



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, January 9, 2024

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:01p.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, Nickesha Sheriff , Land Use Specialist
Attending Members:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten
Remote Participants:	Coombs, Paul
Absent Members:	-
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	-

ADOPTION OF AMENDED AGENDA

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

I. DISCUSSION AND APPOINT

- Appoint PLUS Staff (Esmeralda Martinez, Nickesha Sheriff, and Holly Backus) Enforcement.

Discussion:	Esmeralda Martinez - Mentioned the HDC's tradition of appointing individuals to enforcement roles. - Confirmed Nikki is currently handling inspections. - Recalled that in the past, Billy was responsible for inspections and took over signs, effectively handling enforcement tasks as well. - Acknowledged the enforcement role naturally aligns with inspection duties. - Noted significant changes and shifts occurring within the office currently. - Requested that the three individuals be designated as enforcers to clarify roles and responsibilities.
Motion:	Motion to appoint PLUS Staff Esmeralda Martinez, Nickesha Sheriff, and Holly Backus Enforcement Officers. (Made by: Welsh)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver (Aye)

II. SIGNS

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Walquiria Valero	68 Old South Rd	Wall sign	68/85.5	SHN
Discussion:	Esmeralda Martinez - Reported the Sign Council met that morning. - Informed that out of four applications, only one was recommended for approval. - Specified the approved application was for 68 Old South Road. - Stated the remaining applications were held.			
Motion:	Motion to accept the Sign Committee's recommendation on 68 Old South Road. (Made by: Welsh)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver (Aye)			

2.	Salvador Aguilar 12-9605	5 Macy's Lane	Wall sign	68/40	SHN
3.	Salvador Aguilar 12-9607	5 Macy's Lane	Wall sign	68/40	SHN
4.	Nantucket Atheneum	1 & 3 India St	Free standing sign	42.3.1/73	Ann Scott
Motion:		Motion to hold Items 2, 3, 4. (Made by: Welsh)			
Vote:		Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver (Aye)			

III. CONSENT					
	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Atlas Gallagher LLC	15 Lyons Lane	New shed	76/22	JB studio em
2.	25 Okorwaw Nom Trust	25 Okorwaw Ave	Window revisions	79/174	Val Oliver em
3.	Paul Caggiano	59b Polpis Rd	New Fence	54/261	Val Oliver em
4.	89 Easton St	89 Easton St	Historic Determination	42.4.4/21	BPC hb
5.	Lee Baldwin	5 Mulberry St	New shed	55.4.1/18	Jarek Cohen rp
6.	Robert Young	49 Wauwinet Rd	Ground solar array	66/294	Ack Smart rp
7.	David Butler	26 Clarendon St	Move off/demo shed	76.1.3/121	David Butler rp
8.	Denise Kronau	5 Old Quinet Milk Rt	Solar roof array	20/54.1	Ack Smart vo
9.	Denise Kronau	5 Old Quinet Milk Rt	Solar ground array	20/54.1	Ack Smart vo
10.	Brendan Hunt	35 South Shore Rd	MH addition	80/62	Normand Residential vo
11.	Brendan Hunt	35 South Shore Rd	Re-site On site studio	80/62	Normand Residential vo
12.	John Daly	6 Nobadeer Way	Re-site on site shed	68/172	Rob Anderson vo
13.	Gallery West LLC	1 Mothball Way	Move on garage	83/42.4	SMRD vo
14.	Barrett Farm LLC	19 Barrett Farm Rd	Move off garage	65/16.1	SMRD vo
15.	NT Conservation	165 Cliff Rd	Replace windows	41/65	LFW cp
16.	Patricia McGrath	78 Cliff rd	Move off/ demo garage	30/71	LFW cp
17.	ABCET LLC	58 Baxter rd.	New driveway & apron	49/54	Will Stephens ct
18.	Charina Sisters LLC	112 Madaket Rd	GH addition	40/28	Botticelli + Pohl ct
19.	Edward Mills	2 Hiawasse Ln	New shed	55/469	Atlantic Landscaping ac
20.	Joseph Conway	67 Milestone Rd	Onsite & renovate	68/28.4	Gryphon Architects jp
21.	Amelia Dr LLC	5 Amelia Drive	Reduce scnd porch & demo stairs	67/435	Emeritus LTD vo
22.	Douglas & Gina Lebrech	4r Daffodil Lane	New dwelling	68/719.1	Kris Megna dc
23.	Kara & Joh Rogers	32 Lyons Lane	Revisions	71/6	SMRD dc
24.	30 Tashama Lane LLC	30 Tashama Lane	Covered Porch	55/455	EMDA dc
25.	Tyler Albright	11 Cannonbury Lane	Dwelling revisions	74/22	Val Oliver dc
26.	Tyler Albright	11 Cannonbury Lane	Hardscape revisions	74/22	Val Oliver dc
27.	Summer St Church	4 Trotter's Lane	New Dwelling	67/133	Val Oliver jp
28.	74 N Liberty LLC	74 N. Liberty St	Add post- porch	41/236	Val Oliver jp
29.	Wombat Point LLC	2 Prospect St	Door/window chng & odshowr	55.4.4/3	EMDA sw
30.	Maggie & Luke Kelly	81 Cliff Rd	Pergola	30/165	Sandcastle Const. sw
31.	Amy & Ted Orenstein	5 Crow's Nest Way	New garage	12/22.2	Sandcastle Const. sw
32.	Esposito Fam. Trust	5 Cliff Rd	Addition	80/169	Permit + sw
33.	Erin Wilson	6 Swayze's Dr	Garage revisions	66/163	EMDA sw
34.	James Schwell	28 Flintlock Rd	Alterations & addition	75/79	Topham Designs sw
35.	Nantucket Boys & Girls-	73 Sparks Ave	New dwelling	55/139.3	Emeritus LTD sw
36.	NIR	27 Broad St	Roof replacement	42.4.2/78	T & T Roofing sw
37.	John Kane	12 Pond Rd	Fenestration chngs	56/295	Topham Designs sw
38.	Picano	12 Gladlands Ave	Roof replacement	80/182	Bo Wilson em
Voting:		Welch, Coombs, Camp, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:		-			
Recused:		Pohl, Oliver, Paul			
Representative:		-			
Documentation:		Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:		-			
Public Comments:		-			
Concerns:		-			
Motion:		Motion to approve items on Consent. (Made by: Coombs) (00:07:14)			
Roll-Call Vote:		Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Camp, Patten, Thornewill			
Certificate #				HDC2024 – (as noted)	

IV. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	5 Wauwinet LLC	5 Wauwinet Rd	Pool replacement	20/74	Val Oliver	dc
	pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
2.	Glick & Scruton	31 Eel Point Rd	Pool & hardscape	39/52	David Troast	em
	pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
4.	Four Hawks LLC	4 Hawks Circle	New pool	74/37.3	NAG	rp
	pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
5.	Brendan Hunt	35 South Shore Rd	Pool & hardscape	80/62	Normand Residential	vo
	pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
6.	Randy Sharp	8 Whitetail Circle	Additions	71/25	Thornewill Designs	jp
	change the 4 light door to a 9 light					
7.	Orange Swordfish LLC	28 Orange St	Fenestration changes rev	42.3.2/175	Emeritus LTD	vo
	that the change from ganged 9/9 window to single 9/9 uses the existing window.					
8.	NHA Properties LLC	66 Pochick Ave	Move on from 2 Dukes Rd	79/177	Caleb Wursten	vo
	the move off from 2 Dukes Road's approval and HDC number should included on the COA, along with the previously approved COA.					
9.	22 Tash LLC	22 Tashama Lane	New dwelling	55/451	Val Oliver	jp
	increase front door side casing dimensions to 5/4 x 6 and heascasing to 2x8 w/ cap (more traditional front door trim detailing)					
10.	William & Cherie Dentiste	43 Goldfinch Rd	Add dormer	68/544	JB Studio	jp
	proposed dormer should be off the ridge. <u>BWNIM page 110</u> recommends shed dormers to be setback 6' off the ridge, as well as 1' off the face and 3' off the sides.					
11.	Angels Roost Nom Tr.	8 Silver St	New shed	55.4.1/187	Sandcastle Const.	sw
	COA is not included in pdf, need attached is the draft HDC Survey (Form B)					
12.	Amy & Ted Orenstein	5 Crow's Nest Way	Window change	12/22.2	Sandcastle Const.	sw
	window revisions – c.1978 (NHL data) “Sand Dollar” HDC Survey NAN.3001 – to be included in the file and on the application.					
13.	Nantucket Land Bank	30 Mizzenmast Ext.	Addition & roof replacement	66/433	Gryphon Architects	sw
	top plate buried in header (to lower eave), dormer roof pitch to 3.5/12 (to lower dormer roof termination at main roof)					
14.	Kenneth Coffin Inc	35 Tomahawk rd	Rooftop solar array	69/325	Cotuit Solar	sw
	either fill the roof or remove the (2) lowest panels and center the remainder (as a group) horizontally on the roof plane.					
15.	LACKMILK LLC	29 Milk St	Roof replacement	42.3.3/38	T & T Roofing	sw
	c. 1915 dwelling HDC Survey NAN.698 to be attached with file and indicated on application.					
16.	55 Grove Lane LLC	55 Grove Lane	Pergola addition	41/419	JN Design	sw
	lower roof system and top plate minimum of 1'; structure absolutely not visible at time of inspection or thereafter.					

