



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 30, 2024

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:02p.m. and announcements by Chair Pohl

Staff in Attendance:	Sara Johnson , Administrative Specialist & Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist, Holly Backus , Preservation Planner
Attending Members:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul, Patten
Remote Participants:	Coombs, Thornewill
Absent Members:	-
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	-

ADOPTION OF AMENDED AGENDA

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

I. OLD BUSINESS 01/02/2024

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. RUD1250W Nom Trust	19 West Chester St.	Fenestration changes	42.4.3/7.1	Botticelli + Pohl

- Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: None; Recused: Pohl Last heard 08/29/23.**

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates	-
Recused	Pohl
Representative	Lisa Botticelli
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Identified the structure as a circa 1893 building, originally believed to be a barn based on Sandborn maps. - Asserted that French doors on the front of the structure remain inappropriate, even with future proposed changes. - Expressed skepticism about the visibility of changes, which would eventually be obscured by a future garage, labeling it as somewhat disingenuous. - Emphasized the necessity of a traditional door to maintain consistency with the building's historical context.
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Echoed concerns similar to those mentioned by Holly, specifically regarding the new French door on the front of the building. - Critiqued the placement of the French door in a location typically reserved for a traditional front door facing the street. - Stated that French doors are not suitable for this context, advocating for a more traditional door design as more appropriate.

Comments/Concerns	Camp - Expressed concern that the current design changes significantly alter the character of the old building. - Suggested the possibility of installing a single door with a panel and maybe a storm door as alternatives. - Highlighted the issue with the door's appearance and placement, giving the impression of a front door even though it is not. - Noted the visibility of the door from West Chester, emphasizing this as a core issue with the current proposal. Oliver - Highlighted visibility as the primary concern, noting that if renderings showed the element as not visible, the commission wouldn't have jurisdiction over it. - Suggested that the garage should be constructed first, allowing for a subsequent assessment to determine the appropriateness of proceeding with just a door. - Mentioned the idea of evaluating the proposal once the garage's structure and stature are visible. Patten - Expressed support for installing a barn door in front of the current structure to allow for the construction of the garage, considering it a good idea. Coombs - Confirmed agreement with the opinions and suggestions previously expressed by Val and Holly. Welch - Expressed general agreement with Val regarding the barn doors, specifically in relation to visibility concerns. - Mentioned being open to forgoing barn doors if conditions were set to limit visibility at the time of inspection and thereafter. - Echoed Holly and Mickey's viewpoint that, especially in town, a front door should appear as such, with the stipulation that this applies if the door is immediately on the street or otherwise visible.
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) which includes installing a barn door over the existing doors for the interim. Allowed for the possibility of revisiting and potentially removing the barn door once the project is fully framed. Specified that this condition applies only to the South elevation, highlighting it as the area of concern. (Made by: Oliver) (00:17:10)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye) // Camp (Nay)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

2. **Mariyana Cavalier 08-8982** 4b Goldfinch Rd Addition & dormers 68/597.1 Mariyana Cavalier
 • *Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: None Recused: None. Last heard 09/12/23.*
This Item was not discussed and no action was taken.

II. NEW BUSINESS 01/9/2024				
Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. O'Spray LLC- Hold 02/06	25 Willard St	Main house revision	29/33	Emeritus LTD
Hold until February 6th. No action taken.				
2. Charles Johnson Trust	5 Farmer St	Deck & steps	42.3.2/160	Sandcastle Const.
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patte, Paul, Thornewill			
Representative	Rob Newman, Sandcastle Construction			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified the structure as a circa 1840 3-Bay typical Nantucket building, noting the existence of an HDC survey file but no detailed comments on the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). - Emphasized the importance of including the date of existing structures in any applications before the commission, advising to document this on the COA.			

	- Expressed uncertainty about the intentions behind the proposed changes but understood them to involve expanding the square footage and altering the configuration of a side deck, described as an odd addition to the 3-Bay structure. - Expressed primary concern over the potential for increased encroachment into the driveway and whether this would impede access but had no further concerns beyond this issue.
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Noted that the proposed new deck appears similar to the current structure but is slightly closer to the street and more noticeable from Farmer Street, as observed during a recent visit. - Expressed that this closeness to the street is not a significant concern but recommended the planting of tall evergreens or some form of visual mitigation in front of the deck to enhance screening. - Highlighted a general stance against having decks this close to the street, especially concerning expansions, and proposed planting as a mitigation strategy.
Comments/Concerns	Welch - Deemed the project potentially acceptable under one condition, differing from the suggestion of planting evergreens. - Recognized visibility concerns and proposed planting a deciduous tree, specifically a small specimen tree, adjacent to the property rather than on the deck itself. This approach aims to provide privacy and mitigate visibility, especially during the in-season. - Highlighted that this solution addresses the issue of the deck appearing odd or overly prominent when viewed over the privet, particularly when the tree is in leaf. Camp - Expressed agreement with the idea of screening the deck, acknowledging that it already exists but is being extended forward. - Admitted uncertainty on how to implement the screening without creating an undesirable "floating effect." - Concluded with a general endorsement of the concept of screening the deck. Coombs - Concurred with the proposal to screen the porch, but questioned whether screening would be necessary during the winter as well. - Suggested using a flowering hedge, which would be aesthetically pleasing and complement the street view, as opposed to a more formal choice like Azalea. - Recommended a less formal option like summer mallow, to integrate seamlessly with the surroundings and avoid the appearance of a pine hedge. Pohl - Expressed inclusion in the consensus, specifically referring to Mickey's suggestion regarding the planting of some type of vegetation. - Indicated openness to both the idea of evergreens or the alternative proposal of planting a small tree. - Specified that the planting should occur between the parking area and the new deck.
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) to include stipulation of planting a deciduous tree adjacent to the rear side of the privet hedge to limit visibility, climbing hydrangea on the lattice on the porch. (Made by: Welch) (00:26:39)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

3. Stobie & Dorsett		60 Hulbert Ave	Main house revisions	29/58.1	Thornewill Designs
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Paul				
Representative	Luke Thornewill; Steve Cheney				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified the structure as the George Henry and Elizabeth EMT Summer Cottage, a circa 1888 shingle-style structure built by Edward Retherford Smith, a local builder in Nantucket at that time. - Mentioned that previous approval involved retaining existing windows, which were true divided light (TDL), and noted the necessity of a detailed window survey for replacing them with simulated divided light (SDL), which is considered inappropriate for the vintage of the structure. - Stressed that because the initial proposal and approval did not require changing the windows, a full window survey was not deemed necessary. However, with the new proposal aiming to replace existing windows with completely new ones, a detailed window survey, including the age of the windows and photographs of their interior and exterior, is now required. - Argued that SDL windows are not suitable for historic structures, emphasizing the importance of assessing whether the original two-over-two windows, dating from the late 1880s, can be refurbished to provide necessary energy efficiency without compromising the building's historical integrity.				
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Clarified that the recently proposed addition and changes to some windows were approved with true divided light (TDL) windows. - Noted the shift to proposing simulated divided light (SDL) windows for the entire building, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive window schedule to evaluate the condition of all windows. - Advocated that if any of the original windows are found to be serviceable and restorable, they should be restored.				
Comments/Concerns	Coombs - Agreed with the points made by Holly and Mickey, reinforcing the importance of adhering to the commission's guidelines favoring true divided light (TDL) windows, especially for the front of the building. - Expressed skepticism towards replacing two-over-two windows with a type not immediately recallable but suggested that viewing photographs might provide clearer insight. - Raised concerns about potential unnecessary internal construction implied by the proposed window change. - Advocated for the submission of a detailed window schedule and photographs showing both the interior and a close-up of the exterior of the windows to better understand and evaluate the proposed changes. Oliver - Expressed difficulty reconciling the emphasis on energy efficiency with the desire to maintain historical authenticity in window design. - Suggested the need for a broader discussion on the acceptance of windows that closely mimic the appearance of traditional types while offering improved energy efficiency. - Advocated for considering the prudence of making changes that balance historical preservation with modern energy standards. Steve Cheney - Pointed out that the current muntins on display are 7/8 inches wide, whereas a narrower width of 5/8 inches is proposed to better align with the style of the existing house. - Mentioned that the current spacer bars are gray, which contrasts with the proposal to use white spacer bars. This choice is intended to make the simulated divided light (SDL) windows blend in more seamlessly, especially when painted white, masking their modern construction more effectively. Oliver - Observed an increasing number of requests similar to this one.				

