



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, March 12, 2024
4 Fairgrounds Road and Remote Participation via Zoom
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Stephen Welch (Vice-chair), Abby Camp, Diane Coombs, Vallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Connie Patten, Joe Paul, Carrie Thornewill

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Pohl called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Staff in Attendance:	Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist, Sara Johnson , Administrative Specialist, Holly Backus , Preservation Planner
Attending Members:	Welch, Oliver, Patten,
Remote Participants:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul
Absent Members:	-
Late Arrivals:	Thornewill arrived at 4:26 pm.
Early Departures:	-

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Coombs)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)

I. DISCUSSION & VOTE

Discussion:	Oliver - Requested placement of a discussion item regarding the zoning height change to 40 feet by right at the top of the next meeting's agenda. Coombs - Expressed confusion over receiving three different agendas for today's meeting, with discrepancies noted particularly in the consent items where two expected items were missing from the printed agenda. Welch - Confirmed that the most recent agenda includes item number four, highlighted in bold red type indicating it was "not anticipated by the chair within 48 hours," referring to 93 Sankaty Road.
-------------	--

II. CONSENT

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Luckity Trust LLC	Tuckernuck	Historic Determination	96/8	Val Oliver
2. Eleven Lincoln Ave Trust	32 Jefferson Ave	Revs 2023-10-9273	30/132	Botticelli & Pohl
3. Skyline Farm LLC	5 Skyline Dr	Solar Roof	79/137	AckSmart
4. High garden Holdings LLC	49 Hulbert Ave	Rev Fencing	29/14	Jardins Intl
5. Moran	5B Lily St	Rev 8295	42.3.4/89	Val Oliver
6. Leiss, Mark	5 Coffin Rd (TN)	New Shed	91/9.2	Greg Nichols
7. 111 Cliff Rd Trust	111 Cliff Rd	MH Fen Revs	41/10	Emeritus
8. 111 Cliff Rd Trust	111 Cliff Rd	Gargae Fen Revs	41/10	Emeritus
9. 3 Pleasant St Nom Tr	3 Pleasant St	Addition	42.3.3/155	Emeritus
10. Ontario Inc	5 Coffin St Sconset	Cottage alterations	73.1.4/21	Emeritus
11. NOTLIH LLC	55 Burnell St	Demo move garage	49.3.2/1.4	LFW
12. Joan Bunting	14 Macys Ln	Addition to studio	68/107	LFW
13. Pact LLC	41 Orange St	Shed expansion	42.3.2/224	LFW
14. NIR	27 Broad St	Window replacement like kind	42.4.2/78	Trevor Smith
15. Lee Saper Stein	20 New St	New door	55/337	LFW

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

16. Colby/Giles	2 Weatherly Pl	Deck	67/304.2	Val Oliver
17. Tack3 LLC	26 Washington St	Fenestration changes	42.3.2/23	Chip Webster
18. First Sun LLC J Raith	2 Gold Star Dr	Pergola Fen changes	55/190	Permits Plus
19. Seven Square Rigger LLC	7 Square Rigger Rd	New Dwelling	69/46	Val Oliver
20. Michal Bloxam	37 N Pasture Ln	Pool house	44/81	LFW
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Pohl, Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:				
Public Comments:				
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver Requested to pull #9 – 3 Pleasant Street and move to the regular agenda for further discussion.			
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent, with the exception of Item #9. 3 Pleasant Street. (Made By: Coombs) (00:07:04)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)			

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of Work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Madakiss Realty Trust	7 Sandsbury Rd	Garage guest house	75/52	Val Oliver
Proposed is a revision to the previous approval showing the changes to the design and indicating the previous COA.				
2. Conti	17 Miller Ln	Shed	68/125	Self
Doors changes from horizontal shiplap to vertical barn board				
3. DeRuyter	12 Academy Ln	MH Roof	42.4.3/87	Thornewill
Historic info to be provided on COA form (c.1840 George Furber House) individually significant Greek Revival				
4. DeRuyter	12 Academy Ln	Shed Roof	42.4.3/87	Thornewill
Change to architectural Charcoal Black to match main house				
5. Bo Wilson	30 Ridge Lane	Pool hardscape	38/114	KMLD
Pool not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter; no grade change from existing at time of application.				
6. Meyers, Andrea	99 Cliff Rd	Cedar Fence	30/627	Natalie, Cowger
Alternating sections to be planted with vining plant material to be maintained from time of installation through inspection and thereafter.				
7. Egan Jones Allen & Ann M Trust	15 Pine Crest	New Dwelling	68/435	Kris Megna
Dormers to 4/12 with no change to height of the rafter heel/top plate intersection.				
8. Cisco Sanctuary	5 Bartlett Farm Rd	New doors	65/14	Gryphon Arch
Subject to more photos of overall site being submitted for the file.				
9. Sean Dew	18 Wood Hollow	Pool/hardscape	72/9	Linda Williams
Pool not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter; no grade change from existing at time of application.				
10. Michal Bloxam	37 N Pasture Ln	Hardscape pool	44/81	Linda Williams
Pool not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter; no grade change from existing at time of application.				
11. Fifty-Nine Pochick Ave LLC	59 Pochick Ave	Hardscape pool	79/125	Linda Williams
Pool not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter; no grade change from existing at time of application.				
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Welch) (00:00:00)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

IV. NEW BUSINESS 02/20/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Hummock Pond Holdings LLC	287 Hummock Pond Rd.	Emergency Demo	83/89	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern, Emeritus LTD			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Camp) (00:09:54)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Nyland, Jonathan	93 Sankaty Road	As Built Remove Chimney	49/182	Topham
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner Described the building at issue as a non-contributing structure from the 1980s with a fake chimney and voiced concern about removing the chimney, emphasizing it as a character-defining feature despite its age.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Oliver) (00:12:05)			
Vote:	Carried 3-2 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver (Aye) // Camp, Coombs (Nay)			

V. NEW BUSINESS 02/06/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Ack N Back	33 Quidnet Road	Pickleball Court	21/27.2	Ahern LLC
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern LLC / Sarah F. Alger, PC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner			
Public Comments:	Theresa Eger-Anderson - Expressed appreciation for living in Quidnet for 63 years and highlighted the community's emphasis on neighborly gatherings and respect for outdoor resources. - Voiced opposition to the proposed pickleball court at 33 Quidnet, noting its lack of historical significance and potential disruption to the quiet and rural character of the area. - Expressed gratitude that the court's location was moved further from their year-round home and requested no lights to minimize light pollution if the court is approved.			
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Clarified a misunderstanding regarding the height of a fence, noting that it consists of a seven-foot fence atop a three-foot wall set into the ground, totaling ten feet. Pointed out the need to revise the application form to accurately reflect this configuration as it was not clearly stated. Oliver - Approved the current application location, noting its integration within green, vegetative surroundings and expressing satisfaction with the proposal, especially given the absence of lights. Coombs - Expressed agreement with the relocation of the project and the absence of lights, noting that the new position minimizes noise for neighbors. - Highlighted the surrounding plantings shown in the plan, which should render the installation virtually invisible and help reduce noise, ultimately approving the project. Welch - Suggested that pickleball courts are becoming a prominent community feature similar to pools and proposed that an article should be written to unify community opinions on the matter. - Stated that considerations for approving such projects should focus on lighting, recommending that any approval be conditional on either no lighting or lighting that adheres to the Dark Skies Initiative to minimize light pollution. Camp - Expressed approval for the current project adjustments, including the repositioning of the installation closer to the house and adjacent to conservation areas with no lighting. - Noted that although it is too late to bring forward an article this year, there are plans in the works for future discussions. - Stated an intention to abstain from voting on the current matter to avoid conflicts due to involvement in related activities.
Motion:	Motion to approve the pickleball court, through staff, without lighting and to revise the application to state that it consists of a seven-foot fence atop a three-foot wall set into the ground, totaling ten feet. (Made by: Welch) (00:23:18)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver (Aye) // Camp (Abstain)

