



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, March 26, 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 4:04 p.m.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Amy Keohane (00:10:58)

- Stated she submitted a letter to Chair Pohl on a matter that is not on the agenda.

Holly Backus

- Stated intention to reach out and confirmed receipt of a letter from Amy, which was forwarded per her request.
- Acknowledged that the item is not on the agenda, so a discussion cannot be held during the meeting.

I. DISCUSSION & VOTE

Discussion of Article 38, ATM 2024	Welch - Acknowledged that some members had individual questions needing answers for an informed discussion. - Expressed support for discussions after everyone reviewed the material and sought clarification on any questions. - Suggested everyone read the material, reach out to planning staff with questions.
------------------------------------	--

II. CONSENT – NEW BUSINESS 03/19/24 CARRY OVER

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. 6 Carew Ln LLC	6 Carew Lane	Gates Arbor	73.3.2/62.1	Atlantic
2. Cohen Steven Trust	19 Austin Locke Way	MH Fenestration changes	82/57	Shelter 7
3. Dale Kevin F TR	6 Village Wy	Deck hardscape	14/42	Ahern LLC
4. Dylan & Caroline Wallace	65 Polpis Rd	Window door changes	43/13	Self
5. Chris & Ashley Austin	Maple Lane Lot 7	Color change door rev	67/303	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent. (Made By: Oliver) (00:04:01)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS – NEW BUSINESS 03/19/2024 CARRY OVER

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Lewis, Marjorie	124 Tom Nevers Rd	Pool hardscape	91/43.2	Atlantic
• Pool not to be visible at the time of inspection or thereafter; no grade change from existing at the time of application				
2. Cohen Steven Trust	19 Austin Locke Way	cabana	82/57	Shelter 7
• Subject to top plate height no taller than 7'6" and remainder portion of roof assembly as shown-i.e., if the high point of top plate height is taller than 7'6" lower the entire assembly.				
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent. (Made By: Welch) (00:04:25)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

IV. OLD BUSINESS 02/20/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Harold Bros Realty LLC	6 Highland Ave	Color Change	30/288	Emeritus LTD
2. Harold Bros Realty LLC	2 & 4 Highland Ave	2 nd Dwelling Color Change	30/287-289	Emeritus LTD
3. Harold Bros Realty LLC	2 & 4 Highland Ave	Garage Color Change	30/287-289	Emeritus LTD
4. Harold Bros Realty LLC	2 & 4 Highland Ave	Main House Color Change	30/187-289	Emeritus LTD
NEW BUSINESS 03/05/2024 – MH Color Change - This item was moved up on the agenda, per Welch.				
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner Stated that black was not appropriate but appreciated the streetscape that was provided.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed that the objective is for the houses to fit into the neighborhood and not stand out as unique. - Noted that pretty much every other house in the Cliff area has white sash, making black sash inappropriate. - Suggested Essex Green as a substitute but acknowledged it might still be unusual for the area. - Added that charcoal gray shutters would probably stand out and be inappropriate for the area.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Felt black is not appropriate in this area, especially a little conglomeration of them. - Wouldn't mind black shutters or black doors but preferred white trim and black sash. - Concluded that black does not fit in with the neighborhood. Patten - Agreed with Val and didn't mind the charcoal gray doors and garage but was not in favor of the black sash. Paul - Acknowledged that fitting in with the context is the objective, noting most buildings have white trim. - Recognized the possibility for one structure to depart from the predominant white trim. - Expressed concern about both addresses having matching black sash color. - Liked Mickey's idea of Essex Green as an alternative. - Suggested that adjusting the sash on the home with charcoal shutters might also require adjusting the color of the shutters. - Considered the idea of a Hamilton Blue door and proposed exploring Hamilton Blue shutters or sash for visual interest. - Concluded that the two structures should not match each other and saw an opportunity for one to depart from the white-on-white scheme. Thornewill - Believed black is not appropriate for the area, recalling the HDC's efforts to make the			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	buildings look distinct from each other. • Thought making all of them black would be a step backward as they would read as one big property. • Found Joe's idea interesting and suggested playing with a different color scheme for the smaller building on the right, but not something bold and in-your-face if it is going to be different from white. Welch • Agreed with the previous points and offered specific suggestions regarding color choices. • Would not be adverse to a black shutter, black door, and white sash for the structure on the left. • Preferred the garage to be paired color-wise with the structure on the right, rather than black. • Suggested using Essex or a darker "invisible green" for an individualized look. • Liked the idea of muted colors, such as Hamilton Blue and Hamilton Blue shutters, which are not focal points but add subtle interest. • Mentioned that this neighborhood, like others, doesn't require strict adherence to traditional colors, noting that even the old jail has a Cottage Red door and trim. • Emphasized the importance of the structures fitting in with the neighborhood, asserting that black would not achieve this goal.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Oliver) (00:20:07)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

V. NEW BUSINESS 03/05/2024 (VIEW)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Thomas Lord	15 Coffin Street	New Driveway	73.4.1/34	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill (Camp – temporarily left the room)			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner • Noted for the record that the dwelling on the property is circa 1938, referred to as Hab Trot. • Mentioned the removal of access off Coffin Street and the addition of access to South Road. • Expressed relief that the concerns were reviewed on site, considering this appropriate. • Highlighted that this situation is technically an "as built" and wanted to bring it to the commission's attention. • Stated there was no fee associated with the application. • Indicated that the new access on South Road requires an apron, as it is a paved road, according to the zoning bylaw. • Emphasized the need to ensure the changes conform to the zoning bylaws' dimensionality requirements, specifically 139-20.1. • Acknowledged receiving comments and concerns from the neighborhood.			
Public Comments:	Mark Filipski, 5/7 South Road • Stated that directly north of the property in question, the Lords installed a large, commercial-scale parking lot without a permit. • Noted that the Lords have since applied for a permit after being advised to do so, and although initially told they didn't need one, this was hearsay. • Mentioned that the Lords have a longstanding driveway off Coffin Street, which could have been expanded but was not. • Criticized the lack of communication or notification to the neighbors regarding the parking lot. • Acknowledged that the Lords have rented the home in the past and likely will in the future, causing concern about increased traffic on the modest South Road. • Concluded that the parking lot's scale and the removal of Belgian block were atypical for the			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	neighborhood, potentially affecting property values, increasing traffic, and diminishing the streetscape's tranquility. Williams - Understood that the Lords were unaware they needed a permit until informed, leading to bringing the issue to the commission after the fact. - Noted that the Lords have to pay a fine for the oversight. - Mentioned that the Lords apparently spoke to someone on South Road and received approval, provided they contribute to the street's maintenance. - Confirmed that the Belgian block was installed appropriately to prevent shells from spilling into the street. - Clarified that there were discussions with someone on South Road, but the speaker was not privy to those discussions and was involved to address the issue. Filipski - Stated that was an incorrect statement made by Ms. Williams.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Acknowledged that such issues are unfortunately common lately. - Confirmed that the material is shell, which is appropriate for the area. - Agreed that the parking lot is a large expanse not seen elsewhere on the street or in the area. - Suggested mitigation planting to soften the visual impact. - Noted that while aprons are required, there are no other aprons visible on the street, likely due to being installed before the bylaw. - Emphasized the need for screening at the very least. Welch - Acknowledged that the apron is a zoning necessity and explained that the flare, beginning 10 or 15 feet along the driveway, makes the apron twice as wide as needed. - Recommended eliminating the flare to reduce the apron width by half, creating a straight shot into the driveway. - Suggested planting privet, commonly seen in Sconset, to block the visibility of the parking area. - Emphasized the importance of maintaining the existing driveway width without increasing it, to ensure compliance with rules. - Proposed setting the driveway width at 12 feet, the minimum required, for a successful solution. - Requested seeing the area with a car in the driveway to ensure the width is understood and adhered to, preventing any unintended widening. Coombs - Agreed with reducing the driveway width to 12 feet and creating a straight shot in. - Recommended not adding fences to close it off or along the sides. - Suggested reducing the size of the apron. - Proposed planting along the front to mitigate the overwhelming size of the parking lot on the small street. Paul - Agreed with the previously stated comments. - Mentioned checking GIS for an updated aerial view and suggested that a drone image might be helpful if the applicant wanted to pursue that. - Noted that the parking area next door at 9 is substantial with two curb cuts, a substantial parking area, and a turnaround, indicating no issue with the interior of the property. - Stated that the main concern is the driveway where it meets the street. - Aligned with Steph's comments, recommending a dimensioned plan and a straight shot in. - Suggested that a current aerial view would be a great way to evaluate both properties together. - Concluded that the aerial image shown above is from 2018. Pohl - Agreed with everything that has been said, particularly regarding adding vegetation to obscure the expansive parking. - Supported narrowing the apron portion for a straight shot in. - Emphasized the need for dimensions on the plan.