	- Stated that upon receiving a survey and photographs of the existing windows, if it is determined that none of the windows are original, they would consider allowing the proposed changes.
Welch	- Highlighted that the proposed thinner muntins are more reflective of contemporary treatments, whereas in the mid to early 1800s, muntins were actually wider than what is currently being proposed. - Expressed curiosity about whether the existing, albeit old or antique, windows are genuinely original, emphasizing the importance of conducting a window survey and schedule for clarity. - Voiced an inclination to support energy resiliency and solar initiatives, recognizing the Historic District Commission's (HDC) challenges with these issues, and suggested that there might be an opportunity to combine architectural appropriateness with modern energy solutions without compromising the historic integrity of the property. - Opened to the idea of integrating age-appropriate muntin detail with new window technology, particularly given the property's distance from the main house and its location on Hulbert Ave, which is not entirely within the historic district.
Backus	- Emphasized the critical importance of conducting a window survey to ascertain the specifics of the windows that have been replaced over time and to evaluate the profiles of any historic windows that remain. - Pointed out that understanding these existing profiles is crucial for making informed decisions on what would be an appropriate replacement, should the commission be inclined to approve such changes.
Camp	- Expressed a preference for preserving the historic windows on the front of the building, potentially allowing for modern replacements on less visible sides and the back. - Clarified that the most viewable elevation, determined to be from the north and approximately 100 feet off the road, should retain its historic fenestration. - Suggested a willingness to compromise on updating windows on the sides and back of the building, emphasizing the importance of preserving the appearance of the most publicly visible elevations.
Pohl	- Raised concerns about the significant increase in the depth from the inside face of the casing to the inside face of the sash in the proposed windows compared to existing ones, attributing this change to a much thicker sash and a wider stop in the new design. - Noted that such a design alteration would result in a considerable reduction in the visible glass area, with the increased framing potentially dominating the window's appearance, especially since all components would be painted white, contrasting with the current natural wood finish. - Emphasized the need to include specific measurements from the inside face of the exterior casing to the inside face of the sash in the window survey to accurately assess the impact of these changes.
Camp	- Expressed a desire to make a more informed judgment by comparing the existing and proposed windows side by side. - Sought to evaluate precisely the differences in thickness and overall dimensions to determine whether a larger sash would have a significant impact or if the changes are minimal enough not to affect the window's appearance and integrity significantly.
Coombs	- Acknowledged the inclusion of a photograph of one of the proposed windows in the application package, noting its small size. - Commented on the window's appearance as "heavy," aligning with previous concerns about the increased visibility of wood in the design.
Welch	- Acknowledged concerns about the heaviness of the window design but suggested that this might be mitigated or even eliminated by the use of approved storm frames, referencing a precedent on Union Street where basement windows close to the sidewalk were approved with similar frames.

	- Expressed a willingness to consider the window acceptable under certain conditions, highlighting the role of screen and storm panels in altering the window's appearance. - Focused on the disproportionately wide secondary jam, which doubles as a casing and window stop, noting it as significantly thicker than typical side and head casings and identifying this as the main objection. - Posed that once these elements are masked by storm and screen panels, and considering the larger size of most, if not all, proposed windows, the concern over the window's heaviness diminishes. - Advised seeking a thinner sash, if possible, to avoid potential issues where the storm and screen frames could obscure too much of the sash, leading to an undesirable appearance. - Recommended that if there are options available from a manufacturer (without specifying any names), someone should visit the PLUS Department. - Mentioned that there, one can find a valuable history of muntins, which could be beneficial for understanding and selecting appropriate window styles both for this project and for future considerations.
Motion	Motion to hold for additional information, including a window survey and schedule, and a view. (Made by: Welch) (00:52:40)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

4. Stobie & Dorsett	60 Hulbert Ave	Garage revisions	29/58.1	Thornewill Designs
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul			
Representative	Luke Thornewill			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	-			
Motion	Motion to track the garage revisions to the main house. (Made by: Coombs) (00:55:09)			
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			
		Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)	

5. Smiley 17 N. Water LLC	17 N. Water St	Roof walk	42.4.2/49	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Representative	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Confirmed 17 North Water Street as a contributing structure typical of Nantucket, circa 1812, also known as the Easton house, historically used as a guest house by Carl and Judith Ross, with family ties to the adjacent property at 15 North Water. - Shared personal experience of visiting the properties before they were sold by the Ross family, including accessing the roof walk, and concurred with historical evidence of a roof walk on this historic guest house, citing both a photograph and Lancaster's notes. - Announced plans to email a 1930s photograph from the NHA's digital archive showing the house with a roof walk, intending to share this evidence with the commission. - Acknowledged historical precedence for a roof walk on the property, supported by the photograph found and notations in Lancaster's book and the old HDC survey, but disagreed with the proposed dimensions, considering them inaccurate and misleading compared to the adjacent property's dimensions.			

	- Noted the prevalence of roof walks in the area as part of the typical Nantucket vernacular and suggested reducing the roof walk from four bays to three, with adjustments away from the edges, in accordance with "Building With Nantucket in Mind," page 84, regarding traditional design. - Expressed approval of the absence of a skirt in the proposal and believed that reducing the roof walk to three bays would also negate the need for a cross bracket, as viewed from the front facade.
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Echoed Holly's points about the historical presence of a roof walk on the property but highlighted concerns over its proposed size, emphasizing the need for reduction. - Supported the suggestion to decrease the roof walk to three bays, stressing that the width was also a significant concern. - Requested a side view examination to address the unusual width, noting it creates disproportionately long legs and is out of proportion with traditional roof walks observed in the neighborhood. - Urged for the roof walk dimensions to be adjusted in both length and width to align with the conventional sizes outlined in "Building With Nantucket In Mind," advocating for a more appropriately scaled design.
Comments/Concerns	Welch - Expressed no objection to the concept of a roof walk on the property, but raised concerns about its dimensions, specifically its width (left to right from the front view) and depth (from the perspective of someone standing at the front). Coombs - Agreed fully with Holly's assessment that a four-bay roof walk supported by extensive bracing is inappropriate. - Suggested that while historical evidence of a previous roof walk justifies its inclusion, its dimensions should be adjusted to be more in keeping with the scale of the house itself, rather than mirroring the size of the neighboring property. Oliver - Proposed adjusting the roof walk to more closely resemble the one depicted in the photograph provided, which is not as wide as currently proposed. - Echoed the general consensus that reducing the width would significantly impact the appearance of the roof walk's supporting legs, making them more proportionate. Camp - Expressed difficulty in determining the roof walk's exact placement from the photograph but observed that it appears to be approximately 3 feet off the gable, suggesting it is quite large. - Expressed a preference for a smaller roof walk, particularly in terms of its width, to better suit the scale of the building. Pohl - Acknowledged agreement with the sentiments expressed regarding the roof walk's dimensions and noted a strong consensus on this matter among the Commissioners. Welch - Pointed out a significant discrepancy in the width of the dormers compared to the roof walk, noting that in the image provided, the roof walk extends beyond the dormers when viewed from a central perspective. - Suggested that the roof walk's dimensions should be considered in relation to the overall roof rather than being based on the dormer widths. - Clarified that the roof walk should be positioned within the inner roof planes of the dormers rather than extending to the outer edges of the dormers.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (01:08:30)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

