



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, March 19, 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 4:07 p.m.

Staff in Attendance:	Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist, Holly Backus , Preservation Planner, Billy Saad , Zoning Administrator & Land Use Specialist
Attending Members:	Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill
Remote Participants:	Coombs, Paul
Absent Members:	-
Late Arrivals:	Camp arrived at 4:37 pm.
Early Departures:	Camp left the meeting at 8:03 pm.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

I. DISCUSSION & VOTE

Discussion of Article 38, ATM 2024	Oliver - Mentioned that there are some warrant articles, potentially just one, up for discussion at town meeting related to building height in the CMI District. - Val explained the proposal, which allows 40-foot building heights by right if 25% of the project goes to affordable housing. - Expressed concern that this proposal would remove the Historic District Commission's (HDC) ability to make decisions regarding building heights. - Val intends to bring this up at town meeting and urged the board members to consider it. - Suggested that there could be modifications, such as allowing a percentage of the building to reach 40 feet if the rest remains at a lower height. - Encouraged the board to ponder this issue, as it could render the HDC's decisions moot. Coombs - Questioned whether the HDC's final authority on applications, as stipulated by federal and local guidelines, would be overridden by the proposal. Oliver - Recalled that a few years ago, the height limit was raised to 40 feet but was lowered back to 30 feet after a town meeting. - Noted that the issue has resurfaced after two years. - Understood that the proposal aims to increase housing. Pohl - Noted that if the proposed language is correct, it sounds like the HDC would be superseded. - Stated that as long as the requirement for the percentage of affordable housing is met, it would be allowed as a matter of right, regardless of the HDC's decision. Welch - Clarified that "by right" is typically a planning and zoning term, meaning certain actions do not require a special permit or variance. - Emphasized that historically, the HDC and planning board have had distinct roles, likening it to "Ghostbuster lines" that shouldn't be crossed. - Noted that zoning might allow certain structures, but the HDC still needs to approve them.
------------------------------------	--

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	- Suggested that if discussing this issue, it would be beneficial to come prepared with ideas and engage in official discussions with planning board members for clarity and collaboration. - Recommended that any questions about the proposal should be compiled and answered before having a more productive discussion. - Highlighted the importance of open communication and understanding to ensure everyone knows what is being discussed. Coombs - Emphasized the importance of having another discussion to understand how all board members feel about the proposal. - Noted that the proposal is very important as it will change the atmosphere, likening it to the new Island Home. - Expressed a desire to know that if they speak at town meeting, they will have the support of the board or at least know where others stand. - Hoped the board would go as a team but stressed the need for a discussion before reaching that point.
--	--

II. SIGNS				
Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. NIR Retail, LLC	4 Harbor Square	Wall Sign	42.2.4/1	Workshop APD
SAC Recommendation:	Hold for revisions.			
2. NIR Retail, LLC	4 Harbor Square	Wall Sign (2)	42.2.4/1	Workshop APD
SAC Recommendation:	Hold for revisions.			
3. NIR Retail, LLC	4 Harbor Square	Wall Sign	42.2.4/1	Workshop APD
SAC Recommendation:	Hold for revisions.			
4. VTT Management	48 Center Street	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/1	Sign Here Nantucket
SAC Recommendation:	Approve			
5. VTT Management	48 Center Street	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/1	Sign Here Nantucket
SAC Recommendation:	Approve			
6. NIR Retail, LLC	18A Federal Street	Flag Sign	42.3.1/72	Carolyn Butler
SAC Recommendation:	Approve subject to comments – lighting and window QR code			
7. NIR Retail, LLC	16 Old South Wharf	Wall Sign	42.2.4/2	Sign Here Nantucket
SAC Recommendation:	Approve			
8. NIR Retail, LLC	16 Old South Wharf	Projecting Sign	42.2.4/2	Sign Here Nantucket
SAC Recommendation:	Approve			
9. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	57 Prospect Street	Wall Sign	55/3	William O'Brien
SAC Recommendation:	Hold for revisions.			

Motion:	Motion to accept and enact the Sign Committee's recommendations for all signs listed above. (Made by: Welch) (00:11:26)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)

III. CONSENT – NEW BUSINESS 03/05/2024				
Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. 30 North Beach St LLC	30 N Beach St BLDG A	Fenestration	29/130	Emeritus
2. 30 North Beach St LLC	30 N Beach St BLDG B	Fenestration	29/130	Emeritus
3. 102 Wauwinet Rd Trust	102 Wauwinet Rd	New Foundation/Addition	11/24.2	Botticelli & Pohl
4. 32 Hulbert Trust	32 Hulbert	Revs 9280	29/72	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Patten, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent. (Made By: Coombs) (00:07:04)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Patten, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

IV. CONSENT – NEW BUSINESS 03/19/2024

	<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of Work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Brandon & Haley Scimone	6 Sandpiper Way	Replace Shed Dormer	76/89	Sandcastle Construction
2.	Nantucket Mountain LLC	21 Berkeley Ave	Shed	54/160	Jardins Intl
3.	Squam Holdings LLC	25 Squam Rd	New Garage	21/5	Botticelli & Pohl
4.	Parents Cooperative of Nan	13 Nobadeer Farm	New Dwelling	69/86	Kris Megna
5.	Giles, Janet & Angela	2 Weatherly Pl	Replace Window w/Door	67/304.2	Thornewill
6.	Fong, James	85 Tom Nevers Rd	Rev Roof/Add Porch/ Relocate Shower	91/14	Topham
7.	Seventeen Wannacomet LLC	17 Wannacomet	Addition	41/467	EMDA
8.	Henry Spitzer	1 Sconset Ave	Remove Exterior Stairs	73.4.1/8	EMDA
9.	Nantucket Education Trust	2a Cow Pond Ln	Install Railing to Basement	55/613	Marie Lemberg
10.	Seven Surfside LLC	7 Surfside Dr	New Dwelling	67/249	Val Oliver
11.	Stanley-Brown David	39 Chuck Hollow	New Dwelling	75/109	Kris Megna
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	Pohl – Item 3; Paul – Item 4; Thornewill – Item 5; Oliver – Item 10; Welch				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Clarified the intent to act on adjusting the consent agenda by removing specific items that certain members need to recuse from. - Noted that this adjustment allows the commission to vote on the remainder of the consent agenda separately. - Confirmed that the procedural vote is to remove items 5 and 10 from the vote on the consent agenda. Paul - Clarified that for item number four, there is no change to the design, only a change to the site plan. - Mentioned that the building is being moved 18 feet back from the road, from 32 feet to 50 feet. - Noted that an Exhibit A has been submitted to reflect this change.				
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent, with the exception of Items 5 and 10. (Made By: Welch) (00:17:09)				
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)				
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent, with the exception of Items 5 and 10 noting that Item 4 will include an Exhibit A to reflect the change to the site plan. (Made By: Oliver) (00:20:36)				
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)				
Motion:	Motion to approve Items 5 and 10 on Consent. (Made By: Welch) (00:21:55)				
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)				

