



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 19, 2023

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:02p.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, Thornewill
Remote Participants:	Coombs, Patten, Paul
Absent Members:	-
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	Camp

ADOPTION OF AMENDED AGENDA

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

I. VOTE

- HDC Schedule Jan- Mar 2024.

Motion:	Motion to approve HDC meeting schedule as submitted. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver (Aye)

II. OLD BUSINESS 12/05/2023

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. NIR 09-9197	19 N Water St lot 7	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern LLC
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Miroslava Ahern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Stated that the site should comply with resilient Nantucket design guidelines. - Mentioned the need to adhere to the Old Historic District (OHD) guidelines. - Noted that the Lots have a shared access approved by the planning board in 2015. - Appreciated the inclusion of a brick sidewalk along the front with multiple materials (Belgian block, blue stone, and brick). - Expressed the opinion that the blue stone pavers are too formal and should be more irregular. - Suggested a minimalist approach, stating "less is more," to avoid competing against the architecture.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Agreed with Holly's opinion about the Blue Stone pavers in the application. - Suggested that Goshen Stone pavers might be more appropriate for the entire area. - Noted the presence of a six-foot fence on the rear of the building. - Raised a question about the purpose of the tall fence, especially since it is near the AC condensers. - Highlighted the lack of fencing or enclosure around the AC condensers. - Posed a question regarding the purpose of the six-foot fence and its relation to the adjacent AC condensers.			

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Suggested enclosing the AC condensers completely, especially since the desired area for the Harbor House is on the other side of the fence. - Emphasized that the condensers should be screened with fencing at the necessary height. Ahern - Explained that the house sits higher in a flood zone, requiring air conditioning units to be attached higher. - Expressed hope that the six-foot fence, specifically the gate portion between the property line and the house corner, would provide screening for the AC units and condensers on the building.
Concerns:	Camp - Questioned the general appearance of an access road with multiple driveways. - Expressed concerns about the potential commercial look and the desire to mitigate it. Ahern - Described the concept of the access road as private, quiet, with rear parking and stone driveways. - Differentiated parking areas with short aprons at each entryway. - Emphasized the private nature of the access road for lot owners, not inviting to the public. Welch - Proposed to include the access road in one of the upcoming hardscape reviews as a comprehensive, one-time assessment. - Pointed out that it seems the AC is being blocked from view. - Sought confirmation if there is indeed an enclosure in place for the AC units. Ahern - Confirmed that the enclosure blocking the view of the AC units is intended for the outdoor shower. Oliver - Clarified that while there is a desire for screening the condensers, the specific details of how they should be screened are open. - Mentioned uncertainty about the preferred screening method but emphasized the need for screening. - Noted that the fence is around the outdoor shower inside a window and next to another window. Camp - Aligned with Holly's viewpoint that the extensive use of blue stone is not necessarily appropriate and seems very formal. - Expressed the opinion that the AC units should not be on the street side, especially if it's a corner lot with three sides. - Noted that at the previous meeting there was mentioned of a reduction in the friendship stair on the east elevation to just one way. - Suggested placing the AC on the back side of the mudroom, away from the front door, near the area for recyclables. - Proposed that this location would allow the AC to be completely hidden, and noise would not be on the street side. - Questioned the storage area, specifically asking if there are plans to extend it as a shed. Paul - Stressed the need for a subdivision plan. - Emphasized that the specific property in question requires a revised site plan to align with HDC-approved changes around the front and side entryways. - Referred to the removal or modification of the Friendship stair mentioned by Carrie. - Suggested the necessity for an elevation drawing of the condenser area, especially if it is indeed six feet tall. - Proposed extending the fence all the way to the corner on the plan where the shower is, ensuring screening for the entire length of the back L. Patten - Stated having nothing else to add. - Expressed a hope that if there are revisions, alternatives to the blue stone pavers could be considered.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions and additional information. (Made by: Paul) (00:21:53)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Oliver, Paul, Patten, Thornewill
	Certificate #HDC2023 – 09-9197

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

2. NIR 09-9203		19 N Water St lot 11	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern LLC
Voting:	Camp, Oliver, Paul, Patten, Thornewill				
Alternates:	Welch				
Recused:	None				
Representative:	Miroslava Ahern				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Acknowledged that this lot is situated within a newer subdivision in the Old Historic District (OHD). - Emphasized the requirement for all lots to comply with Resilient Nantucket. - Thanked for the inclusion of the fantastic brick sidewalk. - Noted concerns about the amount of impervious surfaces in a flood zone. - Appreciated the appropriateness of Goshen stone and its less formal nature. - Suggested that the formality of blue stone may detract from the architecture of the Old Historic District (OMD). - Advocated for a "less is more" approach in line with the architectural essence of OMD.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed the primary concern regarding the patio located directly on South Beach Street. - Acknowledged the understanding of the desire or need for outdoor space. - Suggested a potential solution by contouring the patio differently to create a planting buffer between the patio's edge and the fence along South Beach Street. - Emphasized the appreciation for any adjustments that would address this concern.				
Concerns:	Oliver - Stated the proposed stone posts for the new roadway access road are inappropriate and suggested better screening of the AC. Thornewill - Concurred with Val on two points: found the stone posts on the roadway inappropriate and suggested hiding the AC better. - Aligned with Mickey's perspective on the Goshen stone patio, expressing agreement with the notion that it appears too public on the street, especially behind a low fence. - Voiced concerns about the visibility and placement of the Goshen stone patio in that particular location. Patten - Had no additional comments. Paul - Proposed a solution to address Mickey's concerns about the Goshen stone patio by suggesting softening the corners to reduce its formality and create a buffer to the fence. - Indicated a need for screening for the AC units on the street side, emphasizing the importance of mitigating their visibility. - Noted the effectiveness of the shower enclosure as a block from the access road at the bottom of the page. - Expressed concern about the potential visibility of AC units on the side of the building and recommended adding another length of fence off the corner of the building to address this issue. Camp - Voiced concerns about the patio, expressing skepticism about its potential use and suggesting that it might end up as a hard surface that could otherwise support vegetation. - Stated a preference against the patio, indicating a reluctance to support it. - Expressed disapproval of the stone posts in relation to the proposed project.				
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Thornewill) (00:29:00)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Camp, Oliver, Paul, Patten, Thornewill			Certificate #HDC2023 – 09-9203	

3. George Metri 05-8496		12 Angola St	MH Revisions	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill				
Alternates:	Patten				
Recused:	None				
Representative:	Joe Topham				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Acknowledged the context of the project as an infill within the Old Historic District, specifically in a Quaker historic neighborhood. - Appreciated the changes made to the overall width, including the lowering of the ridge of the main block and the second mass.				