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions, which should include a dimensioned plan that accurately represents the existing layout with the exception of a 12-foot straight shot modification to the apron and flare of the driveway and the inclusion of planting. (Made By: Oliver) (00:32:10)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

VI. NEW BUSINESS 03/05/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3 Step Lane LLC	3 Step Lane	Gutters	42.4.2/44	Union Studio
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Hailey Beyer, Union Studio			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Reminded the commission of their previous approval for the reconstruction of the historic Veranda House, which was lost to a catastrophic fire in July 2022. - Referenced the National Park Service Secretary of the Interior's technical brief on the use of substitute materials, mentioning a recent webinar on this topic, specifically concerning historic structures. - Clarified that this project is a replica, as closely as possible within the Old Historic District (OHD) and in alignment with the rehabilitation standards, which purposefully allow for the use of substitute materials when original materials are not reasonably possible or in new construction. - Highlighted the flexibility in the standards to be applied cumulatively, emphasizing that the overall effect of the work, in the context of the specific conditions of the property and the project, should be consistent with the property's historic character. - Stressed the importance of the appearance and physical properties of the material, its performance over time, and the consideration of the location of the gutter.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Acknowledged mixed feelings on this issue. - Preferred wood as the material. - Questioned whether the difference between wood and the substitute material would be distinguishable. - Expressed concern that the profile of the gutter is a bit boxy and not quite the normal wooden gutter profile, which might be noticeable. - Indicated an indecisive stance on the matter.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Given its location and inaccessibility, supported the use of a man-made material. - Recalled approving a similar solution for the Congregational Church tower for maintenance reasons. - Expressed approval for the use of the substitute material, with the caveat that the profile might need tweaking and left that decision to the applicant. Backus - Added to Val's point by highlighting that the Congregational Church, also under a preservation restriction held by the Nantucket Preservation Trust (NPT), demonstrates that using man-made materials for a historic structure can be done effectively. - Emphasized that this consideration applies not only for infill but also for historic preservation purposes. Coombs - Supported using the substitute material as long as it closely resembles the original. - Noted that the picture provided does not match the appearance of the traditional gutters. - Emphasized the importance of the profile being accurate or as accurate as possible.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	Welch - Agreed with Diane, emphasizing that the material should look like the original wood and have an accurate profile. - Pointed out two positive aspects: - The material looks like wood, which is good. - The profile is very similar to the 4-inch versus 3-inch fur gutter profile, reducing concern about this detail. - Noted that, given the ornamental details and the height at which it will be used, the gutter will blend in. - Highlighted the benefit of resilience, as the material will not come off, will not require Chevron shingle oil every 3 years, and will not leach into the harbor. - Emphasized that this material will likely last much longer, potentially 20-30 years or more, without needing replacement. Pohl - Acknowledged the existence of another similar gutter, noting that the profile is a classic 4x5 gutter as opposed to the smaller 3x4 version. - Mentioned that there is a version with a built-in Scotia underneath but chose not to focus on this detail. - Decided to align with the group's consensus on this matter.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (00:40:55)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

3 Pleasant Street Nom Tr	3 Pleasant Street	Addition	42.3.3/155	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged the structure, circa 1804, built for Reuben Dao, as a typical Nantucket building. - Discussed the proposed 770-foot addition, emphasizing the need for it to follow traditional secondary mass sizing and additive requirements as outlined in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Highlighted the importance of historically appropriate additive massing, recommending that the two-story L shape be retained while providing a less subordinate mass off the side, referencing page 67 of "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Noted the absence of the age of the rear L, suggesting that this information should be provided if possible, despite it not being annotated on the old 1989 HDC survey. - Stressed that the new addition should not exceed the size of the existing rear L and deemed the proposed pergola inappropriate for this 200-year-old Nantucket structure, suggesting it be relocated to the rear and out of public view. - Mentioned that the "peekaboo" effect of the addition as seen from the south, although likely not visible, is still inappropriate, and recommended bringing down the mass as much as possible. - Expressed interest in retaining the windows being removed from the existing rear mass as seen from the north, noting the absence of information about windows in the application. - Appreciated the retention of the historic chimneys, especially the rear L, and commended the addition's placement off the main block rather than on it, keeping it as far to the rear as possible. - Noted that the commission received a letter, an email dated March 11th, from a direct abutter at 5 Pleasant Street, which was forwarded to the commission.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group Deemed the project's additions as much too massive in all respects.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	- Noted the awkward placement in terms of additive massing, with the new gable roof lines competing with the main mass. - Suggested that the roof needs to be lower and more integrated into the existing roof system, rather than simply tacked onto the rear. - Found the French doors inappropriate, along with the porch roof facing the front. - Observed that the first and second-floor plans illustrate the large rooms being added, which are out of scale compared to the house itself. - Concluded that the project needs to be reconsidered at a more appropriate scale to the existing building.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Agreed with the HSAG's assessment. - Found the additive massing overwhelming to the original historic structure. - Commented that the second-floor windows are too tall and narrow, suggesting they should resemble the 12 over 12s on the front of the house. - Agreed that the French doors on Pleasant Street are inappropriate, suggesting a single door with an appropriate side window to avoid the "wall of light" effect created by the two spread-apart doors. - Noted the inappropriateness of the pergola on the front and side, as well as the front brackets. - Concluded that the massing is too large and overwhelms the historic structure. - Recommended making changes to the back while preserving the historic integrity of the Pleasant Street side. Oliver, Coombs and Thornewill - Stated they had nothing further to add.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (00:49:43)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