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

V. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS – NB 03/19/2024

	<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of Work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Thea & Peter Kaizer Subject to removal of the roofwalk	6 Nobadeer Ave	New Dwelling	88/10	Kris Megna
2.	Mark & Jamie Leiss Pool not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter; no grade change from existing at time of application.	5 Coffin Rd	Pool & Landscape	91/9.2	Jardins Intl
3.	Tomack LLC Pool not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter; no grade change from existing at time of application.	38 Chuck Hollow	Pool Hardscape	75/66.1	Ahern LLC
4.	Sultanov Dobomir Approval due to lack of visibility, not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter.	24 Hummock Pond	Cabana	56/84.2	JB Studio
5.	Nejat Egilmez Approval due to lack of visibility, not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter.	41 Goldfinch	Add Dormer	68/548	JB Studio
6.	Michele Kolb Subject to boardwalk being wood - NTW	27 N Liberty	Hardscape	41/453	Self
7.	Michele Kolb Vining plants centered at leftmost, center, and rightmost panels.	8 Maine	Fence	60.3.1/435	Self
8.	Jerry/Sandra Michaud Subject to prior COA being included on application	58 Walsh St	Pergola	29/97	Dan Kinsella
Voting: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill					
Alternates: Patten, Paul					
Recused: -					
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.					
Staff Comments: -					
Public Comments: -					
Commissioner Comments: -					
Motion: Motion to approve. (Made By: Oliver) (00:22:36)					
Vote: Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)					

VI. NEW BUSINESS 03/05/2024 - VIEW

	<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of Work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
	Plamen Dimitrov	3 Weatherly Place	Rooftop Solar	67/950	Cotuit Solar
Voting: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul					
Alternates: Patten, Thornewill					
Recused: -					
Representative: -					
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.					
Staff Comments: -					
Public Comments: -					
Commissioner Comments:					
Welch - Asked for a view on the matter due to its location and potential sensitivity concerning the guidelines. - Noted that the property is at the end of a road, specifically a cul-de-sac or a T, not a major road. - Confirmed that it is a secondary dwelling on the lot. - Viewed the property and addressed concerns. - Suggested planting two strategically placed deciduous trees along the front of the property, between the road and the house where the solar panels will be, to address visibility concerns. Oliver - Noted that solar panels are typically not approved on the front of the house. - Mentioned that the upper dormer panels were already approved at some point. - Indicated being okay with the proposal if the lower level is somewhat screened.					

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	Coombs - Expressed concern that the proposal does not align with what is typically approved. - Acknowledged the effort to establish consistent application standards. - Noted that since part of the work has already been done, as mentioned by Val, would agree to approve this particular request. Paul - Identified enough mitigating factors to make the proposal approvable. - Noted that the shallow pitch of the roof and the orderly arrangement of the solar panels contribute positively. - Compared the orderly arrangement favorably to other, more haphazard solar applications. - Emphasized that the goal is not to make the solar panels invisible from the street, but to provide some mitigation through vegetation. - Concluded being fine with the proposal from this perspective. Welch - Suggested that the trees could be moved out a little bit to create a better visual block of the solar panels. - Noted that positioning the trees further from the front step would be more effective.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted with the following revisions: The site plan should show three trees moved eight feet closer to the actual cul-de-sac to avoid being right on top of the house. Approved due to mitigating factors including a shallow pitch roof and black roof. Noted that it is a secondary structure on a secondary mass. (Made by: Paul) (00:28:58)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

VII. NEW BUSINESS 02/20/2024 - RATIFY VOTE FROM 3/12/2024				
Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Jonathan Nyland	93 Sankaty Road	As Built Remove Chimney	49/182	Topham
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to ratify the approval from last week. (Made by: Welch) (00:31:00)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

VIII. 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
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Reid Yenor			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill • Noted that most buildings in the area are one and a half stories, with differing roof lines and dormers, rather than full 29-foot tall five-bay houses. • Suggested looking at trying to integrate more of these design elements to fit in with the surrounding houses. • Emphasized that the current design reads too much like a city block box due to its width and depth. • Reiterated the importance of matching the one and a half story dormered houses seen in the area. • Confirmed that the initial instinct to make these changes was reinforced after seeing the existing buildings in person. Coombs • Agreed with Carrie's observation that the current design is much too formal for Clifton Street, which is situated in the sand moors and requires a more casual, less formal aesthetic. • Noted that the design is more suited for downtown or Cliff Road, rather than the less developed area of Clifton Street. • Suggested that the house should be a story and a half, aligning with the area's character and reducing the height to around 25 feet. • Pointed out that the long roof, particularly the second one down, seems longer than necessary and should be shortened. • Emphasized that the front door needs to be simpler, reflecting the more rural, country house style appropriate for the location. • Questioned the necessity of roof walks in the area, implying that they may not fit the local context. Welch • Offered a different perspective, suggesting that making the structure more country-like is relatively simple. • Proposed creating a 1$\frac{3}{4}$ story effect with dormers on the front, which would truncate the left and right sides of the second floor. • Suggested lowering the top plate in those areas to achieve this effect. • Recommended shaving about two feet off the overall length of the front facade to maintain proportions. • Expressed fewer concerns about the rest of the structure due to its orientation to the street. • Emphasized that the primary concern is the front of the structure. • Concluded that creating the perception of a 1$\frac{3}{4}$ story structure with dormers and truncating the length would be beneficial. Camp • Agreed with Stephen's thoughts on creating a 1$\frac{3}{4}$ story effect. • Believed that breaking up the massing and reducing the extent of the roofline would help achieve a story and a half appearance. • Emphasized that these changes would help to avoid the structure appearing as a solid, unbroken mass. Pohl • Noted that the structure consists of two large blocks connected by a third block, which is nearly the same size. • Pointed out that each block resembles a large house, resulting in an overall appearance of two large houses together. • Highlighted that the ridges, going in both directions, are quite long, at 45 feet. • Mentioned that although it might technically be considered less than two stories, a significant portion of the program is fully two stories. • Agreed with the previous comments, supporting the idea of breaking up the massing and reducing the roofline extent to create a more appropriate appearance. Welch • Suggested lowering the pitch of the roof on the connector, given the visibility from other roads and the lower scrub nature of the surrounding plant material.
------------------------	--