6. MHY Enterprises LLC		9 Union St	As built fence replacement	42.3.1/101	Val Oliver
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	Patten, Thornewill				
Representative	Val Oliver/Bill Steadman				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified 9 Union Street as the Elijah A. Greenhouse, a circa 1820 typical Nantucket structure located on Stone Alley, which was formerly known as Gunther Way and is documented on the 1833 Coffin map and the 1858 Walling map. - Mentioned Stone Alley as a public way connecting Orange to Union streets through the slope of Quantity Bank. - Discussed an issue regarding a silt fence replacement where the DPW (Department of Public Works) sent a letter in October of the previous year, followed by a letter from the HDC in November, noting a lack of coordination with HDC staff on this matter. - Explained steps taken to ensure coordination between DPW and HDC staff for any future encroachment issues within the town and Sconset old historic districts, with DPW Director Drew committing to improved communication. - Clarified that the 15-day notice given by DPW pertains only to the removal of encroachments, not to reinstallation. - Referenced an email from an abutter suggesting that a six-foot board fence would be historically appropriate for the site, citing historic photographs as evidence. - Shared an 1890 photograph from the NHA showing 9 Union Street with a solid board fence along Union Street. - Concluded that a board fence would be appropriate based on historical evidence, expressing concern over the use of pressure-treated wood but recognizing its necessity for durability.				
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Clarified that the fence in question is on the opposite side of the alley from the one discussed earlier. - Voiced concerns over the proposed fence height of 5.5 feet, considering it significantly taller than the existing 3.5 to 4 feet fence, which potentially creates a "tunnel effect" along Stone Alley. - Advocated for replacing the fence at its original height to preserve the alley's open feel. - Expressed a preference for cedar over pressure-treated wood, citing its more traditional appearance and suitability for the historic context.				
Comments/Concerns	Welch - Echoed Mickey's concerns, particularly about the "tunnel effect" created by the proposed fence height and the need for aesthetics consideration. - Raised concerns regarding the cleanup of the area, particularly the removal of spoils from post diggings to ensure the alley retains its stone appearance rather than becoming "Dirt Alley." - Emphasized the importance of maintaining the visibility and accessibility of the stone pathway and ensuring that any residual materials from the fence installation are properly cleared. - Suggested a preference for different fence heights depending on the path's curvature, proposing a lower fence in certain areas with the possibility of a taller fence where appropriate. - Expressed openness to a solid board design, as indicated in historical images, questioning the method of slat fastening (screwed versus nailed) to ensure durability and appropriateness for a heavily trafficked area. - Stated the mid rail's vertical orientation as atypical and inappropriate, suggesting a horizontal orientation more consistent with traditional designs, and indicated a preference for reducing the slat spacing or opting for a solid board to align with historical precedents. - Highlighted the importance of the historic nature of the alley, suggested that the area should undergo a survey. - Recommended that the boundaries of the property should be clearly marked and pinned to ensure accurate understanding and preservation of the alley's historical context. Coombs - Expressed that the proposed fence design is inappropriate for its location, not aligning with the surrounding context of 9 Union Street.				

	- Stated that the fence should be shorter and constructed from cedar to allow it to age naturally and blend in with the historic environment. - Advocated for a fence height of 3.5 to 4 feet to maintain visibility in the historic area, allowing passersby to view the property without obstruction. - Recommended that a simpler fence design could be enhanced with plantings like sweet autumn clematis for aesthetic appeal, emphasizing the use of cedar for its natural aging qualities. Camp - Expressed concerns about the proposed fence type, suggesting that it appears too spindly, and that the choice of wood does not align with historic precedents. - Expressed concern about the implications for the opposite side of the alley, referencing a historic photograph that depicts fences on both sides, indicating that decisions made here could establish a precedent for future treatments. - Voiced a preference for a board fence over the proposed picket fence, especially when considering the unusual height and spacing of the pickets, finding it less offensive. Paul - Agreed with the sentiments expressed by Diane and Stephen, suggesting the installation of a simple Type 2 fence, which is consistent with what is found on the opposite side of the alley. - Highlighted the Type 2 fence as an iconic choice for the island, addressing concerns regarding height and material in a manner that aligns with the area's traditional aesthetic. - Suggested that a Type 2 picket fence, being natural and presumably more suitable for vegetation adherence if desired, would be an appropriate solution for the alleyway. Welch - Suggested that if the fence is to be taller than the typical height, it should be a board fence to eliminate the need for rail details. - Indicated that maintaining a Type 2 fence at its standard height would address any remaining concerns. Pohl - Expressed understanding of the need for privacy but emphasized that the resulting "wall effect" from a tall fence could be problematic, as supported by the evidence from photographs. - Indicated that the impact of the fence on the character and feel of the alleyway, due to its height, remains a significant concern. Paul - Examined photographs more closely, particularly one that shows Stone Alley, and noticed a discrepancy in fence heights. - Acknowledged Val's concerns about the height and clarified the previous mention of a Type 2 fence, noting that the existing fence appeared to be a taller version, possibly covered with vines. - Expressed support for replacing the fence with one that matches the height and style of the existing one, as shown in the photographs, which suggests it was taller than a standard Type 2 fence. Steadman - Analyzed the fence height variation along Stone Alley, noting that at the lower end of the hill, the fence starts at approximately 3 feet in height and then increases as it ascends towards the first visible window, reaching about 42 to 44 inches, not 5 feet as previously discussed. - Pointed out that the fence becomes taller beyond this point, with ivy draping over the top, suggesting a natural escalation in height matching the alley's slope.
Motion	Motion to approve, with an Exhibit A (through staff), setting the fence height at three feet up until the first window and then increase it to four feet, thereafter, including a cap on the fence. Specified that the fence should be a Type 2 design. (Made by: Welch) (01:42:54)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

7. Evonne & Robert Connoly 9a Pilgrim Rd Hardscape 41/217.5 Val Oliver

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten
Alternates	Paul, Thornewill
Representative	Val Oliver
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners stated no concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Coombs) (01:46:57)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