VI. OLD BUSINESS 02/13/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
61 Fairgrounds LLC	63 Fairgrounds, Lot D	Pool Hardscape	67/173.2	Linda Williams
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams Noted that although this item was listed on the agenda as 61 Fairgrounds, it now has its own address, which is 63 Fairgrounds.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs Indicated that the pool appears approvable due to its surrounding planting and isolated location, being the only house in that area. Oliver			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Stated support for the project with the caveat that there are no concerns about visibility at the time of inspection and thereafter. Emphasized that there should be no changes to the pre-existing grade. Patten - Concurred with Val. Thornewill - Expressed a preference for the installation to be positioned closer to the house rather than appearing isolated in the middle of the yard but concluded that the current location is acceptable.
Motion:	Motion to approve, through staff, on the condition that the pool must not be visible at the time of inspection or thereafter, and there must be no change to the grade from what previously existed. (Made by: Coombs) (00:32:09)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds, Lot C	Pool Hardscape	67/173.1	Linda Williams
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Stated support for the project with the caveat that there are no concerns about visibility at the time of inspection and thereafter. Emphasized that there should be no changes to the pre-existing grade. Welch - Requested that the original landscape plans be transposed to the current application. Coombs - Expressed concerns that the pool is too close to the cottage, suggesting it should be moved back towards the main house for better integration into the property layout, highlighting potential visibility issues during snowy days. Patten - Would approve with the conditions mentioned by Oliver and Welch. Thornewill - Was accepting of the placement of the pool due to it not being visible. Welch - Agreed with previous comments about the pool's proximity, noting it is too close to both the deck and the steps. Pointed out that resolving these issues will be necessary for compliance with building codes.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, through staff, contingent on adherence to the previously approved landscape plan. Added stipulations that the pool must not be visible at the time of inspection or thereafter, and there should be no grade changes from conditions existing prior to the submission of the application. (Made by: Welch) (00:37:12)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
----------------	----------------	---------------	------------	-------

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

Richard & Deborah Hohlt	121 Madaket Road	Pickleball Court	40/60.1	Botticelli
-------------------------	------------------	------------------	---------	------------

121 Madaket Road was withdrawn, per the applicant.

VII. OLD BUSINESS – VIEW 02/13/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Carmine & Sheila Giardini	7A Clifford Street	New Dwelling 12-9634	79/19	Reid Yenor

Hold for representation.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS 02/20/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Meehan, James	50 N. Liberty	Rooftop Solar	41/255	Cotuit Solar, Karen A
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that the application lacks historical details about the structure, which is a circa 1920 Craftsman and a contributing structure according to the HDC survey on file. - Stressed the importance of evaluating solar panel installations within the historic district, especially on historic structures. - Pointed out the discrepancies in the roof color between the application's description (gray) and the photos (black). - Also highlighted that guidelines recommend placing solar panels only on secondary masses and appreciated that the panels are not on the facade, acknowledging that the proposal is better than others seen on similar historic structures.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Stated no concerns subject to growing up some privet. Pohl - Stated that color of the roof is a dark grey. Camp - Referenced a written comment from HSAB stating "50 North Liberty, no concerns," but noted potential visibility issues with the south-facing panels. - Expressed support for the idea of enhancing the hedge to mitigate visibility concerns and stated no additional concerns. Coombs and Oliver - Concurred with prior comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, allowing the applicant to increase the height of their privet hedge to a minimum of 12 feet, to ensure sufficient screening. (Made by: Coombs) (00:45:12)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Kaiser, Nathan	5 Dovekie Court	Rooftop Solar	68/561	Cotuit Solar, Karen A
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Suggested conducting a site visit ("view"), emphasizing the need for firsthand evaluation. - Voiced concern about the HDC assuming responsibility for waiving engineering liabilities or certifying that structures can withstand hurricane-force winds, deeming it inappropriate for the commission's role. - Criticized applicants' selective adherence to guidelines, noting it's not suitable for them to decide which guidelines to follow. Specifically addressed the issue of solar panels being non-coplanar and their visibility, arguing that the HDC should decide their appropriateness, particularly when placed on primary structures, which contravenes established guidelines. Coombs - Stressed that if exceptions are made based on individual opinions, it would compromise the consistency of application approvals. Oliver - Decided to reserve further comments until after a site visit ("the view") is conducted. Suggested that the southern-facing panels should be relocated to the north side to still generate power but improve compliance with HDC guidelines. Emphasized adherence to the primary rule of not placing installations facing the road or on the front of a house, confirming the importance of maintaining consistency in HDC decisions. Camp - Spoke in support of a view.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for a view. (Made by: Welch) (00:51:55)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Charles Platt, Maureen	6 Saratoga	Change Windows	41/180	Thornewill
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Carrie Thornewill			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Reported that the HDC survey identifies the building as a 1920s contributing structure originally a barn converted into a dwelling in the 1940s, with renovations approximately ten years ago. - Noted that the dwelling is on the edge of the Old Historic District (OHD) boundary, though still within the broader district.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Expressed that Anderson 400 series windows are not suitable due to the pane configurations for such a historic property. - Recommended conducting a window survey for all applications involving window replacements to ensure consistency with HDC standards.
Public Comments:	Backus read the following statement provided by the Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG): Noted from the survey that the building, originally a barn, was converted into a dwelling around 1940. Emphasized the importance of maintaining the original 12 over 12 window pattern. Suggested that while new light simulating (NLS) windows could be considered, a more traditional wood sash would be preferable to preserve the historical integrity of the structure.
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Recounted participation in the discussion about this property approximately ten years ago, noting that the decision to retain the 12 over 12 window pattern was to ensure the structure harmonized with its location on Saratoga Street and maintained its barn-like appearance. - Spoke in support for keeping the 12 over 12 windows. - Discussed the use of simulated divided lights (SDLs) and true divided lights (TDLs), expressing that SDLs could be acceptable if they visually resemble TDLs. - Highlighted that the building currently has TDLs with storm windows and expressed a personal preference for maintaining the existing window style to fit in with the neighborhood, despite the property not being within the Old Historic District's core. Camp - Expressed openness to the idea of transitioning the building's windows from 12 over 12 to 2 over 2 patterns, believing it could fit the building's style. - Voiced concerns about the quality of Anderson windows, particularly their insulation properties, indicating hesitation to approve them without assurance of their performance. - Mentioned becoming more favorable towards other high-quality insulated window options based on previous submissions and experiences. Oliver - Noted the building's location on a less frequented cut-through street outside the Old Historic District (OHD). - Expressed the view that the HDC should not strictly dictate window choices for property owners. - Stated that the primary concern would be the side of the building facing the road and the driveway. - Supported the idea of allowing changes to the windows, including a switch to the 2 over 2 style, due to the building's secluded positioning on the lot. Welch - Supported Val's perspective, with a suggestion for the applicant to enhance the architectural detailing to compensate for window changes. - Recommended adding more character through trim details, specifically a plank frame detail, on parts of the building visible from Saratoga Street and the driveway area. - Highlighted that this adjustment would add depth to the building's character without altering the internal layout, such as mixing different window styles in different rooms. Pohl - Responded to Abby's concerns by confirming the high quality and weather-tightness of Anderson windows, clarifying that the previous reservations were specifically about the flange characteristic, which is typically unsuitable for traditional detailing required in the