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Expressed concern about the introduction of a shed dormer in the additive mass, citing issues with meeting rail alignment and the height of windows in the second mass. - Appreciated certain elements like the simplified door and front piece but found fault with the proposed door surrounding pilasters and mantle shelf, deeming them out of proportion historically. - Criticized the transom height, suggesting that it should match the headers of the windows for proper scale. - Expressed disapproval of a flush dormer on the facade, suggesting reference to a neighboring structure for a more suitable design. - Acknowledged the reduction in the length of the side additive mass but recommended further reduction for historical accuracy and to avoid cutting into the hill at the rear. - Referenced "Building With Nantucket In Mind" and the Coleman house lean-to as inspiration for the design. - Expressed skepticism about the suitability of the hip on the south side. - Expressed appreciation for kick panels on French doors, suggesting that two doors are more appropriate than the previously proposed number. - Praised the removal of the second-floor deck and French doors but emphasized the need to ensure simplicity in the rear and second-floor elevation with the shed dormer. - Appreciated the overall relocation of the dwelling off the property line and the use of plank frame windows for the infill project.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Suggested adjustments to the second-floor rear dormer by lowering it, bringing the top further away from the ridge. - Proposed lowering the course of shingles above the window casings to achieve the desired dormer placement. - Highlighted Holly's observation about the eaves on the front dormer, emphasizing the need for correction. - Stated that the use of window wells on the front of the house in the Old Historic District, are inappropriate. - Noted concerns about the front door being oddly tall and narrow, suggesting the elimination of the transom for better proportion. - Pointed out the excessive height of shingles between the first-floor and second-floor windows, recommending a drop in ceiling height to address this. - Proposed reducing the ceiling height to 8 and 1/2 feet instead of 9 feet to improve proportions. - Suggested a traditional wood stoop with side railings as a more suitable option. Anne Dewez - Expressed appreciation for the significant changes that have been made to the project. - Acknowledged the concerns raised by both Holly and Mickey, particularly regarding the length of the project and its impact on landscaping. - Mentioned that the landscaping situation is not acceptable and highlighted the need for adjustments. - Recognized the valuable suggestions provided by both Holly and Mickey in addressing the concerns. - Praised the attention to detail exhibited by both Holly and Mickey on various aspects of the project. - Conveyed a decision not to provide further input, indicating confidence in the issues being appropriately addressed by the previous comments. Ann Davis - Shared a recent visit to the Elihu Coleman house, providing measurements from the visit. - Noted that the rear L of the Elihu Coleman house is only 15 feet long despite being a three-bay house from 1722, situated off Cliff Road. - Appreciated the beauty of the Elihu Coleman house but emphasized the smaller scale compared to the presented project, which includes an additive mass off to the side. - Pointed out differences, such as the presence of basement window wells in the presented project, when compared to examples like the Elihu Coleman House and the Major Josiah Coffin House. - Mentioned that the Major Josiah Coffin House also has a small kitchen wart off the back, and highlighted that while these examples share some design similarities, they are significantly larger in scale with larger additions.
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed appreciation for Holly and Mickey's comments. - Voiced opposition to the five-bay design, citing concerns about its overwhelming scale for the lot and visibility as one enters the pony field. - Specifically noted issues with the combination of the five-bay, the right-hand side and the garage, deeming it overwhelming. - Pointed out concerns about the front door appearing tall and skinny, suggesting a need for adjustments.

- Criticized the shed dormer on the right side of the additive mass, proposing a smaller window and a roof design more in line with historical add-ons.
- Expressed disapproval of window wells, emphasizing their impracticality.
- Recommended lowering the large dormer on the roofline to avoid a modern appearance.
- Raised concerns about the length and shape of the conical roof on the long additive mass, suggesting it doesn't read as historic.
- Suggested that shortening the back L could address the terracing problem.

Thornewill

- Concurred with the concern about the front door, suggesting adjustments to either the transom or the tall head casing to avoid a double tall appearance.
- Appreciated the chosen window pattern but noted that the overall house still reads as massive.
- Speculated on the impact of the adjacent garage and proposed simplifying the design by having a five-bay structure with additive massing behind it.
- Suggested that adjusting the positioning of the additive massing, especially on the right, could contribute to a simpler and less massive appearance.
- Reiterated the desire to see the rear L function as a retaining wall, proposing high windows for a bathroom to integrate the hill naturally.
- Expressed concerns about the numerous retaining walls on the property and advocated for incorporating the hill into the design rather than dividing it.
- Appreciated the changes made to the rear of the house and the reduction of the rear L.
- Acknowledged the more successful hip design for reducing the length of the roof ridge.
- Shared agreement with previous comments on the secondary mass with the dormer, suggesting smaller windows for better integration.

Coombs

- Concurred with the comments made by Mickey, Holly, and Carrie.
- Expressed the view that the building stands out as very large and imposing for Angola Street.
- Suggested doing away with the shed dormer on the right-hand side of the proposed North elevation instead of attempting to reduce its size.
- Shared concerns about the extension of the door over the windows, advocating for simplicity in design.
- Proposed using wood for the front stairs and adding a fence for support, citing it as a common feature in the area.
- Appreciated the effort put into adjusting the roof on the south elevation to make it shorter.
- Recognized Joe's hard work on the project and acknowledged the challenges of placing the building without disturbing the surrounding land.
- Acknowledged that the building is making progress but emphasized the need for continued simplicity in the design.

Welch

- Suggested adjustments to the main structure, including simplifying the soffit detail on the dormer, lowering the top plate on the secondary mass at the front to align with the meeting rail, and addressing concerns about window wells.
- Acknowledged the success of the hip design but proposed breaking up the mass, considering changes to the roof pitch or turning it into a gable with a hip addition.
- Recommended bearing the tail end of the structure into the hill for a more sensible use of the backyard and the possibility of retaining the yard side of the mound.
- Anticipated that the suggested changes to the top plate header for the main house and the dropping of the top plate on the addition would result in a material change in the side view.
- Explained the impact on the freeze space, noting that it wouldn't exist if the roof mass were lower by three and a half inches.
- Stressed the importance of simplicity and formality for the front door.
- Supported the suggestion regarding the top plate header on the dormer to bring the connection at the main roof down.
- Discussed the potential segmentation of the rear of the structure, expressing concerns about the complexity of the roof presentation.
- Highlighted the flexibility of the elevation to absorb some complexity in roof lines, especially if they are parallel and not directly viewed in contrast to the importance of breaking down the length of the L.
- Appreciated the chimney design, describing it as marvelous.