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Patten
Alternates:	Paul
Recused:	Thornewill, Oliver
Representative:	-
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve all items on Consent, with the exception of Item 3. (Made by: Welch) (00:08:18)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Patten
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

3. Mark Yelle	3 Halyard St	Pool & hardscape	66/325	Waterscapes	em
pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
Concerns:	Patten - Mentioned the item was on the consent list for review. - Observed the pool was located right on the street. - Expressed concern about the lack of screening for the pool. Pohl - Cautioned about handling cases pulled from the consent or consent with conditions pile, noting the absence of representatives for addressing potential questions. - Advised holding items with questions or concerns for when representation is available. Welch - Clarified the vegetation is situated in the side yard, which might be considered the rear yard due to the house's positioning towards the back of the lot. - Pointed out the rendering lacks depiction of vegetation around the pool area. - The condition of approval stated it must not be visible at the time of inspection and thereafter, eliminating the need for further requests. - Explained if the condition is not met, the project does not pass, preventing closure. - Mentioned a shed at the end of the driveway and existing vegetation, expressing uncertainty about how to proceed. Camp - Requested additional information to understand the nature of the screening mentioned. Coombs - Expressed a desire to obtain measurements detailing the pool's proximity to the rear property line for numerical reference.				
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) subject to adding a condition which is that screening plant materials will be reflected and named on the plan. The first condition remains pool not to be visible at the time of inspection and perpetuity and pool have no grade change from existing or is noted on the original application (Made by: Welch) (00:16:40)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten (Aye) // Camp (Nay)				

V. OLD BUSINESS 12/05/2023					
Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent	
1. 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>					
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten				
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Lindsay Congleton, Atlantic Landscaping				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner No concerns with the architecture.				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	Oliver - Stated that it was appropriate. Coombs - Confirmed approval of the shed located at the other end of the pool. Patten - No concerns. Camp - Stated that it was still inappropriate.				
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (00:20:05)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)				
			Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	

VI. NEW BUSINESS 12/12/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Over here over there trust	82 Polpis Rd	Cottage fenestration	44/25.6	Gryphon Architects
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ethan Griffin, Gryphon Architects			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - No concerns. Camp - Noted that since it was facing back into the interior, indicates the rails are acceptable. - Implied agreement regarding the acceptability of the muttons. Welch - Stated that given the limited to no visibility, had no concerns. Coombs - Acknowledged dislike for the fences but considered them approvable and expressed willingness to support them.			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Coombs) (00:23:28)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
			Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

2. Deborah Campbell	11 Starbuck Rd	Shed	60/25	Jacob Martinson
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Jacob Martinson			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - Stated being the person who requested the missing pictures from the application. - Described it as a very basic shed and expressed no concerns once the photos were provided. Camp - Mentioned that a small room is being created by removing some Pines, suggesting that adding some screening to obscure it would make the area more appropriate due to the lack of features on this elevation. Coombs - Concurred with Camp. Welch - Expressed agreement with the proposed screening, stating no opposition to it and affirming satisfaction with the location.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to include the addition of some screening as shown on the site plan between Starbuck and the shed. (Made by: Camp) (00:26:14)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
			Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

3. Squam Holdings LLC – Hold 1/16	31 Squam Rd	Partial demo/move/additions	21/3	Botticelli + Pohl
---	-------------	-----------------------------	------	-------------------

VII. 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**

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Jacob Martinson
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that the structure is a contributing garage from circa 1915 with an HDC survey on file. At the last meeting, the board requested an inventory of the structure's elements to be retained and sought clarification on why the structure needed to move 3 feet instead of 5. - Appreciated the photos and plans provided but recommended that larger and clearer plans would be more suitable to discern what is being retained. - Expressed appreciation for the Baton garage doors as noted by the board but highlighted that there was no address to the question of moving the garage 3 feet instead of 5. - Critiqued the proposed fenestration, advising that all fenestration should be true divided light (TDL) in the Old Historic District (OHD). - Noted for the record that a letter from the abutters at 11 Vestal Street was received and forwarded to the Commissioners, which is now part of the record.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed general approval of the project, with the exception of one window on the west elevation described as unusual. - Highlighted concerns about the window being a 12 over 12, configured unusually, and noted it as a fold-up, expressing uncertainty about its nature. Kevin Toth - Expressed gratitude to the HDC for its efforts in preserving Nantucket's historic legacy. - Criticized the latest submission for having lines that are "abysmal" and "completely illegible," describing it as unhelpful and unproductive. - Noted discrepancies in the application, with the structure still being moved over five feet despite claims of a three-foot move, as highlighted by Miss Backus and Mary Bergman. - Reminded of the HDC's denial in January 2023 to demolish the garage at 126r Main Street and emphasized the lack of response regarding efforts to restore or stabilize the building over the past year. - Argued that approving the plans to move and redesign the structure would signal to future applicants that HDC decisions can be reversed with time and neglect. - Cited the applicant's representative's statement from the November 14th meeting that the move is to avoid setback violations, criticizing it as inappropriate for a historic structure. - Supported Commissioner Camp's stance from the November 14th meeting for keeping the structure in its current location for historical context. - Echoed Vice Chair Welch's emphasis on preserving the historic character without jeopardizing it by moving, suggesting a smaller move should be considered. - Asserted the latest proposal still plans a move of over five feet for the purpose of avoiding the setback and enabling enlargement and alterations to the structure. - Urged the HDC to preserve the streetscape by maintaining the structure's current location and to enforce the maintenance and repair of historic buildings. - Requested the denial of the application, arguing against exploiting the HDC process through neglect and jeopardizing historic structures. - Advocated for the HDC to stand firm on its decisions and not to facilitate what is seen as a "demolition in disguise." Sarah Alger - Agreed with the points Mr. Toth made, emphasizing the difficulty in approving the plans due to their complete illegibility, making it challenging to understand the proposal.

	- Highlighted the unfairness to Mrs. Coombs, who is unable to see the paper copies, reinforcing the argument that the plans should not be approved for all the previously stated reasons.
Concerns:	Welch - Took exception to the assertion that the issue with drawings submitted without clear lines is not the applicant's responsibility, emphasizing that it indeed is. - Explained that when saving files as PDFs, whether the original drawing size is 24x36 or printed at 8.5x11, the lines should not change, countering excuses related to printing issues. - Warned against the complications that arise from scanning and other processes, stating that any problems resulting from these actions are the responsibility of the person undertaking them. - Declared an intention to vote no on the matter out of principle. Coombs - Expressed agreement with Sarah and Mr. Toth, condemning the quality of what has been presented to the commission as appalling. - Criticized the inability to understand the plans, specifically pointing out issues such as a one by three, implying the presentation or details are inadequate. - Firmly stated opposition to the presented plans, reiterating support for the positions taken by Sarah and Mr. Toth. Camp - Sought clarification on the material of the new foundation, specifically asking if it would be a rubble or similar to what is currently in place. - Addressed a previous speaker's concern, clarifying that the project is not a demolition but rather involves keeping the same structure and moving it 3 feet off the property line, which is considered minimal. - Commented on the window on the west side as being slightly off and suggested it could be replaced with another "B Window" like the one in the front for consistency. - Appreciated the design aspect of the garage doors being visible from the driveway, approving of the simple storm doors as a good choice. Oliver - Expressed contentment with the proposal, specifically noting that what is visible from the street is considered appropriate. Pohl - Expressed appreciation for the building moving only 3 feet and acknowledged the necessity of a new foundation for such a move. - Agreed with a previous point about the side window not being typical for Nantucket, noting that its visibility might be contested but is not a primary concern. - Highlighted the quality of the drawings as a major concern, emphasizing the importance of all board members having access to clear and comprehensive information, regardless of their physical presence at the meeting or participation via Zoom. - Advocated for the submission of digitized drawings that are fully legible to ensure equitable access to information for all board members, indicating a reluctance to approve the project without this provision. Welch - Cited the previously mentioned reasons for voting no on the project, particularly highlighting the insufficiencies of the drawing as a significant factor. - Pointed out that the lack of detailed and clear drawings has overshadowed other important discussions, such as the proposal to move the structure nearly 20 feet away from the street, which the speaker believes deserves further discussion. - Emphasized the need for digitally clear drawings with precise dimensions to facilitate a comprehensive review and enable a final discussion and vote on the project. Backus - Affirmed the discussion about the need for legible plans, stating it's inappropriate to scan plans in the office and then blame the office for legibility issues. - Expressed strong agreement with the approach Mr. Welch has mentioned previously, advocating for the direct emailing of plans from one's computer to ensure clarity and accountability.
Motion:	Motion to hold for until a better set of drawings and a better digital file are provided.

	The motion includes the possibility of making revisions to accommodate the concerns expressed by board members. The project can be reviewed at next Tuesday's meeting, allowing for timely consideration of the necessary improvements. (Made by: Welch) (00:45:02)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
	Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)

2. Richard Farrell Trust 10-9328	12 Gay St	AC equipment	42.3.4/13	Normand Residential
----------------------------------	-----------	--------------	-----------	---------------------

- Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs; Alternates: None Recused: None. **Last heard 10/31/2023**

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Ben Normand
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that the structure was the Atlantic Silk Company, an individually significant structure in the Old Historic District (OHD), built between 1835 and 1836 and converted into a duplex in 1844. - Expressed appreciation for the removal of proposed external line sets on the building. - Emphasized the need to attempt to place AC equipment away from the facade, specifically mentioning Gay Street and Westminster Street, due to the building's significance. - Suggested relocating the AC equipment to the rear of the structure if possible, or engaging in a discussion about proper enclosure if it must remain in its current location. - Noted the structure's white color and mentioned that natural to weather enclosures for AC units are typical, but expressed concern that such an enclosure would be an eyesore for this particular building.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Added reinforcement to Holly's comments, agreeing with the suggestion that the AC equipment could likely be moved to the back of the building to reduce visibility. - Highlighted the building's prominent location, particularly noting its position on the corner, which increases the importance of minimizing visual impact.
Concerns:	Camp - Highlighted concerns regarding the visibility of electrical installations, suggesting that screening it with natural wood and enhancing the existing hedge around the corner could effectively conceal the electrical equipment. - Expressed approval for the arrangement of downspouts, assuming they are white and neatly integrated along the pilaster on the corner, specifically referring to the Westminster elevation. - Suggested that the electrical could be rerouted to enter the house from a less conspicuous location, identifying the current placement as the most visually disruptive aspect on the side of the building, aside from the mentioned improvements. Welch - Appreciated the effort to remove equipment from the front, side, and back of the historic structure, recognizing the structure's high visibility and architectural significance. - Noted that the current condenser location on Westminster, relative to Gay Street, does not align with guidelines, suggesting it should be positioned at least halfway back, with the front face of the condenser in line with the perpendicular drop from the gable. - Highlighted the gable's orientation parallel to Gay Street and perpendicular to Westminster, suggesting visibility considerations. - Discussed the potential for extensive line sets runs, with lengths of up to 300 or 420 feet, depending on the system setup, indicating flexibility in positioning the condenser. - Proposed a more appropriate solution involving moving the condenser and creating a faux water table extension to run it towards Gay Street, then in through the sill, to minimize visual impact and preserve aesthetic integrity, contrasting with the permanence of the condenser's visibility if left in its current location.