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	Old Historic District (OHD). Since the property is outside the OHD, these features are considered acceptable. • Addressed the suggestion about incorporating plank frame detailing, noting uncertainty about its compatibility with the Anderson 400 series windows. • Mentioned that the only visibly impactful windows are a triple gang unit facing the driveway to the south. • Concluded by expressing approval of the application as presented.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (01:02:41)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver (Aye) // Coombs (Nay)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Island Cricket LLC	169 Polpis Road	New 2 nd Dwelling	44/18	Normand Residential
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ben Normand, Normand Residential			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver • Praised the project as a wonderful replacement for the old barn but expressed concerns about the scale of the cupola, noting that while it is not inappropriate in design, it appears too small for the structure. Welch • Recommended enlarging the entire cupola by approximately 30% to achieve a better visual balance. Camp • Described the house as iconic, particularly when viewed from Polpis Road, and expressed a desire to preserve its distinct silhouette. • Suggested toning down the elevation visible from Polpis, which is presumably the north side, to maintain the structure's pure form. • Agreed with earlier comments about enlarging the cupola, specifying an increase by a foot on each side for better proportionality. • Concluded with a wish to see the design simplified, though remained unsure of the specific changes needed to achieve this while preserving the building's essential character. Normand • Discussed the placement of the proposed barn, noting it will be situated behind a large, significant tree and a swath of vegetation. • Emphasized the importance and beauty of the tree, describing it as a "family heirloom". Coombs • Suggested making the cupola wider to better balance its proportions with the rest of the building, noting that it appears too thin and should be almost as wide as the windows on that level. • Despite initial concerns, recognized the architectural appeal of the second-floor deck, accepting its less than 8 ft depth and the necessity of its current support structure. Overall, appreciated the clean and cool aesthetic of the building. Pohl			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	Summarized the main feedback from the discussion, focusing on the size of the cupola. Personally, felt no strong need to insist on enlarging the cupola due to its limited visibility, but acknowledged that increasing its size could enhance the building's aesthetic.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted, subject to the retention of the “family heirloom” tree. (Made by: Welch) (01:12:25)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Maxwell House LLC	15 Cliff Road	Window Changes	42.4.4/56	MCA
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Doug Mills, Mark Cutone Architecture +			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Emphasized the necessity of including the date of construction on the Certificate of Appropriateness, given the revision to a previous approval. - Mentioned the structure is a circa 1900 Colonial Revival with changes documented over the years, as per an HDC survey on file. - Advocated for retaining the separate single un-ganged windows on the southeast elevation, recalling prior discussions about maintaining this feature. - Expressed concerns that modifications to the flanking windows at the front door disrupt the architectural symmetry.			
Public Comments:	Backus - Read the following comments submitted via email from the HSAG: - Regarding the southeast elevation, noted as the most visible, seen through the driveway from Cliff Road. - Highlighted concerns about the current proposal featuring a triple mullion, which adds excessive glazing for a wall that merely encloses a hallway. - Criticized the removal of a window beside the front door, which disrupts the building's symmetry. - Suggested that the previous window configuration was more suitable and that any alterations compromising this balance should be reconsidered, while less visible changes on other elevations were deemed acceptable.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Concurred with previously expressed concerns, agreeing that the triple mullion window is unnecessary and disrupts the aesthetic. - Emphasized the importance of maintaining the window next to the door to preserve symmetry. - Suggested that even if internal adjustments are necessary, the external appearance should retain the window for visual balance. Coombs - Affirmed agreement with the discussed concerns regarding the window configurations. Camp - Expressed concerns about the repetitive nature of the current window design near the front door, suggesting a change to distinguish the area more clearly.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Recommended using two small six-light windows on either side of the door to enhance distinctiveness and prevent the front facade from appearing overly uniform with other windows. Welch - Acknowledged the concerns regarding window visibility, noting that while the elevation in question is perpendicular to the street, it is visible obliquely through the driveway. - Mentioned the structure's significant length, over 100 feet, and that the area around the door where windows are being discussed is slightly recessed. - Suggested that although the architectural design comments are valid, the visibility concerns might not be as significant due to the orientation and positioning relative to typical viewpoints. Pohl - Identified two primary concerns regarding the window arrangement near the entry, expressing support for the idea of varying the window sizes to break the uniformity. - Suggested implementing smaller windows on both sides of the door. Mills - Offered a design adjustment for the windows by proposing to use only the top sash of an "A" window on both sides of the entry door.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) that would include modifications to the windows on either side of the front door on the Southeast elevation and the removal of the triple mold window on the Southeast elevation, returning to the original window configuration as previously approved. (Made by: Camp) (01:21:07)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Nantucket Island Resorts	19 N Water Street, Lot 9	New Dwelling	42.4.2/3	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Described the infill within the OHD, in the former area of the Harbor House Cottages that flanked this road. - Noted that the dwelling under review is the third and could be simpler and shorter in length. - Stated that the facade mimics the bungalows on Harbor View Way and should be simpler. - Mentioned that the second-floor balconies cantilever over the first, which is an atypical feature and may not be appropriate in the OHD, suggesting a simple Juliet balcony instead. - Recommended that all windows visible from a public way in the OHD should be true divided light (TDL). - Commented that the roofwalk seems excessive for this dwelling and questioned its compatibility with the bungalow style.			
Public Comments:	Backus read the following statements submitted by the Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG): Compared the house to 2 Harbor View Way, noting those have more width and that the front elevation has a lot going on in a very narrow facade.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	• Questioned if a single front mass would work better than two, to spread everything out more. • Observed that the third-floor front dormer is very large relative to the dormer roof it sits on, suggesting it should be reduced in size or eliminated entirely as it doesn't serve any functional purpose. • Mentioned that the front balcony is too wide and should be narrower, aligning with the dormer itself. • Pointed out that the east elevation's main gable is awkwardly asymmetrical and should be symmetrical. • Noted that the west elevation's additive mass has a much higher plate at the front, which doesn't relate to the main mass, suggesting the ridge should be dropped down considerably, and the plate height should mimic the main mass. • Recommended that the front door could be more formal in design with more detailed trim. • Commented that the front roof walk is too wide and feels very heavy and cumbersome, despite being a nicely scaled decorative element. • Stated that this is not really a two-story building, which is a requirement for having a roof walk per building code in Nantucket. • Noted that the Juliet balcony on the west will be visible from the shared driveway in the back and that unsupported cantilevers are not appropriate, suggesting a small porch roof would solve that issue and provide fencing for the AC units.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver • Agreed with the comment about the width of the front facade, noting that there seems to be a lot going on in a little space with only an 18-inch rebate. • Suggested that it could be successfully redesigned with one roof line to see how that goes. • Mentioned that the gable form on top of the dormer is a bit unusual. • Agreed about the roof walk, stating it as the primary concern. Coombs • Agreed with the statement that a story-and-a-half building does not call for a roof walk. • Clarified that the roof walk shouldn't be there as it doesn't fit the architecture of the building at all. • Affirmed that the other windows and decks should be true divided light (TDL), as mentioned by HSAG. • Requested to see the dormer under the roof walk without it to assess its appearance. • Noted that there are too many elements for a bungalow, which is what the building is supposed to be, and suggested making the design much simpler. Camp • Observed that the way it's rendered, it looks painted, and was surprised that it was all white. • Suggested it should be different from the ones next door, possibly a Nantucket gray with white trim. • Mentioned being in the process of digesting the design and, overall, did not have any further comments. • Concluded being good with the current design. Welch • Considered the roof walk more appropriate for number 10 or number 11. • Stated that the second-floor deck on the front facade is not appropriate. • Suggested that a bay form underneath the gable might make it work.

