



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 23, 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 Welch called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

I. DISCUSSION & VOTE

Discussion of Article 38, ATM 2024	Oliver Mentioned meeting with Megan Trudell and Christy Fontella to discuss potential compromises regarding Article 38 at the April 2024 Annual Town Meeting. Although they explored suggestions, no final decision was reached. The discussion will continue at a later time.
------------------------------------	---

II. CONSENT

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Shawn Casey	3 5 th Way	Fence	67/269	Self
2. Rabbit Run Rd LLC	26 Rabbit Run Rd	Hardscape	28/9	Ahern LLC
3. Altman	37 Sankaty Head Rd	Hardscape pergola	48/2	BPC
4. Elizabeth Singer	63 Baxter	Move on shed	49/22	Bryan Swain
5. Golden Pond LLC	64 Baxter	Move off shed	49/51	Bryan Swain
6. Damashek, Jonathan	77 Vestal	New cottage	56/473	SMRD
7. Adrienne Hersh	10 Bartlett	Roof	67/149	J Lydon
8. Nyland	93 Sankaty	Revise stairs	49/182	Topham
9. Henry & Marlene Spitzer	1 Sconset Ave	Revision	73.4.1/8	EMDA
10. Cisco Sanctuary	5 Bartlett Farm Rd	New Pergola	65/14	Gryphon Arch
11. First Sun LLC	2 Gold Star	Shed	55/170	Permits Plus
12. Jennie Garafolo	4 Monomoy	Driveway gate	55/67	Normand
13. Linda Williams	6 S Pasture Ln	Move on shed	80/297.4	LFW
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Recused:	Paul			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent. (Made By: Oliver)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)			

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Sharon Foote	3 Sconset	Roof	73.4.1/7	Richard Prunier
COA to reflect ARCHITECTURAL singles, Pewter Gray (GAF)				
2. Gandhi	9 New Jersey	House move	60.3.1/408	Shelter 7
COA # of previous certificate be added to this COA				
3. Ed Grennan	3 Hussey St	Replace deck	42.3.1/112	Oliver
Date of construction to be added to COA (c. 1847 William H. Chase House)				
4. Brendon and Bridget Lower	146 Main St	Color change	41/518	Matthew Rider
Date of construction to be added to COA (c. 1915 – HDC Survey NAN.468)				
5. Seven Pines LLC	78 Pocomo	Window change	15/39	Mark Avery
Date of construction to be added to COA (c.2004)				
6. Carmine & Sheila Giardini	7A Clifford Street	New Dwelling 12-9634	79/19	Reid Yenor
Subject to 2nd floor decks to have cottage corners (vs. corner boards). South Elevation (large second floor deck) split into two after reducing overall length by 1/3, and decks to be centered on respective doors.				
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent with Conditions and the move of 23 Broad Street item under New Business 04/02/24 on the agenda. (Made By: Camp) (00:02:14)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

IV. NEW BUSINESS 03/19/2024 - VIEW

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Parents Cooperative of Nan	15 Nobadeer Farm	Solar Rooftop	69/85	ACK Smart
Date of construction and elevations/dimensions of the structure to be included. (no heights provided for potential move)				
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Welch, Paul			
Representative:	Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Expressed concern about the placement of solar panels on the east roof and asked if the patch of panels could be shifted to the right on that roof plane. Glidden - Noted that the building's twisted orientation would cause the panels to become shaded and receive less light if moved to the back plane. Also mentioned that the fire department prefers all solar panels remain on one side for easier access during venting, primarily from the north side, though access paths would still be left on both sides. - Stressed that this is about doing the right thing for future generations and the school. - Highlighted that the view is distant and emphasized that the proposal was only brought forward after strong confidence that it met the guidelines. Thornewill - Acknowledged the limited visibility of the building and mentioned that it isn't found to be offensive. - Considered the structure as an educational building, which might warrant some flexibility, similar to other minimally visible buildings like those at the Boys and Girls Club. - Stated no real concerns. Glidden - Suggested that one helpful action could be allowing the hedge to grow taller, which would serve as a mitigating measure by increasing the screening of the building from view.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	Coombs - Expressed the need for caution, stating no issue with installing solar panels on a school but would oppose them on a business. Glidden - Clarified that solar panels will also be added to the low porch roof at the amphitheater area, but this change hasn't been resubmitted yet because that section is below grade. - Explained that after reviewing with the fire department, the two lower rows of panels on the south-facing roof will be removed for access, and these will be moved to the below-grade area. This adjustment will not affect the Historic District Commission's visibility, and an updated exhibit will be submitted later. Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Recommended that if the board approves the application as presented, they should include Tobias's suggestion in the approval. This approach would make the process cleaner and more logical by revising the plans based on the mentioned adjustments, rather than handling it as a separate matter later.
Motion:	Motion to approve due to limited visibility and the function of the building. (Made By: Thornewill) (00:10:40)
Vote:	Failed 2-3 // Camp, Thornewill (Aye) // Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Nay) Coombs and Oliver stated their opposition due to the current color of the roof not being black.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Oliver) (00:12:10)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