	Coombs - Expressed curiosity about the positioning of air conditioning units, questioning why they must be placed high rather than staying low, below the first-floor window, to avoid occupying space between windows. - Admitted a lack of familiarity with the technical aspects of air conditioning installation, due to not having personal experience with it.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) moving the enclosure for the condenser unit to the middle of the west elevation, specifically between the second and third basement sash. Detailed the plan to run a horizontal conduit line along the water table, ensuring the color scheme matches with white on white to minimize visual impact. (Made by: Welch) (00:58:20)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

3. More than Enough **10-9331** 30 Russell's Way Roof change rev 77/.8.1 CWA
• *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Patten, Thornewill; Recused: None. **Last heard 10/24/2023***

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Chip Webster
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Recommended for Chip to refer to page 170 of Building With Nantucket in Mind, which specifically addresses chimneys, suggesting it as a helpful resource for consideration in the project's development.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed gratitude to Chip for adjusting the building's position on the front (north) side, noting that even a small setback of a foot significantly enhances the facade's appearance. - Raised confusion about the overall height of the building, as the application lists it as 28'4" on all sides, yet discrepancies exist, with one measurement nearly reaching 29'. This confusion is attributed to the lot's slope, but clarity is sought. - Commented on the chimney size, suggesting it appears too large and noting its absence from the interior plans, implying that reducing its size should not pose a problem. - Highlighted ongoing concerns about the size of the deck, which remains unchanged despite previous discussions. - Acknowledged minor changes, such as window adjustments, as positive but emphasized the need for addressing the larger issues mentioned. Welch - Agreed with Val. Coombs - Suggested that two full flues may not be necessary and that the chimney could integrate better with the overall design if it were reduced, specifically mentioning a reduction of about 6 inches in width. - Expressed appreciation for the architectural adjustments made to the wing, including pushing it back and modifying the windows by removing the mold and separating them, indicating these changes move the project closer to approval. - Acknowledged and agreed with previous concerns about the building's height, particularly noting the mention of a height nearly reaching 29 feet, which exceeds desired limits. - Highlighted a preference for keeping the building's height closer to 25 feet to align with the original intentions for the area, urging further consideration to lower the building's height accordingly.

	Camp - Voiced concerns about the building's height, suggesting it should be reduced to better fit the context. - Identified specific issues with the second floor, particularly highlighting that the decks are overly expansive and the fenestration is excessive. - Agreed with the notion that a large chimney could be designed to accommodate four flues and yet be smaller and less obtrusive than the current design, recommending a reduction in its size to avoid appearing too chunky and formal for the Tom Nevers area. Pohl - Agreed with fellow board members' comments regarding the application, adding an observation related to the topography. - Appreciated the provision of topographic information, which led to the observation that a platform is being created at elevation 38 on natural topography at elevation 36.6, resulting in essentially a two-foot high and deep platform of fill. - Highlighted that this observation underscores concerns about the building's height, especially considering the low vegetation and scrub oak typical of the area, effectively raising the structure's elevation to around 30 feet when accounting for the proposed two feet of fill. Webster - Clarified their understanding regarding changes to the information presented on the front page of the application, specifically mentioning that they believe such details cannot be modified once submitted. - Noted that as the project evolves, including changes to height or other significant aspects, it is the updated drawings that reflect these changes and take precedence over initial application details. - Expressed openness to guidance or clarification on whether and how such information on the application can be amended, indicating a willingness to make adjustments if possible. Pohl - Acknowledged the challenge of discrepancies between application details and subsequent revisions, highlighting that even if changes to the application were possible, there might still be oversight issues. - Pointed out specific instances where ridge height adjustments are made in the plans or elevations but fail to be updated on the application itself, maintaining an outdated ridge height measurement. - Expressed appreciation for highlighting this issue, recognizing its relevance to ensuring accuracy and consistency in project documentation. Welch - Compared the handling of inconsistencies in documentation to building code practices, where in cases of inconsistency, the more restrictive requirement prevails. - Expressed agreement with comments made by the chair regarding concerns about the building's height, emphasizing the need for adjustment. - Opposed the idea of raising the grade, suggesting instead that the building's elevation should be reduced by two feet to address concerns related to its overall height and fit within the surrounding landscape.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revision. (Made by: Coombs) (01:13:40)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

4.	Tigerlily Nom Tr. 01-7689	7 Barnabas Lane	New Garage	30/132	Studio PPark
• Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver; Alternates: None Recused: None. Last heard 03/28/2023					
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	James Krapp				

Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted the project's location within the Woodbury subdivision, which is part of the Old Historic District (OHD) and recognized in the National Register as a prime example of Nantucket architecture. - Expressed appreciation for the inclusion of neighborhood garage precedent photos and the removal of the pent roof, but noted that some photo examples might be taken out of context or from the same subdivision but predate the 1980 subdivision development. - Emphasized the importance of the garage's placement relative to the main dwelling rather than its distance from the street, suggesting the garage facade should be pushed back further to align with guidelines outlined in "Building with Nantucket in Mind," specifically page 105, which states garages were typically set back behind the house. - Recommended making the chimney inboard and inquired about the dimensions of the rear covered porch, pointing out that such a feature is atypical, especially for a garage in the OHD. - Appreciated changes made to the south and east elevations but critiqued the garage design as still too boxy and busy, indicating a need for further refinement.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Agreed with Holly's assessment that the garage is positioned too close to the street, suggesting it should be moved further back on the lot as advised by "Building with Nantucket in Mind," which recommends utilizing as much of the lot's depth as possible. - Critiqued the roof pitch for being too shallow, contributing to the structure's boxy appearance. Recommended experimenting with a steeper 9 or 10 pitch and suggested lowering the plate height rather than raising the ridge to achieve this. - Echoed Holly's comments on the open rear porch being unusual for the area, proposing that it should have a shed roof or a simple hip roof without the horizontal extension to better align with typical architectural features. - Pointed out issues with the flush dormer on the north side, specifically its excessive shingled area. Suggested making the dormer smaller or adding another window in the middle to improve its proportion and appearance. Krapp - Highlighted guidance from "Building with Nantucket in Mind," specifically on page 61, which precedes the advice about garages found on page 105. This section emphasizes that new construction should maintain a pattern of site utilization similar to that of adjacent properties, focusing on building setbacks, facade widths, and the spacing between structures to ensure rhythm and continuity in the streetscape. - Addressed the issue of garage placement in relation to the property's size, acknowledging that while there are precedents for placing garages further back on lots, this particular lot's double width within the Woodbury subdivision presents a unique context. - Argued that moving a structure further back on this wider lot may not align with the established neighborhood context, challenging the general recommendation for garage placement and emphasizing the need for a nuanced approach to site planning that considers the specific characteristics of each lot. Sarah Alger, Owner's legal counsel - Expressed concern that pushing the structure further back may overlook the established precedent in the Woodbury neighborhood. - Noted that most garages in the area are not set back far from the street, challenging the general guideline to push structures to the rear. - Mentioned recent approvals within the neighborhood that did not require garages to be pushed all the way back, suggesting a potential for compromise that incorporates other suggested changes.
Concerns:	Camp - Mentioned that the proposed garage requires a simpler style. - Stated it is too tall, and the dormers complicate the design.

- Recommended replacing garage doors with windows for simple tongue and groove doors.
- Suggested decreasing the size of the additive mass on the right to a minimal addition.
- Expressed a preference for pushing the garage further back on the lot.
- Advised making the window in the gable smaller and simpler.

Coombs

- Agreed with the need to simplify the "wart" on the side of the garage, suggesting it's unnecessary.
- Stated that the flush dormers contribute to the building's boxy appearance and recommended their removal.
- Proposed removing the windows from the garage doors for a more traditional look with black straps.
- Expressed uncertainty about the chimney's purpose and suggested simplifying its design, as it's too ornate for a garage.
- Recommended stepping back the dormers, reducing the chimney's size, and making windows on the second floor and in the garage smaller.

Oliver

- Acknowledged the design's similarity to existing structures, showing appreciation for James's modifications.
- Suggested further pushing back the structure but overall deemed it appropriate.

Welch

- Expressed the need to push the structure back at least six feet further from the street for better alignment with surroundings.
- Recommended lowering the hip roof element towards the rear by approximately 9 inches to reduce its prominence.
- Suggested adjusting the "wart" to a decrease of four inches to achieve a traditional appearance and address concerns about it being too steep.
- Indicated that the pent roof contributed to a quieter aesthetic and suggested a 4:12 pitch for the bump-out to achieve a more traditional presentation and profile.

Coombs

- Advocated for narrowing the "wart" addition to reduce its impact and agreed with keeping the cover over the garage doors, noting it minimizes the structure's prominence.
- Recommended reducing the size of the window on the second floor to lessen its visual impact.
- Expressed a preference for a simpler chimney design, similar to an earlier version, voicing concerns over the current chimney's width and height for a garage.
- Supported the suggestion to move the garage back six feet to improve its positioning relative to the street and overall site layout.
- Suggested making the dormers smaller to diminish the building's overpowering appearance.