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	- Noted that even if the connector roof is a clear story area, the lower pitch won't affect the architectural vocabulary as it will primarily be viewed straight on. - Emphasized that lowering the roof pitch on the connector will significantly impact the perception of the overall massing, making it appear less imposing.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (00:39:16)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (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
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornevill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Roger Dazule			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Recalled that when the application first came in, it was suggested they look at the solar guidelines. - Noted that the house has solar panels on every single roof plane, which is problematic. - Acknowledged that the style of the roof limits the placement options for the panels. - Mentioned that the house is very close to the street, making the panels highly visible. - Suggested removing the panels facing west on the main roof. - Proposed possibly keeping panels on the lower, shallower pitch roof of the porch but emphasized the need for mitigating circumstances like planting a tree. - Highlighted the challenge of finding solutions without seeing how things would fit. - Suggested moving a vent pipe on the lower roof plane on the south side to allow for more panels there, which could reduce the number needed on the front. - Noted that a smaller structure in the backyard could potentially accommodate some panels. - Indicated that panels facing the rear and side would be acceptable. - Stressed the need to consolidate and make the panels on the west side more uniform, possibly reducing their number while still generating sufficient power. Welch - Expanded on Val's comments, emphasizing concerns with the application in relation to guidelines. - Noted that many of the solar panels are directly visible from the street on a dark gray roof, on planes that are part of the primary structure and its mass. - Highlighted that these panels are on typical pitched roof planes, making them more visible than they would be on dormers or secondary structures. - Suggested analyzing the secondary structure for potential solar panel placement, as Val mentioned. - Recommended considering a ground array, noting that the density of solar panels seems excessive for a home of this size. - Emphasized the shared responsibility to reduce visual noise and suggested that a ground array would receive strong support from the HDC. Coombs - Agreed with Stephen that the current application contradicts the HDC's efforts and guidelines. - Highlighted that there are over 30 panels on the house, which is unprecedented and excessive for a single house.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	- Noted that the vegetation around the street is very short and does not provide any hiding for the panels. - Suggested starting again, following the guidelines, and reducing the number of panels. - Proposed considering alternative solutions, such as installing a heat pump, to reduce the need for so many panels. - Emphasized that the house is highly visible from both the front and back, making it crucial to adhere to the guidelines and reduce visual impact. Patten - Agreed with previous comments about the roof, the excessive number of panels, their visibility, and the color. - Had nothing else to add beyond the concerns already expressed. Pohl - Expressed feeling the same way as other board members. - Acknowledged that all important concerns about the application have already been expressed by the other members.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions with a transcript of the meeting discussion to be provided at the next hearing. (Made by: Welch) (00:48:48)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
KMS 126 NT	126R Main St	Rev Garage	42.3.3/98.1	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that the garage is a contributing structure from circa 1915, with an old HDC survey on file. - Emphasized the importance of retaining the garage's visibility from Main Street, as it has been visible for over 100 years and adds to the character and setting of the local and national historic district. - Preferred retaining the garage in its current location but appreciated moving it three feet off the side property line. - Expressed some concern about the 12 feet move but stressed the importance of maintaining the garage's visual quality from Main Street.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Stated that the HSAG is fine with the proposal. - Indicated that placing the garage closer to the street is preferable. - Confirmed that a 12-foot distance from the street is best. Kevin Toth, Main Street - Expressed gratitude to the HDC for preserving the legacy of historic Nantucket. - Raised several key points for consideration: - Questioned the efforts made by the applicant to maintain the historic contributing structure, noting that this question has been raised multiple times over the past year but remains unanswered. - Questioned the purpose and justification for moving the historic saltbox structure in multiple directions, emphasizing that it could be mended and renovated in its current location, which is in clear, unobstructed view from Main Street. - Noted that the latest proposal still does not comply with the HDC's policy of moving buildings, which requires that contributing structures be preserved in			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	their original historic location unless one of four exceptional circumstances exists, none of which apply in this case: 1. The building has been previously moved since its original construction (not applicable). 2. Leaving the building in its original location poses a threat to its continued existence and integrity (not applicable, as the applicant's neglect and plans pose the threat). 3. Leaving the building in its original location poses a threat to persons that is difficult to mitigate by other means (not applicable, as the applicant's workers use the building safely without hard hats). 4. Leaving the building in its original location would deprive the public of benefits associated with its continued visibility due to anticipated as-of-right development (not applicable, as the applicant's plans will make the building less visible to the public). • Requested that the HDC deny the inappropriate move and require the historic saltbox structure to be renovated and remain in its original location. Sarah Alger, Main Street • Echoed Mr. Toth's comments, agreeing with the reasons he provided against allowing the move of the historic contributing structure. • Stated that there is no justification or reason to allow the move. • Urged that the application should be denied.
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs • Agreed with Mr. Toth's well-defined comments on the situation. • Noted that the only reason for the proposed move seems to be to facilitate driving access to the second piece of property off 126 Main. • Expressed opposition to the move based on the existing reasons outlined by Mr. Toth. Oliver • Stated not having a concern, as the structure looks the same visually from the street. Camp • Acknowledged that moving the structure and placing it on a new foundation would make it look the same whether it's 12 feet or 15 feet away. • Believed that the move could result in the restoration of the structure due to the attention it will receive. • Concluded being fine with the application. Welch • Highlighted a concern with the site dimensions and their transfer to the illustrations. • Pointed out that the site plan shows the structure's dimension as less than two feet off the lower rightmost rear corner. • Presumed this information was used to generate the 3D simulation. • Noted that the 3D View shows the structure two feet off the property line versus three feet off the property line. • Emphasized that there is a difference in these measurements, but it is not being accurately represented. • Clarified that the garage is being relocated to be parallel or nearly parallel to its current position. • Explained that at the rear, the garage will be approximately two feet from the property line, with a four to six-inch jog. • Noted that the front of the garage will also be approximately two feet from the property line. • Highlighted that the issue is not the six-inch jog at the rear, but rather the overall foot discrepancy, which is not likely shown in the 3D view because it was generated from a drawing that shows the garage two feet off the property line. • Expressed concern that the documentation does not align with what is being told. • Emphasized the importance of ensuring that the illustration accurately represents what the final outcome will look like.