8. Richard Mack 181b Polpis Rd Driveway 45/1 Val Oliver

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten
Representative	Val Oliver
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Expressed specific apprehensions regarding the driveway's proximity to a telephone pole, particularly in terms of vehicular turning from the direction of Sconset being more challenging than from town. - Acknowledged that from the Historic District Commission's (HDC's) perspective, there might be limited relevance, but maintained that ensuring the driveway's placement respects wetland boundaries and navigational safety near the pole was a primary concern. - Noted that based on Val's presentation, the driveway design appears to adhere to zoning regulations concerning the apron's width and depth.
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Coombs, Pohl, Thornewill, Welch - Stated no concerns. Paul - Assumed that any effect on the bike path would be addressed across a wider area than the driveway crossing itself to minimize any abrupt grade changes and reduce potential hazards. - From the Historic District Commission's (HDC's) standpoint, noted that the proposed driveway materials and design appear appropriate and in keeping with local standards. - Highlighted the necessity for coordination with the Department of Public Works (DPW) to ensure any safety concerns are adequately addressed and mitigated, emphasizing the importance of cross-departmental collaboration for the project's success.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (01:52:13)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

9. Mariela Oviedo 12 Wappossett Circle Solar rooftop array 67/522 Incite LLC

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates	Paul, Thornewill
Representative	Roger Dzul, Incite Solar Solutions
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Oliver

	- Recommended a review of the solar guidelines, emphasizing the preference for avoiding solar panels on the front of houses and seeking uniformity in their placement on roof planes. - Highlighted the aim for the most inconspicuous placement possible for solar panels. - Noted that while the house has a black roof, which is beneficial for solar panel aesthetics, the issue lies in panels being installed on every roof section in varying directions, lacking consistency. - Pointed out that the east-facing side, where panels extend from end to end, is a more suitable arrangement, indicating a preference for a cohesive look. Pohl, Welch, Coombs and Patten - Concurred with Val's comments.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (01:57:14)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

III. OLD BUSINESS 01/16/2024				
Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Leslie Johnson 12-9679	281 Madaket Rd	Pool & hardscape	59.4/292	LFW
• Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Patten; Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 01/23/2024				
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates	-			
Representative	Linda Williams			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Clarified that a special permit from the zoning board is required for the pool. - Mentioned that the property at 51 Washington and the subject property are under common ownership. - Emphasized the importance of the site plan clearly indicating any existing vegetation, which is known to be present and should be preserved to provide screening on all three sides. - Suggested that a more detailed site plan would be beneficial in understanding how existing vegetation will be utilized for screening purposes.			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Coombs - Highlighted the presence of natural vegetation around the site, its setback position, and extensive coverage on all three sides, including significant vegetation on the street side. - Concluded with confidence that the structure or feature in question is unlikely to be visible at all from outside the property. Camp - Expressed acceptance of the proposal under the condition that the existing vegetation, which ensures the structure or feature is not visible, is maintained. Paul - Reported having visited the site and observed the surroundings, emphasizing the need for careful construction management to preserve the existing vegetation, which currently ensures adequate screening. - Expressed approval of the project under the condition that it remains unseen at the time of inspection and thereafter.			
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted, on the condition that the pool is not seen at the time of inspection or in perpetuity. (Made by: Paul) (02:02:37)			
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)			
		Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)		

2. Bertryl Johnson 12-9680	250 Madaket Rd	New dwelling	59.4/213	LFW
• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Patten; Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 01/23/2024</i>				
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates	-			
Representative	Linda Williams			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Stressed that the fenestration of the proposed dwelling should be consistent with existing structures on the lot, acknowledging the lot's subdivision from the main house, which includes a ranch and a cottage, and mentioning a shed as another structure on the lot. - Made a specific request for clarity in the plans regarding the door and fenestration schedule, noting its absence in the provided packet and expressing hope that it might be included in the hard copy. - Commented on the need for deck changes to adhere to an 8 ft depth to align with HDC (Historic District Commission) standards.			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Expressed concern regarding the lack of similarity of the proposed building to surrounding houses. Paul - Observed that while the immediate context consists of relatively small buildings, there are larger, two-story buildings across the street, indicating a mixed context in the area. - Expressed no issue with the house itself or its distance from the street but suggested a preference for rotating the building to have the gable face the road. - Commented positively on the architecture, scale, and story-and-a-half massing, mentioning that having the porch face the road could be aesthetically pleasing. - Indicated that the primary concern is with the siting of the building. Patten - Expressed no significant concerns about the project, based on the belief that it will not be visible. Coombs - Expressed a desire to see the design of the building modified, noting its large rectangular shape does not fit well in an area where houses are spaced widely apart and have surrounding open space. - Suggested exploring ways to break down the building or reduce the size of the mold windows to better integrate it into the surrounding area. Pohl - Voiced strong concerns about the proposed building due to its 7/12 roof pitch, which seems flatter compared to local examples that likely have steeper roofs. - Noted the building's excessive width and its stark contrast with a smaller Cape-style house across the street, despite other large buildings in the vicinity. - Expressed skepticism about the building's visibility not being an issue due to its 150 ft setback, mentioning clear visibility of a boat at a similar distance, indicating the building will be noticeably visible. Camp - Voiced concerns about the building's roof pitch, agreeing that it appears compressed, resulting in a boxy massing. - Critiqued the arrangement of four windows across the front as being unusual. - Raised concerns about the building's scale, suggesting that, despite adhering to the 25 ft height limit, it appears taller than surrounding structures based on provided photographs. - Suggested considering additive massing to mitigate the building's boxy appearance and better integrate it with its surroundings. Paul - Noted the building's natural trim and black windows as positive aspects, suggesting that creating a model could be beneficial for visualizing the building in its context.			

	- Proposed potentially dropping the corner boards to reduce the building's visual impact, especially on the dormers. - Advised simplifying the column details for a more streamlined appearance. - Acknowledged the building's compressed look as a likely consequence of adhering to the 25 ft height restriction, suggesting that significant changes to the footprint might be necessary to avoid this effect while remaining under the height limit.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp) (02:17:44)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

3. SeaHero LLC 12-9683 12 Pilgrim Rd Hardscape & pool 41/476 LFW
• **Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Patten; Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 01/23/2024**

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul
Alternates	-
Representative	Linda Williams/Spencer McCombe
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Proposed a more organic approach to the driveway design, avoiding a direct pour from the road across the entire frontage, and favoring a layout that's more sensitive to the landscape. - Recommended reducing the amount of paving around the pool to minimize hardscaping and enhance the property's overall aesthetic. Paul - Acknowledged a general dislike for retaining walls but recognized that they will be primarily visible to the property owner and have been effectively screened with increased fencing height, which should mitigate visibility concerns. - Expressed comfort with the project due to the comprehensive approach to screening and landscape integration, suggesting that the visibility of the six-foot-tall fence from uphill will be significantly reduced. - Considered the hardscaping concerns raised but felt reassured by the overall site plan and existing vegetation that visibility from Pilgrim Road and other vantage points would be minimal. Coombs - Expressed admiration for the original and appealing design of the pool, noting its unique in-and-out shape and emphasizing that it appears more significant due to the surrounding green grass. - Suggested reducing the amount of bluestone around the pool to allow more natural grassy areas. - Raised a concern about the width of the gate leading to the pool, suggesting it could be narrower since it's intended for pedestrian rather than vehicular access. Patten - Expressed belief that the pool will not be visible from outside the property and, while suggesting a preference for slightly less bluestone, overall feels the current landscaping plan is acceptable. Pohl - Despite earlier concerns about grading, indicated willingness to accept the situation, noting that any issues would primarily affect the property owner rather than neighbors. - Expressed satisfaction with the project, particularly noting the pool's adequate screening and lowered positioning, which mitigates visibility concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted with the proviso that the pool will not be visible at the time of inspection and thereafter. (Made by: Coombs) (02:31:21)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)// Camp (Nay)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

