



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 16, 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
Attending Members:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten
Remote Participants:	Coombs, Paul
Absent Members:	-
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	-

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Comments:	Oliver - Raised concerns about the proliferation of deer fencing on the island, noting its significant increase. - Acknowledged that some deer fencing applications come before the Commission, but most do not. - Observed the widespread visibility of deer fencing, including instances where posts are painted black, indicating a preference for less obtrusive designs. Welch - Agreed to include it under "other business items" for further discussion.
-----------	---

I. CONSENT

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	Kevin & Kelly Purcell	32 Dukes Rd	Fenestration changes	56/188	Topham Designs	AC
2.	Peter & Sarah Gersky	78 Baxter Rd	Roof replacement	49/41	Jeff Booms	rp
3.	CNV Surf LLC	68 Shawkemo St	Addition	44/5	EMDA	rp
4.	TPG Hotels	20 N Water St	Change door & window	42.4.2/46	EMDA	rp
5.	7 Cannonbury LLC	7 Cannonbury Lane	Door change	74/29	EMDA	rp
6.	7 Cannonbury LLC	7 Cannonbury Lane	Rear porch	74/29	EMDA	rp

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent. (Made by: Coombs) (00:05:32)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Camp, Patten, Thornewill
Certificate #	
HDC2024 – (as noted)	

II. 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 01/09/2024*

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Alternates:	-
Recused:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Representative:	Linda Williams
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified the structure in question as a circa 1915 garage/automobile outbuilding with an HDC survey on file, listed as contributing. - Expressed concerns primarily about the fenestration, appreciating the slight movement of the structure but noting the creation of a lot was an action by the owner, introducing non-conformity. - Suggested that a three-foot adjustment would be preferable to five feet regarding the building's positioning. - Indicated that the fenestration needs further revision, specifically mentioning the odd configuration on the west elevation, which has been changed to an 8 over 8 configuration, viewed as an improvement.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic District Advisory Group - Stated that there are no significant concerns with the application, except for the French doors being drawn incorrectly. - Requested for the correction of the French doors on the drawing for the record. Williams - Objected, for the record, to Rowland's comments. Kevin Toth - Expressed gratitude to the Historic District Commission (HDC) for their efforts in preserving Nantucket's historic legacy, emphasizing reliance on HDC to protect historic buildings. - Urged the HDC to apply the same reasoning used to deny demolition last January to deny the current proposal for a significant move, labeling it as a thinly veiled attempt to relitigate the previous decision. - Advocated for the renovation of the historic contributing saltbox structure in its original location, citing unresolved questions regarding efforts to restore the building and the purpose of the proposed move. - Highlighted the absence of any restoration efforts since the property's purchase in 2021 and questioned the necessity and rationale behind moving the structure 17 feet and 5 inches back from Main Street. - Stressed the importance of the building as part of Main Street's streetscape, over 100 years old and dating back to the introduction of automobiles on the island, and warned against actions that erode the historic character of Nantucket. - Criticized the application process as distracting from substantive issues with incomplete and unclear plans, suggesting the move's motive is to facilitate the construction of a large house, thereby compromising the historic structure. - Called for the HDC to maintain skepticism towards owners who allow historic buildings to deteriorate and then seek to demolish or remove them due to self-inflicted neglect. - Requested that the historic outbuilding receive the maintenance it deserves and be preserved in its current location, leveraging the HDC's authority to mandate the upkeep and repair of historic buildings.

	Sarah Alger - Echoed Mr. Toth's sentiments, agreeing with his points and emphasizing the importance of preserving the historic integrity of Nantucket. - Added that, based on understanding and past practice of the Commission, the policy on moving buildings generally requires that contributing structures be preserved in their original historic locations unless one of four exceptional circumstances applies: 1. The building has been previously moved since its original construction. 2. Leaving the building in its original location would pose a threat to the continued existence and integrity of the structure. 3. Leaving the building in its original location would pose a threat to persons, difficult to ameliorate by other means. 4. Leaving the building in its original location would deprive the public of benefits associated with continued visibility, due to anticipated as-of-right development. - Noted that none of these criteria apply to this case, suggesting instead that the move should be denied and the structure should be renovated and maintained in its historic location.
Concerns:	Williams - Clarified that the driveway in question is not a shared driveway but rather leads to a rear lot, distinguishing it from a previously approved one-car space for the front lot on the other side of the house. - Pointed out that the rear lot faces non-conformity issues, specifically with setbacks and frontage, noting it lacks the required 40 feet of frontage. - Mentioned the uniqueness of having two 5,000 square foot lots in town, highlighting this as unusual based on past experience with 41-81L projects. - Identified the lot's anomalies, including the narrow 10-foot frontage from the driveway for the back lot and the placement of the garage within a zero-setback area, indicating a direct encroachment on the setback limit. Coombs - Acknowledged the perspectives of both Mr. Trothe and Sarah, agreeing with their viewpoints. - Expressed frustration over the prolonged deliberations concerning the old shed, noting that it has been discussed more times than typically expected. - Emphasized the importance of preserving historic buildings in their original locations, referencing Mr. Trothe's comments on maintaining the integrity of such structures. - Highlighted the changing proposals regarding the distance of the building's move, from 15 feet to lesser distances, and argued against moving historic buildings based on setback regulations. - Mentioned that in other cases, buildings overstepping setback limits were either adjusted or temporarily overlooked, suggesting a similar approach should be taken with the shed. - Advocated for repairing the shed in its current location to preserve the streetscape and historical character of the area, firmly opposing the idea of moving the shed and stressing the importance of listening to the community's input. Pohl - Restated Camp's question regarding the placement of two quarter-round staircases and associated grade changes, including retention features, primarily occurring on the second lot where the garage is situated, rather than on the main house lot in the front. - Highlighted the inquiry about whether these features, given their location on the garage lot, are considered part of the main house's structure or landscape.

Williams

- Explained that there is an exclusive use easement for the patio area behind the house due to the limited space, which effectively bisects the area between the two lots.
- Clarified that this easement is in favor of the front lot, granted by the back lot, leading to the current arrangement despite the presence of a dividing line drawn on the plans that should not exist.

Oliver

- Expressed the opinion that the proposed shift of the building will not be significantly noticeable, acknowledging this view might not satisfy everyone, albeit with a personal reservation about potentially not liking those developments, acknowledging it falls within the HDC's purview to review and approve such matters.

Welch

- Appreciated the provision of a set of drawings for review and expressed gratitude for them.
- Shared that their position on the building move is evolving and highlighted the importance of considering such decisions on a case-by-case basis.
- Found the recapture and presentation of past HDC guidelines or practices by Ms. Alger as useful and suggested developing a policy based on these to streamline future decisions, establishing clear expectations for builders, designers, etc.
- Advocated for the idea that while exceptions can be made, a general policy should help "put this issue to bed" and reduce time spent on similar matters.
- On the specific case in discussion, expressed belief that the building's move due to setback issues should be minimal to maintain visibility of the historic structure, noting it is a garage at the back of a house.
- Supported a limited move, no more than two feet from the property line, to facilitate necessary maintenance while attempting to preserve the building's historical presence, reflecting on the lack of maintenance over decades.
- Suggested a corresponding backward move for every foot moved to the side to recapture some of the front facade, explaining a shift from a three-foot to a two-foot tolerance as a result of further contemplation and desire for stricter control due to prolonged deliberation on the matter
- Reiterated the stance on the proposed building move, specifying a preference for no more than a two-foot setback from the side yard and no more than two feet further away from Main Street. This approach aims to maintain the building's presence within its historical context while allowing for practical maintenance. The proposal suggests a balanced move: for every two-foot shift towards the interior of the lot, there would also be a two-foot move to the rear, ensuring the building remains closely aligned with its original positioning relative to Main Street.

Camp

- Agreed with the viewpoint expressed by Stephen, emphasizing the importance of the garage's current location in relation to the historic house and its historical significance.
- Expressed concern that moving the garage 17 feet back would significantly disrupt its connection to the historic main house, suggesting that such a move would result in a loss of historical context.
- Acknowledged the necessity of lifting the garage for a slab foundation but advocated for minimizing the move to preserve its historical integrity.
- Highlighted a desire to see the garage doors positioned centrally up the driveway, reflecting its original purpose as a functional garage, suggesting a preference for the garage's orientation to remain authentic to its historical use.