Pohl

- Reiterated concerns about the concrete stoop in the front and emphasized the need for a more traditional solution.

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Addressed the complexity added by the flush dormer and suggested a low window with a full-height dormer on the back as an alternative. - Acknowledged the site's dramatic grade change and supported the idea of integrating the back portion of the L into the retainage for a more naturalized slope. - Expressed a neutral opinion on the roof design (hip or gable) for the back, considering its limited visibility once surrounded by other structures. - Discussed differing opinions on the frontage piece, noting that the transom is a traditional element on 5-bay structures and suggesting a solution involving adjusting the window heights to harmonize with the transom.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions and remove the sconces on the front. (Made by: Welch) (00:58:31)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill Certificate # HDC2023 – 05-8496

4. George Metri 10-9317		12 Angola St	Free Standing Garage/2nd dwelling	55.4/78	Topham Design
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Joe Topham				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Acknowledged appreciation for the proposed structure in the infill within the Old Historic District (OHD) - Quaker neighborhood. - Recommended making the garage more utilitarian in nature and exploring the possibility of reducing its height. - Compared the proposed garage to others in the area, suggesting a simpler gable design with less steep pitch and doors without lights. - Noted that there are three garages on Candlehouse with simpler designs, emphasizing the prevalence of such styles in the neighborhood. - Expressed concerns about the compatibility of the lights in the doors, specifically the 12 lights, and recommended simplifying the design. - Raised a question about the possibility of placing the garage on a mud sill. - Suggested a reduction in height and further simplification.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Raised concerns about the sighting of the garage, noting that it appears too close to the street and suggesting it should follow Building With Nantucket In Mind guidelines by pushing back toward the rear of the lot. - Pointed out the issue of tall retaining walls, especially on the east side, caused by the parking spaces being cut into the grade. - Expressed concern about the double-wide parking space close to the street and recommended a single-width driveway going up the slope towards the garage to eliminate the need for cutting into the grade. - Suggested that pushing the building further back would allow for a narrower driveway, facilitating the addition of screening on the left side to mitigate any required retaining wall and reduce its visibility. - Proposed raising the garage door by raising the driveway, potentially reducing the overall height of the garage. - Advised reducing the shingle space between the garage door and the window above for a more balanced appearance. - Expressed a view that the garage doors don't align with the style of the main house, noting a mismatch between the contemporary nature of the carriage house doors and the Quaker and old-fashioned style of the main house.				
Concerns:	Welch - Presented two options based on the feedback received: either the structure needs to be pushed back further, utilizing the rear left portion as part of the retainage, or some of the second-story mass needs to be shifted back. - Suggested incorporating a hip roof wrap on the front, potentially more substantial than a pent roof or a shed structure transitioning to the second floor. - Mentioned the possibility of creating a smaller second-floor window in response to feedback. - Expressed agreement with comments about using more traditional doors for the garage. - Disagreed with the comment about retainage, expressing a preference for a small retaining wall on the far right of the house rather than lowering the entire house. - Stressed the appropriateness of having the garage cut into the grade to limit its height, noting the structure's comparative size to neighboring lots.				

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Emphasized primary concerns related to what is visible from the street, particularly the front facade, and the need for adjustments to either the location or the massing of the structure. - Reiterated that the garage doors need to be addressed, aligning with the feedback received. - Stated that the retainage on the left and the primarily visible facade, including the garage doors and second-floor window, are not inappropriate. - Suggested making the retaining wall on the left shorter and having a sloped grade on the right instead of retainage for simplicity. - Expressed agreement with the idea that simpler solutions are better, particularly regarding the sloped grade on the right. - Proposed lowering the mass to the right of the primary facade and introducing a coplanar or differently heightened roof on that addition to change the presentation of the mass. - Indicated that such changes could be achieved with a mudsill without significant grade changes. Thornewill - Concurred with Welch and had no additional comments. Camp - Expressed the opinion that the proposed garage is competing with the main house and is too close. - Suggested a smaller structure, potentially cut in half and pushed back, to create a simple garage. - Emphasized that a smaller, simpler garage would work better, and proposed having only one single parking space to provide more room on the left and avoid a shoehorned appearance. - Stated the belief that the current size of the garage is too large for the lot and recommended a smaller, simpler design for better harmony with the main house. Coombs - Expressed agreement with previous comments. - Advocated for minimizing the excavation required for the garage and suggested keeping it as little as possible. - Recommended using old-style garage doors with black steel, potentially without windows or with a small row of windows. - Shared the preference for reducing the height of the garage, questioning why it looks tall, and proposed changes to the garage doors and the large window above. - Recommended having only one parking space in front rather than a double-wide space. - Supported the idea of using a mudsill and suggested exploring ways to push the garage back further without compromising interior design. Pohl - Acknowledged that previous board members have addressed various concerns. - Pointed out that the perceived height issue might be due to the narrowness of the building in relation to its height. - Suggested that lowering the ceiling height, especially in the living space, could help reduce the overall height of the structure. - Recognized the positive aspect of building into the side of the hill on one side. - Indicated overall agreement with the feedback provided by other board members.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (01:22:03)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill
	Certificate # HDC2023 –10-9317

5. George Metri 09-8496	12 Angola St	Hardscape	55.4.4/78	Katy Mitchell
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Katy Mitchell			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted the importance of the site plan of the proposed main home and garage matching with the hardscaping plan. - Mentioned the absence of a paved road all the way to the site and questioned whether an apron is required under zoning. - Clarified that if the road is not paved, an apron from zoning might not be required. - Advocated for the use of appropriate materials like brick and cobble for the apron. - Emphasized the need to reduce the rear L of the proposed house to minimize the need for stone walls. - Referenced Building With Nantucket in Mind guidelines related to landscape plantings and walkway materials. - Provided chapter and verse numbers from the guidelines for dimensions.			