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Found the gable on top of the dormer atypical but noted there might be something about it that works. - Proposed that modifications to the second-floor presentation could make the design more effective. Pohl - Observed the streetscape showing houses 11, 10, 9, 8, and 7, noting that this one is the most complicated and has the least reference to a typical Nantucket-style house. - Countered Stephen's comment, stating that laying a gable on top of a shed dormer seems overly complex and overdone, despite it possibly being done before. - Criticized the minute ridge break, approximately 8 inches from one ridge to another, suggesting it would be simpler to make it one roof plane. - Concurred with Holly's and HSAG's comments.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (01:45:15)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Nantucket Island Resorts	19 N Water Street, Lot 10	New Dwelling	42.4.2/3	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged that this infill within the OHD is elevated to meet FEMA AE8 requirements, following the Resilient Nantucket Design Guidelines, and will include vents. Confirmed that the elevation certificate is on file. - Appreciated the dwelling and the provided color scheme. - Expressed concern about the asymmetrical second-floor gable on the south, suggesting it may be more appropriate as a matching shed dormer rather than a matching cross gable. - Noted that the pitch of the gable on the west seems too shallow. - Recommended removing the brackets on the porch, as they seem too country for the OHD, despite some historic structures from the 1850s having such features. - Agreed that the structure could also accommodate a roof walk, aligning with Stephen's point.			
Public Comments:	Backus read the following statements submitted by the Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG): - Complimented the design but noted that the proportions could be adjusted slightly. - Observed that the main mass feels very tall and skinny, suggesting widening it slightly and lowering the second floor by 8 to 10 inches to reduce the overall height. - Mentioned that the 14/12 roof pitch may be too steep. - Criticized the angled porch brackets as not working well. - Described the 7/12 side roof porch as very awkward. - Suggested changing the east side to simple flush dormers, but stated the west side will need a more creative approach. - Acknowledged the buildings are very close together but stated this will still be very visible. - Recommended adding a chimney in the main mass and moving the proposed chimney on the rear wing inside.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	• Advised that AC units should be screened. • Suggested that the front door trim detailing could be more intricate.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver • Agreed that most points have been covered. • Identified the biggest concern as the very steep 14/12 roof pitch, which is uncommon in the area. • Noted that the opposite side has a 7/12 pitch, making it half as steep, and suggested more continuity in roof pitches would be beneficial. • Concluded that, overall, it's a nice-looking house that just needs some tweaks. Coombs • Agreed with Holly's suggestion to remove the brackets from the front porch. • Noted that the roof pitch is steeper than expected and suggested reducing it from 14/12. • Mentioned that the little dormer on the right fits in well with the overall design. • Reviewed the front door on the north elevation, noting it is clean and not fussy, which is appreciated. • Recommended adding a chimney, as it is not currently visible on the elevations reviewed and suggested placing it either over the little dormer or in the middle to improve the design. Camp • Observed that the design has a Victorian feel and suggested replacing the stick brackets on the front porch with more intricate Victorian-style eave details. • Commented that the current brackets are too country or western and don't align with the Victorian aesthetic. • Agreed with Diane's suggestion about the chimney and proposed adding a Victorian-style chimney to enhance the design. • Mentioned the opportunity to create a more interesting front door that aligns with the Victorian theme. • Criticized the current color scheme for not reading as Victorian and suggested using black sash windows with a white exterior for a more dramatic, Victorian-inspired look, somewhat akin to the Addams Family style. Welch • Suggested changing the roof pitch from 14/12 to 12/12. • Recommended lowering the top plate on the secondary gable on the second floor of the north elevation to maintain proportions once the pitch is adjusted. • Noted that the roof pitch on the covered porch is too steep, referencing an example on Old South Road where this went wrong. • Emphasized that the inappropriate pitch on a small covered porch is noticeable in real life. • Agreed that the current porch brackets are worn out and suggested using something more appropriate. • Advocated for the inclusion of chimneys, stating that they are a vital element of historic structures, and suggested using faux chimneys if necessary. • Pointed out that the incongruent roof pitches on the south elevation stand out, particularly the first-floor gable and the second-story gable, as well as the covered porch. • Stated that a solution is needed for the roof pitch issues and expressed confidence in the designer's ability to address them without providing specific suggestions.