	- Supported a smaller adjustment to the garage's position, aligning more with Stephen's suggestion of a two to three-foot move back and staying closer to the property line, emphasizing a conservative approach to alterations. Pohl - Maintained a more flexible stance regarding the move off the side yard, expressing comfort with a three-foot adjustment, consistent with previous discussions. - Shared a differing viewpoint on moving the garage back, driven by practical concerns about the current proximity between the garage and the back of the house, described as extremely close, with minimal space equivalent to "three credit cards" distance. - Acknowledged the necessity for some adjustment to address the garage's current positioning, suggesting that while there's personal openness to it moving back, the consensus among board members varies significantly. - Noted that opinions within the board range from opposing any move to supporting a move, but with reservations about the extent proposed in the application drawings, indicating a preference for a less aggressive relocation strategy. Williams - Explained the considerations taken into account regarding the garage's relocation, focusing on ensuring fire access and maintaining a safe distance from the back of the house. - Determined that the closest feasible position for the garage, while still allowing necessary access around the corner, is a 12-foot move back from its current location. - Indicated that this 12-foot move was the minimum required to meet these safety and access needs, presenting it as a potential compromise. - Sought feedback on whether this 12-foot move is more acceptable to the board members compared to the initially proposed 17-foot relocation, aiming to find a middle ground that addresses both practical constraints and the board's concerns about preserving the historical context. Pohl - Noted the lack of discussion on the architectural aspects of the building, implying general satisfaction with the 8 over 8 window on the side among the board members. - Expressed personal belief that the side window's visibility will be minimal, suggesting architectural concerns are not a major point of contention. - Clarified that the current discussion is focused primarily on the building's distance from Main Street, as the issue with the side yard setback has been narrowed down to a difference of merely a foot. Oliver - Upon reviewing the application in its entirety, realized the landscaping has not been approved and questioned its necessity in the project. - Pointed out the impracticality of driving a fire truck over the area in question, likely due to hardscaping concerns. - Highlighted the need to review the topography of the site, especially if the issues are related to a grade change, to understand the implications on the garage's position and how it might be affected by the slope of the land. Welch - Emphasized the importance of having the hardscaping component approved before proceeding with a comprehensive review of the proposal.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions, including the details on the staircase, the proposed new location of the building, a site section, and topographical information. (Made by: Coombs) (00:33:00)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver (Aye) // Welch (Nay)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

2. 1 N Swift Rd Trust 1 North Swift Rock New Dwelling 40/2 Emeritus LTD
- *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 12/19/2023*

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul
Recused:	-
Representative:	Matthew McEachern
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	Sharon Alexander - Requested confirmation that the Commissioner's received her letter. Pohl confirmed receipt.
Concerns:	Oliver - Visited the site and observed that the poles marking the building's dimensions are still in place, suggesting that others might also have had the opportunity to assess the site. - Expressed concern over the amount of structure planned for the site, suggesting it appears to be excessive for the available space. - Specifically pointed out that the proposed height of 29 feet is considered too high, leading to a preference for seeing the second floor's visibility reduced. - Requested mitigation regarding the building's height, possibly including modifications to the roofwalk, and noted that the predominance of white color intensifies the structure's visibility. - From a vantage point on Eel Point Road, confirmed the visibility of the poles and by extension, the potential visibility of the building's major ridge line, indicating a significant impact on the visual landscape. - Expressed appreciation for the inclusion of one-story and one-and-a-half-story elements in the design, suggesting a preference for less imposing structures. Coombs - Concurred with Val's concerns regarding the height of the building, emphasizing a need for reduction. - Highlighted concerns about the south elevation, specifically the proportion of windows to wall, describing it as excessive with six windows on the right-hand side, five in the middle, and four above, totaling a "plethora of windows." - Suggested a reduction in the number of windows, noting there's no significant view to the south as Swift Rock Road leading to Madaket is heavily vegetated. - Recommended reducing the building's height to align with typical expectations, suggesting a target range between 25 and 27 feet to maintain consistency with the area's architectural standards. Welch - Concurred with Val. Camp - Acknowledged a longstanding tradition in the neighborhood of maintaining low, simple buildings on large lots, emphasizing that this is a defining characteristic of the area. - Expressed concern that the proposed building, due to its scale compared to existing structures on the lot, appears almost twice as large, highlighting a significant discrepancy. - Argued that the current scale of the proposed building is inappropriate for the neighborhood, suggesting it would appear out of place due to its size. - Advocated for scaling back the size of the building to better align with the neighborhood's established aesthetic and scale norms. Pohl - Concurred with the previous comments.

	McEachern - Acknowledged Diane's concern about the high concentration of windows (fenestration) on the first floor of the south elevation, noting the design intent to capture as much sunlight as possible. - Pointed out that the visibility of the first floor from the south is likely minimal, suggesting that concerns about excessive fenestration could be more relevant to the second floor. - Agreed to apply the proposed reduction in fenestration primarily to the second floor to address these concerns. - Also agreed to address the comments regarding the building's height, indicating a willingness to consider adjustments in response to the board's feedback.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp) (00:41:24)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

III. NEW 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. Squam Holdings LLC - Hold – No action.	31 Squam Rd	Partial demo/move/additions	21/3	Botticelli + Pohl
2. Robin Lord	9 Old Westmoor Farm Rd	New guest house	41/829	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Representative did not state name (00:42:27)			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed that the visible aspects of the project are acceptable, despite acknowledging the connector's unusual design. - Expressed hope that the trees surrounding the area will remain. Welch - No concerns. Coombs - Stated a lack of concerns regarding the visibility of the structure, indicating belief that it won't be highly visible. - Expressed a wish for the inclusion of a chimney in one of the buildings, noting that the design is very simple and plain. Camp - Described the outer buildings as beautifully simple and well-scaled, appreciating their design on an individual basis. - Expressed concern over the abundance of small buildings potentially obstructing the view of the entire site, indicating this aspect as problematic. - Clarified that while each building individually is considered great due to their small size and beautiful scaling, the issue arises from having three of them positioned closely off the road.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (00:48:45)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver // Camp (Abstain)			
		Certificate #		HDC2024 – (as noted)

3. Robin Lord	9 Old Westmoor Farm Rd	New garage	41/829	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Representative did not state name (00:49:08)			
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) (00:49:51)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
			Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

4. ACK N BACK LLC 33 Quidnet Rd Revision 08-6785 21/27.2 Ahern LLC
Hold – No action.

5. 20 Cannonbury Holdings	20 Cannonbury Lane	Lattice removal rev 11-5164	74/14	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen? Representative did not state name (00:50:37)			
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) (00:51:15)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
			Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

6. Carmine Giardini	7a Clifford St	New dwelling	79/19	Reid Yenor
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Reid Yenor			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Pohl - Pointed out a specific zoning bylaw that restricts ridge lengths to a maximum of 50 feet, noting that the proposed design exceeds this limit by 10 feet. - Highlighted that this violation of the zoning regulation will inherently require modifications to the building's design to comply with the bylaw. - Mentioned this information as a general advisory, clarifying that while the board's primary focus is on aesthetics, compliance with zoning regulations is also a necessary consideration for the project.			

Welch

- Expressed concerns about the length of the building's ridge and recommended the use of clipped gables to soften its impact.
- Pointed out the excessive width of the roof, comparing it to a "helicopter landing pad," and suggested that if it's visible, it should be made narrower.
- Explained that reducing the width by one foot would also decrease the height of the skirt.
- Mentioned that the oversized doors and extensive first-floor fenestration might not pose a significant issue if they are not visible from public vantage points, indicating such design elements are at the discretion of the designer and property owner.
- Stated that the overall massing of the building is acceptable, but highlighted the importance of addressing the roof's width and suggested resizing some windows to better distribute visual elements and minimize the expanse of shingle space.

Coombs

- Agreed with Stephen's viewpoint on the roof walk, noting it is too deep.
- Suggested that the gables with small, molded windows should feature larger windows to balance the scale of the house, stating that even if these windows are not visible from the outside, they should still be appropriately sized for the interior experience.
- Recommended that windows in the gables be sized and spaced to match more closely with the rest of the house's windows for consistency.
- Disagreed with the decorative "bracelet" around the main door, noting it doesn't complement the architectural style of the house, which features 2-over-1 windows.
- Advised that the shed dormer on the right-hand side should be resized and repositioned to align with the house's overall window scheme, suggesting it could be made smaller to fit with other elements more harmoniously.
- Called for more consistency in the placement and size of windows throughout the design to achieve a cohesive look.
- Commented on the rear elevation's unusual shed dormer and the single window in the peak of the gable, recommending a double-hung or smaller four-pane window instead of a single pane for aesthetic coherence.

Camp

- Expressed significant concern about the front elevation, particularly noting the placement of the front door facing Clifford Street, which is identified as the main area of focus.
- Highlighted confusion regarding the architectural choices for the second floor, including very high ceilings and disproportionately small windows for such a large mass, echoing Diane's earlier point.
- Pointed out that the second floor seems to disproportionately dominate the first floor, creating an impression of imbalance that could metaphorically "crush" the lower level.
- Suggested that the design of the top floor be adjusted to include secondary massing elements that better relate to the first floor, possibly by lowering the eave height to achieve a more harmonious proportion.
- Questioned the unconventional placement of the roof walk atop the gable in the short orientation, noting that it typically extends left to right along the longer axis of the roof and suggesting that its current positioning appears odd.
- Proposed the addition of a chimney to help break up the massing.
- Expressed a desire to see modifications to the current design to address these concerns and achieve a more balanced and aesthetically pleasing outcome.