Oliver

- Proposed aligning the front facade of the garage with the second mass corner of the main house, which is approximately 2 feet further back, suggesting this adjustment would sufficiently address concerns about the structure's positioning.

Krapp

- Expressed comfort with making the suggested change to align the garage's front facade with the main house's second mass corner.
- Agreed to adjust the pitch of the "wart" without issue, confirming the willingness to accommodate this design change.
- Agreed to reduce the chimney's width by one width and to slightly decrease the mass of the "wart" by about 10 inches to ensure the staircase remains functional.
- Open to reducing the size of the gable window as requested.
- Raised a question about adjusting the pitch of the covered porch to match the changes made to the "wart," aiming for a cohesive design between the two elements.

	- Highlighted the intention to match the pitch of the "wart" and the covered porch for aesthetic consistency. - Agreed to lower the eave on the hip by six inches and adjust the roof pitch to a 4:12. Welch - Recommended the following: - Increase the setback from the street by an additional two feet from the current proposal to improve the structure's integration with its surroundings. - Lower the eave on the hip covered porch by six inches and adjust the roof pitches to 4:12 for both the porch and the "wart" to achieve a more traditional appearance. - Slim down the "wart" by 9 inches to reduce its bulk and create a more proportionate design. - Downsize the window in the gable by one size and reduce the brick chimney by a brick width to streamline the structure's profile and enhance its aesthetic appeal.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to increase the setback from the street by an additional two feet from the current proposal, lower the eave on the hip covered porch by six inches and adjust the roof pitches to 4:12 for both the porch and the "wart," slim down the "wart" by 9 inches to reduce its bulk, downsize the window in the gable by one size and reduce the brick chimney by a brick width to streamline the structure's profile. (Made by: Oliver) (01:45:34)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:0 // Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

5.	Tigerlily Nom Tr. 01-7671	7 Barnabas Lane	Hardscape & pool	30/132	Ahern LLC
	• <i>New Business application to track OB- new garage</i>				

Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	James Krapp
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Highlighted the need for the site plan to reflect existing conditions, including the sidewalk and curb cut, given the lot's vacant status amidst developed surroundings within the Woodberry subdivision. - Expressed appreciation for the inclusion of photos in the application but critiqued the proposed Belgium Block driveway as overly brick-heavy, suggesting shell would be a more suitable and consistent choice with other lots in the Woodberry area. - Commended the use of wood decking around the pool but noted its proximity to the property line, recommending a shift away from the boundary and possibly out of the setback area.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Concurred that Belgian block might be excessive, suggesting brick as a preferable material for the driveway to better suit the area's aesthetic. - Critiqued the use of square-cut granite steppingstones between buildings and at the front for being too formal for the setting. - Noted potential visibility issues from the street into the pool area due to the lack of fencing or substantial planting, with only a privet hedge on the street side mentioned, which offers limited screening, especially in winter. - Recommended enhancing screening around the pool to ensure privacy and minimize visibility from the street.
Concerns:	Paul - Expressed agreement with the feedback on the driveway material choice.

	- Shared concerns about potential visibility issues between the buildings, suggesting the need for measures with more permanence to mitigate visibility, emphasizing the importance of privacy and screening. Oliver - Concurred with Paul. Coombs - Concurred with Joe's remarks but proposed considering the repositioning of the swimming pool further away from the back fence to avoid congestion at the property's rear. - Suggested moving the pool up by two feet towards the interior yard space to alleviate the pressure on the back area and enhance the layout's overall flow. - Emphasized the ample yard space available, indicating that bringing the pool slightly into the lawn area would improve the property's utilization and aesthetic. Camp - Agreed that the structure should be moved away from the setback. - Stressed the importance of ensuring the structure is not visible from Barnabas, suggesting the need for a fence or similar barrier between the buildings to enhance privacy and screening. - Concurred with previous comments about driveway material, recommending brick over Belgian block. Welch - Suggested brick as a preferred driveway material, aligning with consensus for a better aesthetic fit. - Mentioned silver granite as too prominent, indicating a preference for more subdued native stone-colored Belgian block in pinks, tans, and grays as an alternative, though brick remains the favored choice. - Emphasized the need for an element to block visibility through the alleyway between the two structures to enhance privacy. - Recommended moving the specified structure away from the back property line to address spatial and visual concerns. - Requested revisions include: - Replacing the driveway material with brick. - Relocating the pool further into the yard by a couple of feet. - Implementing a more traditional steppingstone arrangement for pathways. - Ensuring that the structure or pool is not visible from public viewpoints at the time of inspection or thereafter.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with revisions as stated by Welch. (Made by: Coombs) (01:56:17)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

6.	Lori Meinke 06-8724	17 Ames Ave	Addition	60.2.4/23	Twig Perkins
• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: none. Last heard 07/18/2023</i>					
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Alyssa Corry				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified the project location as Peddler's Hole, a circle with a 1945 contributing structure, originally listed under 17 Rhode Island Ave and built by Franklin Bartlett. - Noted from the old HDC survey that the structure was constructed using salvaged lumber.				

	- Expressed that the current proposal does not fully honor the existing contributing structure, despite appreciating the changes made. - Highlighted that while understanding the intent for the second-floor addition, the design principle "Building with Nantucket in Mind" suggests the interior should not dictate the exterior's appearance. - Mentioned the existing ranch's height is approximately 15 feet, with the proposed addition adding around 7 to almost 8 feet. - Critiqued the lean-to addition as not effective but appreciated the proposed quirkiness of the new south-facing dormer. - Suggested considering flipping the saltbox addition so its distinctive features face East towards Hither Creek, posing this as a question for the commission's consideration.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Coombs - Expressed concern about the saltbox on the west elevation, particularly the large window on the second floor, suggesting it should be smaller for better proportionality. - Questioned the size of the two windows in the shed dormer, considering whether they should match the first floor's windows for consistency. - Acknowledged Madeket's architectural quirks but recommended adjusting the three windows on the saltbox to alleviate the appearance of excessive roofing on the south elevation. - Suggested making the two small windows on the south elevation larger and possibly lowering the dormer to accommodate windows similar in style to those below (three over three). - Credited Franklin Bartlett as a skilled builder and designer, indicating that careful consideration of these design elements could honor the original quality of work. Welch - Expressed appreciation for the design changes and supported Diane's suggestions regarding fenestration adjustments, particularly for the gable on the saltbox. - Felt the project aligns sufficiently with Madeket's character to be considered appropriate, contingent on specific structural modifications. - Recommended lowering the top plate on the upper gable cord and the lower top plate on the longer lower cord of the saltbox to reduce the overall roof assembly by approximately 6 inches. - Suggested that these adjustments would result in the windows' top plates merging into the header, enhancing the structure's proportions and reducing its height for a more fitting appearance within the context. - Noted that the design in discussion bears resemblance to the west elevation (street front) of a recently approved ranch project on Gold Star. Oliver - Initially found the design acceptable, appreciating its quirkiness reminiscent of Madeket and not perceiving it as overly large, noting its maximum height as 22 feet 9 inches. - Expressed a lack of concern over the changes from the previous design. Camp - Acknowledged the design's quirkiness as fitting for Madeket but expressed concern that the second floor appears somewhat overwhelming in relation to the existing structure. - Suggested that on the East Elevation, reducing the two windows to one could make the addition feel less dominating and more in harmony with the original mass, making the changes more palatable. - Expressed confusion about a previous suggestion to rotate the saltbox addition and asked for further clarification on this point.

	Backus - Clarified that the idea would involve flipping the saltbox so that what is currently facing east would instead be oriented towards Hither Creek, implying a 180-degree rotation from its current position. Camp - Expressed support for the idea of rotating the saltbox to face Hither Creek, noting that such a change could render the second floor's appearance more subtle. - Acknowledged the design's quiriness as characteristic of Madeket but suggested that the proposed adjustment might make the overall addition more palatable. Pohl - Expressed opposition to flipping the saltbox in a way that would position the taller side at the end of the building, preferring the taller part to remain more centrally located to maintain balance in the design. - Agreed with the sentiment that the design embodies the quirky essence of Madeket, supporting Steven's suggestion for easily achievable adjustments to the top plates to refine the structure's height. - Highlighted Diane's observation about the fenestration, agreeing that Madeket's quiriness should not extend to misaligned windows. Specifically mentioned discomfort with the west elevation's two windows (one on the second floor and one directly below) not being perfectly aligned under the ridge, suggesting this alignment should be corrected to avoid visual discord. - Aside from the need for minor adjustments to window alignment and the top plate modification for height reduction, expressed satisfaction with the project's direction.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff), which includes lowering the second story roof mass by approximately 6 inches through the reduction of top plates and centering the stacked double-hung windows on the first and second floors under the gable on the west elevation. (Made by: Welch) (02:08:47)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver (Aye) // Coombs (Nay)
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

7. Dean Lampe **08-8946** 13 Aurora Way Pool & hardscape 56/448 Dean Lampe
• *Commissioners: Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused: none. Last heard 08/22/2023*

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul
Alternates:	Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Dean Lampe
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Coombs - Expressed concerns about the choice of fencing or vegetation used as a barrier, suggesting it should have a more relaxed appearance given the property's location as the last piece in the area. - Recommended repositioning the pool fence to be closer to the property's edge to better integrate with the surrounding landscape. - Approved of the driveway design and its approach, as well as the placement and fit of the houses on the property, indicating they harmonize with the setting. Patten - Expressed belief that the project elements in question are unlikely to be visible from public viewpoints. - Indicated minimal concern about the project details under the condition that specific stipulations are included in the approval with conditions.