4. Rays Court NT		4 Rays Court	Roof walk, 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>					
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	-				
Representative	Ben Normand				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Highlighted the property as the circa 1797 George Ray House with an 1848 addition, noting the presence of a house history and a historic assessment by Brian Pfeiffer on file. - Expressed approval of the removal of a non-original exterior fireplace. - Appreciated the decision to maintain the facade's shingle siding, acknowledging some historical evidence of white but recognizing concerns over excessive use of white in the proposal. - Noted approval of the reduced size of the proposed roof walk but suggested further reduction in both width and length for consistency with "Building With Nantucket in Mind." - Mentioned the historical association of roof walks with hatches or chimneys, both of which are present on this property. - Regarding roofing material, referenced a recent approval of a cooper shed on the property, visible from adjacent roads, possibly Judith Chase Lane, and questioned the roofing material approved for the shed. - Expressed a preference for three-tab black roofing, emphasizing the desire for consistency with the previously approved cooper shed, while noting that architectural black shingles are allowed within the Old Historic District (OHD).				
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Agreed with the previous comments and added emphasis on the need to adjust the width of the roof walk, noting that typical roof walks are only seven or eight feet wide. - Pointed out that the proposed roof walk appears significantly wider and suggested making it narrower and slightly shorter for better proportion and consistency with historical examples.				
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Expressed satisfaction with the full proposal, conditional on a smaller roof walk. - Conceded to the consensus, willing to go with the proposal. Camp - Stated she had no concerns. Paul - Expressed agreement with the proposal but emphasized the need for a slightly smaller roof walk. - Highlighted the importance of considering the chimney's placement, warning against the roof walk reducing too much in both directions, which could result in the chimney protruding awkwardly. - Indicated understanding and agreed with the proposal as is, citing the chimney's location and its relationship to the current roof walk size, cautioning that a significant reduction could compromise aesthetics. Coombs - Described the building as attractive and old, noting it hasn't had a roof walk for a long time, which supports the case for a smaller scale. - Suggested that the roof walk is too wide and that reducing both its width and length would be beneficial. Welch - Pointed out that the roof hatch impacts the aesthetic less than the overall roof walk does. - Stressed the importance of reducing the roof walk's width by at least a few feet.				
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) to reduce the roof walk to 17'9". (Made by: Paul) (02:43:40)				
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) // Welch (Nay)				
Certificate #				HDC2024 – (as noted)	

5. Stark Point LLC 02-7988		16 Easton St	New studio rev 02-7988	42.4.1/11	Botticelli + Pohl
• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver; Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 11/21/2023</i>					
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	-				
Representative	Lisa Botticelli				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Described the project as an infill Gambrell within the OMD section of Brant Point, acknowledging the studio and appreciating the revised massing, height, and simplification. - Expressed uncertainty regarding the revised chimney features, specifically the unusual exterior rectangle and the top of the chimney stack. - Highlighted the importance of the north and south views from Hulbert and harborside, noting the harborside view is obscured by the main house. - Suggested reducing the triple-ganged windows on the north to a maximum of two, possibly separated, and recommended adding shutters to maintain consistency with the rest of the structure.				
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Agreed with Holly's assessment regarding the second-floor windows, noting they overwhelm the wall and make the building appear squat. - Suggested that reducing the window area, either in height or number, could improve proportions. - Concerned with the exterior chimney placement, stating it doesn't fit well along the side of the building and suggesting a repositioning away from the side of the low part of the building.				
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Concurred with the critique of the second-floor triple-gang window, suggesting that two windows would be preferable. Oliver - Expressed uncertainty regarding the chimney but agreed with the suggestion to reduce the number of windows on the top floor on the north side. Welch - Echoed the concern about the chimney, suggesting it should be positioned on the south side and made thinner to avoid presenting as a square, which is atypical. - Advocated for a north-south orientation of the chimney, emphasizing visibility. - Recommended the windows on the second floor of the Gambrel gable end be downsized by one and a half sizes for better proportionality.				
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) to include the following: On the second-floor North elevation, reduce to two windows, separated, not ganged; and adjust the chimney's width to make it thinner, avoiding a square appearance. (Made by: Camp) (02:52:23)				
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 3-0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver (Aye)				
				Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

6. 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>					
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	-				
Representative	Matt McEachern				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Reiterated the previous opinion that two balconies on the North were not appropriate but acknowledged that the introduction of a shingle wall for one balcony helped mitigate concerns. - Suggested that if two balconies are desired, both should feature shingle walls to maintain consistency and appropriateness.				

Public Comments	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Expressed that the addition of a second-floor deck complicates the building's aesthetic, preferring its simpler, more traditional appearance without it. - Stated that the arrangement of two decks in a row for creates an "upside-down house" feel, particularly inappropriate for the cliff area, and advocated for the deck's complete removal.
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Maintained the same position as before, expressing concern that there are too many doors on one side of the building. - Agreed with critiques about the extra balcony, noting a discordance between one being solid and the other open, as well as the inconsistency between a double door and a triple door. - Suggested that the extra balcony should either be eliminated or simplified to a single door, highlighting the strangeness of the two balconies not being cohesive in design. Camp - Concurred with Val on the issue of doors, indicating a willingness to accept the triple French doors due to their set-back position. - Suggested that now the area has been shingled, replacing the French doors with windows would make the design simpler. Paul - Stated that if the decks are to remain, their details should be consistent, expressing a preference for the open version. - Shared concerns raised by Abby and Val but noted a difference in perspective: when viewed at an angle, the shed roofs integrating the decks appear as distinct elements, and the small balcony resembles a Juliet balcony, differing from the elevation view. - Expressed openness to the presence of two balconies but emphasized that their wall details should be harmonized. - Suggested that fully shingling the wall, as Holly proposed, would make the triple French doors visually resemble windows, potentially addressing concerns about their presence on the second floor. Welch - Expressed general agreement with the discussed modifications, not opposed to two second-floor decks given their specific location and orientation. - Conditioned approval on both decks being reduced in size: the one on the Juliet balcony to one door and the triple doors to double. - Stated that reducing the width of the current triple door (which would become a double) is acceptable, as it would result in less open railing, contributing to a balance between uniformity and variety on the house's side.
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) the proposed changes will affect the west elevation, specifying: The double doors will be replaced with windows; and the sidewall rail will also be removed. (Made by: Welch) (03:01:51)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

7. NIR 09-9197	19 N Water St. Lot 7	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern LLC
• Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused: None Last heard 12/19/2023				
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul			
Alternates	-			
Representative	Miroslava Ahern			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Discussed the infill subdivision, specifically the shift from regular to irregular bluestone for hardscaping, and expressed concerns that this change isn't effective, as it maintains a very formal appearance.			

