parallel to the length of the pool, especially on the southern border. **Coombs** - Agreed with the concern that the pool is over the line right to the very end. - Suggested moving the entire structure over towards the other end to address the issue. - Emphasized that the distance from Surfside Road (whether 120 ft or 150 ft) doesn't significantly affect visibility, so the overhang should be addressed by moving it. **Pohl** - Stated the desire for the coping, which needs to be outside of the setback, to be addressed. - Expressed concern that the current drawing does not comply with the setback requirements. - Proposed moving the entire structure further north, away from the lot line, to address the issue.	
Motion:	**Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) with the condition of a vegetative buffer on the south side and parallel to the length of the pool and at least five feet from the property line. (Welch) (4:08:14)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver (Aye) // Camp (Nay)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9493**

27. Ach Ama Realty 11-9517 | 1 Sparks Av | Alterations Windows | 55/180.1 | Eaghmon Banks

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver	
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Eaghmon Banks/David Rader	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Identified the structure as Circa 1977, formerly the rotary restaurant and Lola Burger. - Stated that the structure is a non-contributing one but recognized its significance in Mid Island. - Expressed uncertainty about the proposed materials. - Criticized the appropriateness of second-floor exterior stairs facing Sparks Avenue, suggesting they would be better suited away from the public way and inside if possible. - Critiqued the proposed HVAC ductwork as undesirable. - Called for a rethinking of the proposal for such a highly visible location in Mid Island within the historic district.	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	**Welch** - Expressed lesser concern about the exterior stairs, considering the building's utility nature as a restaurant. - Voiced significant concern about the obtrusiveness of the HVAC system, finding it extensive and lacking adequate description. **Oliver** - Shared similar sentiments regarding the exterior stairs, suggesting improvements such as enclosing and shingling for a better appearance. - Reiterated the main concern focused on the HVAC unit and ductwork, emphasizing its visibility and impact on the building's aesthetic. **Camp** - Expressed approval for the attic space stairs but suggested enclosing it with trellis or doors for added storage and a more aesthetic look. - Acknowledged the challenge posed by the HVAC unit's visibility, recalling a similar situation on Straight Wharf where wood paneling was used to cover it, and proposed exploring that option to reduce visibility. **Coombs** - Expressed concerns about the door's placement in relation to the stairs leading up to it, referencing the historical context of the area with a small building and a parking lot. - Noted understanding of the necessity of exhaust fans but found the location of the door inappropriate. **Pohl** - Expressed acceptance of the exterior stair but questioned the shallow pitch, suggesting a more normal pitch for better functionality. - Mentioned that other restaurants on Straight Wharf have effectively concealed large hoods and recommended taking cues from them.	
Motion:	**Motion to hold for revisions. (Welch) (4:21:19)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – **11-9517**

28. Ach Ama Realty 11-9516 | 1 Sparks Av | New walk-in cooler | 55/180.1 | Eaghmon Banks

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver	
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Eaghmon Banks/David Rader	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	**Holly Backus** - Stated that the proposed location behind the existing shed is appropriate. - Mentioned that the site plan clarity needs improvement and highlighted the need to address meeting the sea, even though it's not directly within HDC's purview.	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	-	
Motion:	**Motion to approve as submitted. (Welch) (4:23:50)**	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – **11-9516**

The following items were not discussed, and no action was taken:

IV. NEW BUSINESS 11/28/2023

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
29.	Julie Meade	8 Bayberry Ln	As-built Front	49/92.1	Michael Humphreys