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Agreed with Abby that the front door could be enhanced with a character element, such as a bracelet window door. Pohl - Noted that the design is moving from Victorian towards Carpenter Gothic, which isn't necessarily in keeping with Nantucket's style. - Expressed a preference for lowering the roof pitch to 12/12, in agreement with others. - Highlighted the disparity between the steeply pitched front roof and the side gables, which are at 7/12, causing a significant visual disparity. - Mentioned that the side gables, particularly the east-west ridge gable, will feel flat when viewed from the road, despite not appearing as problematic in the elevations. - Suggested that roof pitches should be more consistent overall. - Agreed with Stephen's opinion about the steep roof pitch on the porch, especially on the west elevation where it combines with the very shallow gable roof above it. MacEachern - Noted that in the renderings, the side pitches appear steeper than they do in the flat elevations. - Agreed that the two-dimensional projected elevations don't convey the same perspective as the renderings. - Pointed out that the cross gables will likely look less steep in reality, even though the elevations show them as half the steepness of the main roof pitch (14/7). - Acknowledged that if the main roof pitch is dropped, the side north-south gables will appear less shallow. - Mentioned that as you move deeper into the property, the proximity of the dwellings will make the differences in pitch less perceptible.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (02:00:00)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Suni & William Harford	60 Wanoma Way	Addition/Reno/Attach Garage	92/3	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Patten, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Camp, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Expressed concerns about the connector piece between the garage and the house, particularly the use of glass on both sides. - Noted the extraordinary amount of porch on the rear of the structure, indicating that it's excessive. Coombs - Clarified that the front of the structure faces north, possibly backing up to the water. - Identified the garage as the building on the left, confirming the building on the right side is not the garage. - Suggested that the section with the double windows (first and second floor) on the right side should be separated to match the divided appearance of the rest of the building.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Noted that the connection between the house and the garage consists entirely of windows and questioned their necessity, suggesting reducing to two windows instead of three, with one being a slider or opener and the other not. - Expressed a preference for adding a chimney to the structure, possibly on the right-hand side or in the main part of the building, to provide a visual element on the roof besides the roof walk. Patten - Noted that the roof walk looks a little awkward. - Expressed uncertainty about the connector to the garage, questioning its effectiveness and aesthetic fit. Welch - Agreed with previous comments, including Connie's about the roof walk. - Suggested relocating the connector to the garage to the rear, possibly between the bedrooms instead of in front of them, allowing for windows in the bedroom. - Stated that there needs to be a break in the facade presentation as it is much too long. - Expressed concern about the overall depth of the covered porch on the rear, especially if it is a visible element. - Also concerned about the second-floor decks that arise in relation to the rear porch. Pohl - Highlighted the wide deck and the ganged windows on the side of the west elevation, noting they seem off on their own. - Questioned the placement of the roof walk, finding it dubious. - Pointed out the little shed dormer squeezed between the two masses on the west elevation, observing that it seems shoehorned in.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revision. Requested that the revisions include a transcript of this meeting for review. (Made by: Coombs) (02:12:42)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Red Horse LLC	65 Quidnet Road	New Garage	21/115	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Camp, Coombs			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that this is a vacant lot within the historic section of Quidnet. - Mentioned that although the new garage is associated with the reconstructed circa 1900 Rickson house at 88 Quidnet, it is located on its own lot and could be treated separately. - Stated that the fenestration does not have to match the house. - Observed that the proposed garage seems too large. - Recommended reducing the size and scale of the garage.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Acknowledged Holly's point about the garage being on a separate lot but noted that the community might perceive it as related to the reconstructed house when driving by. - Suggested that it would make sense for the fenestration to match in color and size to maintain visual continuity.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Expressed liking the scale of the garage. - Approved of the gable facing the street on Quidnet and the broken back facing the other road, as it effectively turns the corner. Thornewill - Expressed concern about the color, noting that since the garage is by itself on this small site, it could appear stark. - Suggested that the color scheme does not have to match the reconstructed house. - Recommended using a quieter color or natural weathering, which would be more appropriate and in keeping with the appearance of standalone outbuildings that are seemingly unrelated to other buildings. Patten and Oliver - Stated having no concerns with the proposed design.
Motion:	Motion to approve with the condition that all the trim be changed to gray, consistent with the typical HDC palette. (Made by: Oliver) (02:19:02)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Crib LLC	12 Nobska Cottage D	New Dwelling	67/103	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Camp, Coombs, Pohl			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Questioned why the head height of the two first-floor windows is about a foot and a half above the door, noting it feels misaligned with the other windows on the south elevation. - Acknowledged that while it's not a major concern since it's not visible, it does seem peculiar when looking at that elevation. MacEachern - Noted that the discrepancy is likely a drafting error. - Clarified that the window headers are supposed to align with the front door, as they do on the other elevations.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) subject to the following conditions: Lower the south elevation windows to match the door header. Change the first-floor windows on the south elevation to match type A windows, consistent with the other elevations. Included an additional condition to add trim around the door on the north elevation. (Made by: Oliver) (02:23:00)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

The following two items were discussed, and action taken for both concurrently.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Harold Bros Realty LLC	6 Highland Avenue	Color Change	30/288	Emeritus LTD
Harold Bros Realty LLC	2 & 4 Highland Avenue	2 nd Dwelling Color Change	30/287-289	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Camp, Coombs, Pohl			
Recused:				
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that white is more appropriate than black for this area, as black is not historically accurate. - Mentioned that one of the applications for 2 and 4 Highland includes revisions to the site, not just a color change.			
Public Comments:	Backus read the following statements submitted by the Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG): - Stated that black sash and doors are not historically appropriate for this neighborhood, as there are no other houses in the area with black sash. - Noted that even gray shutters would look out of place in this neighborhood.			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Suggested that a streetscape with color would be super helpful for context. - Expressed no concern with the black sash, liking the idea of contrast and believing it will tone down the busyness of the fenestration. - Noted that there was a lot of discussion regarding fenestration and busyness in previous applications. - Concluded that the black sash will probably mitigate many of the previously discussed concerns, and therefore has no concerns with the current proposal. Thornewill - Expressed an opposite viewpoint, considering black to be inappropriate, especially with white trim. - Felt that the contrast is too stark for the area. - Emphasized that this area of the cliff is iconic and suggested using a more monotone or less contrasting color scheme. Patten and Oliver - Concurred with Carrie's comments. Welch - Suggested that providing a colorized streetscape would be helpful, given the relevance of these three properties. - Believed that a splash of color can be effective and is a traditional approach in the area. - Requested a colorized streetscape for presentation. - Encouraged thoughtful consideration of colors, emphasizing that differentiation between the properties could be important. - Advised taking into account the differentiation of the properties, especially since at least two of them appear to be on separate lots, when considering colorization.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for additional information and revisions, subject to deadline being heard at the next HDC meeting. (Made by: Oliver) (02:30:27)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
450 Green Park LLC	2 Stone Alley	Railings	42.3.1/102	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Camp, Coombs, Pohl			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that 2 Stone Alley is an individually significant structure converted from a barn to a dwelling between the 1850s and 1870s. - Mentioned that the addition of railings is characteristic of the sunroom, which was expanded into a deck. - Expressed the belief that the proposal is not historically appropriate or consistent with the building's original intent. - Disagreed with the proposal, stating that if the railings are decorative in nature and not intended for actual use, they should not need to meet the full height of a standard railing. - Highlighted that the perception of the deck as a usable space is highly inappropriate for this historic structure.			
Public Comments:	Backus read the following statements submitted by the Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG): - Noted that expanding the sunroom to the current approved size was already a stretch. - Stated that adding the railing creates a very large second-floor deck, well over 8 feet deep. - Mentioned that this does not meet the current criteria in building with Nantucket in Mind. - Asserted that the previous state looked fine and that the current proposal is historically very inappropriate.			
Commissioner Comments:	MacEachern - Confirmed that the railing was sized to a height that allows for usability, aligning with the existing approved deck off the bedroom. - Explained that the decision was also influenced by the surface material of the flat roof; options considered included rubber (less attractive) and metal (copper). - Stated that the visibility of the flat roof element led to considering this particular deck. - Designed the railing to a usable height, acknowledging uncertainty about the frequency of its use but ensuring it is functional if needed. Oliver - Stated intention to visit the site for a better understanding. - Noted the absence of dimensions, which makes it difficult to assess the size. - Expressed concern about the size of the second-floor deck, indicating it is significant. - Opposed the railing as it currently is, due to its height and the way it overwhelms the small rear piece of the structure. - Clarified that the concern is both with the height of the railing and its impact on the appearance of the rear piece. - Planned to review original details from home records to compare. Patten - Agreed with Val, expressing opposition to the current deck and railing. - Described the deck and railing as seeming kind of massive.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	Paul - Suggested conducting a site visit to gain a better perspective. - Noted that, despite listening to many reviews, personally viewing the framed structure would be worthwhile. Thornewill - Agreed that the deck and railing seem very overwhelming. - Concurred that seeing it in person would be helpful for making a more informed decision. Welch - Agreed to conduct a site visit to better understand the proposal. - Suggested that a more understated approach may be more suitable. - Stated that the final decision will depend on the historical reference and context.
Motion:	Motion to hold for additional information and a view. (Made by: Oliver) (02:38:40)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