	Patten - Expressed agreement with previously stated concerns, particularly highlighting confusion regarding the fenestration, noting inconsistencies in window sizes with some being too small and others too large. - Concurred that adding a chimney might contribute positively to the overall design and help address some of the massing issues. - Focused attention on the west elevation, identified as the front of the house, pointing out architectural concerns: - The dormer on the left side appears to extend to the very end of the structure, raising concerns about its proportions and integration with the rest of the facade. - Mentioned an imbalance caused by a small dormer on the opposite side featuring a disproportionately large window, contributing to the overall confusion in the design. Pohl - Reiterated the zoning restriction that limits ridge length to a maximum of 50 feet, suggesting a preference for designs with ridges shorter than the maximum to ensure compliance and possibly enhance aesthetic appeal. - Provided a forewarning about potential adjustments needed to meet zoning requirements, indicating that designs should be prepared with this limitation in mind. - Highlighted a specific issue on the west elevation concerning the setback from the gable face to where the dormer begins, noting that the current design shows a setback of approximately one foot, whereas a minimum of three feet is required. - Noted that the most significant challenge affecting the design would be the current reliance on a building dimension that exceeds the zoning limit, specifically a 60-foot length that does not comply with restrictions. - Suggested that substantial revisions to both the second and first floor plans would be necessary to address these zoning compliance issues and design concerns
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp) (01:06:55)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

7. Stark Point LLC	16 Easton St	Fenestration revision	42.4.1/11	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified the project as infill within the Old Mill District (OMD) of Brant Point on Easton Street, noting the location's relevance to the discussion. - Acknowledged the unusualness of having a wall without windows but recognized that this feature pertains to the rear of a garage, which might justify the design choice. - Suggested that if the rear of the garage is to be highly visible, screening should be considered and detailed on the site plan to mitigate any potential aesthetic concerns. - Stated that aside from the issue of visibility and the potential need for screening, there are no other concerns with the project.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Advisory Structure Group - Suggested the inclusion of two small six-light windows as a reasonable request to enhance the wall's appearance, indicating that this addition would be more appropriate and visually appealing than leaving the wall entirely blank.			

Concerns:	Camp - Mentioned a precedent where, in similar situations, the solution was to install windows but allow for them to be covered, though the method of covering wasn't specified. Oliver - Shared initial concerns about the large blank wall but, upon understanding the wall's location next to a hedge, reassessed the situation. Coombs - Expressed a preference for installing windows on the large blank wall, noting that the hedge might not always be present. - Recommended that adding three windows beneath the existing second-floor windows could improve the appearance, aligning with architectural symmetry. Thornewill - Stated no objection to the current design, specifically referring to the secondary mass on the first floor where the windows were noted to be unbalanced. - Mentioned the belief that the design aspect in question is unlikely to be visible due to its proximity to the property line, expressing overall approval and satisfaction with the design as presented. Welch - Acknowledged that the fenestration and placement are atypical compared to current design standards. - Concluded that despite the deviation from typical design standards, the project is still considered approvable.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (01:11:34)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

8. John Daly	6 Nobadeer Way	New 2 nd dwelling	68/172	Rob Anderson
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Rob Anderson			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated the belief that structures within the subdivision created around the time frame of World War II are considered contributing elements to the district.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - Initially expressed concern regarding the comparison between the stature of the existing house and the proposed design. - Mentioned that after visiting the site, it was observed that there would be no visibility issues due to its location on a dead end. - Concluded that, based on the site visit and the lack of visibility, there are no longer any concerns regarding the proposed design. Welch - Expressed concern about the overall height of the structure. - Suggested specific architectural adjustments to reduce height, including burying the top plate of the second floor into the header to eliminate the head casing and replace it with a fascia.			

	Pohl - Discussed Stephen's suggestion regarding architectural adjustments to reduce the building's height by modifying the eave design. - Explained that lowering the eave to eliminate the need for a head casing could effectively reduce the height by approximately six inches, assuming all other dimensions related to the ridge height remain unchanged. - Noted that the current design for the floor structure ("floor sandwich") appears to have a thickness of only one foot, implying there might be limited space for further adjustments within the existing design parameters. Camp - Noted that the area is characterized by a mix of architectural styles, initially dominated by ranch-style homes. - Acknowledged that there is a trend towards constructing larger homes in the area. - Concluded that a reduction in the height of the proposed structure would be beneficial, aligning with the evolving architectural context while respecting the area's original character. Coombs - Expressed agreement with the previous comment, noting the simplicity of the street, originally populated by ranch-style homes and some one-and-a-half-story houses. - Highlighted the street's limited access, being an in-and-out road, as a factor in maintaining the area's character. - Expressed a desire to see the proposed structure's height reduced to better integrate with the neighborhood's scale. - Mentioned that the building's dimensions, as understood, are 20 feet in width and 10 feet in the other direction, indicating it is not a large structure. Pohl - Acknowledged the structure's position behind a single-story building and towards the back of the lot, suggesting that its taller stature might not significantly impact visibility due to perspective. - Indicated that the single-story building in front could conceal most of the taller structure behind it, mitigating concerns about its height. - Expressed openness to making reasonable adjustments to reduce the ridge height if possible, but considered the building's height acceptable for a modest two-story structure in its context. - Suggested reducing the top plate header by six inches could be a satisfactory compromise for addressing concerns about the building's scale.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) by lowering the top plate by six inches to create a top plate header. (Made by: Welch) (00:49:51)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

9. Stephen Graham	6 Gardner Perry Lane	door & window change	55/31	EMDA
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ethan McMorow			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified the structure as a 1982 non-contributing infill within the Old Historic District (OHD), noting its contemporary design yet adherence to the area's vernacular.			

	- Endorsed the change from clapboard to shingle facade as suitable, aligning with traditional materials and enhancing the building's integration into the historic context. - Approved the addition of a side or L-extension featuring a bay window, recognizing it as a nod to common 1920s architectural additions, thus fitting within the historical narrative of the area. - Expressed a preference for the bay window addition over the initially proposed 6-over-6 triple gang windows, arguing that the bay window is more historically resonant and contributes positively to the building's character.
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Commissioners had no concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (01:27:08)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

10. 156 Cliff Nom Trust- 156 Cliff Rd New Main house 41/836 S. Metz

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill, Pohl
Recused:	-
Representative:	Sophie Metz
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed no concerns regarding the design's aesthetic or architectural elements but raised issues about the building's height. - Noted that the structure is almost 30 feet high, which is considered too tall, especially for its location on Cliff Road. - Voiced concerns that such a height could set a precedent for future developments in the area. - Expressed a desire to see the building's height reduced by a couple of feet to better align with the surrounding context and expectations for the area. Oliver - Highlighted the roof walk as the primary concern, noting uncertainty about its visibility due to the lack of topographical information. - Accepted the explanation provided by Sophie that the roof walk is positioned a few feet down, alleviating some concerns about its impact on the structure's profile. - Expressed hope that the view from the property would not be marred by an unattractive fence located on the adjacent Hickory Meadow. Coombs - Suggested making the three molded windows on the right-hand side of the front of the house larger, matching the size of the windows on the other side and separating them for a balanced look. - Expressed a broader concern with the scale and placement of windows on other parts of the building, specifically mentioning that windows in the small gable on another elevation should not be so small, advocating for uniform window sizes throughout unless there's a specific functional reason (like a bathroom) for smaller windows. - Questioned the building's classification, asking whether it is technically considered a two-story house or a story-and-a-half with a roof walk.

	Metz - Clarified that the building is considered a two-story house due to the eave line encroaching slightly into the upper windows of the main mass where the roof walk is located. - Added that the structure appears as a story-and-a-half on the flanking mass Coombs - Recommended separating the gabled windows that are currently molded together, highlighting an excess of shingle space on the sides that could be better utilized. - Emphasized visibility concerns, noting that regardless of direction on Cliff Road, the house's upper levels, including the pool area, will be visible due to the land's topography, suggesting a "deep dip" that offers a clear view from above. - Suggested that the windows be enlarged to occupy the extra shingle space, advocating for a uniform window size that enhances the house's appearance and brings life to the facade. Paul - Initially concerned about the overall height of the building but considered this concern mitigated by the grade change on the site, taking Sophie's explanation into account. - Suggested that altering the roof pitches from 11 to 10 could reduce the building's height to below 30 feet, which, given the building's distance from the road and its positioning on the site, as well as the presence of lots in front of it, seems acceptable. - Expressed no concern about the use of ganged windows due to the introduction of fenestration variety that combines both ganged and freestanding windows, enhancing the architectural design. - Indicated approval of the overall design, contingent on a modification to the roof's pitch to address the height concern. Welch - Indicated agreement with the previous comments and suggestions, particularly those proposed by Joe regarding changes to the design. Camp - Expressed concern about how the building will be perceived from Cliff Road. - Urged for efforts to reduce the building's height, suggesting a target of around 28 feet or so to mitigate potential visual impact and better blend with the character of the area.
Motion:	Motion to approve, through staff, reduce the overall height of the building by 9 to 12 inches through adjustments in roof plane management or wall height management. (Made by: Paul) (01:51:27)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

11. 156 Cliff Nom Trust-	156 Cliff Rd	New garage	41/836	S. Metz
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Pohl, Thornehill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Sophie Metz			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Coombs - Expressed a desire to relocate the garage further back on the property to prevent it from being prominently visible in front of the house from the driveway.			