2538970 Ontario Inc.	5 Coffin Street (Sias)	Exterior Alterations	73.1.4/21	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 - For the record, noted that this is a circa 1930 dwelling within the Old Historic District of Sconset, and it is indicated as contributing on the HDC survey. - Observed that the application indicates SDL windows and doors, which are considered inappropriate for a historic structure within the OHD of Sconset, suggesting the retention of existing windows if possible. - Appreciated the proposed porch extension, as it is in keeping with the bungalow-type cottage. - Commented that the west elevation changes seem to have a lot of glazing and recommended checking the percentage as noted in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Mentioned receiving an email from Mr. Rob Benchley, representing the Sconset Advisory Group, which stated that there seems to be too much glass on the east and west elevations, especially for this part of the village so close to the core. - Conveyed the group's comments and concerns about the proposed changes.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Appreciated the bungalow style being promoted, noting it enhances the west interior elevation. - Suggested reducing the two small windows near the gable to just one, as having two seems excessive. - Focused on the south side along Coffin Street, confirming it is towards the water and noting it won't be very visible.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	- Identified the main concern as the elevation facing Lindberg Street, particularly the one window that seems bothersome. Coombs - Mentioned that the use of SDL windows was previously discussed, and it was suggested that TDL windows would be more appropriate for the historic building. - Noted that while some existing windows are SDLs, the preference should be for TDLs in keeping with the building's historic nature and its location in the Old Historic District. - Agreed that the windows should make sense and match the historic character as much as possible. - Commented on the small porch under the two second-floor windows on the left, suggesting it might need kick panels or should be adjusted to align better with the other windows. Welch - Commented that the west elevation seems like a wasted effort, with the 6-over-2 fenestration appearing out of place and creating a juxtaposition with the semi-bracelet door glazing. - Suggested that the west elevation windows should reflect the door glazing and be configured as 6-over-6 or 6-over-1 to create a more cohesive look. - Noted that if the west elevation is not going to be visible, it's less of a concern, but still mentioned that the triple doors should at least have panels to match the front door's design. - Agreed with Abby that the two four-light windows are one too many on that elevation. - Emphasized that changes made to the doors on the west should also be applied to the east elevation, while leaving the north elevation unchanged. Oliver - Agreed with previous comments. - Noted there may be a need for a window survey to determine the existing types (SDL vs. TDL). - Observed that due to the large hedge, the first floor will likely be obscured, making the second floor the main focus. - Expressed uncertainty that anyone would be close enough to discern the difference in window types from a distance. Pohl - Had one issue regarding the west elevation, which faces Lindberg. - Noted that the new porch features a shed roof with an appended hip roof pushed further out to highlight the front door. - Found the design of one porch roof stacked on top of another not ideal. - Suggested that the long shed roof of the farmer's porch might look better as a hip roof, to align with the existing hipped porch roof. - Commented that the existing hipped roof is attractive, in keeping with the overall design, and mimics the hipped dormers, recommending this design approach for consistency. MacEachern - Acknowledged the attempt to use a hip roof for the first-floor porch. - Noted that due to the high plate height of the first floor compared to the second floor, the hip roof appeared odd. - Offered to bring in visuals of the hip roof option to show the commission for further consideration.
Motion:	Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Made by: Welch) (01:00:35)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

Glidden	24 Rugged Road	Pergola	67/164	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:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Suggested that the pergola looks a little forced in its current position. - Recommended pulling the pergola back a couple of feet to keep it in proportion with the rest of the structure. Welch - Suggested adding a vertical element, such as lattice, on the rugged road side to create more visual weight where the post is. - Explained that this addition would modify the perception of the roof element, making it appear less wide over a small post. - Noted that incorporating some beautiful vining material planted on it would enhance the visual appeal. Oliver - Agreed that the pergola feels out of place because it is the same exact width as the house. - Suggested cutting it back a few feet to help it blend better with the overall structure. - Recommended simplifying the design by reducing the overhang. - Supported the idea of adding lattice for additional visual interest. - Confirmed that the pergola is natural to weather. Coombs - Agreed with Val's comments about needing to reduce the width of the pergola to make it less full. - Noted that the pergola appears wider than the small gable and suggested bringing it in to integrate better with the front. - Mentioned that while the pergola looks acceptable when viewed head-on, it becomes very obvious from the side views (south and north), so reducing its width would help it fit in better. Pohl - Agreed with the suggestion to cut back and scale down the pergola a bit to achieve better proportions and integration with the overall structure.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) the following: - Cut back the pergola to 12 feet. - Keep the pergola natural to weather. - Add a lattice on the roadside. - Use a simpler end cut for the pergola. (Made by: Oliver) (00:28:58)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

63 Hulbert LLC	63 Hulbert Avenue	Main House Porch Fen Rev	29/9	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates:	Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	- For the record, this is the Ariba Patterson Cooper and James Brown House, a Colonial Revival from circa 1915 to 1923. An updated Form B (HDC survey) is forthcoming, but the old HDC survey indicates it is a contributing structure. - Noted that the commission's prior approvals for changes to the structure included a historic determination on file. The facade facing Hulbert Avenue has always had two windows in the gable, and the previously approved alterations maintained this feature. - Found the proposal to add three windows to the gable inappropriate as it alters the character-defining features seen from Hulbert Avenue. - Approved the door changes to the east as they are more consistent with the existing dwelling's style. - Expressed concern about the north side facing the water, noting that the proposed changes seem to increase the glazing beyond what is recommended per "Building with Nantucket in Mind" and what historically exists. Requested clarification on the percentage of glazing proposed. - Found the outdoor showers on top of the deck out of place and noted this might be a recurring issue for the commission. - Deemed the proposed friendship stairs on the west side inappropriate to the vernacular of the house, suggesting that one side is sufficient. Recalled a previous proposal for a large stairwell on the water side and referenced past applications where friendship stairs were evaluated, emphasizing that they are not typical for a Colonial Revival structure.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Commented on the east side of the building, noting that the lattice screen structure looks like a deck railing and should instead resemble a simple fence for screening purposes, avoiding a complicated deck-like appearance. - Agreed that the elevated outdoor shower on the west side is not appropriate and should be moved to grade level to reduce visibility from the harbor. - Reiterated that the friendship stairs are not appropriate, aligning with Holly's assessment. - Supported Holly's comments about the inappropriateness of changing from two to three windows on the front of the building facing Hulbert Avenue.
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Agreed with Holly and Micky's comments, noting that these points have been consistently raised over time. - Reiterated that the issues identified have not significantly changed and the same concerns continue to be relevant. Welch - Agreed that the outdoor shower visible from the harbor is a tough sell. - Reiterated that the friendship stairs are not appropriate. - Preferred the two-window configuration but would also be okay with three windows if the small hip roof jog was present or restored. Patten - Agreed with the previous comments, particularly regarding the outdoor shower and the friendship stairs. - Expressed less concern about the change from two windows to three windows. Camp - Agreed with the previous comments, finding the three windows aesthetically more pleasing than the two. - Agreed about the concerns regarding the shower and the lattice screen, suggesting that a simple railing might be a better alternative. - Agreed that the friendship stairs are excessive. - Expressed overall agreement with the consensus of the group. Pohl - Acknowledged that the mechanical enclosure is required to be above the floodplain, which is why the lattice structure is used. MacEachern - Agreed with Mickey's suggestion about creating a fence or railing as an alternative to the lattice structure.