	- Acknowledged the structures possess a certain formality not typical of Nantucket but argued that hardscaping should utilize more traditional materials to better integrate with the surroundings.
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Concurred with Holly's comments.
Comments/Concerns	Paul - Supported the choice for AC unit placement and, while acknowledging Holly's concerns about the patio, opined that the overall design and layout of the lot incorporate organic elements, such as non-linear, spaced, and slightly jogging walkways. - Believed that the landscape strikes a balance between natural and structured elements, expressing satisfaction with the slight rigidity of the patio due to the overall achieved balance. Patten - Expressed agreement with Joe's assessment, indicating satisfaction with the current layout as proposed. Thornewill - Expressed concern about the lack of lawn space, noting that everything is either a plant, stepping stone, patio, or driveway, which may contribute to an unnatural feel, especially if future projects follow this pattern. - Observed the abundance of plants but the absence of soft ground surfaces, suggesting a preference for less planting in favor of more grass and natural surfaces to soften the overall appearance. - Approved of the enclosure for the AC and shower. Oliver - Indicated acceptance of the regular bluestone for pavers, particularly if grass is incorporated between them. Welch - Concurred with previously expressed opinions, particularly regarding plantings in the absence of grass space, suggesting a shift towards more monolithic groupings of plants. - Highlighted that traditionally, such spaces are either concealed behind privet hedges or feature lawn, pointing out that the current setup's complexity and lack of continuity with traditional styles is the main issue to address.
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A to include clarifications on the drawings of the stones and simplify the plants. (Made by: Oliver) (03:11:41)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

8. NIR 09-9203 19 N Water St. Lot 11 Hardscape 42.4.2/3 Ahern LLC				
• Commissioners: <i>Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: Welch; Recused: None Last heard 12/19/2023</i>				
Voting:	Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul			
Alternates	Welch			
Representative	Miroslava Ahern			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Acknowledged the project as an infill subdivision within the OHD, noting the corner lot's prominence and potential focus of attention as the development progresses. - Appreciated the removal of Goshen pavers along the street side, deeming it much more suitable for the setting. - Expressed concerns about the Goshen patio along the sidewalk but recognized the effort to add vegetation to seclude it from public view, addressing previous concerns from commissioners. - Thanked for all the noted changes, including the addition of red elements, enhancing the proposal's overall appeal. - Suggested a preference for a brick apron for the access road over cobble, while acknowledging that cobble is not inappropriate for the context.			
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Stated no concerns.			

Comments/Concerns	Paul - Expressed a conditional approval of the application, contingent on changing the apron to brick, and showed appreciation for all the changes that have been made to the proposal. Camp and Patten - Concurred with Joe's comments. Thornewill - Expressed a preference for brick as the material for the apron but voiced a concern about a specific post detail. - Highlighted that the post gives the impression of leading to a gated development, which is not desired for this project, particularly because of the uniformity in lot sizes and architectural detailing across the development. - Advised that removing the post to avoid the gated community aesthetic, especially on South Beach Street, would be a beneficial modification.
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A contingent on changing the apron material to brick and removing the entry post without prejudice. (Made by: Paul) (03:20:13)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

9. 10 Silver St 11-9512 10 Silver St New dwelling- main house 55.4.1/187 JB Studio • Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten; Alternates: Oliver; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023				
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten			
Alternates	Oliver			
Representative	Juraj Bencat			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Provided feedback on an infill project within the Old Historic District (OHD), specifically in the Fish Lot section, highlighting previous comments about the area's suitability for three-bay, one-and-a-half-story structures, citing nearby examples at 44 Pine Street and 7 Silver Street. - Expressed appreciation for the shift from a four-bay to a three-bay structure and a decrease in formality, yet emphasized the need for further reduction in size, massing, and the spacing around bays, as well as between the first and second floors. - Recommended referencing historic three-bay structures in the neighborhood for guidance and suggested the house should not be two full stories tall, but rather 1 and a half to 1 and 3/4 in height, with both ridge and eaves needing adjustment. - Critiqued the additive massing as not aligning with "Building With Nantucket in Mind" or historical precedents, describing it as haphazard. - Appreciated the inclusion of a section drawing but noted the necessity of a topographical plan. - Acknowledged and appreciated the repositioning of the proposed structure closer to the street, aligning with traditional access methods for such structures, but expressed concerns over the proposed all-brick driveway to the right of the entrance, suggesting it should be significantly reduced.			
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Noted that the front facade of the building has excessive single space, suggesting either a reduction in width or a shift to a four-bay design to better utilize the space. However, the idea of scaling down the building entirely, making it shorter and more akin to a story and a half or three-quarters, was favored. - Commented on the simplicity of the front door trim, recommending more detailed and traditional detailing. - Pointed out that the B and C windows in the main mass, presumably on the second floor and possibly the gable ends, appear too small and should be resized to align with the first-floor front windows. - Proposed relocating a decorative chimney from the rear mass to the front mass for appropriateness and criticized a gable addition facing west as sticking out oddly, suggesting a shed addition on the side of the building might be more harmonious.			

	Kathy Ward, Abutter - Expressed concern regarding the placement of the driveway, particularly the safety and appropriateness of where vehicles would be backing out. - Noted that houses on the street are generally small and do not feature six bedrooms, a cabana, and a guest house, questioning the scale of the proposed development in comparison. - Raised a query about the necessity of a cabana, especially since the pool has been removed from the plans, indicating a need for clarification on this aspect of the proposal. Maryann Hill, Abutter - Expressed a concern about the potential runoff and changes in water flow resulting from the hardscape at the front of the house as well as the overall massing. Welch - Clarified that issues related to runoff and water flow changes due to hardscaping fall outside the scope of their review, which focuses on architectural design, elements, character, and setting.
Comments/Concerns	Coombs - Asserted that the building's height should be limited to a story and a half to a story and three-quarters, rather than two full stories. - Critiqued a particular mulled window on the west elevation as too large and improperly positioned, recommending it be made smaller and lowered to match the single windows that were deemed appropriate for the location. - Expressed a desire for specifications on the building's height and length from the front, noting an agreement with earlier comments that the front door needs more detailed trim due to its current simplicity. - Commented on the chimney on the west elevation, suggesting it appears too wide and should feature corbelling near the top rather than a simple structure. - Raised concerns about the building's footprint in relation to the property lines, based on the available site plan, recommending the building be scaled back, especially if it's to be a three-bay structure, to reduce excessive spacing between windows and ensure window sizes are typical for a three-bay house. Thornewill - Agreed with previously stated concerns and emphasized the need for reducing the overall massing of the building by at least 10 to 15%. - Pointed out that the one-story additive dining room mass appears completely inappropriate, suggesting that transforming its roof into a shed roof might be a more suitable option, as mentioned by Mickey. - Highlighted the visibility of this elevation from the town lot, underscoring its significance. - Also emphasized the importance of including a chimney on the main mass to contribute to the architectural character of the building. Paul - Agreed with the calls for reduction and supported Mickey's suggestion regarding a chimney on the main mass. - Viewed positively the inclusion of a gable off the back as a good move, suggesting it adds informality and might be more successful as a shed roof. - Noted a vast improvement in the site plan compared to the original, including better utilization of the property, forward movement of the structure, and changes to parking, all seen as positive developments. - Acknowledged the complexity of the project, indicating that while many positive steps have been taken, further time and discussion might be needed to address all aspects of the development. - Emphasized a global perspective in assessing the proposal, recognizing many moves in the right direction without delving into specifics at this stage. Patten - Echoed agreement with previously expressed sentiments, not adding new critiques but reinforcing concerns about the building's size relative to the lot, covering it entirely from width to length. - Highlighted the complexity of the project, as mentioned by others, emphasizing the need for reduction in the building's size.