IX. OLD BUSINESS 03/05/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Mariela Oviedo	12 Wapposett	Solar	67/572	Incite LLC
Hold for representation.				
Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
James Rodgers	9 Orange	Parking Space Revision	42.3.1/150	NAG
Voting:	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Stephen Theroux, NAG (Nantucket Architecture Group, Ltd.)			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that the proposed driveway is for the historic structure at 9 Orange Street, a contributing Peleg Coggeshall House circa 1774. - Appreciated the changes, including reducing the length of the space and adding a gate at the location of the existing fence. - Observed that the two gates together seem at odds and suggested this needs to be re-evaluated. - Asked about the material of the track and confirmed from the color rendering that it is cobble. - Thanked the applicant for keeping the existing granite curb and recommended that it remain in place, brought flush with the asphalt in situ, as it would be appropriate and has been seen in other historic districts. - Clarified that the existing granite curb should act as the apron, maintaining the historic sidewalk on site. - Appreciated the helpful color plans and provided comments accordingly. - Noted confusion regarding whether the brick walkway is being changed, as there was a discrepancy between the color rendering and the site plan. - Confirmed that the pathway leading to the front door will be shifted over about two feet, and the existing bricks will be reused to recreate the pathway. - Highlighted the historic granite curbing from the 1800s that separates the sidewalk and the public way from the asphalt, which was once cobblestone.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Noted that the granite curbing will need to be modified to provide access for vehicles to drive over it. - Recommended that the granite curb and brick should be brought flush with the asphalt, maintaining their position in situ. - Mentioned that current plans do not show how this tapering will be executed. - Suggested adding corner roundings to the existing granite curb instead of removing it, to preserve its historic placement. - Noted that once the applicant receives the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA), they will need to go to the Department of Public Works (DPW) for an encroachment permit. - Mentioned that they will need to work with DPW to meet criteria regarding pitch and other specifications. - Explained that typically, any material removed during the process goes back to DPW. - Emphasized the importance of retaining the historic material in situ for the benefit of the historic district, rather than having it stored at DPW.
Public Comments:	Backus read the following statements submitted by the Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG): Noted that the comments were similar to those from the last submission, with no new points raised.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Stated having no concerns. Coombs - Agreed that using as much of the historic curbing, brick, and other materials as possible is important, as these often end up stored at DPW without further use. - Recognized the historic value of the little house and expressed satisfaction with the driveway solution. - Approved of the approach to retain and reuse historic materials in the project. Thornewill - Acknowledged that the applicants have complied with previous requests. - Clarified that Diane's comment about backtracking cars referred to reducing the number of cars to one, as having two seemed excessive for the small historic house. - Explained that the intent was to pull the cars away from the house, and this was achieved by limiting the space to accommodate only one car. Patten - Agreed with the previous comments, particularly the importance of retaining the historic material. Pohl - Suggested negotiating with DPW to drop the existing curbing down so that it is flush with the asphalt. - Proposed altering the brick pitch to use it as the apron, considering it a great idea. - Acknowledged that having three gates in a row might be a little awkward. - Predicted that the pedestrian gate will likely remain closed most of the time, except when in use. - Anticipated that the car gates will be open most of the time, and when all gates are closed, they will look like a continuous fence. - Stated having no concern about the gate arrangement.
Motion:	Motion to approve with the conditions that the materials be kept in situ and the application needs to be modified to reflect that there will be only one parking space instead of two. (Made by: Oliver) (02:50:11)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
FP4 N Water	4 N Water Street	New Dwelling	42.4.2/90	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged that this infill will be associated with the Obed Joy House, a circa 1846 Carpenter Gothic structure by Edward Easton. - Appreciated the changes made, including relocating the secondary door on the facade, changing the gable and roof pitch, dormer pitches, and the clapboard color to gray, considering these successful modifications. - Noted previous comments from Commissioners suggesting the removal of the central entry, and while understanding reasons not to remove it, suggested exploring making it offset for historical consistency with other Greek Revival gable-ended structures in town. - Mentioned the central hip roof over the doorway, recommending further study to make it more consistent with similar structures on Center Street. - Questioned the overall height, which is 29'11" to the ridge, and confirmed that the elevation is not due to FEMA requirements, as the FEMA line is in the middle of the road. The elevation is for aesthetic purposes to be consistent with the historic structure and neighboring buildings.			
Public Comments:	Backus read the following statements submitted by the Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG): - Noted that the covered entry is uncharacteristic of North Water Street and should be eliminated. - Stated that the center entry is very unusual for almost anywhere in town, especially North Water Street. - Suggested lowering the second floor to reduce the space between the first and second-floor windows. - Recommended changing the 9/12 windows to 6/6 windows, which are more characteristic of the style of the house. - Indicated that typically the second-floor windows should be the same size as the first-floor windows. - Mentioned that the second panel front door is also not appropriate. - Suggested that the roof on the rear addition should drop below the main roof. - On the north side, recommended lowering the dormer roof slightly, raising the windows a few inches, and using a wider sub rake to address the excessive shingle space between the windows.			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Suggested that the small roof over the front door should be removed to match the straight design of other entries. - Expressed a preference for eliminating the front door roof, questioning its appropriateness. - Otherwise, believed the building fits well within the line of surrounding structures. - Did not mind the north elevation, noting it is not easily visible. - Considered the east elevation as the front and generally acceptable.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

- Expressed uncertainty about the necessity of shutters and wanted to hear other opinions on that matter.

Thornewill

- Agreed with concerns about the shutters.
- Felt that black shutters overwhelm and dominate the facade.
- Suggested either removing the shutters entirely or painting them the same color as the clapboards to quiet their appearance.
- Believed that a simpler facade without the contrasting shutters would be more appropriate.

Camp

- Suggested that both options, with or without shutters, could be successful.
- Proposed that if opting for no shutters, there is an opportunity to create a very Greek Revival-style front door with sidelights and a classical entryway.
- Acknowledged that the little hip roof over the door works but understood concerns about its simplicity compared to neighboring buildings.
- Mentioned that a unique little window in the attic gable could be a place for an additional embellishment if no shutters are used.
- Appreciated the changes made, especially the removal of the secondary door and just having a window there.
- Liked the proportions of the windows on either side but criticized the nine-over-six windows, suggesting they be simplified to generous six-over-six windows for a more classic look.
- Clarified that the preference is for six-over-six windows, appreciating their simplicity and beauty.

Paul

- Acknowledged that while initially considering shifting the front door, now believes keeping it centered adds uniqueness to the building compared to the neighboring structures.
- Recognized historical precedent for off-center entries but finds a centered entry believable and fitting for this context.
- Expressed concern about the hip roof structure over the entry, noting it feels top-heavy, possibly due to its projection and overhang.
- Suggested simplifying the entry roof, potentially making it flat.
- Agreed that the front door could be more interesting, aligning with comments about enhancing the door's design.
- Supported the idea of incorporating a unique window in the gable end, as seen in neighboring buildings, but questioned the effectiveness of the current small window with shutters.
- Believed that shutters are appropriate but recommended toning down the black to a tone-on-tone color with the clapboards.
- Stated that the mass at the back of the building does not pose any issues.