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	- Acknowledged that a railing might blend more seamlessly than lattice. - Considered using a fence or railing as opposed to lattice, while noting that a railing would allow visibility through it. Pohl - Expressed concern about the friendship stairs. - Agreed with Abby on the three windows, noting they line up with the three apertures below, which is a plus. - Stated that the outdoor shower needs to be lowered down. Welch - Suggested that on the east elevation, a shingle wall without a cap or with a natural-to-weather cap without a fascia would blend in and disappear. - Noted that this approach would create a unified field appearance rather than a separate texture, especially if the shingle courses are aligned continuously from one side to the other, wrapping towards the French doors from the left corner of the house.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, to include the following: East Elevation: AC condenser enclosures to be a shingled railing. North and West Elevation: Omit the outdoor shower. West Elevation: Eliminate the friendship stairs and have the stairs run in one direction toward Hulbert Avenue. (Made by: Welch) (01:17:31)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)

1 N Swift Rock Road Trust	1 N Swift Rock	Patio	40/2	Ahern LLC
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Welch			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	Sharon Alexander - Noted that, in addition to the 504 square foot patio, there are two other patios under the pool hardscape: one is 380 square feet, and the other is 400 square feet. - Added that there is 840 square feet of decking to be considered under the pool hardscape, bringing the total decking and patio square footage to 2,124 square feet, which seems like a lot of hardscape.			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Acknowledged that the 14 by 36 patio seems a bit long but noted that it is far back from the road. - Stated no issue with this particular patio. Thornewill - Confirmed that the patio is at grade and will not be visible. - Agreed with this assessment. Coombs - Agreed that since the patio is not visible, there is no problem with it. Oliver - Acknowledged that based on visibility, the patio is acceptable. - Noted it is unfortunate that the patio and pool are not considered together but mentioned difficulty in accessing the pool information. Pohl - Concurred with the previous comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (01:25:55)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

1 N Swift Rock Road Trust	1 N Swift Rock	Pool Hardscape	40/2	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Welch			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner			
Public Comments:	Lisa Berger, 27 Eel Point Road - Expressed concern about the property sloping down from Eel Point Road. - Noted the pool size of 18 feet by 44 feet, which is as large as the pool at the Nantucket Club, making it quite large. - Echoed concerns about the total patio and decking area, amounting to 2,124 square feet, which is considered excessive. - Stated that all these elements combined make it feel like a hotel in an area with many small houses, making it too much. - Emphasized that the presence of all these features will make it noticeable and audible from Eel Point Road, comparing it to having the Nantucket Hotel behind them.			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Agreed that the pool is too large and should be a regular residential size, not a hotel size. - Noted that the entire development gives off an inappropriate feeling for Swift Rock Road, making it seem like a small city within itself. - Highlighted concerns about the eight-car parking space, which contributes to the oversized feel of the property. - Emphasized that the porches, decks, and parking need to be reconsidered to align with the streetscape and the character of the area, which is not like this at all. - Acknowledged that while the property might not be visible from the street currently, future visibility and impact should be considered. - Concluded that the lot, although large, must still fit in with the neighborhood and currently has too much outside surrounding area being built. Thornewill - Agreed that the pool is indeed humongous at 44 feet long with surrounding decking. - Acknowledged that it may not be visible from anywhere currently. - Expressed willingness to take a drive to Eel Point to assess visibility, but noted difficulty in identifying the house since it isn't built yet. - Mentioned that with the grade, visibility concerns might arise from Eel Point, where the area is more exposed. - Suggested that repositioning the Cabana and reducing the pool size could help mask it better. - Emphasized that any approval should come with the caveat that the pool must remain invisible. Oliver - Acknowledged that the commission's purview is limited to what can be seen from a public way. - Recognized that opinions on whether the pool and surrounding structures are too much cannot be the basis for decisions. - Agreed that while a smaller scale might be more fitting for a beach community, it is not within the commission's scope to determine this aspect. Camp - Expressed difficulty in assessing the project due to its large scale and suggested breaking it into smaller parts for easier evaluation. - Acknowledged the challenge in making a firm decision but noted that the project being at the back of the property somewhat mitigates concerns. - Supported the idea of reducing the pool and hardscaping by a few feet to make the project seem less monumental.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	- Concluded that overall, the project seems acceptable but recommended slight reductions to improve its fit within the property. Pohl - Acknowledged that the project will not be visible from Eel Point Road due to intervening lots and their respective houses, nor from Swift Rock. - Concluded that the project is not visible from a publicly traveled way.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted due to the lack of visibility, in addition, the pool cannot be seen at the time of inspection or thereafter in perpetuity; No grade changes from existing are allowed without applying to the HDC. (Made by: Oliver) (01:36:55)
Vote:	Carried 3-1-1 // Pohl, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye) //Coombs (abstain) //Camp (nay)

1 N Swift Rock Road Trust	1 N Swift Rock	Pavilion	40/2	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Welch			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	Lisa Berger, 27 Eel Point Road - Expressed concern that the project will be visible from Eel Point Road, based on daily observations. - Noted that the project adds to the total square footage of the property, compounding the impact. - Highlighted that the pavilion has unnecessary windows on the south elevation, which will allow light to be visible from Eel Point Road. - Recommended removing these windows to reduce light pollution. - Mentioned that the pool equipment is planned for the back side of the pavilion and expressed concern about the noise impact on neighbors. - Suggested reconsidering the placement of the pool equipment to mitigate noise issues.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Appreciated that the structure is short in stature but found the 20 by 20 porch on a 10-foot-wide building excessive. - Suggested that if reductions are necessary, this porch seems like a reasonable place to make cuts without significantly impacting the overall project. - Noted that the current design adds a lot to an already busy lot. Camp and Coombs - Concurred with Oliver. Thornewill - Expressed concern about the proportions of open to closed spaces and the placement of the chimney. - Noted that the south elevation, facing Eel Point Road, is the simplest and most appropriate in appearance. - Indicated that visibility of the other elevations is less of a concern if they are not visible from public ways. - Emphasized the importance of considering a better location for the pool equipment out of neighborliness, given the multiple buildings on the property. - Encouraged at least considering the neighbors' perspective when placing the pool equipment. Pohl - Agreed that the porch, in relation to the enclosed portion of the structure, is excessively large and needs to be pared back.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (01:42:33)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

1 N Swift Rock Road Trust	1 N Swift Rock	Garage	40/2	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Welch			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD - Clarified that the abutters were notified of the new dwelling and garage in the initial notification. - Explained that the approval for the garage was delayed due to changes made to the main house. - Confirmed that although the notification mentioned the garage, the approval process for the garage was postponed until the main house was approved. - Asserted that the abutters were technically notified about the garage.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged the issue with the abutters' notice for the garage. - Clarified that the original abutters' notice included both the main house and the garage, but the garage should have had a separate notification. - Confirmed that the initial notification from November is still valid within the six-month timeframe but did not specifically cover the garage as a standalone application. - Noted that the application for the garage was received in March, and it should have had its own abutters' notification due to its size. - Brought this issue to Matt's office after it was brought to attention, confirming that the abutters present did not receive a specific notice for the garage application.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Acknowledged that although the initial notification included the garage, it was not ready for review at the same time as the main house. - Agreed that notifications are meant to specify the date of the hearing, which was not the case for the garage. - To err on the side of caution, suggested holding the review of the garage to ensure proper notification and avoid any claims of inadequate notice from abutters. Oliver - Suggested that when the garage reappears for review, all other structures on the site should be included for comparison. - Referenced the previous practice of comparing structures when the big house was next to the existing house.			
Action:	No action was taken due to the insufficient noticing to the abutters.			

VII. OLD BUSINESS 03/12/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Iamadummy LLC	77 Eel Point Road	Rev to COA Beach Stairs	32/44	JB Studio
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Juraj Bencat, JB Studio			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Confirmed that the structure is made of natural-to-weather wood. - Agreed that it looks similar to other structures in the area.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	- Acknowledged the necessity of elevating it to maintain the integrity of what's beneath, which is a requirement by the Conservation Commission (ConCom). - Expressed approval of the project. Paul - Agreed with Val and mentioned having a similar project approved at 119 Eel Point Road. - Noted that if the Conservation Commission (ConCom) has approved this construction, it is deemed appropriate. Coombs - Expressed approval of the project, finding it in line with previous agreements.
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Oliver) (02:00:23)
Vote:	Carried 3-0 // Welch, Oliver, Paul (Aye) * Due to technical difficulties, Coombs was not online during the vote.