	- Noted efforts to generally avoid prominent garage placements due to visibility concerns, especially considering the property's topography. - Suggested that there appears to be sufficient space on the property to move the garage back, aligning it more closely with the end of the house and maintaining a more harmonious aesthetic. Oliver - Acknowledged Diane's concern regarding the garage placement but provided a different perspective, noting that the garage is set back from the front of the house, albeit at a different angle. - Expressed satisfaction with the current placement of the structure and indicated approval of the project as submitted. Camp - Expressed agreement with Val's viewpoint on the garage placement, showing no immediate concern with its current positioning. - Highlighted a potential future concern regarding the amount of driveway material in front of the house, implying a consideration for the visual impact or practical aspects of the driveway's design and materials. Paul - Initially shared Diane's concerns regarding the placement of the garage but reconsidered upon contemplating the potential effects of rotating and sliding the structure back. - Speculated that altering the garage's position might inadvertently make the house appear longer, suggesting that the current placement could have unintended benefits. Welch - Acknowledged the validity of Diane's point regarding the garage placement. - Opined that, given the specific location and circumstances of this project, the current design and placement of the garage are likely to be approvable.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Paul) (01:54:37)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

12. 156 Cliff Nom Trust-	156 Cliff Rd	New guest house	41/836	S. Metz
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Pohl, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Sophie Metz			
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: Oliver) (01:56:32)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) // Coombs (Nay)			
		Certificate #		HDC2024 – (as noted)

13. Meg & Mike Connolly	150 Surfside Rd	Move on dwelling	80/53	Val Oliver
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Val Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Thornewill - Mentioned reviewing the project for potential inclusion in the consent agenda but encountered difficulty in understanding the front elevation due to the lack of clear visuals. - Noted that various photos were available, but none adequately clarified what the west elevation, assumed to be the front, would look like. - Indicated the inability to access or visualize the west elevation due to the property's location, suggesting that a drawing or clear depiction of the front elevation would be helpful for assessment. Camp - Expressed a desire to understand the visual impact of the cottage from Surf Side Road, particularly in the context of the surrounding vegetation. - Inquired about the height of the building, which was clarified to be approximately 15 feet, suggesting a relatively low-profile structure. - Concluded that if the existing vegetation remains in place, the cottage is unlikely to be overwhelmingly visible or dominant in the landscape, suggesting a minimal visual impact. Thornewill - Corrected the previous assumption about the visibility of the cottage due to vegetation, noting the presence of a driveway in front of it and its proximity, 32 feet from the road, which could affect visibility. - Emphasized the importance of not relying solely on vegetation for screening and suggested that a drawing of the front elevation be provided. - Advocated for having a clear record of what will be visible from the road, underscoring the need for documentation of the building's appearance, even if it is a minimal structure.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for supplemental information. (Made by: Welch) (02:01:54)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			
			Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

14. TACK 3 LLC	3 Commercial St	Add dormers chngs	42.3.4/22	CWA
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul, Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Chip Webster			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Confirmed that there was an HDC Survey for a 1970s structure known as the Crows Nest, part of the Sherburn Associates Harbor View building complex. - Discussed proposed changes to an existing dormer facing the harbor, noting the current presence of an atypically long dormer flanked by smaller gable dormers on the same plane, creating the appearance of a shed gable dormer.			

	- Commented that the proposed changes to the dormer are better in proportion but suggested further adjustments to comply with "Building With Nantucket in Mind," specifically advocating for a 4:12 roof pitch. - Recommended that the gable dormer be modest in proportion, feature just one window instead of two, and have the eave brought closer to the window headers to enhance its appearance. - Emphasized that the shingle wall under the windows should be minimal, aligning with architectural guidelines and aesthetic standards for Nantucket.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Identified the building as a very old structure, likely dating from the late 1800s, suggesting that Sandborn Maps could have provided useful historical context. - Highlighted the historical significance of existing shed dormers on the front of the building, noting their appearance in old photographs and their contribution to the building's historic character. - Critiqued the proposed changes as inappropriate, specifically pointing out that the proposed gable dormers are too tall and massive, potentially detracting from the building's original aesthetic. - Expressed that the proposed connector on the front of the building is not suitable, as it would overwhelm the front roof plane and alter the historic character of the structure significantly. - Acknowledged a similar dormer on the rear of the building, which is not highly visible from public areas, but argued that this does not justify similar alterations on the front, emphasizing the importance of preserving the building's historic integrity and appearance. Backus - Concerned with the lack of historic information in the application, placing responsibility on the applicant (Chip) for this oversight. - Emphasized the necessity for applications involving existing structures to include a construction date to avoid reliance on staff for historical data. - Noted that the '89 survey on file does not specify a date but, given its classification as contributing, suggests the Tax Assessor's 1970 date might be incorrect, supporting Mickey's assertion of the building's older age. - Mentioned the building's association with Sherburn Associates' development work on Commercial Street and Commercial Wharf, including it in their portfolio of cottages, indicating its historical significance. - Concurred with the need for more detailed historical information, such as Sandborn Maps, to provide a comprehensive background on the building. Rowland - Confirmed personal review of Sandborn Maps, verifying the building's presence on them. - Clarified that the building is in its original location, emphasizing its considerable age compared to surrounding structures, underscoring its historical significance.
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed concern that the north elevation, with the proposed ganged window dormers, appears overwhelming. - Expressed a preference for a simpler design approach to the dormers, suggesting modifications to reduce their visual impact. Oliver - Agreed with concerns about the front facade being overwhelmed by the current design. - Suggested possibly adding a third shed dormer as a way to balance the front elevation.

	- Noted that the design also overwhelms the structure on the east and west sides, indicating a need for modification to better suit the building's overall proportions and aesthetic. Coombs - Expressed a desire for the north elevation to remain unchanged from its current state, specifically advocating against the introduction of new gables. Pohl - Indicated agreement with the comments made by Holly in the introduction, aligning with her observations and suggestions.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp) (02:09:56)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

15. NIR LLC	Straight wharf	Roof & shed dormer addition	42.2.4/1	Paul Beaulieu
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Paul Beaulieu			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Clarified the structure's status as a contributing building from the Sherburn Associates B era, mentioning there is an HDC survey from the 1960s that classifies it as contributing to the local National District. - Discussed concerns raised by George Hall, the wiring inspector, regarding electrical issues with the structure and the necessity of architectural modifications to address these concerns. - Recalled a similar case from a few years ago involving a shed dormer addition on another wharf, which George Hall had reviewed, indicating he had expected revised plans to avoid the proposed pitch for the current project, suggesting a preference for consistency with previously approved applications. - Mentioned receiving a letter of support for the proposal, but not for the specific architectural approach being discussed, particularly concerning the pitch of the roof. - Recommended against changing the pitch as proposed, advocating for maintaining consistency with the pitch used in previous, similar projects to ensure architectural cohesion across structures affected by flood zone considerations and external modifications necessitated by internal requirements. - Confirmed that the electrical inspector who submitted information on Friday stated that the pitch of the roof could remain as it currently is, without the need for alteration.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Voiced concerns about the proposed changes to a shed located prominently on the wharf, highlighting its clear and visible profile. - Argued that altering the roof to a 12 pitch represents a significant modification for the small building, potentially impacting its character. - Critiqued the proposed dormer pitch as too shallow and the main roof pitch as too steep, noting that the dormer is positioned too close to the building's edge, contrary to the preference for a setback of a few feet. - Advised against raising the plate height, suggesting it would be equally problematic. - Recommended that any new windows be smaller and possibly feature a light window design instead of larger panes to maintain the building's scale and character.			

	- Suggested the submission of detailed mechanical drawings to provide clarity on the extent of necessary work, emphasizing the importance of understanding the minimal requirements for the project.
Concerns:	Oliver - Mentioned it would have been useful to have a photograph of the building along with adjacent structures for context. - Expressed no objection to the dormer's current design, noting its consistency with old Nantucket's architectural style of small sheds and shacks, and stated that a deviation from the standard 3-foot setback is acceptable. - Agreed with concerns about the size of the windows being too large and suggested they should be smaller. - Concurred with the presenter's preference for maintaining the current eave line, suggesting that adjusting the roof pitch might be preferable to raising the walls, which could result in an awkward appearance with a shallow pitch. Camp - Expressed concern that increasing the roof pitch alters the building's old, historic profile, moving away from its original character. - Suggested that if a dormer is necessary for additional headroom or equipment space, it should be positioned away from the ridge line to preserve the shed's simplicity, which is seen as a key aspect of its aesthetic appeal. - Emphasized the inherent beauty in the shed's simplicity and cautioned that modifying the roof pitch too drastically detracts from this. - Proposed that a compromise regarding the building's design modifications might be necessary to balance functional needs with preserving its historic character. Paul - Described the building as quirky and seemingly appropriate for its location, initially not considering its historic status. - Expressed a shift in perspective after hearing Mickey and Holly's background information, leading to reservations about the best approach for alterations. - Contemplated the idea of lifting the entire building to gain height but recognized that making the walls taller could result in an unsightly appearance. - Agreed that keeping the current eave line and opting for a steeper roof pitch seems sensible. - Asked the applicant for clarification regarding the purpose of the dormer, initially understood as a means to bring in light but later suggested by Mickey to be related to the building's electrical functionality. Beaulieu - Explained the necessity to elevate electrical switch gear on CMU blocks and waterproof it, raising it approximately 16 to 30 inches above its current position, to protect against flooding and meet clearance requirements around the equipment. - Clarified that adjusting the roof pitch alone wouldn't suffice to accommodate the necessary clearances, necessitating the addition of a dormer. - Mentioned that adding a dormer without windows was considered potentially more unsightly, leading to the decision to include windows in the dormer design, with openness to adjusting window size for a better aesthetic. - Discussed the limited flexibility in the floor plan for relocating the electrical equipment due to the complex infrastructure on the wharf and the need to align with existing main feeds, which influenced the dormer's off-center placement. - Acknowledged the thought process behind the proposal, emphasizing a desire for the structure to look appealing while addressing practical considerations.