Pohl

- Mentioned coming around to the hipped portico in the front, although unsure if others would agree.
- Supported Abby's idea of changing from 9-over-6 windows to more conventional 6-over-6 windows.
- Appreciated the finesse applied to the back piece and the positive changes to the dormer.
- Suggested accommodating others' concerns regarding the shutters and paint color.

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Expressed overall support for the project at this point. Welch - Requested clarification regarding the connector shown in the lower right image but not in the East Elevation. - Confirmed that there is a connector from the rear left that should show up on the East elevation, leading to the building on the left. MacEachern - Clarified that the building telescopes to the rear and the section in question was intended to be moved. - Confirmed that the buildings are not perpendicular and parallel to the historic structure. - Stated that they are not connected at the first-floor level, only by a deck. - Confirmed that the two structures were disconnected based on feedback from the initial meeting. - Explained that they are now connected only by a deck, requiring one to go outside one building to enter the other.
Motion:	Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (03:10:03)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye) – Camp was not in attendance during the vote.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Whitney Gifford Trust	32 Pocomo	Gate	14/77	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner			
Public Comments:				
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Stated no previous issue with the gate until now. - Found the current iteration very unusual. - Preferred the previous version of the gate. Paul - Echoed the previous comments, recalling a number of options previously presented. - Preferred the version with the curved top over the angled top. - Stated having no other concerns given the progress and current state relative to the road and scale. Coombs - Expressed dislike for the proposed 7-foot gate, preferring the previous version. - Questioned why the boards (cross supports) are on the outside, as they are typically on the inside where only the owners see them. MacEachern - Clarified that the cross supports are on the property owner's side to keep deer out, and are shown as a lighter line weight since they are not visible from the road, despite being set back from the road quite a bit. Welch - Acknowledged Diane's point about traditional fence construction, where slats are typically on the outside. - Understood that the current design adds slats to a slatless gate for deer proofing.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Agreed that traditionally, slats would be on the outside and slightly larger, with the crossbuck on the back side for a more authentic presentation. Thornewill - Expressed concern about the height of the gate being taller than 9 feet and painted white. - Suggested that a natural to weather finish would be more subtle and appropriate. - Agreed with the preference for a curved top over an angled top. - Indicated approval for a gate that is natural to weather with a curved top. Coombs - Preferred the curved top over the pointed top. - Suggested a natural to weather finish instead of painted white to avoid drawing attention to the gate. - Questioned the effectiveness of a 7-foot height for deterring deer. - Expressed hope that a 7-foot fence would not be placed around the entire property. - Supported a slightly scooped-out design and natural to weather finish for the gate. Welch - Expressed being okay with the proposed gate given its location and appreciated the change to move it further from the street. - Agreed that a natural to weather finish is more appropriate. - Noted that Diane's comment about the reversed slats (with cross supports on the inside) is now noticeable, but considering the gate's location relative to the street, it is probably acceptable.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted with a curve top design that is natural to weather and includes a dimension indicating the distance from the road to the fence. (Made by: Oliver) (03:19:57)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1 N Swift Rock	1 N Swift Roack	New Dwelling	40/2	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	Lisa Burger, Abutter - Noted that the comparison did not take into account that there will be two houses on the property, while the original neighborhood properties each have only one house. - Mentioned that the speaker's house is 1,500 square feet, while the combined size of the two proposed houses will be closer to 6,500 square feet, making a direct comparison inappropriate. - Emphasized that the HDC should not be looking at this comparison alone. - Pointed out that, despite removing one window on the south elevation, another was added, resulting in the same total number of windows. - Clarified that the initial concern was about the number of windows, not the doors. - Expressed uncertainty about whether the concerns regarding the gable porch were addressed. - Questioned the reason for the increase in ground cover from 2,649 to 2,864 square feet.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	• Concluded that the proposed mass is too much for the property and would be visible from both the speaker's house and Eel Point Road. MacEachern • Clarified that there will be two dwellings on this property, similar to other houses in the area with two dwellings. • Confirmed that this application is for the main house.
Commissioner Comments:	Welch • Confirmed that the dotted blue line represents the prior proposal profile. • Acknowledged that there have been very dramatic changes in the revised proposal. • Stated that, on its own, the structure appears to be approvable, though there may be some quibbling over fenestration. • Expressed a desire to see a chimney on the main mass of the structure. Oliver • Expressed gratitude for the significant changes made, particularly the variation in roof height and reduction in fenestration. • Acknowledged the remaining concern about the decks, which are approximately 14 feet deep. • Noted that the street elevation provided some answers to the concerns about the second house on the property. • Mentioned that neighbors are concerned about previous restrictions for one structure per lot, which have apparently lapsed, but this issue is out of the HDC's control. • Confirmed that the primary lingering concern is the size and visibility of the decks. Coombs • Questioned the height difference between the two buildings, noting that the existing building is 26 feet tall and the new building is 28 feet tall. • Mentioned that typically, the secondary building should be shorter, suggesting it should be 23 feet tall. • Confirmed that the existing structure will remain at 26 feet, with the new primary dwelling at 28 feet, establishing a hierarchy between the two. • Expressed concern that a two-foot height difference might not be easily noticeable from the road, such as Swift Rock or Eel Point. • Clarified that the 2,478 square feet mentioned is for the new house alone, not a combined total with the existing structure. • Acknowledged that 1 Swift Rock Road is a large lot and recognized the constraints given the existing building's height and the desire not to increase the new building's height to 30 feet. • Summarized the primary contention as the insufficient height difference between the existing and new buildings. • Noted that the two buildings are fairly close together, with the new building at 2,478 square feet and the existing building at 1,668 square feet. • Acknowledged that, while these sizes are substantial, there is a lot of acreage on this lot, allowing for some separation. • Recognized that the buildings will be seen together due to their proximity, but also noted that from the beginning of Swift Rock Road, they appear farther apart. • Mentioned the addition of a pool and questioned the purpose of the 200 square foot pavilion. • Expressed no problem with the new house's setup but highlighted concerns about the total square footage and the close proximity of the buildings.