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Acknowledged that dimensions are what DPW and zoning are looking for. - Suggested a potential conversation between staff regarding the requirement of an apron if the road is not paved.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Highlighted the differences between the proposed neighborhood and Union Street and Lily Street, emphasizing the rural nature of the area. - Suggested that a tall retaining wall might not fit well in a rural area compared to urban downtown denser areas. - Proposed that the top two tiers of the retaining wall may not be necessary, and a steeper slope could achieve the same goal with a shorter retaining wall. - Expressed skepticism about the success of landscaping between tiers. - Mentioned the presence of a trash closet to the left of the garage, noting that it might not work in the proposed configuration. - Emphasized the idea of eliminating the top two tiers of retaining walls to address the concerns. Anne Dewez - Expressed strong agreement with Mickey's perspective. - Referenced a precedent, the wall across at 3 North Mill Street, which has a slope behind it. - Highlighted the significant issue of the cumulative 12-foot retaining wall requiring a 4-foot steel safety fence. - Noted that the discussion of retaining walls may be futile until the situation with the owners above is sorted out. - Emphasized the need to address the uncertainty regarding the work the owners above have agreed to before discussing landscape details. Ann Davis - Clarified that the Main Street example mentioned is a parameter wall, not a retaining wall, and described it as a lovely brick wall that extends to Liberty Street.
Concerns:	Coombs - Raised concerns about the proposed landscaping plan. - Emphasized the need for a more relaxed and informal approach. - Noted that the proposed continuous wall-like effect may not fit well with the informal character of Angola Street. Thornewill - Highlighted the importance of showing the height of proposed structures, especially to determine the need for safety fences. - Raised questions about the permissibility of building a large wall on the property line. - Questioned the necessity of extensive retaining walls, suggesting the possibility of working with the natural hill and minimizing structural interventions. - Advocated for a more natural approach, emphasizing the option of maintaining grassy slopes and avoiding excessive landscaping. - Suggested cutting into the hill to gain space without creating steep retaining walls. - Expressed a preference for simplicity and working with the existing natural features of the landscape. Welch - Advised coming back with the retaining wall once the structure is up or providing a cross-section showing existing and proposed grades for the rear yard. - Suggested illustrating changes in slope for the retaining walls in the back to demonstrate a less dramatic impact. - Discussed the front retaining wall, considering the neighbors' driveway and recommending a shell or native pea stone driveway instead of a formal apron. - Proposed avoiding the apron on the dirt road until the road catches up and suggesting a change to the perception of formality with a pea stone driveway. - Encouraged providing examples or illustrations for the stone retaining wall and the step area by the driveway. - Emphasized the need for sections or visuals to address concerns about retaining walls in the back. - Proposed showing illustrations of the Stone retaining wall and step area on the plan. - Recommended stepping down the retaining wall on the left side of the driveway to make it less prominent. - Focused on visible aspects, such as the retaining walls and grade changes, and expressed acceptance of blue stone in the plan. - Noted the presumption of having grass around the structures and no significant concerns about blue stone in the proposal. Camp

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Shared a similar situation at their house with a steep hill. - Suggested having the first retaining walls in the back be two and a half to three feet and then letting the rest of the hill remain natural. - Express a preference for a naturalistic approach with grasses or vegetation that grows naturally. - Proposed considering an alternative where the garage doors are present, but the space is not used for parking, allowing for a more gradual and natural cut into the grade with stone steps. - Recommended breaking up the consistency of the retaining wall, even if overhanging plants are present, to achieve a more naturalistic look. - Encouraged exploring options that work with the existing landscape and maintain a rural feel. Pohl - Highlighted the HDC's risk-averse nature and the need for tangible evidence rather than taking things on faith. - Suggested being cautious about assumptions related to the visibility of retainage and emphasized the importance of concrete information. - Encouraged considering alternatives and architectural solutions to mitigate the amount of retainage. - Mentioned the possibility of revisiting the issue with more context after the construction progresses. - Acknowledged the challenge of eliminating 100% of retainage but emphasized the goal of mitigation. - Supported the idea of expediting the process by presenting minimized retainage options in the next submission. - Reiterated the importance of providing concrete solutions that address the concerns raised during the discussion.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions and additional information. (Made by: Welch) (01:55:26)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill Certificate #HDC2023 – 09-8496

6. Robert Sarkisian 03-8052	8 North Mill St	MH addition & alterations	55.4.4/78.2	Topham Designs
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Joe Topham			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Emphasized the importance of the west and north elevations, which face North Mill and Angola Street, respectively. - Recommended simplicity for the north elevation in the main block, avoiding gang windows or bay windows. - Suggested incorporating bay windows in the additive masses instead of the main block for historical appropriateness. - Discouraged the "creating history" component but acknowledged historical appropriateness for bay windows in additive masses around the 1920s. - Advocated for reducing the height of the gable and rear mass, acknowledging the appreciated reduction in the middle mass's ridge height. - Expressed concern about the visibility of ganged French doors on the south elevation from North Mill and stressed appropriateness if screened from public view.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Pointed out that the sighting of the garage remains a problem due to its proximity to North Mill Street, suggesting a solution by rotating the house to face Angola Street. - Advocated for facing Angola Street to address the alignment issue with the adjacent building at 12 Angola Street, creating a more orderly appearance. - Mentioned that facing Angola Street would result in the low addition to the right of the main mass softening the corner view, as it would be facing the intersection of the two streets. - Criticized the architecture of the connector piece, stating that it does not follow typical additive massing for the Old Historic District (OHD) and suggested correcting it to telescope down more naturally. - Critiqued the saltbox roof on the south elevation, suggesting that it is facing the wrong way and proposing a symmetrical Gable with flush dormers for a more normal appearance. - Concurred with Holly's comment about inappropriateness of gang windows facing Angola Street. - Expressed disapproval of window wells on both sides facing both streets, stating that window wells are not appropriate in the Old Historic District when facing the street. Ann Davis - Expressed agreement with Mickey's comments and highlighted shared sentiments.			