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	- Clarified that if the illustration shows the garage at 12 feet from the property line, that positioning is acceptable. - Noted that if the garage is going to be further from the property line than shown in the illustration, it should move forward more to retain more of the historical view. - Highlighted the need to preserve the historical perspective, which supports the HDC's ability to accurately state that the historic character and fabric of the structure have not been significantly altered. - Stressed that moving the garage further off the property line (e.g., 5 feet) could hide it behind the house, thus altering its character and setting. - Expressed concern about needing another set of drawings that accurately represent what is approved. - Highlighted the importance of having a clean set of drawings to avoid confusion and ensure clarity. - Stressed that having accurate, clear drawings will simplify the process for everyone, including the applicant and the board, and prevent issues with coherence and understanding. Pohl - Agreed with Abby's opinion that the proposal is beneficial for the structure, which has been in poor condition for a long time, even before the current owner took possession. - Believed that placing the structure on a new foundation and moving it would not adversely affect its historic character. - Concluded being okay with the application as submitted.
Motion:	Motion to approve, (through staff) memorializing the fact that the building will be positioned 2 feet 7 inches off the side property line at the front and 2 feet zero at the back and that the building will be moved back by 12 feet, as opposed to 15 feet. (Made by: Camp) (01:06:46)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver (Aye) // Coombs (Nay)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Bert Johnson	250 Madaket Rd	Rev New Dwelling	59.4/213	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Patten			
Alternates:	Oliver, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Acknowledged that the rotation, reduction to two windows on the north gable, and roof pitch adjustment help mitigate the structure from feeling squat. - Noted that the remaining concern is on the west elevation. - Pointed out that Dreamlines often designs five-foot porches with seven-pitch roofs that come right up under the windowsills. - Suggested extending the porch to seven feet deep and reducing the pitch to a five-pitch roof to improve the house's appearance. - Indicated having no other concerns. Camp - Noted that the reduction to two windows on the second floor of the north elevation now makes the windows not relate well to the other fenestration. - Appreciated the steeper pitch on the main roof but expressed concern about the overall fenestration pattern. - Suggested that the oblique view of the west elevation with the double-ganged windows might be problematic.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	- Recommended considering reducing the three dormers with double-ganged windows to single windows, as they will still be visible from the street. - Emphasized the importance of maintaining a cohesive design and avoiding an overly busy appearance. Coombs - Agreed with Abby on the west elevation, noting that the three dormers with double-ganged windows are too heavy for the house. - Suggested reducing the dormers to single windows and rearranging them for a better fit. - Found the roof idea mentioned by Joe Paul interesting and wanted to see it implemented, as it could add an appealing element by tucking under the roof. - Appreciated the work done so far but wanted the design to be a bit simpler and more in harmony with the property. Patten - Noted that the north elevation with two windows looks a little bare. - Mentioned that three windows were preferred but understood the difficulty due to the modular nature of the design. - Shared interest in extending the porch, as previously mentioned by Diane. - Indicated not having many other concerns beyond these points. Pohl - Completely agreed with Joe's observation about the steeply pitched and very shallow porch. - Suggested that making the porch deeper would be beneficial, but it should also include a shallower roof pitch. - Noted that the porch roof pitch being almost as steep as the main roof pitch is unusual. - Stated that this concern about the porch is the only remaining issue with the project at this point. Paul - Suggested that removing the corner boards and using cottage corners on all the shed dormers could calm down the appearance of the dormers. - Proposed that on the west elevation, changing the center dormer from double windows to a single window (as it is in a bathroom) would allow more of the main gable to be visible and maintain the fenestration in the bedrooms.
Motion:	Motion to approve the project with the following conditions: The porch will be 7 feet deep with a 5-pitch roof. All shed dormers will lose their corner boards. On the west elevation, the center dormer will have a single window instead of a double, and the dormer size will reduce accordingly. (Made by: Paul) (01:30:27)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Coombs, Paul, Patten (Aye) //Camp (Nay)

X. NEW BUSINESS – VIEW - 03/05/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Nantucket Historical Assoc.	89 Bartlett Rd	Solar Roof	66/410	AckSmart
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver Noted that while the building is significantly off the road, the black solar panels are very noticeable against the light gray roof.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	- Suggested asking Tobias if some panels on the southeast (facing the road) could be moved to the southwest, which is less visible. - Acknowledged that this might create a sawtooth effect on the southwest side, but it would be less noticeable. - Proposed keeping the panels on the southeast side as close as possible to the front-facing gable. - Recommended planting a tree to help mitigate the visibility of the panels from the road. Coombs - Acknowledged that it might be hard to see the panels because the building is tucked in the back with trees around it on the backside. - Noted that since it's a commercial building, the visibility issue might be less significant. - Suggested that the panels' visibility might not be overly concerning given the building's location and surroundings. Welch - Not opposed to Val's suggestion to move the panels from the southeast (facing the road) to the southwest. - Acknowledged the challenge with solar efficiency due to the different sun exposure on the southwest side. - Expressed interest in seeing the layout and impact of moving the panels and planting a tree to mitigate visibility. - Highlighted the need to understand how the panels would fit on the southwest roof with the sawtooth effect before deciding. Camp - Agreed with Val's suggestion to avoid visibility from Bartlett Road. - Supported moving the panels to the side gable and keeping the ones in the back. - Indicated approval if the panels can be arranged in a way that minimizes visibility from Bartlett Road.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (01:40:08)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
McDonough	5 Moby Way	New Cottage	65/9	Gryphon Arch
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornehill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ethan Gryphon			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Visited the site to assess concerns about the fenestration. - Noted that the little garage at the beginning of the driveway blocks any visibility into the lot. - Mentioned that the house's positioning further reduces visibility. - Concluded that if anything is visible, it would be from Hummock Pond Road, but due to the low elevation, only the roof might be seen. - Stated that this observation alleviated the initial concern.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (01:43:01)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