	- Suggested reconsideration or modification of the additive dining room space to address concerns regarding the project's scale and fit within the lot. Welch - Agreed with Joe on the project's positive direction but emphasized the need for further work, suggesting an overall reduction of approximately 25%. - Deemed the addition off the rear, part of the T-shaped structure, as inappropriate and advocated for its removal. - Highlighted the importance of including a chimney on the main mass, emphasizing its significance in the structure's design within the area, with attention to appropriate sizing and design details. - Suggested the front façade could benefit from more detailing, potentially including a transom, to enhance its architectural interest. - Expressed concerns over the shed roof's pitch, describing it as atypical and potentially problematic for the structure's proportions and aesthetic coherence, particularly noting the unusual appearance of a bump-out on the far right as inappropriate for the context.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (03:44:44)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

10. 10 Silver St 11-9511 10 Silver St New Cottage 55.4.1/187 JB Studio				
• Commissioners: <i>Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten: Alternates: Oliver; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023</i>				
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten			
Alternates	Oliver			
Representative	Juraj Bencat			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Highlighted the need for the site plan to reflect the .2% chance of FEMA flood risk, as indicated by the HMP and visible on GIS, noting concerns from abutters. - Suggested that a FEMA elevation certificate might be necessary. - Advised that the guest house should be simplified and reduced in scale, considering its considerable size in terms of both height and width. - Recommended that, since the north face overlooks Silver Street, it should feature a front door. - Criticized the dormers for being too large and the meeting rails for not aligning. - Found the south rear dormer more appropriate, though still large, suggesting a general reduction in scale for the structure. - Deemed the exterior chimney inappropriate, recommending an inboard placement with typical corbeling as detailed in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Mentioned the requirement for a hardscaping plan to accompany the applications.			
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Echoed agreement with the critique of the building's boxy proportions, describing it as massive and suggesting the earlier proposal's thinner profile was preferable. - Highlighted the issues with the flush dormer meeting rails and suggested moving the chimney inside.			
Comments/Concerns	Coombs - Pointed out that the corbeling of the chimney is incorrectly positioned, being too high up when it should be situated at the first-floor level, and highlighted the lack of integration with the structure, making it atypical. - Suggested that, if possible, the chimney should be moved inside to maintain consistency with traditional architectural practices. - Noted that the current building appears wider than previous submissions, advocating for a narrower, smaller structure to fit appropriately on the small lot and within the context of Silver Street, emphasizing the importance of maintaining scale and proportion in the area.			

	- Criticized the building for occupying too much of the lot space, both side to side and front to back, which is deemed not suitable for the location. - Suggested a preference for the previously submitted west elevation, which presented a more conservative, narrower, and smaller profile. - Commented on the mismatch between the eaves and windows, calling for a reduction in the building's size to enhance compatibility with its surroundings. - Expressed interest in reviewing the previously submitted south elevation, indicating it might be more appropriate than the current proposal, suggesting that reverting to or incorporating elements from the previous submission could offer a better fit for the site and its context. Thornewill - Echoed Diane's preference for the scale of the main mass from the previous submission, excluding the front gable piece facing west. - Considered the south elevation of the current rendition to be the most successful due to its simplicity, despite its size. - Criticized the chimney on the west for being too wide, contributing to a squat appearance and off proportions, making the structure seem larger than it should. - Suggested the necessity of a front door on the north, pointing out the current front door's awkward placement within a small shed mass, likely on the west side. Paul - Reflected on Diane's summary, feeling it aligns with their own impression of the guest house and main house appearing almost as one continuous structure, acknowledging a slight exaggeration in this perception. - Suggested that returning to the original design and location for the guest house might alleviate some concerns about the main house by creating a more open lot layout. - Preferred not to comment on the specifics of the current design, expressing a fondness for the previous design and location as a more suitable approach for the property's development strategy. Patten - Expressed agreement with the points previously discussed and chose not to add any new comments to the conversation. Welch - Expressed agreement with the preference for the previous location and structure but reserved specific comments until further review of the main house is conducted, indicating potential for more significant feedback on the massing depending on decisions made regarding the main house. - Addressed the relevance of FEMA floodplain matters to the discussion, explaining its importance due to the elevation requirements set by the federal government for the structure. - Highlighted a discrepancy in the representation of grade changes on the west and east elevations compared to the north and south, suggesting the need for a site section for the structure, whether in the current or alternative location, to accurately reflect these variations. - Indicated that the design could undergo significant changes based on outcomes related to the primary mass, emphasizing the importance of understanding the site's topography and regulatory requirements in the design process.
Motion	Motion to track the proposed cottage alongside the main house development, noting that this does not preclude the architect from making and presenting modifications in the interim. Emphasized the necessity of resolving the design and details of the main structure first, highlighting the importance of incorporating FEMA floodplain considerations into the plans. Stressed that any retaining elements and a site section that illustrates the topography and how the structure interacts with the grade should be prominently displayed on the site plan, underlining the importance of these elements for a comprehensive review. (Made by: Coombs) (04:00:37)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

11. 10 Silver St 11-9510	10 Silver St	New cabana/shed alterations	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul, Patten; Alternates: Oliver; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023 Hold To Track				
12. 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				
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates	-			
Representative	Dean Lampe			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Paul - Initially had doubts about the visibility of the retaining wall from a public way but has since been convinced that it won't be significantly visible. - Stressed the importance of working with the natural topography of a property rather than flattening sloping lots, to avoid the proliferation of retaining walls across the island. - Noted that the design is considered appropriate, with the tallest part of the retaining wall being 33 inches and abutting a wetland. Patten - Stated that she had no concerns. Coombs - Described the wetland's variability in presence and extent, noting it merges with another wetland near Meadow View. - Expressed belief that a fence planned for the area would not be visible from public viewpoints, raising no visibility concerns. - Raised a practical suggestion regarding the proximity of the fence to the pool and shed, recommending potentially moving it back about two feet to allow more room.			
Motion	Motion to approve due to lack of visibility. (Made by: Coombs) (04:13:14)			
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)			
			Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

IV. NEW BUSINESS 01/23/2024

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Will Hausberg	103 Eel Point Rd	Move off/ Demo	32/6	Wilson Co.
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	-			
Representative	Linda Williams			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	There were no comments or concerns stated.			
Motion	Motion to approve for a move demo. (Made by: Coombs) (04:17:46)			
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye) // Pohl (Nay)			
			Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

Items 2-4 are held.

2. Ack N Back LLC	33 Quidnet Rd	color change studio Rev COA	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
3. Ack N Back LLC	33 Quidnet Rd	color change MH Rev COA	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
4. ACK N BACK LLC	33 Quidnet Rd	Revision 08-6785	21/27.2	Ahern LLC