	- Strongly advocated for the new house to follow the example set by the houses around the Garden of the Sea, emphasizing features such as window wells, ganged windows, and small additive masses that speak to the vernacular. - Stressed the importance of the new house aligning with the established architectural tone in the area.
Concerns:	Camp - Advocated for the front of the house to face Angola Street, emphasizing the visual appeal when the two houses are side by side. - Expressed unease with the appearance of the other house coming off North Mill, suggesting that side-by-side placement would look better. - Suggested a "broke back" style for the house facing North Mill, with a simpler and more historic telescoping back approach. - Noted concerns about competing gables in the current design and recommended a quieter facade with a broke back design. - Proposed simple and old-fashioned Federal style windows for a more historically accurate appearance. - Emphasized the prominence of the location and the belief that simplicity is key to achieving a more appealing and historic look. Welch - Appreciated the success of the box window in the design. - Mentioned incongruity with a typical connector and expressed openness to alternative images or suggestions regarding the dormer. - Emphasized the need to simplify fenestration or eliminate the dormer. - Discussed potential design options for the north-south orientation, considering variations in gable styles and their impact on the overall appearance. - Acknowledged the diversity of structures in the Nantucket historic district, highlighting the importance of appropriateness rather than strict adherence to typical styles. - Expressed a pragmatic approach, recognizing that a variety of structures contributes to the character and setting of the area. Coombs - Stressed the importance of considering appropriateness based on the location, mentioning that what works on North Liberty Street may not be suitable for Angola Street. - Inquired about the screening of three mold windows on the first floor, expressing concerns about their heaviness for the house. - Suggested breaking apart the three mold windows if visibility from Angola is an issue. - Discussed the idea of turning the front door to face Angola Street, with Joe explaining that North Mill is expected to be the predominant street. - Expressed agreement with Joe's reasoning for having the frontage face North Mill. - Raised a concern about the shed dormer on the right side of the west elevation, suggesting its removal. - Asked about the elevation going up the street and whether it follows the natural contour or is softer. - Encouraged the separation of triple windows and two windows on the north elevation to provide a more authentic and fitting appearance. - Recommended separating the windows by about a foot for a more historical feel. Patten - Expressed appreciation for the west elevation, which will face North Mill Street. - Indicated support for the minor revisions suggested by Stephen. - Overall, expressed satisfaction with the design, stating that it looks good. Pohl - Not concerned about the reverse saltbox design, finding it reasonable and functional. - Requested the removal of the light well on the main mass facing North Mill, as it is positioned on the formal front face of the building. Welch - Requested suggestions for modifications to the dormer fenestration configuration to improve its overall appearance. Pohl - Mentioned not liking the shingle course between the two windows. Topham - Confirmed the suggestion and acknowledged the possibility of changing the configuration to a three-light ganged window. Camp

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Advised making the fenestration on the main mass more consistent to potentially create the impression of a front-facing building, considering the bumped-out window might otherwise give the appearance of a side-facing structure.	
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) focusing on the North elevation, in addition the connector triple set double-hung windows will be made the same size as the A-windows; the dormer will have a top plate header, a slightly lower roof mass, no corner boards, and triple windows; and the window in the center will be on the center line of the window below. (Made by: Welch) (02:39:55)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:2 // Pohl, Welch, Patten (Aye) // Camp, Coombs (Nay)	Certificate #HDC2023 – 03-8052

7. Robert Sarkisian- 11-9406		8 North Mill St	Free Standing Studio/ Garage	55.4.4/78.2	Topham Designs
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten				
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill				
Recused:	Oliver				
Representative:	Joe Topham				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - The site plan needs revision without the connector between the two infill lots. - Consider reducing the height of the connector if possible. - The connector should be pushed back further from the facade of the main home. - Garage doors for both infill lots should be windowless, carriage-style doors, or baton doors. - The fenestration and dormers seem odd; consider smaller dormers and windows more in line with the neighborhood.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Noted that the garage is nearly parallel to the facade of the house. - Referred to "Building With Nantucket in Mind" and suggests pushing the garage to the back of the lot. - Encouraged consistency in the Commission's approach regarding the placement of garages, particularly in the old historic district.				
Concerns:	Welch - Agreed with the concern about the distance from the street for the garage and expresses appreciation for the door choice, finding it appropriate. Camp - Agreed with the concern about the garage's proximity to the main house and suggested simplifying the front fenestration and doors, opting for a simpler garage door with batten doors, and possibly a smaller, simpler window above. Patten - Agreed with the suggestions to push the garage back, possibly bring it down a bit, and eliminate windows on the garage doors. Coombs and Pohl - Concurred with the previous comments. Topham - Explored the possibility of bringing the house forward to address some of the issues. - Mentioned a 9-foot separation between the two structures and proposed having the garage gable four feet back from the secondary mass. - This adjustment would have created a more even stagger and resulted in the garage being approximately 20 feet off the street. - Expressed the challenge posed by the 10-foot front setback requirement in the zoning regulations.				
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) to remove the deck from the site plan, shift the garage back from the street by 7 feet, and specify the garage doors to be of "B-Groove" style. (Made by: Welch) (02:51:33)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten (Aye) // Camp (Nay)		Certificate # HDC2023–11-9406		

8. Robert Sarkisian	8 North Mill St	Hardscape	55.4.4/78.2	Topham Designs
• No discussion or action taken.				

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

9. Valerie Osley 10-9354	305 Polpis Rd	Fence	25/9.7	Sandcastle Construction
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Camp, Patten			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Rob Newman			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Appreciated the major reduction in length of the fence. - Was concerned with the proposed location of the 40-foot and 60-foot sections of the six-foot board fence, especially in the open. - Acknowledged the natural weathering of the fence but noted the lack of existing understory in the area. - Emphasized the importance of native plantings to blend in with the property, suggesting Bay Berry, Holly trees, etc. - Requested a cross-section in the application to better understand the visual impact of the berm, fence, and plantings. - Expressed concern about visibility through the understory, particularly from Polpis Road.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - Thought that given the reduction, it's acceptable as it will naturally weather. - Agreed with Holly's suggestion for natural plantings that will last and not be eaten by deer. Paul - Agreed with everything said by Holly and Val. - Appreciated the consideration given by the applicant and owner. - Trust that the fence will be adequately screened, possibly by the owner, and fine with it. - Suggested a cross-section would be nice but expressed trust in using Native vegetation for screening. Coombs - Mentioned that taking a view might not be beneficial since the fence wouldn't be visible from a distance. - Concluded that it would be okay.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (02:59:58)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			Certificate #HDC2023 – 10-9354

10. Harold Bros. LLC 11-9434	2-4 Highland Ave	New dwelling revision	30/288	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Mentioned the commission's previous opinion on the roofwalk. - Appreciated the changes made to the chimney. - Expressed the view that the roof walk, with or without a skirt, is not considered appropriate. - Acknowledged the adherence to the two-story plate height recommendation from Building With Nantucket in Mind.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Pointed out the partial skirt on the roof walk, which is considered awkward and visible from the street. - Mentioned the discomfort with the enclosure on the front of the house. - Suggested that reducing the width of the roof by a foot could improve proportions overall.			
Concerns:	Oliver - Not in favor of the roof walk due to the long legs and steep roof pitch. - Mentioned that without any skirt, it doesn't seem appropriate or fitting with the style of architecture. - Expressed approval of the chimney reduction, considering it looks good and is appropriate. Coombs - Did not like the roof walk, finding it inappropriate and not fitting the style of architecture. - Was against the roof walk but liked the chimney. Camp - Found the roof walk too small and believed it would work better if it were longer and aligned with the roof lines.			