TACK3 LLC	3 Commercial Street	Rev Dormers	42.3.1/38	CWA
Voting:	Pohl, Oliver, Thornewill (Camp, Coombs not present during the representative's presentation)			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Chip Webster			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - For the record, confirmed that this structure is not from the 1970s. It is known as Crow's Nest and is part of Sherburn Associates' Harbor View building, contributing to the historic district. Photographic evidence shows it has existed since the 1880s. - Acknowledged that the proposed changes to the existing dormer are primarily on the harbor side and the north. - Noted that while the dormers are atypical, they are flanked by two smaller gable dormers on the same plane, giving the appearance of a shed gable dormer. - Stated that the existing configuration is appropriate and that gable dormers need to conform to "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Mentioned that the structure has undergone many revisions over time, even before "Building with Nantucket in Mind," making dormers historically appropriate. - Suggested that it might be nice to nod to the structure's appearance from the 1930s up to 1968. - Expressed that the proposed changes on the north elevation do not necessarily pay homage to its original appearance but acknowledged that the photographic evidence shows various fenestration changes, especially on the gable ends, pointing out that it has not had typical Nantucket fenestration.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Noted that this building dates back to at least the 1880s. - Stated that the proposed front dormer does not meet "Building with Nantucket in Mind" guidelines, which emphasize that dormer design and placement should not disrupt the simplicity of the front roof plane, a key aspect of the building's architectural character. - Cited the guideline stating, "Shed dormers, particularly trunk or full ones which cover the main roof plane, are neither appropriate nor desirable." - Emphasized that the front of the building is different from the back and changes permissible at the back are not suitable for the front facing the street. - Asserted that the presence of an earlier small gable dormer, which has been removed, should not influence current decisions, as it was a short-term appendage, and the building now has a more appropriate facade that should remain unchanged.			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill Agreed that keeping the front facade as it is would be a good decision, especially since it has been changed from the historic configuration for the better.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	- Acknowledged that the historic photograph shows a central gable that would not be desirable to bring back. - Supported the idea that while adding light is important, the rear already has plenty of light, and maintaining the current front facade preserves the building's character. - Concluded that if the proposed changes were for the back, they would be more acceptable, but since they are for the front, it's best to leave the facade unchanged, aligning with Holly and Mickey's views. Oliver - Agreed, based on the pictures, that the two shed dormers have been consistently present for quite some time. - Preferred to keep the front facade simple and unchanged. Pohl - Agreed with the sentiment that removing the gable dormer was an improvement. - Acknowledged that restoring the gable dormer would have historical precedent but preferred keeping the current simple front facade.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (02:15:54)
Vote:	Carried 3-0 // Pohl, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

More than Enough LLC	30 Russells Way	Chimney Deck Grade	77/8.1	CWA
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Chip Webster			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Appreciated the changes made, noting they have made the house look much more handsome. - Expressed that the chimney still seems too big, especially since it does not even have an inside fireplace. - Suggested reducing the chimney to a size similar to what is shown on the side elevations if it is being kept for aesthetic purposes. - Acknowledged the effort in breaking up the decks, although still finding them wide, but considered the approach successful. - Praised the overall height reduction of the house. - Thanked Chip for working with the commission on these adjustments. Coombs - Appreciated the efforts made, noting the significant positive difference. - Liked the chimney, feeling it pulls the house together and aligns with its design. - Acknowledged that all major concerns previously raised have been corrected. - Thanked Chip for addressing the feedback and making the necessary changes. Camp - Noted that the front door's portico contributes to the "rocket ship" effect of the main mass. - Suggested that a shed farmer's porch front would reduce this arrow-pointing appearance. - Appreciated the chimney but expressed uncertainty about it. - Mentioned that the central placement of the chimney might be contributing to the focal point effect, making everything seem to be pointing at it. Welch - Stated satisfaction with the current design and expressed appreciation for the changes made.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	Pohl • Expressed concern that although the grading change was addressed, the building height remains an issue. • Noted that initially, with the proposed grading change, the building was 28' 4" high. Now, without the grading change, the building is 29' 6" high. • Pointed out that the building height was kept the same despite removing the grading change, which is concerning. • Expected the building height to come down to 28' 4" without the grading change, rather than increasing in height. Camp • Stated she shared the same concerns regarding height. Webster • Acknowledged the red dotted line indicating the original submission height, showing the building has come down approximately 18 inches from the original submission. • Recognized that the absolute height relative to sea level has been reduced as a result. Pohl • Clarified the confusion by pointing out that if the building is now 29'6" and has come down a foot and a half, it implies the original height would have been 31 feet. • Noted that this would have exceeded the zoning limit of 30 feet, raising concerns about the initial proposed height. Webster • Acknowledged that re-grading raises the starting point, ensuring compliance with zoning requirements by maintaining the average grade between existing points. • Offered to bring the height down another six inches, reducing it to 29 feet. • Also offered to make the chimney smaller, possibly simplifying it to a square shape. Camp • Noted that the building is perceived as very tall, both in actual height and appearance. • Recommended that the height be reduced by at least another foot, aiming for a maximum height of 28 feet. • Expressed concern that the current height makes the building appear looming and reducing it would improve its scale and visual impact. Webster • Explained that the perception of height is due to the high placement of the first-floor windows and the considerable amount of shingles visible on the elevation. • Clarified that to lower the building, the reduction would come from the bottom, raising the shingle course and reducing the space between the bottom of the shingles and the first-floor windows. • Highlighted that the porch is at the first-floor level, and currently, there are four risers leading up to it. • Suggested that lowering the entire structure by reducing the height of the risers would bring down the building, making it look less tall and reducing the perceived height. Welch • Agreed that the appropriate solution is to limit the overall number of risers to two. • Noted that the current high placement of the foundation wall results in an atypical presentation with extended shingles masking it. • Suggested pushing the foundation back down into the ground to address the excessive number of exposed shingle courses. • Highlighted that this approach will also reduce the number of steps. Webster • Acknowledged that you need about 22 inches from grade to finished floor, which typically requires three risers. • Proposed having two risers to the porch and then one more to get into the house, ensuring the total number of risers doesn't exceed three. • Confirmed that each riser would be approximately seven and a half inches, which would address the height perception issue while maintaining functionality.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions including a section through the building. (Made by: Camp) (02:32:02)