	Paul - Concluded by noting the building's height is under 16 feet, a threshold recognized by local zoning regulations as distinguishing sheds from other structures based on height. - Indicated agreement with Val's perspective. Patten - Suggested the possibility of a compromise involving adjusting the roof pitch to a less steep angle and incorporating smaller windows in the dormer to address concerns. Pohl - Highlighted the importance of understanding the specific requirements for the electrical equipment and its placement to better evaluate and justify the proposed design changes. - Pointed out a discrepancy between the trim package on the existing building and the proposed design, noting that the proposed trim appears more elaborate. - Appreciated the acknowledgment of this discrepancy and the commitment to address it. Oliver - Proposed the idea of redesigning a portion of the building in a saltbox style while maintaining the other part of the shed at its current 6-pitch roof. - Suggested this architectural change could add character and align with the eclectic nature of buildings in the area. Paul - Shared a train of thought similar to Val's, focusing on the possibility of maintaining the lower pitch for a significant portion of the building's roof while making adjustments only where necessary to accommodate equipment. - Suggested that a roof modification, specific to the area needing functional adaptations for equipment, could prevent altering the entire building's massing, thereby preserving its quirky character. - Offered various architectural solutions, such as adopting a saltbox style or adding a dormer near the edge, to meet functional requirements without compromising the building's original form.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp) (02:24:18)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

16. Anna Fisch	14 Brant Point Rd	Addition & renovations	29/150	Liza Konetchy
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Welch			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Liza Konetchy			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified the building as a non-contributing structure, with an old Historic District Commission (HDC) survey on file from 1986. - Noted that the proposed second-floor addition on the left side of the facade disrupts the original symmetry of the building. - Recommended that the addition's height be significantly reduced to align with principles of proper additive massing, addressing concerns that the current proposal creates a disproportionately long ridge.			

	- Mentioned that the roof walk was not an original feature of the building, suggesting that any prior approval for such an element should be included in the project file for reference. - Emphasized the need for the project to adhere to "Building With Nantucket in Mind" guidelines.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Expressed that visibility issues were not a major concern for this project. - Agreed with the previously mentioned comments about the two-story additions on one side of the building, suggesting that a reduction in their height would be preferable.
Concerns:	Oliver - Viewed the removal of the screened-in porch and the roof walk as positive changes to the project, placing them in the "PLUS column." - Expressed no concerns with the proposed modifications, considering the building's location, its non-historic status, and the overall context of the changes. Thornewill - Noted that under different circumstances, there would be a preference for the garage's second floor to feature a knee wall and dormers that significantly reduce in size, creating a telescoping effect. - However, given the specific location of this project, concluded that the current design is acceptable and does not require those modifications to be suitable for the context. Camp - Shared similar views with Carrie, indicating that if the project were in a more visible location, concerns would be raised about its design, particularly regarding its length and the appearance of additive massing. Coombs - Expressed ambivalence about the building due to its history of modifications and low visibility, suggesting it has blended into its surroundings over time. - Expressed approval for the removal of less desirable elements, such as the roof walk aligning with the opinions of Holly and Val regarding the project's direction. - Noted that the building's secluded positioning means that many of its features remain unseen, emphasizing its discreet presence on Brant Point Road.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (02:32:06)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

17. Gifford Whitney Trust-	32 Pocomo Rd	Outdoor fireplace	14/77	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Oliver, Thornewill, Welch			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Paul - Described the building as somewhat monolithic in appearance but also noted it seems well screened by vegetation. - Expressed comfort with the visibility of just the top part of the chimney, if that were the case.			

	- Concluded that based on an assessment of the aerial view, the building is likely not going to be visible due to the surrounding vegetation. Camp - Raised concerns about the complexity of the design, questioning how it could be simplified to align more closely with Nantucket's aesthetic. - Acknowledged the previous point that the structure may not be visible due to screening but emphasized that its design still significantly deviates from typical Nantucket architectural styles. Patten - Expressed agreement with Joe's viewpoint, indicating no concerns regarding the project, primarily due to the expected lack of visibility. Coombs - Suggested that the structure will likely be difficult to see from Pocomo Road, based on the site plan and the positioning relative to surrounding features. - Highlighted the presence of houses on both sides of the property and existing vegetation as factors contributing to the structure's limited visibility. - Concluded that, given these considerations, the structure would probably not be visible at all from the public vantage points.
Motion:	Motion to approve, due to lack of visibility. (Made by: Paul) (02:40:20)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:2 // Pohl, Patten, Paul (Aye) // Camp, Coombs (Abstain)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

18. 23 Broad St LLC-	23 Broad St	Revisions 10-4843	42.4.2/77	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Camp, Oliver, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Clarified that the Historic District Commission (HDC) survey identifies the Brotherhood as an individually significant Greek Revival structure built after the Great Fire of 1846. - Noted a discrepancy in the application materials, where the HDC survey included is actually for an old garage on the site, not the Brotherhood building itself. - Commented on the proposed change to the door type for residential access to the third floor as sensible. - Expressed concerns about the plan to extend a covered, hipped roof over the stairs, describing it as elaborate and potentially competing with the building's historic Greek Revival facade, particularly the main entrance on the west elevation. - Suggested that a simpler roof design for this new entry would be preferable, as it would not clash with the architectural significance of the existing structure.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Acknowledged the west elevation as the building's front facade and concurred with Holly's observation that the proposed hip roof interferes with the facade's appearance. - Described the current massing as clean and stated that the hip roof addition would disrupt the building's corner pier, negatively impacting its aesthetic. - Criticized the existing addition to the back of the Brotherhood building for not being stylistically compatible with the main structure, and expressed concern that the proposed hip roof would further connect these architecturally disparate sections in a way that detracts from the building's integrity.			

	- Stated that covering the stoop with a hip roof is unnecessary and architecturally inappropriate, emphasizing a preference for maintaining the building's current appearance without the proposed modification.
Concerns:	Welch - Acknowledged the concerns raised but pointed out that the front of the house is situated on the side of the building, approximately 60 feet back from the street, suggesting a degree of separation from direct public view. - Mentioned there is validity in opting for a shed-style roof as it could blend in or camouflage with the existing shed structures, following similar architectural lines in a more abbreviated form. - Counterbalanced the argument by suggesting that the proposed hip roof, with its specific trim details, could serve as a nod to the building's Greek Revival formality, potentially enhancing the architectural dialogue between new additions and the historic character of the main structure. Thornewill - Expressed understanding of the differing viewpoints but highlighted a specific concern regarding the west elevation, noting that the entry porch appears larger than its counterpart, impacting the building's visual balance. - Acknowledged that adopting a similar roof style for the new addition could be seen as respecting the building's existing architectural elements. - Opened to the introduction of new elements as long as they do not drastically alter the building's character, suggesting that the proposed changes may not significantly detract from the building's appearance. - Proposed potentially reducing the size of the stoop to ensure it does not overpower the building's existing features, indicating a willingness to accept the proposal. Camp - Had no concerns. Coombs - Expressed a hope that the deck could have been designed smaller to reduce its visual impact and ensure it does not overshadow the building's main entrance. Pohl - Expressed agreement with Matt's viewpoint regarding the choice of a hip roof for the addition, highlighting two main reasons: • The hip roof design resonates with the portico over the front door, creating architectural harmony. • More critically, the hip roof design minimizes intrusion into the facade of the existing historic building, preserving more of its original character compared to a shed roof. - Concluded with approval of the project as submitted.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted, with the stipulation that all implementations in the field will match the details provided in the drawings. (Made by:) (02:52:03)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

19. O'Spray LLC-	25 Willard St	Main house revision	29/33	Emeritus LTD
------------------	---------------	---------------------	-------	--------------

Hold – No action.