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Mentioned the different roof lines on the left and right, expressing that the small roof walk is not working well in that context. - Stated opposition to the roof walk. Paul - Expressed a different perspective, mentioning that if the roof walk is narrowed and a skirt is added, it could break up the west elevation and mitigate roof intersections. - Suggested that the roof walk could work on the house if it were modified as mentioned. - Acknowledged that their opinion may differ from others.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to include the elimination of the roof walk. (Made by: Oliver) (03:07:12)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
	Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9434

11. Harold Bros. LLC 11-9433	6 Highland Ave	New dwelling revision	30/288	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Maintained the opinion that two balconies facing North Star are not appropriate, even with the minor changes, and expressed concern about visibility from North Star on the second floor.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed agreement with the opinion that the two second-floor decks next to each other make the building look like an upside-down house on the cliff			
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed agreement with the opinion that the first set of French doors is visible and doesn't work well, especially in comparison to the three bays going towards the back of the house. Oliver - Expressed the opinion that there are too many doors on that side of the house, regardless of whether the porch is integrated or not. Believes it is excessive. Paul - Expressed that the design is an improvement over the previous one. - Suggested considering a single door for the proposed smaller deck and modifying the rail detail. - No issues with other revisions. Welch - Suggested that the rail system on the left deck would be more appropriate as a full shingled wall. - Expressed concern about the post configuration below. - Appreciated the panelization at the bottom of the doors.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Oliver) (03:14:03)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul			Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9433

12. WSTT Holding LLC 10-9286	1 Sconset Ave	New shed	73.4.1/8	Atlantic Landscaping
• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: Paul, Thornewill; Recused: None.</i> No discussion or action taken.				

III. NEW BUSINESS 12/12/2023

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Robert Veghte	2 Anns Lane	Pool reduction rev 05-8469	49/59.1	Jaime Ranney
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Jaime Ranney			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Expressed no concerns with the current proposal, noting that it is more appropriate with the elimination of hardscaping and improved orientation.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	-			

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted subject to submission of the prior approved plan and under the same conditions of the original approval. (Made by: Welch) (03:20:31)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:2 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver (Aye) // Camp, Coombs (Nay)	Certificate #HDC2023 – (as noted)

2. Matthew Roberts **11-9561** 21A Daffodil Lane Roof top Solar array 68/749 Empower Energy

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill	
Alternates:	Welch, Patten, Paul	
Recused:	-	
Representative:	Clark	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	Oliver - Suggested a review of solar guidelines for the project, expressing concern about the placement of solar panels on the front of the house, considering its full two-story height and multiple roof planes. All remaining Commissioner's concurred with the previous comments.	
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (03:26:02)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill	Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9561

3. Over here over there trust 82 Polpis Rd Cottage fenestration 44/25.6 Gryphon Architects

4. Deborah Campbell 11 Starbuck Rd Shed 60/25 Jacob Martinson

No discussion or action taken.

5. O'Spray LLC **12-9577** 25 Willard Lane Hardscape fencing 29/33 Edgewater Landscape

Voting:	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten	
Alternates:	Thornewill	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Paul Cronin	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Originally built by James Gibbs in 1881 on Hulbert Avenue, moved to the current location in the 1930s. - A historic determination has been approved, and there's a draft Form B with associated historic information. - Two existing driveways and a recently approved garage apartment with approved driveway locations. - Recommendation for an asphalt apron instead of a formal apron. - Concerns about the decking and the semi-public private access between the two driveways, suggesting it gives a formal and commercial look.	
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed concern that everything proposed for the Brant Point area, especially Willard Street, seems too formal. - Suggested moving the patio, terrace, boardwalks, outdoor kitchen to the back of the house for a less visible and more informal look.	
Concerns:	Oliver - Suggested that the proposed elements could be reduced and made less formal. Coombs - Expressed the view under consensus that the proposed plan should be reconsidered. - Criticized the formal nature of the walkways on Willard Street, deeming them inappropriate for the location. - Suggested moving the walkways to the back, following the natural land contours for a more informal appearance. - Emphasized that the current plan has taken away the charm and historic character of the old building on Willard Street, transforming it into something more modern. - Pleaded to respect the charming old building and proposed that the landscaping should align with its historic nature. Paul - Contemplated the nature of boardwalks, associating them with informality, and noted a somewhat formal arrangement in the presented plan. - Questioned whether the formal appearance observed is due to the rendering, seeking clarification from the applicant.	

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Raised a question regarding plantings around the secondary parking space and between the boardwalk and privet, suggesting a need to soften the overall design. - Advised the applicant to consider connecting the kitchen with the dining patio, moving it back from the street to create a more cohesive and softened look. Patten - Had no additional comments. - Expressed the desire to see revisions in the presented plan. Pohl - Advised to focus on reducing formality in the plan. - Suggested showing the 25 and 50 on the plan to clarify available space. Oliver - Requested an example of the kitchen for the board members. - Asked for photos or examples of the proposed stone for the patio. Pohl - Stated the absence of objections to boardwalks in general. - Stated that boardwalks can be either informal or formal. - Noted that the current plan renders boardwalks in a somewhat formal way. - Directed Paul to review and consider the feedback provided by the board members.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (03:36:51)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten
	Certificate #HDC2023 – 12-9577