XI. NEW BUSINESS 03/05/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
61 Fairgrounds LLC	63 Fairgrounds Road	Dwelling Revisions	67/173.2	JB Studio
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Pohl			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Juraj Bencat/Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Suggested that changing from modular to stick build would improve the overall height since it would eliminate the need for a double floor system between floors. - Mentioned skepticism about the argument for modular construction impacting height, as stick build offers more flexibility. - Acknowledged that while the design is similar to the neighboring houses, those houses are farther off the street. - Expressed concern that the new design might change the character of the area. - Noted confusion about the height discrepancy, where the new design is stated to be 27'7.5", but the previous design was 28'2", yet the new design appears significantly lower. Bencat - Explained that the left design was previously approved with a height of 28'2". - Clarified that the new design had to adjust the height to 27'7.5" because the previously approved height was not buildable. - Noted that the need to adjust the height was a significant reason for the changes. Welch - Noted that there is a clear error in the numerical valuation of a scale drawing, which appears closer to 22 or 23 feet tall, not 28 feet. - Emphasized the importance of using a scale drawing to ensure accurate proportions and relevancy of design elements, regardless of potential errors in dimensions. - Suggested moving past the topic of height discrepancies as it is unproductive. - Acknowledged that the current presentation is a modification to a slightly taller farmhouse style, as opposed to a cottage farmhouse style. - Indicated that the debate should focus on the merits of the application based on the presented design. Thornewill - Noted that the design features a five-bay system on the first floor and a four-bay system on the second floor, which is acceptable for the informal neighborhood. - Mentioned the design likely changed due to the dormer adjustments while keeping the overall plan. - Expressed uncertainty about the argument that the previous approval couldn't be built as designed. - Agreed that the new design is approvable, emphasizing the importance of keeping the height at 27 feet 7 inches to maintain neighborhood scale. - Acknowledged that while larger buildings are going in, maintaining a slightly smaller scale is beneficial for the neighborhood. Camp - Preferred the previously approved design with a more cottagey appearance and the dormer in the front. - Felt that the new design is too formal for the neighborhood, which consists of smaller houses. - Noted that the previous design, despite being labeled 28'2", looked smaller and more in keeping with the neighborhood. - Pointed out the horizontal panes in the back G windows and suggested addressing this issue.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	Coombs - Supported the proposed elevation, noting that the reduction of the four windows above the five blocks on the east elevation will fit in better. - Suggested adding kick panels to the French doors on the west elevation to lighten up those windows and doing the same to the door to the right. - Agreed with Abby's observation about the small square "chicklet" windows, suggesting they should be changed. Welch - Mentioned a preference for the smaller cottage style, but acknowledged that the proposed design is still approvable, though not ideal. - Suggested making minor modifications as mentioned previously. - Requested either a faux chimney or the inclusion of trees in the landscaping to enhance the design. - Emphasized the importance of bringing back a detailed landscaping plan for the project's success and offered help in this aspect. - Believed that adding a chimney would blend well with the overall design and enhance its appeal.
Motion:	Motion to approve with the addition of a chimney placed to the left or right but inboard, not centered. (Made by: Thornewill) (01:57:39)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye) Camp (Abstain)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Kath Sayle	103 Washington Street	Additions Alterations	55.1.4/37	Topham
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Camp, Pohl, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams/Joe Topham			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Recognized the structure as a circa 1975 commercial building that is contributing. - Noted that the site plan should clearly indicate the total proposed square footage being added, which is currently unclear. - Expressed concern that the proposed fenestration on the facade might exceed the requirements within the context of the building. - Observed that the 20-light ganged windows on the north elevation do not seem to relate to the rest of the building's facade. - Mentioned that part of the north elevation will be shielded by the neighboring building, questioning the functionality and fit of the fenestration in that area.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Noted that enclosing the existing deck area with a full two-story addition creates a very tall vertical wall right on the street edge without any one-story additive massing to mitigate the height. - Suggested that the design would be much more successful if the second floor remained as is and the first-floor deck area was enclosed with a glassed-in porch, providing lower additive massing to soften the street-side appearance. - Mentioned that a glassed-in porch is a common additive feature and would support the concept of corner-to-corner glazing, preferably wrapping around the corner. - Pointed out that the proposed fenestration presents an uninterrupted wall of glass with no historical precedent. - Highlighted that the large eight-foot-wide French doors above are also unprecedented and very unusual. - Stated that the proposed roof walk is not appropriate on a commercial-scale building, as their original intent was for residences.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	Indicated that the vertical board proposed for the southern addition is not appropriate, suggesting that those walls should remain shingled as they are now.
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Suggested that it would be beneficial for someone to visit the site to get a clearer understanding of the context. - Described the building as having a complicated front and a casual, organically grown structure. - Mentioned that the refrigeration building on the left has been a long-standing feature, essential for storage. - Noted the land is very flat with minimal vegetation, which makes visualizing the layout easier. - Emphasized the importance of understanding the space between the stairs leading to the second floor and the adjacent art club building. - Recommended defining the spatial relationships better to clarify what is being worked with. - Encouraged a site visit to gain a better perspective on the overall layout and context. Patten - Expressed that the proposed changes are a welcome alteration to the existing building. Paul - Commended the proposed changes for successfully bringing back the vernacular of the waterfront warehouses, similar to those torn down when the yacht club was built. - Expressed a desire to visit the new establishment, indicating an improvement over the current building. - Suggested recommendations: - On the east elevation, mentioned that shingling the gabled piece and using vertical boards on the link between the main mass and the secondary mass would be fine. - Noted that the six windows across the facade could benefit from a little bit of shingle area to the left and right of each double hung and suggested echoing the rhythm of the fenestration on the ground floor to match the large opening above it. - The first-floor windows should be vertically aligned with the second-floor windows. The second floor is successful in identifying the center of the building with its shutters, and this rhythm should be echoed on the first floor for a more cohesive look. - On the east elevation, the gabled piece should be shingled, and the link between the main mass and the secondary mass could have vertical boards. - The central portion of the first-floor windows could be all glass, matching the proportions of the second-floor windows. Maintain the current height of the first floor since it's existing but ensure the divisions between the first-floor windows relate better to the second floor. - If not possible to fully implement the suggested changes, even a slight alignment to the left and right of each double hung on the first floor, matching the second floor's rhythm, would enhance the design. - Overall, these adjustments aim to create a more harmonious and visually appealing facade while preserving the character and functionality of the building. Welch - Stated that the small gable on the addition to the left would be better off shingled for a cohesive look. - Mentioned removing the crossbucks from the double and single doors unless they are intended to be visible when open, ensuring form follows function. - Suggested adding superficial adornments to indicate the original posts and water table, enhancing the filled-in porch's appearance.