20. Quidnest LLC-	26 Quidnet Path	New dwelling	21/150	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul			
Alternates:	Oliver, Thornewill, Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Assumed that Matt and his client have consulted with the planning board to ensure that the aspect of a second curb cut and other related details are approvable, highlighting the importance of compliance with planning regulations. - Expressed no additional comments on the project.			
Public Comments:	Susan Floren Smith - Voiced significant concern about the proposed house's location and scale, particularly its adherence to the setback on all sides and its proximity to Quidnet Road, noting that no other structure from Pulpus to Squam is as close to the road or to the exact setback limits. - Highlighted efforts by many in the community to maintain distance from property lines and exceed setback requirements, suggesting that the proposed structure's positioning on a thin strip of land results in a scale that feels inappropriate. - Expressed worries about the building's height and visibility, fearing it might be overwhelming within the context of its surroundings. - Raised concerns about the precedent this development might set, particularly regarding cutaways and subdivision of lots in an area where such practices were previously discouraged. - Called for a thorough review of the setback, height, and visibility issues, stressing the potential for this project to establish an "unhealthy precedent" for future development along Quidnet Road. - Expressed concerns about the proposed curb cut and the overall size and scale of the project, which entail the installation of large septic systems. - Highlighted worries about the impact on local flora and fauna, as detailed in an email. - Stated that, as abutters and for the first time in over 25 years, they find themselves opposed to the proposed development, indicating significant reservations about the project's impact on the surrounding environment and community.			
Concerns:	Coombs - Expressed approval for the project, describing the house as nicely simple and aesthetically pleasing. - Complimented the external chimney, specifically noting its proper corbelling. Paul - Suggested that the dormer and windows should be symmetrical, pointing out that the window on the left may need to be repositioned for aesthetic balance, without necessarily aligning with the windows below. - Indicated that there might have been an attempt to align the dormer windows with those on the lower level, but emphasized the importance of achieving symmetry on the elevation. Camp			

	- Suggested exploring the possibility of extending the front porch on the South elevation to wrap around, adding a hip roof to better integrate with the first floor and complement the left side of the building. - Mentioned a desire for a more cohesive relationship between the four windows on the second floor and the dormer, speculating that bringing the windows closer together might enhance a cottage-like appearance. McEachern - Agreed with Joe's suggestion, recommending adjusting the placement of the second-floor window furthest to the left by moving it to the right to match the spacing of the window on the right side, believing this adjustment would resolve the issue. - Addressed the proposal of extending the hip roof around the corner by pointing out constraints due to the defined building envelope on the site plan. Mentioned that expanding the roof in the suggested manner would exceed the allowable building envelope as per regulations from the planning board. Welch - Expressed concern about the building's height, suggesting it may be a bit too tall. Pohl - Agreed with the suggestion for a reduction in height, aligning with Stephen's earlier comment, indicating support for adjustments to the project's scale. - Suggested a site visit to view the project with ridge poles installed, providing a clearer understanding of its height and scale in the physical context.
Motion:	Motion to hold for a site visit to view the project with ridge poles installed. (Made by: Welch) (03:06:48)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

21. Peter Carey	6 West York Lane	Revisions	55/14	Peter Carey
-----------------	------------------	-----------	-------	-------------

This item was not discussed and no action was taken.

22. David Brownlee	81 Main St	Dormer revision	42.3.4/71	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Relocated a circa 1760 house to its current location by Obed Worth, a master mariner, in 1801, maintaining its characteristic Nantucket 4-bay architecture. - Reviewed a revision approved in March/April to extend a dormer, previously allowed on the west side, to ensure consistency with the west's existing dormer design. - Advised against integrating dormers into the main ridge, particularly for buildings of this architectural vintage, as per "Building with Nantucket in Mind" guidelines. - Initially believed the east dormer would be most visible from Walnut Lane, but acknowledged the provided photos showing the additional space with a mockup. - Expressed indifference towards the dormer extension, recognizing typical preferences against such designs but also noting the asymmetry created by the absence of matching dormers on both sides.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Highlighted that the connecting dormer will be highly visible from the side street.			

	- Noted that such connecting dormers are advised against in "Building with Nantucket in Mind" due to architectural guidelines. - Recalled that during the last application, it was deemed inappropriate to include this type of dormer. - Expressed concern about setting a bad precedent, even though similar examples exist in the area, particularly because of the building's significant age. - Recommended maintaining the building's design as previously approved, without the addition of the connecting dormer.
Concerns:	Oliver - After viewing the mockup and the dormer on the other side, expressed reduced concern compared to initial impressions. - Indicated approval of the proposed changes based on the new information and visual representation provided. Welch - Suggested that, in comparison to other elements, the dormer is likely to blend into the overall structure and not stand out significantly. - Acknowledged the existence of similar features in the area, suggesting that while slightly atypical, the circumstances of this specific location make the dormer approvable. Camp - Expressed initial indecision but concluded that the current dormer design might actually draw more attention than if it were integrated into the roofline. - Suggested that the proposed changes could result in a more subdued appearance. - Indicated approval of the proposed dormer modification, considering it potentially quieter and more fitting with the overall design. Coombs - Expressed a contrary opinion to other comments made during the discussion, specifically opposing the addition of the dormer. - Voiced concern that the combination of the chimney, dormer, and an additional windowless dormer contributes to a cluttered appearance on the roof, particularly evident in the first picture of the east elevation. - Highlighted that while the east elevation's existing design is not problematic, the addition of the connecting piece to the roof detracts from the building's aesthetics, labeling it as inappropriate for its location. - Concluded with a personal dislike for the proposed modification, suggesting it diverges from typical architectural practices and does not harmonize well with the building's character. Pohl - Expressed concern that the current detailed design poses a construction nightmare, particularly highlighting the problematic interaction between a valley and an adjacent dormer, which could lead to water damage, rotting shingles, and substrate deterioration. - Acknowledged that while these construction and durability concerns might not strictly fall within the purview of architectural review, it's deemed irresponsible to subject an old house to such potentially damaging conditions. - Voiced support for an alternative design that allows the dormer to run back to the house, agreeing with the sentiment that this approach not only appears "quieter" but is also a more correct construction method.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (03:16:46)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

23. Michael Pearlsen

20 Derrymore Ln

New garage

41/112

LFW

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Linda Williams
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Camp - Wondered if the structure could be positioned further back into the yard to avoid obscuring the main building. - Suggested that relocating it would be more historically accurate and eliminate the current "building on building" appearance. - Noted the proximity of the structure to the main building appears very tight. Oliver - Visited the neighborhood to assess if similar structures exist, noting a preference for the new addition to be less tall relative to the main house. - Observed that the proposed structure's height, though not excessive in general, appears overwhelming in relation to the house based on the perspectives provided. - Suggested either moving the structure more forward to possibly connect it in some way or lowering its height, especially on the side facing the street, to reduce its visual dominance. - Commented on specific design details, such as the second-floor door being off-center in relation to the balcony, which could be improved by centering it on the gable for better symmetry. - Acknowledged the unique placement of the house, describing it as "weirdly placed" and "strange," implying challenges in integrating new structures seamlessly. Paul - Suggested that the new structure will appear connected to the main house regardless of its actual configuration, proposing the addition of a breezeway or a patio to create a deliberate connection and avoid the appearance of haphazardly adding structures to the property. - Echoed Val's concern about visibility from Derrymore, particularly the gable being visible, and suggested that centering the Juliet balcony and door on the gable could simplify and improve the elevation's design. - Highlighted the need to possibly reconfigure the stairs to accommodate these changes. - Noted that the inclusion of smaller windows, roof brackets, and the garage door adds charm to the side of the house, which is currently dominated by a large dormer. - Expressed belief that, with minor adjustments, the new structure could enhance the streetscape. Coombs - Expressed curiosity about the possibility of lowering the structure by about a foot to reduce its roof pitch and align it more harmoniously beneath the gable facing the east elevation.

	- Highlighted concern that the garage's current height competes with that of the main house, suggesting a need to lower it for a better architectural relationship. - Questioned if there could be a way to adjust the structure's height to ensure it sits below the gable line, aiming to mitigate the appearance of competition between the two structures. - Mentioned the presence of two shed dormers, further emphasizing the overall concern that the proposed structure's height appears to be too imposing and competes with the main house. Welch - Agreed with Joe's perspective that, despite some concerns, the proposal could enhance the appearance of the existing structures. - Suggested that for this improvement to occur, the building needs to be reduced by six inches in height on the first floor and feature a 6-inch centered lattice on the Derrymore side to soften the elevation. - Proposed an alternative of a complete redesign that emphasizes the first floor over the second and attaches the structure more directly to the main building, utilizing ground space to reduce overall height. - Expressed belief that the project could be approved with the initial modifications, citing neighborhood precedents for such design elements. - Specifically focused on improving the East Elevation by reducing the first floor's height by six inches and adding lattice, aiming to significantly enhance its appearance. - Urged for consistency in the application of design and architectural standards across different projects and locations to ensure fairness and adherence to established guidelines. Paul - Shared Val's viewpoint on the project, focusing on the elevation with two gable dormers visible from Derrymore, emphasizing the need for aesthetic adjustments. - Suggested that the interior should feature a straight run stair to facilitate centering the Juliet balcony and the door on the gable for symmetry. - Supported the idea of lowering the structure by six inches if possible to improve proportions. - Expressed strong support for incorporating lattice as a design element to enhance the appearance. - Highlighted a specific design issue with the door and balcony being off-center on the gable, describing it as particularly bothersome and calling for adjustments to achieve a balanced look.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff), subject to specific conditions: A six-inch reduction in the building's height. Installation of lattice between the gable windows on the East Elevation. Adjustments on the North Elevation to center the fenestration and balcony for improved symmetry. (Made by: Paul) (03:36:48)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:2 // Welch, Coombs, Paul (Aye) Oliver (Nay), Camp (Abstain)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