30.	40 OSR LLC	2 Forrest Ave	New mixed-use rev 08-8905	69/10	Emeritus
31.	Yauheni Shubin	8 Gray Ave	Fenestration & roof	67/772	JB Studio
32.	Margaret Connolly Trust	151 Surfside rd.	Roof walk covered porch	80/36.1	JB Studio
33.	Christopher Tofalli Tr	122 Main St	Fens, 2nd floor deck	42.3.3/100	JB Studio
34.	Pamela Krueger	4 Weeweeder Av	Move dwelling on lot	80/102	LINK
35.	Pamela Krueger	4 Weeweeder Av	Move shed on lot	80/102	LINK
36.	Pamela Krueger	4 Weeweeder Av	Plunge pool	80/102	LINK
37.	9 Thirty Acres LLC	9 Thirty Acres Ln	New fence	67/115.7	LINK
38.	61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot D	Roof and fenestration	67/173.2	JB Studio
39.	61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot B	New pool	67/173	JB Studio
40.	61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot C	New pool	67/173.1	JB Studio
41.	61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot D	New pool	67/173.2	JB Studio
42.	Steven Jemison	4 Lavendar Ln	New pool	33/24	JB Studio
43.	Richard Dober Tr	10 Silver St	New MH dwelling	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
44.	Richard Dober Tr	10 Silver St	New Gh/ cottage	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
45.	Richard Dober Tr	10 Silver St	Cabana /Shed alterations	55.4.1/187	JB Studio

V. OLD BUSINESS 12/05/2023

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	John Brazilian Tr	34 Easton St	Parking & outdoor shower	42.1.4/18	David Bartsch
	• *Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul; Alternates: Camp; Recused: None. Last heard 10 03 23*				
2.	Dean Lampe	13 Aurora Way	Pool & hardscape	56/448	Dean Lampe
	• *Commissioners: to be added later.*				
3.	NIR **09-9216**	19 N Water St lot 7	New dwelling	42.4.2/3	Emeritus LTD
	• *Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 11 28 23*				
4.	NIR	19 N Water St lot 7	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern LLC
	• *New Business application to track OB- new dwelling*				
5.	NIR **09-9203**	19 N Water St lot 11	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern LLC
	• *Commissioners: Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: Welch; Recused: None. Last heard 11 28 23*				
6.	George Metri **05-8496**	12 Angola St	MH Revisions	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
	• *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill; Alternates: Patten Recused: None Last heard 10 24 23*				
7.	George Metri **10-9317**	12 Angola St	Free Standing garage	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
	• *New Business application to track OB- new dwelling*				
8.	George Metri	12 Angola St	Hardscape	55.4.4/78	Katy Mitchell
	• *New Business application to track OB- new dwelling*				
9.	Valerie Osley	305 Polpis Rd	Fence	25/9.7	Sandcastle Construction
	• *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Paul; Alternates: Camp, Patten; Recused None. - last heard 11 14 23*				
10.	CMR 11 Osprey Way LLC	11 Osprey Way	Move off or demo dwelling	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch.
	• *Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul: Alternates: Patten; Recused: Welch. Last heard 11 14 23*				
11.	63 Hulbert Ave LLC	63 Hulbert Ave	MH addition & revision	69/9	Emeritus LTD
	• *Commissioners: Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused None. Last heard 11 28 23*				
12.	Whitney Gifford Tr.	32 Pocomo Rd.	Gate, driveway & fence	14/77	Emeritus LTD
	• *Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 11 21 23*				
13.	Harold Bros. LLC	2-4 Highland Ave	New dwelling revision	30/288	Emeritus LTD
	• *Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 11 21 23*				
14.	Harold Bros. LLC	6 Highland Ave	New dwelling revision	30/288	Emeritus LTD
	• *Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 11 21 23*				
15.	WSTT Holding LLC	1 Sconset Ave	Pool & hardscape	73.4.1/8	Atlantic Landscaping
	• *Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: Welch, Thornewill Recused: None. Last heard 11 28 23*				
16.	WSTT Holding LLC	1 Sconset Ave	New shed	73.4.1/8	Atlantic Landscaping
	• *New Business application to track OB- new dwelling*				

MINUTES

Motion:	**Motion to approve the HDC Minutes of October 10 and October 17, 2023. (Welch)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (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- December 12th at 4pm *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	**Motion to adjourn at 8:25 pm**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 6-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano
YouTube Link: https://youtube.com/live/DYM4bHNkmOM?feature=share

Nantucket Old Historic District 'Sconset Old Historic District