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	Agreed with the concept of filling in the porch traditionally to justify the different rhythms between the first and second floors.
Motion:	Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Made by: Oliver) (02:17:14)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Jo & Neil Paterson	11 Burnt Swamp Lane	Add & Window Change	56/227	Sandcastle Const.
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Pohl			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Chuck Lenhart, Sandcastle Construction			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Commended the good job on the project and mentioned that the one-over-one windows, though unusual, are fine for the location. Coombs - Remarked that the fence is deep into the woods and surrounded by vegetation, expressing no problem with it. Camp - Commented on the loss of charm due to the addition of the gable and the change from paned windows, expressing regret over the loss of the simplicity of the main mass. - Acknowledged that despite the changes, the structure is not visible. Oliver - Noted that the natural weathering and sand tone windows and sash further mitigate the structure's visibility.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (02:22:10)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
John Wise	16 Williams Street	Move Off Demo Dwelling	55/372	Normand
John Wise	16 Williams Street	Move Off Demo Shed	55/372	Normand
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Coombs, Patten, Welch			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ben Normand, Normand Residential			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that the structure is a circa 1950s contributing Cape. - Expressed concern about potential demolition, especially considering the housing need. - Appreciated the sensitive plan in place and the proposed layout. - Suggested that the property card information should be included. - Observed that there were no elevations, only photographs. - Recommended a move-off as a more beneficial alternative if possible.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group Stated no concerns.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Supported the idea of a move or at least part of it moving. - Appreciated the overall concept.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	Voiced concern about insufficient parking but acknowledged that it is not within their purview.
	Camp Supported the concept of putting small cottages in place of the existing structure.
Motion:	Motion to approve both items. (Made by: Oliver) (02:30:12)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3 Step Lane LLC	3 Step Lane	Gutters	42.4.2/44	Union Studio

Hold for representation.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1N Swift Rock Road Tr	1 N Swift Rock	Patio	40/2	Ahern LLC

Hold per applicant's request.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
39 Monomoy Road LLC	39 Monomoy Road	Pool/Spa	54/79	Ahern LLC

Hold per applicant's request.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
39 Monomoy Road LLC	39 Monomoy Road	Primary dwell demo move add	54/79	WAPD

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Welch
Recused:	-
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted the property is known as Kinder Tuck, a Circa 1920 Colonial Revival. - Highlighted the house is documented in the book "An Nantucket Enclave Monomoy Heights." - Stated the current application should be treated as a revision to the previous approval. - Requested the inclusion of previously approved plans in the current application. - Appreciated the extensive window survey and intention to retain historic windows. - Opposed the proposed removal of the Saltbox portion, a character-defining feature. - Indicated the rear addition, designed by Robert Minnow in the 1960s, is contributing. - Requested the site plan and application clearly identify the size of the proposed addition. - Stressed the need for photographs from visibility points, especially for unique fenestration proposals. - Noted additions should follow Secretary of the Interior's standards. - Criticized the new chimney's size, design, and location as inappropriate. - Appreciated the retention of historic chimneys and their use as functional rather than faux. - Pointed out potential discrepancies in cardinal points on the plans. - Requested a revision to include previous plans due to the significant review effort made by the board last year.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG) Concurred with Holly's comments.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Appreciated the effort to keep the front facade as is. - Found the introduction of the middle chimney out of character for the house. - Opposed the oversized church windows on the east facade. - Felt the scale of the addition overpowers the existing house. - Suggested more additive massing instead of one long ridge line on the east facade. - Expressed similar concerns for the north and west facades with large windows.

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

- Recommended finessing the design to look more like an addition rather than a new house attached to a small existing structure.
- Noted the previous approval seemed more additive with Gables, enhancing the overall design.

Thornewill

- Agreed with Val's points regarding the design.
- Felt that the original iconic house is being overshadowed by the massing of the addition and its fenestration.
- Suggested the new fenestration should reflect the existing house's scale.
- Agreed the new chimney is unnecessary.
- Advised to refer back to the previously approved design that was achieved through a process of breaking down the massing.
- Expressed concern about moving the building, recognizing its prominence.
- Accepted the 25-foot move as tolerable since the building's perception will remain largely unchanged.
- Preferred not to move the building if possible.

Camp

- Agreed with Carrie's point about the GHI windows.
- Stated that the renovation should maintain the original style of the house.
- Opposed moving the house 25 feet back from the road.
- Clarified that the house's original siting is significant and should be preserved.
- Found the GHI windows incompatible with the architectural style.
- Mentioned that the massive chimney is out of scale.
- Suggested copying the dimensions of the existing chimneys to maintain sensitivity to the original building.

Coombs

- Stated opposition to moving the house back from the road.
- Explained that the house is a significant visual feature when approaching Monomoy.
- Emphasized the importance of maintaining the house's visibility and siting.
- Disliked the proposed large GHI windows, finding them inappropriate.
- Expressed appreciation for chimneys but found the proposed chimney too large.
- Preferred that the house remains in its original location and as original as possible.
- Noted the importance of preserving the character of the land and building.

Pohl

- Expressed no concerns about the relocation of the building, differing from other board members.
- Found the cathedral windows to be a significant departure and troubling.
- Noted the size of the rear L as a concern, aligning with others' desire to see what was previously approved.
- Mentioned issues with the fenestration on the East Elevation and the chimney on the back.

Kotchen

- Suggested staking out the proposed new location to visualize the move, indicating thorough consideration of the matter.
- Added that the house's current location is nonconforming and creates an unsafe condition, as it is way over the setback lines and right on the road.
- Believed moving the house back 9 feet and sliding it 25 feet would be imperceptible in the context of driving down Monomoy Road, maintaining its visual prominence and importance.
- Mentioned the move would create a much safer condition, as currently there is no driveway and parking is obstructive.

Motion:

Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp) (02:56:28)

Vote:

Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
39 Monomoy Road LLC	39 Monomoy Road	Garage	54/79	WAPD
39 Monomoy Road LLC	39 Monomoy Road	Pool Cabana	54/79	WAPD
39 Monomoy Road LLC	39 Monomoy Road	Shed	54/79	WAPD

Hold per applicant's request.