6. Jonathan & Roni Foster	12-9566	43 N Liberty St	Revs 09-9167 Addition	41/153	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill				
Alternates:	Camp, Paul				
Recused:	Pohl				
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Described the building as a Circa 1930 contributing structure within the Old Historic District (OHD). - Mentioned the previous approval of an addition on the facade for a 52.5-foot extension. - Noted that the new addition, despite being small, creates an odd roofline on the front facade. - Highlighted the unusual elevation without a window, considering it atypical for this Cape-style structure. - Recommended moving the front wall, if possible, in line with the past facade addition to maintain the same roof plane and eave. - Suggested adding a 6 over 6 window on the south elevation.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Stated that the structure is in an awkward spot with uneven roof pitches. - Referenced the principle of "Building With Nantucket in Mind." - Noted that the current design erases the nice setback between one building mass to the next, creating an awkward feel. - Suggested that incorporating the new addition more into the main roofline might alleviate the awkwardness. - Conveyed that the proposed design, as it stands, doesn't seem to work well.				
Concerns:	Oliver - Acknowledged understanding of some concerns raised. - Mentioned observing a tree in the provided photos, particularly in the driveway area, which mitigates the impact of the proposed addition. - Expressed a sense that Nantucket is known for quirky little add-ons, suggesting a more lenient perspective. - Stated a lack of significant concern, while also indicating a lack of opposition to the suggestions made by others. Coombs - Expressed agreement with the addition, stating that it fits in well. - Described it as small and indicated that there is no significant issue or problem with it. Thornewill - Expressed contentment that the structure is not evolving into a two-story building, indicating satisfaction with its current design. Patten - Made no additional comments.				
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Patten) (03:41:59)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill				Certificate #HDC2023 –12-9566

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

7. Squam Holdings LLC 31 Squam Rd Partial demo/move/additions 21/3 Botticelli + Pohl
No discussion or action taken.

8. 1 N Swift Rock Rd Trust **11-9588** 1 N Swift Rock Rd Garage Demo/move 40/2 Emeritus LTD

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver	
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Matthew McEachern	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Stated uncertainty about the vintage of the building, estimating it to be from the 80s or 90s. - Expressing a desire for historical information and suggesting it would be helpful to know the year of construction. - Mentioned the potential requirement for a building permit if it was constructed post-1972. - Made a comment about the architectural style, describing it as reminiscent of “Sconset-Like” and noting that it seems unusual for the area. - Noted the absence of property card information and highlighted the Commission's past requests for such information for demo moves. - Expressed satisfaction that there is interest in the building, indicating a positive response to potential preservation efforts.	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	Commissioners stated no concerns.	
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to include the property record card information, dimensionality and ridge heights. (Made by: Welch) (03:45:56)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver	Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9588

9. 1 N Swift Rock Rd Trust **12-9580** 1 N Swift Rock Rd New Dwelling 40/2 Emeritus LTD

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver	
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Matthew McEachern	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner -	
Public Comments:	Lisa Burger - Shared the family's ownership of their house for 30 years. - Mentioned the understanding that one of the HDC's roles is to ensure new construction aligns with nearby houses in terms of scale, massing, and proportion. - Provided historical context about the North Swift Rock Road Association, built in the late 1980s with a protective Covenant limiting each of the six lots to a single-family house. - Emphasized that the proposal for one North Rock Road, if approved, would introduce a second single-family dwelling, contrary to the original Covenant. - Highlighted the specific details of the proposed construction, stating it would have a total area of 4,499 square feet. Pohl - Clarified that the board doesn't involve itself with subdivision covenants and emphasized their responsibility for exterior features visible from publicly traveled ways. - Acknowledged that restrictions related to the number of dwellings, size, and location fall under the applicant's responsibility in a different format. - Encouraged the applicant to provide comments on the architecture, as that is within the scope of the board's jurisdiction. - Emphasized the board's limitation in addressing subdivision covenants and suggested that such matters are better addressed through the appropriate channels. Lisa Burger - Provided historical background and perspective on the proposed project, highlighting that it would be the first and only house to have two single-family dwellings. - Shared additional perspective on the speaker's house, which directly faces the proposed development and is 500 square feet.	

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Raised concerns about the accuracy of the photo in the application, particularly regarding its location on Eel Point Road. - Emphasized that the structure would be visible from Eel Point Road, contrary to the applicant's claim. - Mentioned a 338-foot easement called Thresher Way granted to homeowners, which runs alongside the property and should be considered. - Expressed concerns about the south elevation, specifically noting six different Ridge lines and expressing worry about the overall height of the house, which is 28.1 feet without the Widow's walk. John Moy - Expressed agreement with the concerns raised by Lisa. - Acknowledged listening to the meeting for a couple of days, waiting to address the issue. - Pointed out the board's objections in the past regarding building size not being appropriate for the neighborhood. - Objected to the construction of a second dwelling on a lot that is over twice as big as the existing dwelling and much larger than other dwellings in the subdivision. - Conveyed the opinion that such a construction doesn't seem right in the context of the neighborhood.
Concerns:	Oliver - Requested the opportunity to view the area to better understand the concerns raised. - Shared concerns about the existing tall and large house for which there is no picture provided but has a photo. - Noted a disparity in the listed height on the application (28 feet) and the drawing (29 feet). - Expressed reservations about having two buildings on the property, considering the historical context of a 22-foot height limit. - Voiced the desire to visualize the location, potentially using poles, to assess the context of the area before making any decisions. - Addressed neighbors, mentioning the potential expiration of restrictions in developments without an active homeowners association after 25 years. Camp - Expressed a favorable stance towards having a view. Welch - Concurred with the need for a view. - Requested a staking plan for the complex structure, specifically marking the tallest ridges with stakes and flags. - Emphasized the importance of having a roof plan that accurately reflects the staking, allowing for coordination during the next hearing when a view is conducted.
Motion:	Motion for a view, subject to distribution of a roof and staking plan and additional information to include a topographical site plan. (Made by: Welch) (04:00:11)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
	Certificate #HDC2023 – 12-9580

10. Kathryn Cook 12-9637	85 Low Beach Rd	Glass connector rev 10-7257	75/31.3	Rich Gammons
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Rich Gammons			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that the subject is outside the Old Historic District (OHD) of Sconset. - Mentioned that glass connectors are contrary to the principle of "Building With Nantucket in Mind." - Acknowledged that the proposal is before the board because it was suggested they could come back. - Highlighted that if the structure is visible from the rear of the lot, even though not from a public way, it should be noted that the rear lot is perpetual open space owned by the Sconset Trust. Although private, it is accessible to the public.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed being thrown for a loop when visiting the site due to a large open space between two Gables. - Noted the realization that there are doors on both sides, resembling a glass connector. - Shared personal concern about the nighttime visibility of two floors of glass glowing in the dark with a wide-open expanse around it. - Mentioned the precedent set by a similar situation in Quidnet, considering it inappropriate and potentially creating a negative impact on the surrounding area. Coombs			