	Paul - Stated no issue with the inclusion of the pool in the project. - Raised a question regarding a feature labeled as a "retaining wall," specifically inquiring about its height due to the absence of detailed information or contour data in the provided documentation. Lampe - Clarified that the retaining wall extends along the back side of the property up to the shed, where it ends. - Noted that the wall wraps around to the corner of the shed, extending 13 feet from the corner, and is approximately three feet high. - Mentioned that the wall becomes flush with the grade near the area where the pool equipment is located, indicating a gradual transition in the wall's height. Camp - Expressed concern regarding the height of the retaining wall. Paul - Expressed the need for additional details regarding the retaining wall to fully assess its impact and integration with the project. - Indicated approval of the pool's inclusion but highlighted concerns that might arise without further information on the retaining wall. - Pointed out that the current drawing on the screen depicts the retaining wall extending along the side property line, suggesting a discrepancy that necessitates a revised drawing for clarity. - Expressed the need to know the material of the retaining wall for a better understanding of its aesthetic and structural impact. - Acknowledged that while the wall itself may not be directly visible, its presence implies significant landscaping changes, including the addition of fill to level the yard.
Motion:	Motion to hold for more information. (Made by: Coombs) (02:19:34)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

8.	FP 4 North Water-	4 North Water st	Move off dwelling	42.4.2/90	Emeritus LTD
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill, Patten, Paul; Recused: None</i> Last heard 09/26/23				
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Matthew McEachern				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified as an individually significant structure, constructed in 1846 following the great fire. - Built by Edward F. Easton, a known housewright, with historical documentation from both the 1980s HDC survey and the 1960s HABS information characterizing it as a carpenter classic. - The rear section of the structure, originally a separate shed, was added after the house was constructed post-great fire. - Sandborn maps and water company maps from 1887 and 1890 show the house and the rear section connected during the period the Joy family owned the dwelling. - Historically, the rear section contained two bedrooms and a bath, which at some point may have been converted to an office. - Emphasized the importance of retaining this rear section on site due to its contribution to the historic character of the streetscape and the overall significance of the structure.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Echoed Holly's sentiment on the significance of certain architectural elements, noting that these components constitute about half of the building's footprint.				

	- Stressed that removing these elements would significantly alter the historic character of the building, given their origins in the late 1800s. - Advocated for keeping these elements in place or repurposing them on-site to maintain their historical context and connection to the original location, rather than relocating them out of town where their significance would be diminished.
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed conditional approval for moving the structure in its entirety, with the expectation that any new construction in the area would preserve the historic character of the existing environment. McEachern - Clarified that the proposed replacement for the portion of the structure to be moved is a one-story building, aligning with the scale and character of the existing architecture. - Emphasized that this approach was modeled with the intention of maintaining the scale of the area, responding to previous discussions and concerns expressed by the board and individuals like Mickey. - Assured that the new addition, in contrast to concerns of it being a two or two-and-a-half-story structure, would indeed be of a very similar scale—a one-story structure. - Suggested that details and considerations for the new one-story addition would be addressed in a subsequent application, indicating a planned and thoughtful approach to the replacement structure. Backus - Suggested considering the upcoming proposal for the replacement structure before making a final decision on the current application, hinting at the interconnectedness of the decisions. - Highlighted the architectural significance of the existing structure, particularly noting the columns that adorn three sides of the building. - Pointed out that the proposed replacement might obstruct the view of one side of the existing structure. Welch - Recommended pulling forward the application for the proposed replacement structure to better understand what is being suggested, even if not opening it up for immediate comment, highlighting the importance of visualizing the proposal alongside discussing it. - Agreed with previous comments about the replacement needing to reflect the essence and architectural profiles of what was originally there, in line with typical approaches to such projects. - Acknowledged the complexity of dealing with a property that includes multiple historic structures interconnected by additions, some of which may not align with the original architectural style and could be seen as detracting from the primary building's historic and aesthetic value. - Expressed ambivalence about the argument that removing certain additions could enhance visibility and appreciation of the historic structure, while also expressing concerns that what is proposed as a replacement might detract rather than enhance the overall historic character. - Concluded that a detailed review of the proposed replacement is essential to fully assess its impact and suitability in preserving the historic integrity and character of the site. McEachern - Explained the intention to relocate the rear section of the historic structure to a new location, emphasizing that the new proposal aims to replicate the original massing and scale in a one-story format, albeit not exactly due to its original "ramshackle" nature. - Requested to review the new proposed building's plans to compare and contrast with the existing structure, aiming to clarify the intentions and design philosophy behind the proposed changes. - Highlighted the preservation challenges associated with retrofitting or modifying historic structures, noting that significant interior and structural changes are often required to meet contemporary needs. - Argued that relocating the historic section in its entirety to be repurposed as a two-bedroom dwelling, maintaining its original function, is a preferable preservation strategy over significantly altering the structure for modern use.

	- Suggested that reviewing the site plan of the proposed new building would provide valuable insights into how the relocation and new construction aim to respect and preserve the historic character of the original structure while adapting to current living standards. Camp - Expressed a strong preference for renovating the existing historic buildings on the site, emphasizing the importance of preserving real, historical structures despite their aesthetic imperfections. - Highlighted the value of these buildings as genuine pieces of history, with their character enhanced by historical additions. - Voiced opposition to the demolition or relocation of these structures based on a brief glimpse of the proposed replacement, advocating for the preservation of history as it currently stands. Pohl - Suggested taking a comprehensive look at the entire project proposal to offer comments on the overall package, indicating a willingness to dedicate time to discuss the first item listed under new business in detail. McEachern - Concurred with Pohl and proceeded to provide a summary of the 4 North Water Street (Addition) item under New Business. (02:38:08)
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (03:08:06) * This motion was in conjunction with Item 1. New Business 4 North Water Street – Addition.
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

VIII. NEW BUSINESS 01/02/2024				
Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. FP 4 North Water -	4 North Water St	Addition	42.4.2/90	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Requested clarification on the proposed ground cover for an addition to an individually significant structure, noting the existing rear L from the 1890s is 845 square feet, with unclear documentation on the new addition's square footage. - Critiqued the proposed new infill Gable-ended Greek Revival addition as inappropriate for the historic structure, emphasizing that new additions should be compatible in massing, scale, and architectural features to maintain the property's historic integrity. - Highlighted the importance of recognizing each property as a record of its time, place, and use, cautioning against changes that create a false sense of historical development or add conjectural features from other buildings. - Mentioned that changes acquiring historic significance over time should be preserved, including the existing Obed Joy house and its rear addition. - Pointed out that the proposed addition, as viewed from the north, would obstruct the visibility of the fluted columns on three sides of the structure, questioning the classification of the revivalist period due to similarities between Gothic Revival and carpenter Revival styles. - Acknowledged that the addition does not attach to the main block of the Obed Joy house but still deemed it inappropriate for the site. - Suggested considering a separate structure for the new infill within the Old Historic District (OHD) as a more suitable approach, given zoning possibilities and the context of Matt's proposal for an additional structure.			

Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Noted that the proposed new building significantly overshadows the original structure in size, suggesting a more modest scale would be preferable. - Indicated a detached building might be more suitable, allowing for a design that respects the original structure without necessitating the removal of any historic parts. - Acknowledged the explanation given for connecting the buildings due to accessibility concerns but emphasized that a separate construction could still achieve compliance while preserving the integrity of the original building.
Concerns:	McEachern (02:47:57) - Clarified that while it's possible to achieve accessibility with detached buildings, the inclusion of an elevator lift and a handicap parking space between the two structures was a deliberate design choice to optimize accessibility. - Explained that the buildings were intentionally separated to ensure they would be perceived as distinct entities from the streetscape, while still enabling a single point of entry for enhanced accessibility, thereby avoiding the redundancy of two closely situated lifts. - Addressed concerns about the new building's scale, acknowledging the possibility of reducing its size in response to feedback, particularly from Mickey. - Highlighted the significant effort invested in accessibility analysis to address one of the main challenges of commercial projects in the core district: providing accessibility in a way that is both effective and aesthetically sympathetic, leading to the decision to connect the buildings with a one-story element. Camp - Emphasized the historic nature of the building, noting that as a standalone structure, it is not required to meet handicap accessibility standards through renovation, suggesting such adaptations could be applied to the new infill instead. - Strongly advocated for the structures to be separated to honor the historic house, suggesting that the current design, while fine, appears more modern and hotel-like rather than reflecting the historic character expected in such a context. - Voiced preference for preserving and restoring the historic ancillary structures extending down the back of the property, reinforcing the value of maintaining the integrity of the original building. - Expressed that any new construction should not overshadow the historic house but rather be designed in a way that is clearly subordinate, ensuring the new addition complements rather than competes with the historical significance of the existing structure. Coombs - Agreed with Abby and Holly on the importance of preserving the historic building along with its naturally evolved side part, emphasizing the need to protect rather than alter historic structures for additional construction. - Critiqued the proposed new building for resembling a hotel, highlighting concerns about its impact on the character of the Brand Point area. - Argued against relocating parts of the historic building to Madaket or elsewhere, advocating for keeping all components together to maintain the integrity of the site. - Suggested exploring alternatives to connect the two buildings, such as internal ramps, to allow accessibility without compromising the historical context. - Expressed that constructing a new, unrelated building next to the existing historic structure would be a significant mistake, undermining the area's historical continuity and aesthetic. Welch - Voiced concerns about the proposed East Elevation (A201), highlighting several issues: - The connector piece does not adequately honor the historic structure it attaches to, despite its relatively diminished value compared to the primary historic structure on the corner. - Described the combination of two different architectural styles through the connector as an "odd marriage," suggesting it does not create a cohesive aesthetic.

- Suggested that if the new addition is to be directly connected, it should reflect the style of the existing structure rather than possessing its own distinct identity, to avoid presenting an atypical combination of different periods and styles.
- Proposed the idea of a subterranean connector to maintain aesthetic integrity and suggested this could facilitate ADA compliance without compromising the visual harmony between the two structures.
- Recommended reviewing the first-floor plan and site plan for further context to these comments, indicating that the physical layout and connectivity of the proposed addition and the existing structure need careful reconsideration to preserve the site's historic character.