Winston Hindle	1 McKinley Ave	Roof	73.3.1/75	James Lydon
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that Mr. Lydon was absent and mentioned Val's review for possible consent. - Stated that the question about other structures on the lot was answered with photographs. - Concluded that the other two structures would be changed to match the proposed color for this one structure. - Mentioned photographs provided showing the garage and main house in the same black color, with some areas more faded than others. - Explained the plan to replace as needed with architectural, considering the good size of the roof. - Recorded that the structure is a contributing 1916 structure in the old historic district of Sconset. - Approved the proposal as the black architectural is within the approvable list for the old historic districts and expressed no concerns.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG) - Stated that HSAG did not review this item but personally had no concerns. Backus - Stated that Rob Benchley, Sconset Advisory Group, provided comments stating that they had no concerns.			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (02:30:27)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Deborah B William	10 Easy Street	Brick Sidewalk	42.3.1/78	Sandcastle Const.
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Rob Newman, Sandcastle Construction			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated for the record that the dwelling on the lot is a circa 1933 contributing structure. - Mentioned that this is a revision to the previous approval from 2020. - Noted that the previous approval included grass pavers, which were deemed more appropriate. - Emphasized that grass pavers are resilient and consistent with the resilient Nantucket design guidelines. - Acknowledged the precedent for brick within the old historic district but stressed the importance of resilience due to the location's tendency to flood.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	- Expressed that the material change should align with the existing design guidelines. - Highlighted that the proposed addition of a brick sidewalk at the back should match the existing irregular stone pavers at the front of the structure.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG) - Mentioned that it wasn't clear that this was a pre-existing approval. - Noted that the focus was on the two-car wide issue, which now seems to be a done deal. - Expressed appreciation for the concept of having grass and green space. - Commented that there will be a lot of brick on Easy Street and suggested mitigating the amount of brick. - Proposed the inclusion of grass strips or other features to break up the solid brick paving.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Acknowledged that given what's already on Easy Street, which is all brick, this proposal seems consistent. Camp - Recalled having concerns about the area becoming very bricked up and originally wanting more green space. - Mentioned being okay with the brick but expressed a desire to find a way to soften the look, possibly with some greenery or another solution. Coombs - Stated having a problem with the parking area in front of the house as it seems out of place compared to other houses in the area. - Expressed a desire to try incorporating grass to soften the look and make it blend better. - Wished for a way to make the house's appearance align more with the surrounding homes. Pohl - Mentioned that Val shared a picture of Killen Real Estate, showing a mud pit where two cars are parked. - Noted that the grass-concrete solution looks terrible based on the photograph. - Stated an understanding of why brick might be preferred over the grass solution. Welch - Suggested a tradeoff by incorporating some green next to the parking area. - Proposed adding something viny and soft growing on the fence or a salt spray wind-loving specimen tree. - Recommended implementing greenery to soften the area around the parking. Pohl - Agreed with the idea of breaking up the expanse of brick with something else, such as cobblestones.
Motion:	Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Made by: Welch) (03:10:18)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Wilbert Garcia	12a Daffodil Lane	Fence	68/769.1	Welin Abreu
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Camp, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Welin Abreu			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Suggested a plain board fence. - Proposed extending the fence to the edge where the parking begins, just past the front porch. - Recommended making the fence four feet high. Welch - Noted that the pencil top of the fence isn't typical and suggested two alternatives: turning the fence upside down or adding a cap with two pieces of cedar and a top. - Indicated the fence would be six feet high from the porch extension and four feet high from the porch to the road. - Mentioned if a pre-made fence is used, the rail would make it four foot three to get the bottom rail to work and expressed no objection to this. Paul - Stated he had no concerns. Pohl - Explained that the support side of the fence should face the property owner's side, while the good side should face the neighbor's property, as per a town ordinance.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) based on Commissioner's comments. (Made by: Welch) (03:19:09)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3 Pleasant St Nom Tr	3 Pleasant St	Addition	42.3.3/155	Emeritus
HOLD FOR NEXT MEETING PER APPLICANT - EMERITUS				
2538970 Ontario Inc	5 Coffin St (Sias)	Exterior alterations	73.1.4/21	Emeritus
HOLD FOR NEXT MEETING PER APPLICANT - EMERITUS				
Harold Brothers Realty Inc	2-4 Highland Dr	MH color change	30/187-289	Emeritus
HOLD FOR NEXT MEETING PER APPLICANT - EMERITUS				
Glidden	24 Rugged Rd	Pergola	67/164	Emeritus
HOLD FOR NEXT MEETING PER APPLICANT - EMERITUS				
63 Hulbert LLC	63 Hulbert Ave	MH porch fen revs	29/9	Emeritus
HOLD FOR NEXT MEETING PER APPLICANT - EMERITUS				

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Peggy Schnieder	10A West Dover	Demo Shed	55.4.1/192	Val Oliver
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Val Oliver, Val Oliver Design Inc.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Mentioned that the structure is likely from the 1940s and resembles more of a workshop than a shed, based on Sandborn maps and its symmetrical design. - Requested that the structure be thoroughly documented before removal, highlighting details such as the front door and flanking windows, to preserve its historical context for future reference. - Explained that this documentation will aid in updating the cultural resource surveys for the west Monomoy or New Town area.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG) Suggested that the new construction design should consider the existing building's scale and form, using it as a reference for the new construction.			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill Expressed acceptance of the proposal but noted sadness due to the uniqueness of the existing building.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