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
-------	--

Ted & Amy Orenstein	5 Crows Nest Way	New Dwelling	12/22.2	Sandcastle Const.
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Rob Newman, Sandcastle Construction			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Suggested changing the front door to three panes of glass and one panel to reduce busyness. - Recommended separating the two first-floor windows on the west elevation to cover more space and balance better with the two windows above, reducing the amount of exposed shingles. - Although the east elevation faces the ocean and may not be publicly visible, suggested adding kick panels to the bottom of the French doors and reducing the number of French doors from four to three. - Noted a preference to see the four windows on the north elevation spread out more across the bottom. - No issues with the south elevation. - Inquired about corbeling the chimney closer to the first floor, while accommodating fireplaces on both floors. Camp - Agreed with Diane about the fenestration, finding the east elevation overly fenestrated with French doors. - Suggested reducing the number of French doors and adding kick panels to help. - On the west elevation, suggested that the secondary mass off to the left should mirror the main mass more, as it currently looks like an appendage. - Recommended separating the windows to relate better to the other side. - Agreed about the front door, noting it seems odd and gives the building an identity crisis, appearing both formal and country-like. Patten - Agreed with previous comments, particularly concerning the east elevation. - Believed the number of French doors is not appropriate, even though it faces the water. - Okay with the other elevations but supported the idea of separating the windows on the west. Thornewill - Agreed with the suggestions for the west elevation, proposing reducing the side lights to three lights instead of extending them all the way down. - On the east elevation, found the number of doors excessive and suggested changing to six-light doors and reducing the number of panels from four to three, to better match the window proportions. - Praised the structure's simplicity and noted that the current windows and doors on the east elevation make it appear busy. Welch - Regarding the front door, not as concerned about the fenestration itself but suggested that a natural to weather or quaker gray finish would be more appropriate. - Agreed with other comments about modifying the fenestration. - Pointed out a drafting inconsistency: on the south elevation, the vertex of the shoulders terminates at the house, while on the east and west elevations, it terminates into the chimney. Suggested rectifying this discrepancy and clarifying the intended design.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	Noted that terminating the shoulders into the house is not typical for residential settings and is more common in commercial buildings. Recommended cleaning up this detail for clarity.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (02:48:58)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Patten (Aye)

Smiley 17 N Water LLC	17 N Water	Add Roofwalk	42.4.2/49	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	- Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - For the record, this is a circa 1812 typical Nantucket structure, formerly the Easton Street Guest House, owned by the Ross' many years ago. - Appreciated the revisions and the effort to reference the historic photo from the 1930s. - Supported the idea of mimicking the historic roof walk as much as possible, though suggested it could be slightly narrower. - Believed that the proposed appearance on North Water Street looks proportionately appropriate.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - This roof walk should follow the example set by the earlier one shown in the historic photo. - It should be three bays wide and one bay deep, matching the early photo. - Currently, it is shown as three bays wide and two bays deep, which is too wide. - The roof walk should be no deeper than the standard seven or eight feet and should be symmetrical to the ridge, as an asymmetrical roof walk would be out of character for a house of this age. - Early roof walks were utilitarian, designed for one or two people to access the roof, not for large groups.			
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Acknowledged Mickey's point regarding the roof walk not sitting symmetrically on the ridge. - Noted that the previous problem was the posts interfering with the dormers due to the walk's length. - Observed that with the narrower roof walk, it now seems feasible to position it symmetrically on the ridge. - Concluded that the posts should be able to align properly without obstructing the dormers. - Agreed that no one on the board wanted the roof walk to look too long on the front. - Noted that the previous issue was due to the roof walk being much deeper. - Pointed out that with this new width, achieving symmetry may now possible. Thornewill - Acknowledged that the original roof walk was very narrow, intended for just one or two people. - Recognized that in today's world, there is a desire for more people to use the roof walk, necessitating a slightly wider design. - Agreed that the current proposal still reads a little long. - Questioned the front-to-back placement, noting it is not centered on the ridge. - Wondered if this asymmetry will be noticeable. MacEachern - Agreed that it is unlikely to be highly visible from the rear. - Acknowledged the willingness to center the roof walk, ensuring it clears the dormers. - Reiterated that the length is based on the historic photograph.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	Welch - Acknowledged the reduced width and depth (front to back), allowing the overall mass to shift forward without interfering with the dormers. - Recognized that the roof walk is still longer than the original and suggested bringing it in by at least a foot and a half, aligning it closer to the ridges of the doghouse dormers. - Supported shifting the roof walk forward by about a foot, believing the off-center placement will not be visible. - Noted the historical use of chimneys for burning wood and the current practice of installing faux chimneys, expressing less concern about the chimney. - Emphasized the need to reduce the width and shift the roof walk forward. Camp and Coombs - Agreed that the roof walk should not be as long in length and should be symmetric on either side of the ridge. Welch Proposed Exhibit A: - Move the roof walk towards the street by a minimum of a foot and as much as possible without interfering with the ridges of the dormers. - Decrease the width by approximately 18 inches on each side to either align with or just past the ridges. - Implement a total reduction in the length of the roof walk by approximately 3 feet. - Execute these changes through staff, as outlined in Exhibit A. Thornewill - Proposed setting a specific maximum width to prevent the roof walk from extending too far back and avoid having 10-foot-long legs on the back.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) as stated by Mr. Welch. (Made by: Welch) (02:59:14)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

KAC Holdings LLC	156 Madaket Road	Pickleball and Driveway	39/13.4	Atlantic
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Lindsay Congelton, Atlantic Landscaping			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Appreciated the revisions. - Mentioned that Commissioner Welch emphasized the importance of character and setting, suggesting that having the structure within 20 feet of the main house would be more appropriate. - Acknowledged that the owners propose to have a structure in the future, but questioned whether the proposed location meets the board members' intentions. - Wanted to bring this concern to the board's attention.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Acknowledged the narrow lot and the challenges it presents. - Considered that the area where the pickleball court is located might be the best place for it, considering noise and visual aspects. - Questioned the reason for the huge driveway in the application, which enters at the bottom right and leads to a wall and another parking space, ultimately ending at the pickleball court. - Noted that the driveway configuration seems to disrupt the layout, especially with the additional entrance.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	Congelton • Acknowledged that one of the owner's parents is handicapped and unable to navigate the bumpy road. • Explained that the driveway design is intended to provide easier access via Madaket Road for the handicapped parent. Coombs • Acknowledged that the proposed driveway takes up a lot of space on the narrow lot, with everything extending from sideline to sideline. • Noted that the lot includes a pool, making it very busy. • Conceded that, given the constraints and the amount of space available, this seems to be the closest and most feasible solution. Camp • Expressed doubt about whether this is the best site for a pickleball court. • Noted that the long, narrow shape of the lot isn't conducive, as it necessitates a driveway that takes up a quarter of the lot's length. • Questioned why the pickleball court isn't placed closer to the house instead of being all the way over there. • Considered the current placement of the pickleball court inappropriate. Thornewill • Asked about the fence height, noting it has a significant impact on visibility. • Agreed that blocking the existing driveway is a good idea but expressed concern that it may not be enough to hide the court, given the proximity to the street and the new driveway leading directly to it. • Mentioned that the lot's natural vegetation is wild and scrub-like, and introducing blocking vegetation may create something inconsistent with the character of the setting. • Expressed doubt that it will be easy to effectively mask the court. Congelton • Acknowledged that a tall fence was not proposed, only a short four-foot fence for the pickleball court. • Explained that the current roadway only feeds one other house, with the intention to heavily vegetate the area. • Offered to cut back the shell driveway from reaching the pickleball court, stopping it at the two-car parking area. • Suggested adding more vegetation in the area of the driveway to enhance screening, if that pleases the board. Thornewill • Suggested that relying on the neighbor's sliver of land for screening may not be sufficient if they decide to clear their land. • Recommended removing a significant portion of the driveway and possibly shifting the pickleball court closer to the house, where the numbers "81914" are indicated. • Proposed buffering the court more effectively by utilizing existing vegetation and enhancing it, ensuring better screening from the street. • Advised leaving the existing vegetation where the driveway is planned and moving the pickleball court closer to the natural buffer of trees, adding more vegetation as needed. Welch • Considered the location inappropriate and stated an intention not to vote in favor, even with a taller fence. Pohl • Mentioned being okay with the proposal, especially with a 4-foot fence. • Acknowledged that there doesn't seem to be enough support for the proposal from others.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (03:11:00)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