24. Doherty Ack LLC	2 Mariner Way	Pool rev	55.1.4/72	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner			

	- Identified the project as an infill subdivision within the Old Historic District (OMD), noting that the use was established through a zoning freeze with the planning board. - Expressed concern about the aesthetic impact of a 6-inch vertical slat cedar enclosure intended to screen an 18-inch elevated pool from public view. - Questioned the effectiveness of the proposed screening, especially considering the potential visibility over a typical railing or deck. - Sought clarification on how the pool will be adequately screened in perpetuity, factoring in both the proposed enclosure and any front vegetation. - Acknowledged the Coastal Zone Management (ConCom) requirement for elevation due to flooding and FEMA flood zone considerations but remained focused on how the pool will remain hidden from public view to satisfy HDC requirements. Williams - Clarified that the previously approved pools are not visible from the street side because they are located behind the buildings and not on the Mariner Way, Union Street, or Washington Street Extension sides. - Mentioned that one of the pools is situated within the L of the building, making it invisible from public vantage points. - Noted that the pools are designed to be installed with adequate drainage solutions and are positioned over 100 feet away from Washington Street Extension, further reducing visibility. - Explained that the pools are enclosed within decks that have railings around them, ensuring they remain hidden from view at the time of inspection and in compliance with the principle that they cannot be seen from public ways. - Affirmed that the pools will maintain their original locations, dimensions, and screening behind the buildings, with the only change being a 6-inch elevation from the ground to address drainage and flooding concerns, ensuring continued compliance with visibility and aesthetic guidelines.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Referenced the project drawings, noting that the top of the pool is indicated to be 25 and a half inches above the deck level, which suggests that the side of the pool would be visible through the railings. - Expressed concern that the visibility of the pool's side through the railings would appear unusual and inappropriate within the context of the Old Historic District. - Asserted that swimming pools have historically not been part of the Old Historic District and argued that they should not be permitted due to their potential to negatively impact the historic character of the neighborhood. Amy Keohane, Abutter (03:48:21) - Voiced opposition to the above-ground pools proposed at 2, 4, and 6 Mariner Way on behalf of themselves and nine other property owners in the vicinity, including a direct abutter of 6 Mariner Way, who also participated in the call. - Stated that none of the abutters received certified letters in August 2021 when the original HDC applications for the structures were submitted, with the first notice of planned work coming from ConCom approvals in April 2023. - Expressed concern that the proposed development, including the revised plans for above-ground pools after ConCom rejected in-ground pools in a flood zone, is incongruous with the neighborhood's character. - Highlighted the technical conformity of the pools with outdated wetland regulations despite objections from the community and the Nantucket Land and Water Council, describing it as a tragedy given recent flooding events.

	- Argued that the presence of three pools in a sensitive area near wetlands, the harbor, and Goose Pond is excessive and inconsistent with the principles of "Building with Nantucket in Mind," which emphasizes preserving the natural landscape and fostering a sense of place. - Appealed to the HDC to reconsider the approval of the pools and the overall development plan, emphasizing the need to respect the natural beauty and tranquility of the neighborhood and to build in harmony with the land rather than dominating it. - Urged the HDC to reject the plans, relying on the commission to uphold its values and support development that enhances rather than detracts from the natural setting. Glen Wood, Attorney for the Applicants - Emphasized the need to focus on the visibility issue, suggesting that if the pools are not visible, the Historic District Commission (HDC) may not have jurisdiction over them. - Mentioned that the revised plans were created to gain approval from the Conservation Commission (ConCom), and all three projects have been approved without appeal, granting them active permits. - Stated the revisions were aimed at making the pools non-visible to address HDC concerns, implying visibility is the primary criterion for HDC's consideration. - Responded to opposition comments by affirming compliance with the Wetlands Protection Act and local Wetlands bylaw, indicating environmental concerns have been adequately addressed. - Clarified that the HDC reviews projects individually, not cumulatively, focusing on visibility and impact within their jurisdiction. - Suggested requesting a continuance to further refine the plans in response to HDC's concerns, indicating a willingness to adjust the proposal to meet HDC criteria.
Concerns:	Pohl - Clarified that the topic, while not directly within the purview of the discussion, has been researched, relating to the ability to have pools in the Mariners Way subdivision. - Explained that when a subdivision is created, there is a "freeze" on zoning changes, and Mariners Way was within such a freeze period when zoning changes occurred, allowing certain provisions like pools that would not be allowed under new zoning. - Specified that this situation is not about being grandfathered in or a plan freeze under State subdivision control, but a common occurrence in zoning practices. - Mentioned that zoning freezes have led to complications in the past, referencing the failure of the building permit cap initiative 15 years ago as an example of unintended consequences from such freezes. - Noted that previous pool approvals were granted on the basis that the pools were flush with the deck, maintaining a low profile. - Highlighted a concern with the current project drawings, which depict a significant wall right behind the railing, diverging from the previously approved flush design. Oliver - Requested clarification on the actual height of the structure, noting concerns about it being 25 and a half inches high, which could potentially allow visibility through the railing, similar to a picket fence. - Expressed interest in understanding how the structure will be screened effectively, suggesting that a shingled wall railing might be necessary for adequate screening. - Acknowledged that the projects have already received approval from the Conservation Commission (ConCom), implying that the Historic District Commission (HDC)'s scope is limited to discussing the visual aspects rather than regulatory approvals. - Emphasized the focus should be on the appearance of the structure, expressing a desire not to see the pools if they are visible through the railing, in line with HDC's jurisdiction over the visual impact within the historic district.

Welch

- Pointed out that the projects are being discussed collectively, whereas they are separate applications with varying degrees of visibility.
- Suggested that it would be more appropriate to evaluate each application individually based on its unique characteristics and merits.

Coombs

- Clarified that HDC decisions do not have to align with Conservation Commission approvals, emphasizing the commission's autonomy in its considerations.
- Expressed concern about the unprecedented situation of having three pools within 100 feet of each other, elevated 24-25 inches above ground, highlighting this as a deviation from the island's norms.
- Questioned the rationale behind approving elevated pools, especially in flood-prone areas, and whether there are specific regulations mandating such elevations for pools in these locations.
- Argued that if a property is in a flood zone, it does not automatically justify the installation of an elevated pool, suggesting alternative considerations or restrictions could be applied.
- Focused on the application for unit two, stating that an above-ground pool is inappropriate and contradicts established HDC guidelines for pools to be in-ground.
- Emphasized the importance of preserving the character of the Old Historic District and viewed the proposed elevated pools as a significant departure from HDC standards.
- Shared personal experience and familiarity with the area, using this to underscore the proposed development's inappropriateness and potential negative impact on the neighborhood's character and environment.

Camp

- Expressed confusion over how the project received approval from the Conservation Commission (ConCom), suggesting that, despite any grandfathering or technical compliance, the proposal remains inappropriate for the historic district.
- Highlighted concerns about the project's impact on the streetscape and its proximity to the beach, emphasizing that constructing such features in these locations seems highly unsuitable.
- Criticized the idea of pouring cement and installing pools in a sensitive area right on the beach, pointing out the disconnect between the proposal and the environmental and historical values of the district.

Welch

- Highlighted a concern with the detail of cladding adjacent to the railing, noting that as drawn, it may not be constructible in a way that allows for proper maintenance.
- Acknowledged that while maintenance isn't typically within HDC's purview, approving a design that cannot be maintained, potentially exposing concrete, would be problematic for HDC standards.
- Suggested that this issue, though not entirely relevant to this specific application, is similar to issues in other applications where it will be more pertinent.
- Advised that the applicant and their agent reconsider and rectify this detail for the project's success.
- Emphasized the need to clarify the exact height of the structure, suggesting it should be certified and, if relevant, included in the ConCom's order of conditions.
- Stressed that any changes to the deck's height from previously approved plans should be clearly stated to avoid raising it further than initially allowed.
- Concluded that for this specific location, the lack of visibility due to existing structures and plant materials is acceptable, indicating that these elements are appropriately used to shield the pool from public view.

	Pohl - Expressed concern about the deviation from the previously approved pool design, which was flush with the deck, noting that the current design involves a portion of the railing being backed by boards. - Highlighted the maintenance challenge with these boards, as pointed out by Steven, noting that accessing them for maintenance would require removing the entire railing. - Raised a safety concern regarding the potential hazard posed by the pool's elevated wall, especially for children sitting on the parapet wall who could fall backwards, questioning the compliance of this design with safety codes. Welch - Expressed concerns about barrier and safety requirements, indicating doubts that these critical aspects are adequately addressed in the current project drawings. - Clarified that the primary concern is not the presence of an automatic pool cover but whether the drawings fully represent all elements required to comply with building code requirements. - Emphasized the importance of ensuring the Historic District Commission (HDC) reviews complete plans that include all necessary architectural elements for compliance. - Highlighted the HDC's jurisdiction over architectural features, stressing the need for comprehensive plans to accurately assess and rule on the proposed construction. Pohl - Highlighted a key difference from previously approved pools, noting that these pools are elevated rather than flush with the deck, which presents a unique challenge. - Pointed out that the elevated pools are immediately adjacent to the railing, compromising the railing's appearance and potentially its function. - Raised concerns about maintenance issues due to the close proximity of the pools to the railings, suggesting that this design might hinder proper upkeep and longevity of the railing structure.
Motion:	Motion to hold for additional information, which includes: • Clarifications and construction details of the cladding, both without and with the railing cross-section. • Confirmation that all elements required for construction and to receive a building permit are depicted in the drawings. • Include a request for clarification on the height of the pool relative to the deck and grade, specifically referencing the order of conditions. The aim is to ensure the HDC can accurately assess and make decisions based on the architectural elements presented in the proposal. (Made by: Welch) (04:05:59)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

25. Doherty Ack LLC		4 Mariner Way	Pool rev	55.1.4/72	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Linda Williams				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Expressed similar concerns as previously mentioned, particularly focusing on how the structure will be screened since it is not flush with the deck.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Mentioned a relevant precedent where a pool application was denied in the Mill Hill area due to concerns about preserving the historic character of the location.				