	- Suggested incorporating the existing doors and maintaining a simple profile in the future design, avoiding a full two-story structure that dominates the space. Welch - Agreed with previous statements and emphasized the commission's role in preserving the community's architectural integrity. - Suggested recognizing the unique design of the existing structure, highlighting its significance to the community despite its non-traditional style. - Recommended using the current structure as inspiration for the new design, focusing on simplicity and incorporating key architectural elements and fenestration for a successful outcome. Camp - Agreed with previous statements regarding the demolition and documentation of the existing structure. - Supported creating a new design that reflects the symmetry, simplicity, scale, and height of the current building. Coombs - Echoed the sentiment that the new design should aim to duplicate the existing structure's features to fit well within the location and be well-accepted. Pohl - Agreed that the simplicity of the existing building is highly appreciated, and emulating that in the new design would be ideal, noting a consensus among the board members.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted, with the condition of providing additional imagery, including close-ups of the fenestration and straight-on shots. (Made by: Welch) (03:31:05)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Twenty One India LLC	21 India Street	Window Replacement Like-Kind	42.3.4/21	Linda Williams
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Pohl, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that this is a circa 1800 typical Nantucket home, built for John Howland Swain, a blacksmith. The history is documented in NPT's book "Off Center: The Westco Acre Lots". - Thanked Linda for providing a window survey, and although restoring windows is best for preserving historic fabric, using Boston sash replacements is appropriate and consistent with the Nantucket profile.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG) - Mentioned that these windows will be highly visible from India Street, even though they are on the side of the house. - Replacing them with new windows would change the historic character of the house. The pictures show that the windows clearly need repainting but do not show rotting windows. - Preferred to see these windows restored rather than completely replaced.			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Patten) (03:36:32)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Elizabeth Fonriest	11 New Street	Replace Windows	55.4.1/39.1	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Mentioned that this structure is a circa 1972 infill in the old historic district with an HDC survey on file, confirming it is contributing. - Noted appreciation for the window survey provided, which shows a definite lack of maintenance. - Stated happiness to see this application presented for consideration. - Acknowledged the preference for true divided lights (TDLs) within the old historic district but due to the structure's age, expressed no concerns with the simulated divided light (SDL) Anderson windows proposed. - Clarified that if the structure were older, there would be more concern about maintaining TDLs. - Concluded with no concerns regarding the application.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG) - Stated that it is acceptable to replace the windows as they are obviously rotted and not that old. - Mentioned that while this is in the old historic district (OHD), Anderson windows with the typical exposed cladding are not preferred. - Suggested that any other SDL windows would be fine for the replacement.			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Noted that due to the date and condition of the building, expressed approval for the window replacement based on these factors. Camp - Agreed with the use of white sash for the windows. Coombs - Agreed that the white sash would be a good choice. - Mentioned a preference for Boston sash as a good and usable option. Welch - Specified that the windows should be SDL traditional window construction, including the casing. - Clarified that Anderson windows with a flange are not suitable due to their non-traditional casing. - Stressed that the windows need to look traditional on the exterior but can be SDL. - Preferred the use of a white spacer.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, with the conditions as stated by Commissioners. (Made by: Welch) (03:46:05)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Seventeen Mill Street LLC	17 Mill Street	Window Replacement Like-Kind	55.4.4/47	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that 17 North Mill is a circa 1840 structure built for Thomas Potter, a mariner, for his father-in-law, Peter Ray. - Highlighted that the structure has historical significance and an NPT marker. - Mentioned that the application involves window replacement with like-kind for five windows. - Expressed a preference for restoring existing windows but acknowledged the use of 6 over 6 Boston sash as acceptable. - Confirmed that Boston sash windows are known for their historic Nantucket profile. - Concluded with no concerns regarding the application.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG) Stated that their preference would be to restore instead of replacing.
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve like-kind window surveyed replacement, as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (03:49:50)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
NOTLIH LLC	55 Burnell Street	Reno Dwelling	49.3.2/1.4	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that the structure is outside the Sconset Old Historic District and was moved from 25 Clifton Street in 2021. - Noted the structure's date as being between 1960 and 1971, placing it at the higher end of the contributing status. - Mentioned minor comments regarding the new shed dormer, emphasizing it should come off the ridge as recommended by "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Acknowledged the proposed shed dormer as a net improvement. - Pointed out that the skylight on the west, though existing, should also conform to the standards of "Building with Nantucket in Mind" and include a mutton in wood.			
Public Comments:	George Berg, Architect - Pointed out the intent to keep the skylight. - Explained the effort to "right size" the windows to make them more stable in shape and form. - Mentioned that the rest of the structure exists and the goal is to make it a little bit better.			
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Used the house as a tutorial to discuss window manufacturers with a flange around them. - Highlighted the west elevation with a gang of five windows to show the white flange before the natural trim. - Stated that the flange is historically inappropriate. Coombs - Studied the house and noted that the windows were mixed up and hard to decide upon. - Sent it back, suggesting a closer look at the windows. - Observed that the windows didn't make much sense in their current positions. - Advised against letting it go without further examination.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Camp) (03:58:49)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye)			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Ten Straight Wharf LLC	10 Straight Wharf	Addition	42.3.3/98	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul, Oliver			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that the NHL data indicates the structure was built in 1849, and there is no HDC file. - Mentioned the desire to have some history on this structure in the future. - Appreciated that it's being a reused window TDL. - Acknowledged that it will be unusual to have no windows on the west elevation being enclosed but, due to its proximity to the adjacent property line, has no concerns. - Expressed no concerns with this application.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG) Stated no concerns.			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by:) (02:50:11)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Thomas Lord	15 Coffin Street	New Driveway	73.4.1/34	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated for the record that the dwelling on this lot is a contributing structure from circa 1938 called "Hab Trot" with an HDC survey on file. - Believed that the work in question has already been done, suggesting this is an as-built application. - Unsure if a fee has been received for this work. - Noted that the access has been moved from Coffin to South Road. - Reminded the commission that they received an email from abutters concerning this application. - Suggested a view might be in order due to the concerns raised by abutters to see what has been done. - Acknowledged that it is positive one structure is being removed and a new one is being done instead of having two. - Mentioned that Sconset had no concerns with the application but noted issues with the adjacent property and ongoing construction. - Indicated that inquiries and FOIA requests were made by members of the Sconset Civic League and others, questioning if there was approval for the ongoing work. - Recommended the commission conduct a view to better understand the situation and address the concerns raised.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Agreed with the suggestion to conduct a view. - Stated that this would help in assessing the concerns and determining their relevance to the commission's decision.			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

Motion:	Motion to hold for a view. (Made by: Welch) (04:07:50)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
K22S LLC	126 Main Street	Rev Window Location	42.3.3/98	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
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 this is the Arthur B. Collins house, Circa 1750, a typical Nantucket structure, said to have been moved from Sherburn. - Mentioned that many changes to the structure have been approved, contributing to its restoration. - Highlighted that the window in the middle of the east elevation is original, while the newly constructed one is new. - Expressed concern that the change might remove any existing historic fabric. - Noted that all the sheathing has been retained from the original main block of the structure. - Concluded with no further concerns.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group (HSAG) Stated no concerns.			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Welch) (04:10:20)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Nantucket Property Owner	19 Honeysuckle Drive	Rev Dwelling Style	68/397	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Commented that there is a significant grade change from the house footprint to the street. - Suggested that the plans should reflect the extra steps required due to this grade change. - Mentioned that three steps or more will necessitate a railing.			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by:) (02:50:11)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Nantucket Property Owner	3 Beach Grass Road	Rev Dwelling Style	68/884	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			

Minutes for March 19, 2024; Adopted June 4, 2024

Recused:	-
Representative:	Linda Williams
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners had no concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted so long as it is grey trim and black sash. (Made by: Welch) (04:17:52)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Guillermo Delascasas	23 Pond View Drive	Reissue Shed COA	81/28	Linda Williams
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Oliver) (04:18:52)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (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
- Discussion of salvaging demos
- Discussion of options for house moves

OTHER BUSINESS

Next HDC Meeting- March 26, 2024, at 4pm ***HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:19 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6eWeQPBTs3o>