McEachern

- Explained the rationale behind the design approach, emphasizing that the one-story connector, due to its setback, is intended to make the structures appear as two separate entities from the street view.
- Discussed the deliberate decision not to mimic the Gothic Revival style of the existing structure, considering the architectural context of the area, including a neighboring two-story Greek Revival house.
- Aimed for the new addition to be perceived distinctly from the original structure, reflecting an intentional departure in style to ensure that each building is seen as independent despite their physical connection.

Welch

- Expressed concerns about the current design approach, particularly the connector piece between the existing structure and the proposed addition, deeming it an unsuccessful strategy.
- Suggested a potential solution that involves rotating the proposed structure 270 degrees, moving it to the upper backside of the lot, which could allow the existing structure to serve as the connector.
- Proposed that the kitchen and common area, which require ADA accessibility, be located at the rear side of the existing lot to facilitate accessibility without compromising the historic integrity of the site.
- Emphasized the importance of the new addition and the existing structure appearing as two separate buildings, suggesting that the physical connection should be discreet and positioned behind the new building, out of view.
- Highlighted the necessity of retaining and honoring both the original and the less historically significant structures, suggesting that the proposed changes would better respect the site's historic character.
- Clarified that for the proposal to be acceptable, it must present the buildings as distinct entities, achievable by repositioning the connector to be less visible and separate from the newly proposed addition.

Oliver

- Expressed agreement with Steven's proposal for repositioning the proposed two-story addition to make it appear as a separate structure from the existing building.
- Considered a similar idea of relocating the new section around the corner to further distinguish it from the original structure, enhancing the perception of it being independent.
- Emphasized the necessity for the new addition to visually present as a distinct entity, suggesting that if treated as a completely separate building, its style would harmonize with the existing house and others on the street, notably those of Greek Revival architecture.

Pohl

- Expressed initial surprise at the old age of the addition to the historic building, noting its lack of architectural resemblance to the main Carpenter's Gothic structure.
- Acknowledged insights from Holly and Mickey about the addition's historical connection to the main building, growing to appreciate its unique character.
- Discussed the possibility of retaining the one-story addition as a connector while introducing a new, adjacent building, thus respecting the historical relationship between the structures.

	- Raised aesthetic concerns regarding the proposed Greek Revival building, noting a perceived discrepancy in scale compared to the Carpenter's Gothic structure. - Suggested including a streetscape in the proposal to provide context and a better sense of scale among neighboring buildings. - Emphasized the desire for the new addition and the historic building to be perceived as two separate entities, suggesting that utilizing the existing rear addition as the connector could be a less contrived solution that honors the site's history. - Highlighted the importance of maintaining the distinct and standalone character of the Carpenter's Gothic building, suggesting that embracing its unique form in the design could facilitate the perception of the buildings as independent yet harmoniously connected. McEachern - Acknowledged the usefulness of including a streetscape in the proposal to better understand the project's context within the neighborhood. - Noted the unique and interesting character of the corner where the project is located, emphasizing that a detailed view of the streetscape, including the house directly next door, was considered extensively during the design process. Welch - Suggested that removing the connector, as per the board's concerns, could potentially increase available ground cover, opening the possibility for a slightly wider Greek Revival addition. - Proposed moving the bump out closer to the Carpenter Gothic structure, highlighting this adjustment as a potential benefit in terms of design flexibility and site utilization. - Indicated that such changes could create a more favorable trade-off for the project, improving its chances of success in addressing the board's feedback. - Mentioned that adjusting the proportions and positioning of the new addition in this manner could lead to a more successful and appropriate design, aligning with earlier comments about the presentation and proportions of the structures. McEachern - Clarified the board's desire to work with the existing structure, noting a lack of support for moving it and how this preference shapes the project's approach. - Acknowledged the importance of the connector in the project's success, suggesting the existing portion of the structure could remain while proposing a new building. - Highlighted potential accessibility challenges that might arise from maintaining the existing structure and constructing a new building, indicating the possibility of seeking variances from the state. - Expressed hope for support from the board in the event that variances are needed to address these accessibility issues. Backus - Acknowledged a clearer understanding of the project's intentions, especially concerning the conversion of the historic structure for commercial use. - Pointed out that converting an individually significant historic structure to commercial use might allow for exemptions from certain codes specifically because of its historic status. - Suggested the client might explore historic tax credits and other benefits eligible for historic structures, particularly those designated as individually significant. - Recommended considering these factors in the project planning, suggesting that having a separate structure for the new addition could be a more advantageous approach in leveraging the historic building's potential benefits and complying with relevant codes and incentives.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (03:08:06) * This motion was in conjunction with Item 8. Old Business 4 North Water Street – to track with Move Off Dwelling.
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

VII. OLD BUSINESS 12/19/2023

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
9.	FP Madaket -	23 Madaket Rd	Move on dwelling	41/303	Emeritus LTD
	<i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill, Patten, Paul; Recused: None Last heard 09/26/23</i>				
	Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
	Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
	Recused:	-			
	Representative:	-			
	Documentation:	-			
	Staff Comments:	-			
	Public Comments:	-			
	Concerns:	-			
	Motion:	- *No motion made – but Track with 4 North Water Street**			
	Roll-Call Vote:				
				Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

VIII. NEW BUSINESS 01/02/2024

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Applicant requested to hold Items 2 and 3.				
2. Robin Lord	9 Old Westmoor Farm Rd	New guest house	41/829	WAPD
3. Robin Lord	9 Old Westmoor Farm Rd	New garage	41/829	WAPD
4. Mark Howard	13a Willard St	Structure rev	42.4.1/15.1	Thornewill Designs
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Luke Thornewill			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Mentioned the existence of a 1960 HDC survey, noting the building was part of the White Elephant Guest House. - Highlighted that the cottage, along with its "sister" cottages at 13 B and C Willard, were part of the White Elephant Resort portfolio historically. - Noted that the other two structures are older bungalows from the 1915 and 1920s, making the discussed cottage the more contemporary among them, yet still an integral part of the White Elephant Resort. - Expressed a preference for preserving structures rather than demolishing them to make way for new constructions, appreciating the efforts made by Luke and his clients to retain and possibly move the building instead of opting for demolition.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Clarified that the project was not reviewed by the whole group. - Indicated that the general comments from the group would likely align with those expressed by Holly, suggesting a consensus or shared perspective on the importance of preserving the structure and the concerns regarding demolition and replacement.			
Concerns:	Welch - Questioned the accuracy of the structure's dimensions (37 by 32), suggesting they may appear misleading in terms of the feasibility of relocation. - Inquired if Housing Nantucket had been directly contacted with the plans and given a clear opportunity to express interest in acquiring the structure. - Suggested that if the structure cannot be relocated, considering its 1960s origin, demolition could be considered. - Recommended that approved drawings for the move be forwarded to Housing Nantucket with a request for a response within seven to ten days, to provide a clear timeframe for decision-making. - Expressed personal comfort with proceeding with demolition if no viable interest or plan emerges from Housing Nantucket or similar entities within the specified period. Thornewill - Added information that builders and movers had been consulted on-site, both indicating significant challenges with relocating the structure, including the necessity to cut it in half, making the process impractical. - Highlighted past experiences with the Housing Authority, noting their general reluctance to accept structures requiring extensive modifications, such as cutting. - Requested consideration of the practical feedback from builders and movers regarding the feasibility of relocating the building, implying that demolition might be a more viable option given these constraints. Welch - Recognized that if the structure exceeds 22 feet in width, it would require cutting to navigate through AR Street, further complicating the relocation process. - Expressed appreciation for the clarification and insights into why relocation might not be feasible, given the structural modifications and logistical hurdles involved. Patten			

	- Expressed willingness to support the proposed course of action, such as demolition, under the condition that all potential alternatives have been thoroughly explored and exhausted. Paul - Indicated acceptance of the situation, given that no viable option for relocation has been identified, and conveyed comfort with proceeding under these circumstances. Coombs - Expressed surprise and frustration over Housing Nantucket's reluctance to accept a pre-existing house due to the requirement for it to be cut in half for relocation. - Highlighted the contradiction between the significant efforts and resources allocated to developing low-cost housing for employees and the inability to utilize an already built house. - Questioned the cost-effectiveness of building new houses compared to modifying and relocating an existing structure, even if it involves cutting it in half. - Voiced disappointment over the decision to demolish a perfectly good house due to logistical challenges or regulatory constraints. - Reflected on the broader issue of prioritizing what is important to the community and the island, lamenting the lack of a solution that would allow for the preservation and reuse of the house. - Concluded that if there are no alternatives and nobody willing to take the house, then demolition seems to be the inevitable outcome, despite reservations about the decision. Pohl - Echoed the board's overall sentiment, acknowledging the effort made to find a solution for the house. - Recognized the significant challenges and expenses associated with cutting a house in half and the subsequent reconstruction, including structural repairs, finishing, and updating wiring and plumbing. - Understood why Housing Nantucket might be hesitant to accept the house given the extensive work and costs involved, including the need for a new foundation. - Expressed agreement with the decision to proceed given the circumstances and the due diligence performed. Backus - Highlighted the potential value of structures from this vintage, particularly those considered contributing within the period of significance, emphasizing their potential for reuse in affordable housing projects. - Pointed out that such structures, despite being targeted for demolition, could qualify for historic and affordable housing tax credits, offering a financial incentive for preservation and adaptive reuse. - Noted previous discussions with decision-makers about the benefits of leveraging these tax credits to address housing needs, underlining the missed opportunities to utilize "not so historic" structures for solving current housing issues. - Stressed the importance of considering these structures as resources in tackling housing shortages, advocating for a reevaluation of demolition practices in favor of preservation and adaptation for affordable housing. - Clarified that relocating a historic structure can still make it eligible for historic tax credits, an important consideration for potential uses such as rental properties. - Emphasized that, based on state and federal laws, a contributing structure within the period of significance (up to 1975 for Nantucket) can apply for these tax credits, highlighting Nantucket's long history of moving structures as part of its national and local identity. - Noted that despite relocation or modifications like cutting in half, structures that are correctly researched and identified as being built within the period of significance can still qualify for historic tax credits, underlining the importance of thorough historical research and documentation. - Pointed out past instances where the Historic District Commission has allowed structures believed to be built outside the period of significance to be moved, which later research revealed to fall within the significant period, thereby qualifying for tax incentives.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Made by: Patten) (03:21:29)

Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Pohl, Welch, Patten, Paul (Aye) // Coombs (Nay)
Discussion Cont.	Following the motion, discussion continued. Welch - Suggested that when approving new building projects, consideration should be given to limiting the width of structures to 22 feet. - This recommendation is based on the foresight that narrower buildings are more easily relocated in the future, preserving the flexibility and adaptability of the built environment. Coombs - Proposed an innovative approach to reusing split buildings by not recombining them, but instead repurposing each section into one-bedroom apartments. - Critiqued the lack of creative solutions for the preservation and adaptive reuse of structures, suggesting that automatically opting to reconstruct them for their original purpose or demolishing them reflects a lack of imaginative thinking.
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

5. Ack-Tu LLC	14 Plover Lane	Plunge Pool	12/53	Matt Dacey
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Tom Dacey			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Welch - Expressed the opinion that, given adherence to standard conditions typically applied to such projects, the proposal is considered approvable. Paul, Patten and Coombs - Concurred with Welch.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) an 8x20 plunge pool not visible at time of inspection or thereafter, no change to the grade from existing prior to time of application. (Made by: Welch) (03:28:45)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)			
			Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

6.	5 Sparrow Nom Trust	5 Sparrow Dr	Roof walk	68/530	Sandcastle Const.
	Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
	Alternates:	-			
	Recused:	-			
	Representative:	Chuck Lenhart			
	Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
	Staff Comments:	-			
	Public Comments:	-			
	Concerns:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
	Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (03:31:51)			
	Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)			
			Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	

7. David Butler	26 Clarendon St	New shed	76.1.3/121	David Butler
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			

Representative:	David Butler
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Commissioners reviewed with no representative present.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (03:33:56)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

8. ACK N BACK LLC 33 Quidnet Rd Revision 08-6785 21/27.2 Ahern LLC
Request to hold.

9. Jason Tilroe	75 Main St	Addition to shed/cottage	42.3.1/13	Thornewill Designs
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Luke Thornewill			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - The outbuilding in question was part of the Henry Coffin House, an individually significant brick house documented by HABS, built by James Field, head carpenter, in the 1830s with a construction cost of \$8,291.43. - The main structure on the lot, associated with one of the wealthiest men in the country, Henry Coffin, reflects significant historical value, including Coffin's contributions to the public welfare and his status as one of the largest landowners. - The existing shed, smaller of two on the site, features a brick wall on the north at Liberty Street, with its history tracing back to at least the 1880s based on Sandborn Maps analysis. - Appreciation was expressed for the attention given to this historic structure, currently in poor condition, with Penn Austin expected to work on its restoration. - Apologies were extended to Luke for not responding earlier to an email about the proposal, with a request for a copy of the review by Penn Austin. - Support was shown for converting the historic shed into a cottage, with a suggestion to retain some of the existing fenestration to preserve its quirky features, including the slanted eave. - Concerns were raised about potential site changes to accommodate parking if required by planning board regulations, hoping such changes would not detract from the site's historical integrity. - A photograph from the 1960s by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) was mentioned, underscoring the importance of the documentation and restoration efforts for this historic structure.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Expressed general support for the concept of adding to and restoring the building but emphasized the importance of preserving its unique characteristics, which contribute to its historical value. - Suggested maintaining features like the sloping eave and the sway in the ridge to retain the building's old appearance, cautioning against extensive rebuilds that might result in the structure looking too new. - Highlighted the significance of working with the building's "quirkiness" rather than altering its distinctive aspects, citing previous successful projects where preserving irregularities maintained the historical look. - Pointed out a specific feature of interest: an existing bricked-in doorway, where the outline and change in bricks are visible, suggesting that this revealing evidence of the building's past should be preserved without significant alteration.			
Concerns:	Oliver			

- Expressed appreciation for retaining brick walls in one of the gables, enhancing the building's aesthetic and historical context.
- Suggested adding ivy to the walls facing Liberty Street and on the specified end to further contribute to the building's character and connection to its environment.
- Recommended replacing the proposed six-panel door with a baton door to better align with the building's historical attributes and overall design aesthetic, indicating a preference for more traditional architectural details.

Welch

- Agreed with Mickey about the feasibility of maintaining the building's crooked eave as a nod to its history, citing an example of a house on Union Street that was rebuilt with an intentionally out-of-plumb facade for historical accuracy.
- Expressed concern about the work process and the need for streamlined procedures, specifically regarding the brick wall's structural integrity, based on a previous inspection.
- Suggested that if there are structural concerns with the brick wall, these should be addressed in the application process to avoid the necessity of submitting a separate request later.
- Recommended keeping the application open to discuss and resolve issues related to the brick wall's structural integrity, ensuring that any necessary repairs or modifications are planned and approved efficiently.

Thornewill

- Collaborating with Pen Atkin and Ben Breer, an engineer, who are currently analyzing the structural integrity of the brick wall along the property, including its entire length and around the corner.
- The goal is to ensure the wall's preservation, with plans to rebuild or restructure it as necessary, including possibly buttressing it from the garden side to address any structural weaknesses.
- Acknowledged the client's commitment to addressing the wall's condition, aware of concerns from neighbors and visible issues like bulges, curves, and vegetation growth that compromise its structure.
- Noted that while the idea of growing ivy on the wall was appreciated, the current ivy contributes to the wall's deterioration, indicating a need for careful consideration of any future vegetation to avoid further damage.
- Emphasized that the brick wall is a significant part of the project, with plans to include its preservation and necessary restoration in the overall project scope.

Welch

- Highlighted the forthcoming work on the wall as a significant aspect of the project, indicating that it will require HDC approval due to its impact and necessity.
- Pointed out that the current proposal only lists the wall as existing, without detailing the specific restoration or repair work planned, suggesting future submissions will be needed to address the wall specifically.
- Emphasized that even seemingly minor work, such as repointing, will necessitate HDC approval, strongly suggesting that the wall's condition likely requires more extensive intervention than just repointing.

Patten

- Expressed no further comments or concerns regarding the overall project.
- Echoed the desire to see the quirky eave line preserved if possible, underscoring an interest in maintaining the building's unique architectural features.
- Supported the idea of preserving or replicating the door in line with Val's previous suggestion.

Coombs

- Expressed interest in seeing the proposed solutions for the one-brick wall to ensure its safety while maintaining its aesthetic appeal.
- Conveyed confidence in the team's ability to address the necessary structural work effectively.
- Highlighted the building's significance as a landmark on Liberty Street, appreciated by passersby for its distinctive charm.

	Pohl - Suggested that changing the current door to a baton door should be a straightforward request for the board to approve, implying it's a minor alteration that could significantly enhance the project's aesthetic coherence. - Expressed a preference for preserving the building's slanted eave, noting its contribution to the structure's unique character and historical authenticity. - Inquired whether maintaining the slanted eave is a detail that could be approved immediately or if it requires further consideration and planning to ensure feasibility and compliance with the project's overall goals and constraints. Thornewill - Raised a practical concern regarding how to integrate an access point into the structure with a slanted roof, indicating a need to balance design preferences with functional requirements. Backus - Highlighted the importance of retaining the building's current fenestration pattern as closely as possible to preserve its architectural integrity. - Suggested exploring the possibility of maintaining the existing eave by reconsidering the placement of the entryway, rather than relocating it to a different side of the building, to allow for the preservation of distinctive architectural features.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (03:52:30)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

10. Everton Dumont de Moura	7 Hull Lane	Move on shed	67/272	Everton Dumont de Moura
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Everton Dumont de Moura			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed acceptance of the shed's overall structure. - Voiced concerns about the portico feature, specifically mentioning its stone base, questioning its compatibility or typicality within the neighborhood's context. Welch - Expressed understanding and acceptance of the project after clarifying the perspective from which the image was viewed, specifically noting that the viewpoint is down the driveway. - Highlighted the placement of vegetation as depicted in the image, recognizing its location relative to the driveway and the structure, which resolved initial confusion.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (03:59:48)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			
		Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	

11. Fitzgerald T & S	7 West Chester St	Remove fenestrations	42.4.3/13	Topham Design
This item was heard after Item 12.				
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Joe Topham			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner			

	- Expressed that running leaders (downspouts) on the interior of the building is not feasible due to the framing structure, which does not support vertical integration of such elements within the house's internal framework. Welch - Expressed approval for the proposed enclosure, noting its eventual aging process will result in a gray, weathered appearance, which is not a concern. - Indicated a preference for natural weathering over painted finishes, which would require maintenance to prevent graying. - Confirmed that the boxed line sets meet requirements and are deemed compatible with the shingled style home. - Requested that the final submission to staff specifically mark the locations of the two leaders, one on the east side and one on the west side of the home, ensuring clarity and precision in the project's documentation. Enos - Detailed the positioning of the line set for the mini-split system on the west elevation, specifying it will be located to the left of the windows, directly above the single-story window. - Clarified that the line set will run straight down from its position above the window, then go underneath the dwelling to connect to the mini-split unit inside the house. - For the line set on the other side of the dwelling, confirmed it will also be positioned to the left of the window, with the exterior components being made of cedar to blend with the house before entering the structure. Welch - Referenced the guidelines that stipulate HVAC units should be positioned further back than the halfway point of the front of the house, implying that the applicant's placement of the unit adheres to this requirement. - Mentioned that line sets should also be enclosed as per the guidelines, indicating the applicant has followed these instructions. - Suggested that the project could potentially be placed on the consent agenda, if not for the omission of the vertical line sets in the drawings. - Advised the applicant, Wayne, to include drawings of the vertical line sets in future submissions, clearly indicating their placement and that they will be boxed in cedar, finished natural to weather, to ensure compliance and potentially streamline the approval process. Pohl - Appreciated the exterior approach to installing the HVAC system, noting the importance of not disturbing the interior of the historic building, which aligns with preservation values. - Acknowledged that while the interior alterations fall outside the board's jurisdiction, there's a personal appreciation for methods that respect the building's historical integrity. - Agreed with previous points about handling such installations, affirming that the application complies with the guidelines and directives for managing exterior modifications. - Expressed confidence that the leaders, as part of the HVAC system, won't be visible from the street or will be indistinguishable from typical rain leaders, minimizing impact on the building's external appearance.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) that the drawings be annotated to show the exact locations of the leaders. (Made by: Welch) (04:12:23)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

13. Ben Gifford	28 Sheep Pond Rd	Move off/ demo	63/34	Wilson Co.
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Bo Wilson			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			

Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Commissioners had no concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve, by necessity. (Made by: Oliver) (04:18:32)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp. Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

14. 20 Cannonbury Holdings 20 Cannonbury Lane Lattice removal rev 11-5164 74/14 WAPD
Request to hold.