5. Plamen Dimitrov	3 Weatherly Place	Rooftop solar	67/950	Cotuit Solar
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates	-			
Representative	Karen Alence			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Welch - Expressed confusion regarding the structure's designation, suggesting it appears to be the primary mass on the property and requesting clarification on its status. - Noted that it is the most visible structure on the lot and raised concerns about the appropriateness of having solar panels visible on what seems to be a primary mass. Coombs - Concurred with Stephens's comments. Thornewill - Agreed with the concern about solar panels being visible on the front of the building, acknowledging that while there have been exceptions for dormers, the general practice is to avoid placing them on highly visible front-facing areas. - Suggested that solar panels could be acceptable on less visible parts of the building, like the back, but emphasized that any placement on the front, including the dormer, would be too conspicuous due to the structure's prominent visibility. - Highlighted the importance of adhering to established norms and practices that typically prohibit solar panels on the front of buildings. Pohl - Acknowledged the difficulty of the situation, noting the solar panels are on a black roof and low-pitched areas, which might make them less obtrusive. - However, expressed skepticism about the likelihood of approval for the solar panels as proposed. Thornewill - Suggested a possible alternative placement for the solar panels on the upper part of the northern roof, proposing they be slanted at the same angle as the dormer below to maintain a cohesive appearance. Welch - Expressed concern that the application might be designed to intentionally receive a denial, aiming for an appeal, which could be seen as a waste of the Historic District Commission's (HDC) time. - Pointed out that HDC guidelines have not significantly changed in nearly 30 years, aside from improvements in technology efficiency. - Noted that their HDC is one of the most permissive in Massachusetts regarding solar installations, despite overseeing the nation's largest historic district and landmark. - Highlighted that there appears to be space for a ground array, questioning why the applicant's agent has not considered this as an alternative to mitigate the visual impact of rooftop installations. This is in line with a long-standing viewpoint that one of the key visual aspects of a Nantucket home is its roof. - Requested a cross-section of the structure to assess ceiling heights, suggesting it might be irresponsible to offset electricity for a large space without considering the impact on heating and cooling needs. Additionally, they asked for a comparison of kilowatt usage relative to the proposed solar installation size, implying the amount of solar might be excessive and suggesting the application's aim might be to provoke an appeal through its exorbitant scope.			
Motion	Motion to approve solar panel installation on the South dormer and North dormer only, specifying that each set of panels is to be installed on the corresponding dormer. Included the option for a ground array, contingent upon the provision of private screening at least as high as the highest point of the array, to mitigate visual impact. Stipulated that no further review of the ground arrays would be required once these conditions are met. (Made by: Coombs) (04:28:04)			
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

The remainder of the items were not discussed, and no action was taken.

6.	Richard & Deborah Hohlt	121 Madaket Rd	Pickle Ball Court	40/60.1	Botticelli + Pohl
7.	Balaji Gandhi	9 New Jersey Ave	Move House onsite	60.3.1/408	Shelter 7
8.	Drake Real Estate LLC	5 Davis Ln	Rev to previous 7911	82/72	Val Oliver
9.	Richard Gioiosa	4 Whitetail Circle	Replace doors	71/23	John Kuszpa
10.	Ceylon Elves LLC	3 Wyers Way	Renew coa 72818	41/380	Botticelli + Pohl
11.	Ceylon Elves LLC	3B Wyers Way	Renew coa 72941	41/380.1	Botticelli + Pohl
12.	Richard Arnold	12 Winn St	New Barn	56/203	Sandcastle Construction
13.	Richard & Gale Valero	7 Waydale Rd	Addition	55/84	Val Oliver
14.	CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Main House	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
15.	CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Secondary Dwelling	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
16.	CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Cabana	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
17.	CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Carport	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
18.	CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Shed	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
19.	CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Pool & Hardscape	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
20.	CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Spa	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
21.	Jesse Dutra	2 Sea Fox Circle	Pool & Hardscape	55/107.4	Waterscapes
22.	Scarlett O'Hara LLC	43 Nobadeer Farm Rd	Demo/Move	69/17	Jamie Reid
23.	Clifford Williams	11 Somerset Rd	Replace portico & add clapboard	56/96	Val Oliver
24.	15 CHR LLC	8 Chuck hollow Rd	Remove chimney	72/31	Val Oliver
25.	23 Sankaty Head Trust	23 Sankaty Head Rd	Alterations to Garage	48/4.1	BPC
26.	South Cambridge LLC	4 S Cambridge St	Fenestration	59.4/111	JB Studio
27.	The Westmoor Club	10 Westmoor Ln	Reduce Alterations rev 12-7526	41/809	Goldsmith Architects
28.	Jeff & Michele Krohn	14 Center St Sconset	Roof/outdoor shower	73.1.3/104	SMRD
29.	Steven Cohen Area 51 Trust	51 West Miacomet Rd	Demo mov off	81/52	WAPD
30.	Steven Cohen Area 51 Trust	51 West Miacomet Rd	New dwelling	81/52	WAPD
31.	Steven Cohen Area 51 Trust	51 West Miacomet RD	New shed	81/52	WAPD
32.	Conan & Brooke Laughlin	29 Baxter Rd	Pool & hardscape	49.2.3/9	Ahern LLC
33.	Vaziki Ashkan	9 Woodbury Ln	Hardscape	41/551	Atlantic Landscaping

V. OLD BUSINESS 01/30/2024

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	Matt & Alison Smith 11-9537	232 Madaket Rd	MH Fenestration/dormer/porch	59.4/9/120.1	Brook Meerbergen
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/05/2023</i>				
2.	Matt & Alison Smith 11-9536	232 Madaket Rd	New 2 nd dwelling	59.4/9/120.1	Brook Meerbergen
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/05/2023</i>				
3.	Matt & Alison Smith 11-9535	232 Madaket Rd	New shed	59.4/9/120.1	Brook Meerbergen
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/05/2023</i>				
4.	Matt & Alison Smith 11-9534	232 Madaket Rd	Driveway	59.4/9/120.1	Brook Meerbergen
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/05/2023</i>				
5.	Andrew & Stacey Roseau	148 Polpis Rd	Addition	27/19	JMS Architecture
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill; Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: none. Last heard 12/12/2023</i>				
6.	Robert Stock 08-9002	50 Squam Rd	As-built Fence	31/13	Cohen + Cohen
	• <i>Commissioners: Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused: none. Last heard 11/28/2023</i>				
7.	NT Conserv. Fndtion 11-9489	165 Cliff Rd	New dwelling	41/65	Val Oliver
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill; Alternates: Paul; Recused: Oliver. Last heard 12/05/2023</i>				
8.	Tigerlilly Nom Trust 01-7671	7 Barnabas Lane	Pool & hardscape	41/563	Ahern LLC
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: Pohl, Thornewill, Patten; Recused: None. Last heard 01/09/2024</i>				
9.	Ospray LLC 12-9577	25 Willard St	Hardscape & fence	29/33	Edgewater Landscape
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten; Alternates: Thornewill; Recused: None. Last heard 12/19/2023</i>				
10.	26 Quidnest LLC	26 Quidnet Path	New Dwelling	21/150	Emeritus LTD
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul; Alternates: Oliver, Thornewill, Patten; Recused: None. Last heard 01/16/2024</i>				
11.	1 N Swift Rock Tr.	1 N Swift Path	New dwelling	40/2	Emeritus LTD
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 01/16/2024</i>				
12.	Whitney Gifford Tr.	32 Pocomo Rd	Gate, driveway, & fence	14/77	Emeritus LTD
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: Patten, Thornewill; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023</i>				
13.	Kathryn Cook 12-9637	85 Low Beach Rd	Glass Connector rev 10-7257	75/31.3	Rich Gammons
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: Patten, Thornewill; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023</i>				

MINUTES

Motion:	Motion to approve the HDC Minutes of September 26, 2023, November 28, 2023, & December 5, 12, 19 2023. (Camp)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye) // Welch (Abstain)

POTENTIAL ITEMS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

- Discussion of Previously Approved Best Practices.
- Classification of street trees & vegetating mapping
- Discussion of Wind Turbines
- Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, Intro (update as needed)
- Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings
- Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new Historic dwellings
- Hardscaping
- Discussion of salvaging demos
- Discussion of options for house moves

OTHER BUSINESS

Next HDC Meeting- February 6th at 4pm ***HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:33 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PSL2OShdirM>