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	- Suggested that if the existing building were positioned farther toward the beginning of Swift Rock Road, the separation would be clearer, making the presence of two structures more acceptable. Camp - Expressed ongoing concern that the size of the new building dwarfs the original, in terms of height, mass, and overall scale. - Highlighted that the original neighborhood historically did not allow second dwellings, making this addition seem overly large and out of character. - Emphasized the need to consider the historical context and scale to maintain harmony with the original structure and neighborhood. Pohl - Acknowledged that Matt has made several revisions to mitigate the impact on the landscape. - Recognized that the building is positioned as far as possible from Swift Rock Road without encroaching on the setback, considering the deep lot. - Appreciated the changes made to address concerns. - Shared Val's concern about the depth of the porches, noting that they are quite deep. - Overall, expressed being fairly okay with the current plan despite the concerns about the porches.
Motion:	Motion to approve, (Exhibit A) with the condition that the second-floor decks be cut back to 10 feet. Invited the applicant to come back for further review once the structure is framed to assess visibility. (Made by: Oliver) (03:44:04)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver (Aye) // Camp (Abstain)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
26 Quidnet LLC	26 Quidnet Path	New Dwelling	21/150	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Acknowledged that Matt has addressed all the concerns that were raised. - Stated having no remaining concerns. Camp - Agreed that the design is appropriate for the setting in Quidnet. - Stated being okay with the proposal. Coombs - Appreciated the differences and changes made by the applicant. - Expressed belief that the proposal will be okay.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (03:48:37)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye)			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Ack MidIsland LLC	18-26 Sparks Avenue	New Mixed-Use Building	55/231.1-2-307-310	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Coombs, Oliver			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Explained that when the issue first arose several months ago, a letter was received from the planning board directed to members of the commission. - Responded to all questions in the letter thoroughly, and the planning board or other relevant parties have a copy of the response letter. - Clarified that the response provided was based on how the HDC would apply their regulations to the issue, without expressing any personal opinions. - Emphasized that the reason for not sitting on the matter is due to a request for recusal made by Linda, based on an allegation of having expressed opinions about the case. - Stated firmly that the claim made by Linda about expressing opinions is untrue. - Stated the intention to clarify their position on this particular application. - Indicated willingness to sit as an alternate if needed, due to the issue Linda raised previously. - Emphasized that it is unfair to be removed from an important consideration based on a fabricated issue. - Highlighted that the ethics board reviewed the matter and determined there was no unethical behavior. - Made this statement to set the record straight. Pohl - Explained that due to the current composition of the established board and recognizing having had this discussion previously, expressed hope that, despite not liking it, the current composition is respected. Oliver - Appreciated the space between the two structures. - Expressed a preference for seeing three structures total, as opposed to the current one in one, for more variation in eave lines and an additive massing look. - Noted that although the current design is broken into two structures, it remains larger than the original, but 715 square feet smaller than the last submission. - Highlighted that despite zoning allowing for 40 feet, the height still feels too high and requires careful consideration. - Emphasized that this decision will be a turning point for Nantucket, cautioning against moving in a direction that doesn't align with the area's identity. - Stated that the design doesn't relate to the common identity of the area, which was formerly residential houses, and stressed the importance of considering the Mid Island as a home for many people. - Suggested that eliminating the bowling alley could help scale down the building. - Concluded with the belief that less is more, urging the applicant to scale back the building to do what's right for Nantucket.			

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

Camp

- Noted that the current setting consists of a few one-story buildings, giving the area a small neighborhood scale.
- Pointed out that the proposed building, with elevations of 36 feet, will have a significant impact on the neighborhood due to its height and massing.
- Appreciated the effort to break up the building into two separate masses but agreed with Val that three masses would be optimal, with varying styles and heights, including a story and a half, to better relate to the existing neighborhood.
- Mentioned that the courtyard on the north side is a good attempt at creating public space but would be dark and cold in winter, suggesting that public space on the west side might be better.
- Suggested architectural elements such as setting the building back further from Sparks Avenue to create a larger sidewalk setback.
- Recommended that double dormered windows be replaced with single dormers to avoid a heavy, boxy appearance, especially on the third floor.
- Stated that the south elevation still appears repetitive and that the massing should be further broken up.
- Criticized the use of Cobblestone gray for trim, as it reads as a heavy color; suggested a lighter color like Platinum gray, used at the hospital, for a building this size.
- Noted that using a lighter color would provide contrast to other buildings like the Stop & Shop, which is already in a darker shade.

Patten

- Appreciated the videos, finding them well done and helpful.
- Liked that the buildings are broken up into two masses but would not oppose breaking them up into three.
- Expressed a major concern about the height, which is still considered very high.
- Hoped for a reduction in overall height to achieve a better scale.

Paul

- Found the 3D videos super helpful, especially given the limitations of 2D drawings, which do not help the project much.
- Suggested that 2D drawings be supplemented with 3D vignettes alongside elevations for better understanding.
- Noted that the 3D videos effectively demonstrate the step back and dynamic nature of the buildings, which aren't conveyed well in 2D.
- Appreciated the splitting of the building and liked the pedestrian-friendly design.
- Supported the idea of having two buildings and agreed that three buildings would be even better.
- Recommended changing some of the color and detailing on the separate buildings to reduce homogeneity, aligning with Abby's suggestions.
- Noted that the third-floor dormers still feel a bit top-heavy.
- Despite the height, believed the design presents a pedestrian scale.
- Expressed a preference for reducing the height further but felt overall positive about the progress and dynamic nature of the design.

Welch

- Appreciated the helpful 3D videos and the changes made, especially the separation of buildings from one into two.
- Expressed torn feelings with two competing thoughts:
- Agreed that splitting the buildings into three would be beneficial and suggested changing the connector piece to read more as a connector with its own identity,

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

	potentially by losing some program on the second floor and altering the north elevation presentation. • Recognized that while there is a way to make this project passable with requested changes (e.g., reducing height, addressing shed dormers), there is a larger opportunity to set the tone for the area. • Emphasized that this project sets the tone for the mid-Island area, potentially a new downtown core for retail, restaurants, and mixed-use residential housing. • Referred to historical precedent, noting that downtown Nantucket once had three-story commercial structures with residential elements on the third floor. • Suggested exploring a design that reflects a commercial identity with residential elements on upper floors, similar to historical downtown buildings, rather than oversized residential structures. • Urged the applicant to consider developing the concept further, acknowledging the potential need for fortitude and resources. • Highlighted the importance of addressing the perception of oversized residential buildings to ensure the area's long-term development is appropriate. Pohl • Appreciated breaking up the single large building, noting it previously read like a large hotel (Breton Woods Grand Hotel). • Found the change to two buildings a significant improvement, while acknowledging that three would be even better. • Highlighted the value of contributors' insights, particularly on paint color and reducing scale. • Suggested that changing the paint color between the buildings could help avoid a monolithic appearance. • Noted that the connector piece, along with other aspects like height modulation and story-and-a-half elements, were recurring concerns among members. • Agreed with Abby's suggestion of incorporating story-and-a-half elements to further modulate and visually break up the massing. • Appreciated the overall reduction in height and encouraged further modulation to enhance the project's integration into the neighborhood. • Agreed with other board members' comments, finding Stephen's forward-looking perspective interesting. • Noted that if this area is to become the new downtown, it will evolve over time. • Emphasized that there is no need to establish a particular precedent immediately with this project.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp) (04:21:55)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul (Aye)

ALL OTHER ITEMS LISTED ON THE AGENDA WERE NOT DISCUSSED AND NO ACTION WAS TAKEN.

POTENTIAL ITEMS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

- Discussion on distinguishing between solid and veneer brick on chimneys and foundations.
- Discussion of Previously Approved Best Practices.
- Classification of street trees & vegetating mapping
- Discussion of Wind Turbines
- Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings
- Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new Historic dwellings
- Hardscaping

HDC MINUTES MARCH 12, 2024; adopted May 21, 2024

- Discussion of salvaging demos
- Discussion of options for house moves

OTHER BUSINESS

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

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:26 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=TweKRhFST0Y&t=5650s>