90 N. Liberty Presv. Trust	90 N Liberty Street	Garage Partial Demo/Add	41/22	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that 90 North Liberty Street includes the 1930s Herbert Gardner garage, which is proposed to be revised and integrated as an addition to the Major Josiah Coffin House, a circa 1724 individually significant lean-to. - Noted the historic significance of the main dwelling, emphasizing its association with Major Josiah Coffin, who served in the French and Indian War. - Described the main dwelling's features, including a five-bay facade, a massive central chimney with a corbelled cap, and its status as one of the oldest houses on Nantucket, built during the town's move from Capaum to Wesco. - Highlighted that Major Josiah Coffin was the son of Mary Gardner and Jethro Coffin, and after Jethro Coffin's death in 1726, his widow lived with Major Coffin and his family at this site. - Warned that significant alterations to contributing properties can sever their physical connections with the past, lowering their historic integrity. - Appreciated the reduction in scale and massing of the garage but found it highly inappropriate to attach it to the individually significant lean-to, which is 300 years old. - Recommended creating the garage as a separate structure, maintaining the existing garage's independence, as this would be more appropriate for the historic site.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Agreed with Holly's assessment that the barn, which used to be a garage, has improved significantly. - Acknowledged that the main issue is the proposal to attach the barn to the historic house. - Stated that it would be inappropriate to attach any accessory building to the back of this very old historic house.			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Agreed that the barn/garage/cottage has improved significantly. - Expressed concern about the connection, particularly on the south elevation. - Noted that, ideally, none of the structures would be attached to preserve historical integrity. - Found the north elevation more successful, but pointed out that the window in the connector is too large and the structures are almost flush, which is problematic. - Preferred the structures to remain separate, emphasizing that the barn looks great on its own. Paul - Agreed that the barn looks appropriate and is in character with the house. - Appreciated the incorporation of some historic elements on the back. - Acknowledged that as a purist, there is agreement with fellow board members about the link. - Felt that the link, given its low height, and with the adjustment of the window, reads as a separate structure. - Believed that the link represents how a barn would be attached to a home of this era, making it feel appropriate. Oliver - Agreed with Joe and referenced the old book "Big House, Little House, Back House, Barn" which illustrates how such structures evolve. - Found that this project fits that concept well. - Complimented the overall design as well done. - Clarified that the front of the house faces into the lot and inquired about the location of the driveway.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

Botticelli

- Noted that the driveway is off of Cliff Road, entering where it says "existing driveway" on the site plan and leading directly to the garage.
- Mentioned that the shape of the driveway might need slight adjustments since the garage doors have been moved.
- Clarified that the south elevation is not visible from North Liberty Street due to the distance and the angle, implying that the breezeway wouldn't be seen from that viewpoint.

Oliver

- Agreed that if the south elevation can be seen, the three doors in the connector are not favorable.
- Conceded that if the south elevation is not visible, then it is acceptable.
- Liked the current iteration with the barn look.

Coombs

- Believed it is very important not to change the existing structure.
- Noted the 50-foot wetlands buffer as a constraint.
- Recommended getting rid of the connector, as it does not fit well with the old part of the building.
- Stressed that preserving the appearance of one of the oldest buildings on Nantucket is crucial.
- Pointed out that the garage is not currently attached, and the intersection of Cliff Road and North Liberty is very busy.
- Acknowledged that the structure is attractive as it is and emphasized the importance of keeping it as close to the original as possible.

Camp

- Emphasized the importance of the front of the house, noting that it is not highly noticeable when driving down Cliff Road.
- Suggested that if a connector with glass is necessary, it should be on the Cliff Road side with windows like six-over-sixes to match the old house on the south elevation.
- Expressed concern that the barn/garage looks too modern, particularly with the dormers.
- Proposed considering a saltbox shape for the barn or removing the dormers facing the old house to better preserve the historic character.
- Highlighted the goal of showcasing the old house in its glory without modern elements detracting from it.

Botticelli

- Noted that from North Liberty Street, the plan indicates that none of the elements being referred to as concerns on the south side would be visible.
- Highlighted the shape of the lot, which suggests that the south elevation's features will not be seen from North Liberty Street.
- Recognized the owner's effort to maintain the historic integrity of the house, noting the restoration of every window and the preservation of the original rooms without expanding the kitchen.
- Stressed the goal of creating a usable bedroom with an attached bathroom while preserving the historic character of the house.
- Emphasized the lack of visibility of the south elevation from North Liberty Street, and noted the decision to place French doors facing south rather than north to avoid modernizing the view from Cliff Road.
- Suggested that if there are concerns about the visibility of the south elevation and the three French doors, an approval could be granted with a single door, and further review could be conducted once framing is complete to ensure the elevation is not visible.

Coombs

- Acknowledged the responsibility of maintaining historic buildings, particularly those with significant history like this one, both inside and out.
- Questioned whether the HDC should prioritize preserving the original state of the building over accommodating changes that might not be visible.
- Emphasized the importance of preserving the historic integrity of the building, given its age and original condition.

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

- Raised the question of whether the principle of "you can't see it" should outweigh the responsibility to maintain the building's historical authenticity.

Botticelli

- Acknowledged that many historic buildings have had additions over the years, noting that this one remains in a very preserved state.
- Believed that the proposed addition is sympathetic to the integrity of the original house, using actual pieces and restored windows from the original structures.
- Expressed uncertainty about what other revisions could be made beyond removing the French doors on the back and making the connector a little shallower.
- Emphasized that the dormer likely won't be visible, as the house is never viewed directly facing south.
- Reiterated that the intention is to maintain the historical authenticity while making necessary additions.

Camp

- Acknowledged Diane's point that this isn't just any house, but one of the oldest on Nantucket.
- Emphasized the importance of preserving its historical authenticity given its significant age and heritage.

Oliver

- Acknowledged the extensive discussions over the years regarding what's appropriate for historic additions, such as those on Stone Alley.
- Understood that successful additions leave the original structure largely untarnished, allowing for the natural evolution of houses.
- Agreed with Lisa about the visibility, noting that the driveway is minimal off Cliff Road.
- Accepted Lisa's willingness to change to one door and come back after framing to assess whether adding the other two doors back is necessary.
- Considered whether pushing back the addition would make a significant visual difference from Cliff Road.
- Supported the idea that this addition could have evolved naturally, especially with the removal of the big window and retaining some elements of the existing structure.
- Expressed personal approval of the proposal, with a few minor tweaks.

Backus

- Addressed Diane's question by referencing the Secretary of the Interior's standards, which form the basis of "Building with Nantucket in Mind."
- Quoted that significant alterations to a contributing property can sever its physical connections with the past, lowering its historic integrity.
- Highlighted the recommendation to avoid adding this addition to the historic structure to preserve its integrity.
- Noted that this structure is specifically outlined in the preservation section of "Building with Nantucket in Mind" on page 17, which emphasizes sustaining, maintaining, and retaining character-defining properties.
- Explained that preservation is the most stringent and historically accurate approach, with examples including properties maintained by the Nantucket Historical Association and other notable private residences.
- Emphasized that the Major Josiah Coffin House, the structure in question, is a 300-year-old significant property within the local and national historic district.
- Recognized the evolved plans incorporating board comments but reiterated that having a separate structure would be more appropriate to maintain the integrity of this individually significant structure.

Botticelli

- Acknowledged that there is no mandate stating the structure must be kept in its current condition.
- Noted that the owner had the right to make changes and chose not to significantly renovate or rehab the interior, demonstrating a commitment to preserving the building's historic integrity.