15. Eleven Lincoln Ave Trust	32 Jefferson Ave	Garage Add dormer	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Camp. Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ray Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified the structure as a circa 1920 outbuilding with an existing HDC survey on file. - Expressed doubt about the visibility of the new dormer from the east, specifically from the front of the contributing garage. - Commented on the atypical 2 over 2 roof pitch observed on the south elevation, suggesting a preference for a design adjustment to reduce the height and align the fenestration more closely with traditional design language, recommending true divided light (TDL) windows. - Noted the positive aspect of the dormer not being visible from Jefferson Avenue, indicating a level of acceptability due to its limited visibility. - Concluded with an appreciation for the project, given its minimal impact on visible streetscapes.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed a preference for simplifying the design by focusing on just the door, which would result in a smaller and more conventional shape. - Indicated that this change would help avoid creating an unusual or awkward appearance in the structure's design.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (04:32:02)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp. Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			
		Certificate #		HDC2023 – (as noted)

The Items listed below were not discussed and no action was taken.

16. Carmine Giardini	7a Clifford St	New dwelling	79/19	Reid Yenor
17. Stark Point LLC	16 Easton St	Fenestration revision	42.4.1/11	Botticelli + Pohl
18. John Daly	6 Nobadeer Way	New 2 nd dwelling	68/172	Rob Anderson
19. Stephen Graham	6 Gardner Perry Lane	door & window change	55/31	EMDA
20. 156 Cliff Nom Trust- Hold 1/16	156 Cliff Rd	New Main house	41/836	S. Metz
21. 156 Cliff Nom Trust- Hold 1/16	156 Cliff Rd	New garage	41/836	S. Metz
22. 156 Cliff Nom Trust- Hold 1/16	156 Cliff Rd	New guest house	41/836	S. Metz
23. Meg & Mike Connolly	150 Surfside Rd	Move on dwelling	80/53	Val Oliver
24. TACK 3 LLC	3 Commercial St	Add dormers chngs	42.3.4/22	CWA
25. NIR LLC	Straight wharf	Roof & sed dormer addition	42.2.4/1	Paul Beaulieu
26. Anna Fisch	14 Brant Point Rd	Addition & renovations	29/150	Liza Konetchy
27. Gifford Whitney Trust-	32 Pocomo Rd	Outdoor fireplace	14/77	Emeritus LTD
28. 23 Broad St LLC-	23 Broad St	Revisions 10-4843	42.4.2/77	Emeritus LTD
29. O'Spray LLC-	25 Willard St	Main house revision	29/33	Emeritus LTD
30. Quidnest LLC-	26 Quidnet Path	New dwelling	21/150	Emeritus LTD
31. Peter Carey	6 West York Lane	Revisions	55/14	Peter Carey
32. David Brownlee	81 Main St	Dormer revision	42.3.4/71	LFW
33. Michael Pearlsen	20 Derrymore Ln	New garage	41/112	LFW
34. Doherty Ack LLC	2 Mariner Way	Pool rev	55.1.4/72	LFW
35. Doherty Ack LLC	4 Mariner Way	Pool rev	55.1.4/72	LFW
36. Doherty Ack LLC	6 Mariner Way	Pool rev	55.1.4/72	LFW

37.	PACT LLC	41 Orange St	Fenestration revisions	42.3.2/224	LFW
38.	SeaHero LLCC	12 Pilgrim Rd	Hardscape & pool	41/476	LFW
39.	Leslie Johnson	281 Madaket Rd	Pool & hardscape	59.4/292	LFW
40.	Bertryl Johnson	250 Madaket Rd	New dwelling	59.4/213	LFW
41.	Town of Nantucket	20 S. Water St	Replace windows	42.4.2/29	LFW

IX. OLD BUSINESS 01/02/2024

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	61 Fairgrounds Rd LLC 11-9505 • <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/23</i>	61 Fairgrounds Rd Lot D	Main house revisions	67/173.2	JB Studio
2.	61 Fairgrounds Rd LLC 11-9506 • <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/23</i>	61 Fairgrounds Rd Lot D	Pool & hardscape	67/173.2	JB Studio
3.	61 Fairgrounds Rd LLC 11-9507 • <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/23</i>	61 Fairgrounds Rd Lot C	Pool & hardscape	67/173.1	JB Studio
4.	61 Fairgrounds Rd LLC 11-9508 • <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/23</i>	61 Fairgrounds Rd Lot B	Pool & hardscape	67/173	JB Studio
5.	RUD1250W Nom Trust • <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: None; Recused: Pobl Last heard 08/29/23.</i>	19 West Chester St.	Fenestration changes	42.4.3/7.1	Botticelli + Pohl
6.	Mariyana Cavalier 08-8982 • <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: None Recused: None. Last heard 09/12/23.</i>	4b Goldfinch Rd	Addition & dormers	68/597.1	Mariyana Cavalier
7.	Elizabeth Singer 11-9430 • <i>Commissioners: Pobl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Patten, Paul, Thornewill; Recused: None. Last heard 12/05/23.</i>	63 Baxter Rd.	Pool revision	49/22	Jeffrey Lee
8.	Kevin M. Bates 05-3773 • <i>Commissioners: Pobl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill; Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 6/03/21.</i>	28 Norwood Ave	New dwelling	71.3.3/109	Kevin Bates

X. NEW BUSINESS 01/9/2024

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Peter & Sarah Gersky	78 Baxter Rd	Roof replacement	49/41	Jeff Booms
2.	Matt Fee	50 Cliff Rd	Roof replacement & Window	41/28	Peter Fernandes
3.	54 Prospect LLC	4 Birdsong Lane	Window & porch revisions	55.4.4/80.3	Brook Meerbergen
4.	NT Land Bank	28 Washington St	move off/ demo front bldg	42.3.2/23.1	Normand Residential
5.	NT Land Bank	28 Washington St	move off/ demo tank #1	42.3.2/23.1	Normand Residential
6.	NT Land Bank	28 Washington St	move off/ demo tank #2	42.3.2/23.1	Normand Residential
7.	NT Land Bank	28 Washington St	move off/ demo gazebo	42.3.2/23.1	Normand Residential
8.	CNV Surf LLC	68 Shawkemo St	Addition	44/5	EMDA
9.	TPG Hotels	20 N Water St	Change door & window	42.4.2/46	EMDA
10.	7 Cannonbury LLC	7 Cannonbury Lane	Door change	74/29	EMDA
11.	7 Cannonbury LLC	7 Cannonbury Lane	Rear porch	74/29	EMDA
12.	Charles Johnson Trust	5 Farmer St	Deck & steps	42.3.2/160	Sandcastle Const.
13.	Kevin & Kelly Purcell	32 Dukes Rd	Fenestration changes	56/188	Topham Designs
14.	Stobie & Dorsett	60 Hulbert Ave	Main house revisions	29/58.1	Thornewill Designs
15.	Stobie & Dorsett	60 Hulbert Ave	Garage revisions	29/58.1	Thornewill Designs
16.	James Bessey	12 Correia Lane	MH revisions	80/59	Brook Meerbergen
17.	James Bessey	12 Correia Lane	GH/Studio revisions	80/59	Brook Meerbergen
18.	James Bessey	12 Correia Lane	Garage/barn revisions	80/59	Brook Meerbergen
19.	James Bessey	12 Correia Lane	Pavilion revisions	80/59	Brook Meerbergen
20.	Smiley 17 N. Water LLC	17 N. Water St	Roof walk	42.4.2/49	Emeritus LTD
21.	North Liberty LLC	13 N Liberty St	Addition & window replmt.	42.3.4/15	SMRD
22.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #2	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
23.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #3	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
24.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #10	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
25.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #1	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
26.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #14	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
27.	MHY Enterprises LLC	9 Union St	As built Fence replacement	42.3.1/101	Val Oliver
28.	Evonne & Robert Connolly	9a Pilgrim Rd	Hardscape	41/217.5	Val Oliver
29.	Richard Mack	181b Polpis Rd	Driveway	45/1	Val Oliver
30.	Richard & Linda Andersen	8 High Brush Path	New Fence	56/370	LINK
31.	Clay st Dev LLC	44 Skyline Rd	Move off studio	79/990	Nt Structure Unlt.
32.	Joan Bunting	14 Macys Lane	Move on studio	68/107	Nt Structure Unlt.
33.	Clay st Dev LLC	44 Skyline Rd	Move off cottage	79/990	Nt Structure Unlt.
34.	Joan Bunting	14 Macys Lane	Move on cottage	68/107	Nt Structure Unlt.
35.	Mariela Oviedo	12 Wappossett Circle	Solar rooftop array	67/522	Incite LLC

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 16th 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 8:24 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 7-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C4Fc4EFe3fo>