	- Suggested that similar considerations regarding the historic character should be applied to the current application.
Concerns:	Welch - Stressed the importance of comparing previously approved drawings with the proposed changes to clearly understand any modifications, a common request in the review process. - Highlighted inconsistencies in the presentation, noting discrepancies between claims that nothing has changed and indications that both decks and pool elevations have been altered. - Emphasized the need for complete information, especially given the contentious nature of the application and the potential for an appeal, underscoring the commission's responsibility to review applications thoroughly and to standard. - Called for additional information, including: - Clarification of what was previously approved, with changes clearly marked. - Detailed information on the proposed modifications. - Clear details on the heights of structures, referencing the order of conditions for accuracy. - Reserved commentary on the architectural merits of the proposal until the requested information is provided, focusing on the need for clarity and completeness in the submission. Camp - Highlighted the openness of the landscape in the area under discussion, noting the visibility from Mariner Way down to Washington Street, emphasizing the area's marshland character. - Stressed that the openness and natural features of the location should be key factors in considerations about visibility and the potential impact of any development. Coombs - Emphasized the original marshland character of the area, noting the presence of small, scalloped shacks and the lack of significant vegetation or tall trees, which impacts visibility. - Raised concerns about what can be seen from Washington Street and Washington Street Extension, highlighting the need to assess views from these public roads. - Stressed that the Historic District Commission (HDC) should make decisions based on comprehensive information provided by applicants, not influenced by external directives. - Called for more detailed information on the proposed development at number 4, including its placement on the property and potential visibility from various perspectives, such as from Duck Pond and other vantage points. - Urged applicants to submit thorough views and information for evaluation, specifically before proceeding to review additional applications like number 6, to ensure informed decision-making. Pohl - Highlighted a scenario involving a porch with a roof at 72 Main, overlooking a small park on Fair Street, and posed a hypothetical addition of a deck with a railing-backed wall covering two-thirds of it, questioning its appropriateness in the Old Historic District (OHD). - Answered the hypothetical scenario with a strong negative, stating such a modification would not be historically appropriate in the OHD. Welch - Affirmed the addition of the deck and enclosure. - Raised concerns about visibility.

	- Deemed Marshland vegetation as screening ineffective. - Believed that the deck will be visible and inappropriate. - Expressed similar concerns regarding an unspecified aspect numbered six.
Motion:	Motion to hold for additional definitive information of all elements required. (Made by: Welch) (04:19:49)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

26. Doherty Ack LLC	6 Mariner Way	Pool rev	55.1.4/72	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Suggested that this aspect may be the only one masked by the building itself. - Recommended consistency in screening requirements across all aspects. - Example given of using shingled railing instead of actual railing, suggesting consistency in such decisions across the board.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Pointed out potential visibility from Washington Street Extension and Mariner Way - Advised checking for visibility from that specific location.			
Concerns:	Welch - Noted that this aspect is likely to be visible from Washington Street Extension. - Highlighted the Marshland as the only barrier between the aspect and the structure from Washington Street Extension. - Mentioned restrictions on planting in that area. - Expressed concern about requesting vegetation consistent with Marshland if planting is allowed. - Emphasized the need for vegetation to match Marshland characteristics rather than creating a permanent wall-like screening. - Referred to the aspect as a foreign element in the historic setting.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for additional definitive information of all elements required, including the location of the pool equipment. (Made by: Welch) (04:25:18)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
		Certificate #		HDC2024 – (as noted)

The following Items were not discussed and no action was taken.

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

IV. 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	61 Fairgrounds Rd Lot D	Main house revisions	67/173.2	JB Studio
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/23</i>				
2.	61 Fairgrounds Rd LLC 11-9506	61 Fairgrounds Rd Lot D	Pool & hardscape	67/173.2	JB Studio
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/23</i>				
3.	61 Fairgrounds Rd LLC 11-9507	61 Fairgrounds Rd Lot C	Pool & hardscape	67/173.1	JB Studio
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/23</i>				

4.	61 Fairgrounds Rd LLC 11-9508	61 Fairgrounds Rd Lot B	Pool & hardscape	67/173	JB Studio
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/23</i>				
5.	RUD1250W Nom Trust	19 West Chester St.	Fenestration changes	42.4.3/7.1	Botticelli + Pohl
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: None; Recused: Pohl Last heard 08/29/23.</i>				
6.	Mariyana Cavalier 08-8982	4b Goldfinch Rd	Addition & dormers	68/597.1	Mariyana Cavalier
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: None Recused: None. Last heard 09/12/23.</i>				
7.	Elizabeth Singer 11-9430	63 Baxter Rd.	Pool revision	49/22	Jeffrey Lee
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: Patten, Paul, Thornewill; Recused: None. Last heard 12/05/23.</i>				
8.	Kevin M. Bates 05-3773	28 Norwood Ave	New dwelling	71.3.3/109	Kevin Bates
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill; Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 06/03/21.</i>				

V. NEW BUSINESS 01/9/2024

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	Matt Fee	50 Cliff Rd	Roof replacement & Window	41/28	Peter Fernandes
2.	54 Prospect LLC	4 Birdsong Lane	Window & porch revisions	55.4.4/80.3	Brook Meerbergen
3.	NT Land Bank	28 Washington St	move off front bldg	42.3.2/23.1	Normand Residential
4.	Maria Mitchell Assoc.	33 Washington St	Move on from 28 Washington st	42.3.2/82.1	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.	Charles Johnson Trust	5 Farmer St	Deck & steps	42.3.2/160	Sandcastle Const.
9.	Stobie & Dorsett	60 Hulbert Ave	Main house revisions	29/58.1	Thornewill Designs
10.	Stobie & Dorsett	60 Hulbert Ave	Garage revisions	29/58.1	Thornewill Designs
11.	James Bessey	12 Correia Lane	MH revisions	80/59	Brook Meerbergen
12.	James Bessey	12 Correia Lane	GH/Studio revisions	80/59	Brook Meerbergen
13.	James Bessey	12 Correia Lane	Garage/barn revisions	80/59	Brook Meerbergen
14.	James Bessey	12 Correia Lane	Pavilion revisions	80/59	Brook Meerbergen
15.	Smiley 17 N. Water LLC	17 N. Water St	Roof walk	42.4.2/49	Emeritus LTD
16.	North Liberty LLC	13 N Liberty St	Addition & window replmt.	42.3.4/15	SMRD
17.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #2	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
18.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #3	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
19.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #10	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
20.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #1	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
21.	NIR Retail	Old South Wharf #14	Roof replacement	42.2.4/2	T & T Roofing
22.	MHY Enterprises LLC	9 Union St	As built Fence replacement	42.3.1/101	Val Oliver
23.	Evonne & Robert Connoly	9a Pilgrim Rd	Hardscape	41/217.5	Val Oliver
24.	Richard Mack	181b Polpis Rd	Driveway	45/1	Val Oliver
25.	Richard & Linda Andersen	8 High Brush Path	New Fence	56/370	LINK
26.	Clay st Dev LLC	44 Skyline Rd	Move off studio	79/990	Nt Structure Unlt.
27.	Joan Bunting	14 Macys Lane	Move on studio	68/107	Nt Structure Unlt.
28.	Clay st Dev LLC	44 Skyline Rd	Move off cottage	79/990	Nt Structure Unlt.
29.	Joan Bunting	14 Macys Lane	Move on cottage	68/107	Nt Structure Unlt.
30.	Mariela Oviedo	12 Wappossett Circle	Solar rooftop array	67/522	Incite LLC

VI. OLD BUSINESS 01/16/2024

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	Rays Court NT	4 Rays Court	Roofwalk, windows rev 04-6226	42.3.2/3	Normand Residential
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 11/21/2023</i>				
2.	Stark Point LLC 02-7988	16 Easton St	New studio rev 02-7988	42.4.1/11	Botticelli + Pohl
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 11/21/2023</i>				
3.	Harold Bros LLC 11-9433	6 Highland Ave	New dwelling rev	30/288	Emeritus LTD
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused: None Last heard 12/19/2023</i>				
4.	NIR 09-9197	19 N Water St. Lot 7	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern LLC
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused: None Last heard 12/19/2023</i>				
5.	NIR 09-9203	19 N Water St. Lot 11	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern LLC
	• <i>Commissioners: Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: Welch; Recused: None Last heard 12/19/2023</i>				
6.	10 Silver St 11-9512	10 Silver St	New dwelling- main house	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten. Alternates: Oliver; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023</i>				
7.	10 Silver St 11-9511	10 Silver St	New garage/ cottage	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten. Alternates: Oliver; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023</i>				
8.	10 Silver St 11-9510	10 Silver St	New cabana/shed alterations	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten. Alternates: Oliver; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023 To Track</i>				

9. 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 01/09/2024*

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 23rd 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 8:27 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 6-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F4E9XlaGrpg>