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	Welch - Suggested caution in distinguishing between alterations and additions to a historic structure, noting that the current project involves an addition rather than a significant alteration. - Acknowledged that the Secretary of the Interior's standards apply to alterations but not necessarily to additions. - Highlighted that the rest of the structure remains intact and unchanged. - Noted that the discussion has centered on whether the addition is more or less appropriate, without a definitive argument that the connector is inappropriate. - Referenced historical precedent showing that a connector can be appropriate, citing 33 Prospect as a similar example. - Encouraged board members to visit the site and observe the extensive and complex historic preservation and restoration efforts undertaken on the existing structure, suggesting they would find it worthwhile and informative. Thornewill - Agreed that pushing back the connector and reducing the window size would further minimize interference with the existing structure. - Recognized the efforts taken to preserve the building, noting that the addition disturbs only about six feet of historic fabric, which is minimal compared to many renovations. - Initially considered a purist stance but, after reviewing the preservation efforts and the reduced impact of the barn, found the project impressive. - Expressed readiness to support the project, acknowledging the care taken to preserve the historic structure while making necessary additions.
Motion:	Motion to approve through staff, with the following conditions: Reduced the width of the connector by at least two feet to provide a shadow line and depth to the connecting pieces. Ensured the window on the left side of the rear is small in nature. Approved a single French door for now, with the option to come back without prejudice to apply for three doors after the framing is complete. (Made by: Thornewill) (03:40:56)
Vote:	Carried 3-1-1 // Oliver, Thornewill, Paul (Aye) // Coombs (Nay) // Camp (Abstain)

VIII. NEW BUSINESS - VIEW - 03/19/2024 - VIEW

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Michele Kolb	27 N. Liberty	Rear Door Rev	41/453	Self
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Michele Kolb			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - For the record, this is an individually significant circa 1798 Seth Ray Cooper shop. - Acknowledged the recent approval of a great restoration project for this structure, including a historic determination in 2023. - Expressed concern that the proposed changes are not appropriate, noting that the existing double French doors are out of character and were added in modern times. - Emphasized that the six-light triple doors are not historically sensitive. - Highlighted that the board previously approved 15-light kick panel doors, which are more appropriate and consistent with the character of the historic district.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	- Appreciated the intent to use salvaged materials but reiterated the importance of maintaining historically sensitive features. - Recommended adhering to the previously approved 15-light kick panel doors to ensure consistency and appropriateness for the historic structure.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Agreed fully with Holly's assessment. - Stressed that the original approval is much more appropriate for a building of this age and style.
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Appreciated the work being done on the house, noting that it is similar to the significant effort on the corner of North Liberty and Cliff. - Acknowledged the importance of the project and recognized it as a labor of love. - Believed that anyone else who has visited the house would also appreciate the work being done. Camp - Agreed with Stephen's point about being left with the existing elements if not approved. - Considered the newly proposed changes as the lesser of two evils compared to the current state. - Wished the new six-light French doors related better to the small six-over-six window in the adjacent massing, noting a slight disjunction. - Acknowledged that the new six-light French doors are better than the two sliders. Oliver - Suggested double doors. Coombs - Favored Holly's suggestion, agreeing with her assessment. - Noted concern about a nearby maple tree and questioned how it fits into the plan. - Asked whether the intention is to cut down the tree, given the importance of preserving this one of the oldest buildings. Pohl - Given the lack of visibility and the "net benefit" in comparison to the sliding doors, expressed being okay with the proposal as presented.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted, with Exhibit A, eliminating one door as specified. (Made by: Oliver) (03:52:47)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

IX. NEW BUSINESS 03/19/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Gottwald Family Trust	4R Jefferson Avenue	Garage Addition Alteration	29/48.1	Topham
Gottwald Family Trust	4R Jefferson Avenue	Garage Historic Determination	29/48.1	Topham
Gottwald Family Trust	4R Jefferson Avenue	Cottage Historic Determination	29/48.1	Topham
Gottwald Family Trust	4R Jefferson Avenue	Cottage Alterations	29/48.1	Topham
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Camp			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill, Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Joe Topham, Topham Design, LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Recognized that these structures are in the AE flood zone and require elevation certificates. - Acknowledged that as contributing structures, they do not need to meet the substantial compliance section of the building code due to the historic determination exemptions, as outlined in the resilient Nantucket design guidelines.			

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	- Appreciated the approach of elevating structures without meeting the full eight feet required by FEMA, in line with the design guidelines for contributing structures. - Expressed difficulty in assessing how much of the garage structure is being retained and how the elevation impacts its historic integrity. - Applauded the owners and Joe for utilizing design guidelines to avoid creating larger structures and retain historic character. - Recommended incorporating kick panels in fenestration for consistency with the Brant Point area. - Clarified that the garage is being converted into a cottage with living space above, raising it by one foot above the worst flooding level, and retaining as much of the existing structure as possible. - Requested clear elevation certificates and detailed comparisons between the existing and proposed structures to ensure compliance and preservation of the historic integrity. - Noted the need to eliminate shingle space between character-defining windows and the second floor for a more appropriate appearance.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed no concerns regarding the garage, noting that important features are being retained and disturbance is minimized. - Acknowledged that the garage is low, removed from the street, and not very visible. - Commented on the smaller cottage, suggesting a change from horizontal to vertical skirt boards, as horizontal skirt boards are not historically accurate. - Hoped that the noticeable sag in the ridge, visible in photographs, would be left as is and not repaired, preserving the historic character.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Suggested conducting a site visit to gain a better understanding of all the buildings and the overall feel of the site. - Expressed that a view would help in forming more informed opinions about the proposed changes and their impact. Pohl - Given the insights from Holly and Mickey about this project and now having a clear understanding, including the labeling issues (main house, guest house, garage, cottage, etc.), agreed that the architecture is very charming. - Appreciated the effort to retain the historic elements, recognizing it as a commendable approach. Welch - Understood and appreciated the idea of a site view but felt comfortable commenting and acting on the project this evening. - Agreed that the modifications to the garage structure are acceptable given its location and lack of visibility, acknowledging there may be room for fine-tuning but not deeming it necessary. - Supported the proposed approach for the cottage structure, as long as the appropriate paperwork, including the elevation certificate, is provided. - Appreciated that no significant modifications are being proposed for the historic structure, aligning with the goal of preserving its character. Oliver - Acknowledged familiarity with the location. - Appreciated that two of the buildings, including the garage, are being retained. - Expressed overall satisfaction with the approach and the efforts to preserve the historic structures. Coombs - Spoke in support of a view. Pohl - Acknowledged that these are very well-designed enhancements to the existing structures. - Appreciated the use of the historic determination to guide the project. - Agreed with Mickey's point about changing the horizontal boarding to vertical, even though it won't be visible from Jefferson Street or the front of the property.

Minutes for March 26, 2024; adopted June 25, 2024

	Topham • Agreed to meet Abby and Diane on site to address any concerns they might have. • Offered to reopen the application if any issues arise during the site visit.
Motion:	Motion to approve all four applications, with Exhibit A, with the following conditions: 1. Cottage: Change the skirting to vertical board and retain the sagging roof. 2. Garage: Approve as submitted. 3. Historic Determinations: Approve the historic determinations as written. 4. Documentation: Provide the necessary format and elevation certificate. (Made by: Welch) (04:13:04)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver (Aye) Coombs did not respond.

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- April 2, 2024, at 4pm ***HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:18 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=SZeJbXgZnRI>