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

	- Aligned with Val's perspective, agreeing that the proposed glass structure is not suitable for the particular property. - Mentioned ongoing discussions and deliberations on both sides about the property. - Expressed the belief that glass is not appropriate for this strip of land. Paul - Expressed the desire to go out and take a look at the site. - Mentioned confusion about the photo on the screen with two gables, as there are no elevations showing gables forward. - Stated the preference that two-story glass walls should not be visible from any vantage point. Camp - Had no additional comments. Welch - Supported the idea of a view, deeming it appropriate. - Expressed the willingness to visit the site at night to assess the concerns raised by Val regarding the visibility of lights. - Requested the coordination with staff to turn on lights at the back of the house during the nighttime visit. - Conditioned the approval on receiving a full set of approved drawings in a packet, including the site plan and elevations showing the proposed changes. - Asked for confirmation about the availability of supplemental sheets showing the proposed elevations. - Suggested informing the board in advance about the night when lights will be turned on for the observation.
Motion:	Motion for a view, subject to receiving a full set of approved drawings in a packet, including the site plan and elevations showing the proposed changes. (Made by: Oliver) (04:09:32)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul Certificate #HDC2023 – 12-9637

IV. OLD BUSINESS 12/19/2023

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. KMS 126NT 10-9327	126R Main St	Reno relocate garage	42.3.3/98.1	LFW

• Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: None. **Last heard 11/14/2023**

No discussion or action.

Comments:	Pohl - Clarified the reason for asking about comments, emphasizing fairness to those who have been waiting to voice concerns. - Referenced the policy that addresses situations where people wait all night but the presenters repeatedly decide not to present, deeming it unfair. - Noted the numerous applications on both properties and the need to check their status with respect to the policy. - Mentioned that the situation may be considered a strike against the properties based on the information available. Welch - Clarified that the policy is not prejudicial against anyone but is in place to ensure fairness and consistency in the process. - Acknowledged the potential confusion with other applications related to 126R Main Street.. - Stated that if there has been an offense, consequences outlined in the best practices will be followed, and a determination will be made based on whether it qualifies as an offense.
Public Comment: (04:10:45)	Sarah Alger - Mentioned being present throughout the day. - Expresses willingness to provide comments but conveys a readiness to return on another day if needed. Kevin Toth- Stephanie Bradford- - Offered to provide a list of times when the application has been delayed or not heard due to the applicant's representative not showing up. - Mentioned the most recent instance on Halloween, highlighting that it was not ideal for attendees but was given a pass due to the holiday.

2. Matthew Stone 10-9323	47 Milk St	Pool location rev	56/201	LFW
--------------------------	------------	-------------------	--------	-----

• Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: None. **Last heard 11/14/2023**

No discussion or action.

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

3.	1 Caroline Way LLC 10-9234	1 Caroline Way	Porch & Balcony rev 4680	82/58-59	Vincente-Burin
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Paulo Vicente				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	Oliver Suggested eliminating one set of double posts on the second floor on the west side and turning those areas into shingle columns to simplify the design. Camp, Coombs and Paul concurred.				
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) that the double posts on the second floor of the west become shingled to match the rest of the deck. (Made by: Oliver) (04:09:32)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				Certificate #HDC2023 – 10-9234
4.	ACK AMA Realty 11-9517	1 Sparks Ave	Fenestration chngs & HVAC	55/180.1	Rick Beaudette
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill, Paul				
Recused:	None				
Representative:	Rick Beaudette				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Stated that the Circa 1977 rotary restaurant is non-contributing. - Recommended shingling in the stairs as more appropriate, consistent with the building at five Sparks Avenue. - Asked about the board fence on top of the building to hide HVAC. - Recommended the board fence to be natural to weather and at the minimum height as needed				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	Welch - Expressed appreciation for the changes, noting that they substantially address concerns. - Stated that the design now looks like a 1970 Nantucket restaurant. - Declared having no concerns. Camp - Pointed out finding the fencing on the broke back egregious, mentioning it ruins the profile. - Raised a question about the location of the big vent shown above and expressed a preference for the vent over the boxing. Oliver - Appreciated the changes, specifically noting the shingling in the steps as great. - Expressed agreement with hiding the vent and mentioned that the previous issue with big ductwork around the back is now resolved. Coombs - Expressed the view that hiding the vent is not necessary, as it has been part of the building for a long time and is associated with a business. - Suggested going with what is already there without adding additional elements.				
Motion:	Motion to approve per Exhibit A (through staff) everything requested on the most recent drawings, with the exception of the fencing around the existing exhaust. (Made by: Camp) (04:27:53)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9517

The remaining items were not discussed, and no action was taken.

5.	Richard Farrell Trust 10-9328	12 Gay St	Ac equipment	42.3.4/13	Normand Residential
• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs; Alternates: None Recused: None. Last heard 10/31/2023</i>					
6.	More than Enough 10-9331	30 Russell's Way	Roof change rev	77/.8.1	CWA
• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Patten, Thornewill; Recused: None. Last heard 10/24/2023</i>					
7.	Tigerlily Nom Tr. 01-7689	7 Barnabas Lane	New Garage	30/132	Studio PPark
• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver; Alternates: None Recused: None. Last heard 03/28/2023</i>					
8.	Tigerlily Nom Tr. 01-7671	7 Barnabas Lane	Hardscape & pool	30/132	Ahern LLC
• <i>New Business application to track OB- new garage</i>					

HDC Draft Minutes December 19, 2023

9.	Lori Meinke 06-8724	17 Ames Ave	Addition	60.2.4/23	Twig Perkins
Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: none. Last heard 07/18/2023					

MINUTES

Motion:	Motion to approve the HDC Minutes of October 24, 31 & November 21, 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- January 2nd at 4pm ***HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**
- Discussion on distinguishing between solid and veneer brick on chimneys and foundations.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:29 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 6-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c7OANtmZgoA&t=15000s>