V. NEW BUSINESS 04/02/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Beach Bucket LLC	14 Silver Street	Demo/Move	55.4.1/182	Chandra Miller
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Chandra Miller			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Mentioned that the structure in question is a contributing historic resource within the local and National Historic District in the Fish Lots neighborhood. Research indicates the building was constructed between 1823 and 1826 by Josiah Gorham. - Emphasized that demolition would be inappropriate due to the structure's historical significance and impact on the New Guinea neighborhood. - Suggested that restoration, rather than demolition, is more suitable, despite the building's history of water damage and neglect. - Highlighted the potential to elevate the structure to address flooding concerns.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Highlighted the building's significant age, dating back to 1823, and emphasized the importance of preserving it in place. - Noted that the engineer's report and photographs show typical exterior rot and foundation issues from neglect, which are relatively easy to repair. - Stated that the structure, including the roof, appears solid and can be restored and retained as a second dwelling.			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Supported the idea of restoring the building, noting its 1823 origin makes it a true antique. - Emphasized its iconic Nantucket profile, which adds a unique character to the site. - Believed that preserving and renovating the structure would enhance the site's authenticity and overall appeal.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	Coombs - Asserted that the building should neither be demolished nor moved, given its historical significance since 1823. - Emphasized that the structure, despite its current condition, is repairable, noting that other buildings in worse condition have been successfully restored. - Stressed the importance of preserving the building as part of the historically significant New Guinea and Fish Lots area. Paul - Agreed with previous comments, emphasizing the building's position on the lot offers flexibility without hindering other activities. - Noted that the front elevation, particularly the ridge, appears to be in good shape despite the building sitting in the ground. - Acknowledged that while the underside may need repair, such restorations are feasible if done thoughtfully. - Supported keeping the building on site in its current location. Oliver - Agreed with the consensus, noting that there isn't much information available from the two interior pictures, which only show a floor. - Supported the views of other members, emphasizing the lack of a full interior assessment but still agreeing with the decision to keep the structure on site. Welch - Expressed support for the board's decision regarding whether to move or retain the building on-site. - Acknowledged agreement with the reasons stated by the board and raised the question of whether there is a consensus to keep the structure in its current location or simply ensure it remains on the property. Miller - Expressed willingness to work with the building but raised concerns about significant drainage issues due to its location on the lot. - Noted that the property's position at a low point exacerbates the problem, with water runoff from Silver Street contributing to the condition. - Acknowledged the building's importance to the New Guinea neighborhood and Fish Lots, and questioned whether lifting the structure would be necessary if it remains in its current spot. Welch - Suggested a motion to hold for revisions, allowing time to consider how best to approach the situation. This could involve deciding whether to keep the structure in its current location or move it elsewhere on the site. - Recommended assessing the grade and determining whether to address topography through changes to the structure, adjustments to the grade, or a combination of both. - Proposed bringing back a revised site plan and elevations for further review by the board.
Public Comment:	Linda Williams - Supported keeping the historic structure in its original location but emphasized the need for significant repairs due to severe water damage. - Explained that the foundation has crumbled, and the house needs to be elevated and placed on a new foundation to prevent future flooding. - Noted that the town plans to fix the nearby parking lot to address drainage issues. - Reiterated that while the house is habitable, it requires extensive renovation, including raising it out of the ground by at least a foot or two.
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Expressed openness to considering a relocation of the house on-site.

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	- Indicated that if the application proposed lifting, moving, and repairing the house rather than demolishing it, there would likely be support from the board. - Noted that building relocations are common on Nantucket and emphasized flexibility in the house's positioning on the lot. The previous focus on specific setback distances was due to the original demolition request, but there is no rigid adherence to keeping the house at its current exact location.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Camp) (00:27:40)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. 23 Broad St	23 Broad St	Roof Change	42.4.2/77	T & T Roofing
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Supported the proposed changes to the Brotherhood building, originally from the 1830s-1840s. - Acknowledged that the changes had already been vetted and deemed consistent with the approvable list. Expressed no concerns and endorsed the modifications.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Stated no concerns.			
Commissioner Comments:	There were no comments made by Commissioners.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Camp) (00:30:40)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3. Matt O'Connor	22 Tashama	Pool Fence Hardscape	55/451	KMLD
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Katy Mitchell, LM Landscaping Designs, Inc.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Expressed that the fencing is excessive and the pool is too large for the triangular space it's in. - Suggested scaling back both the fencing and the pool size. - No concerns were raised regarding the driveway. Paul - Suggested that the six-foot fence should be moved back to the rear corner on both sides of the house, rather than starting at the front corner, as this placement might look severe. - Proposed dropping the fence to a four-foot board fence at the rear corner. - Agreed that the six-foot fence on the shower side makes sense for screening, especially if the pool remains its current length. - Appreciated that the fence is set at least three feet, possibly four, off the property line, as opposed to being right on it. Coombs			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	- Expressed a preference for a five-foot fence instead of a full six-foot fence. - Noted that the apron didn't appear to be 10 feet and supported reducing the pool size to 30 feet, as previously suggested. - Proposed removing two feet on each side to prevent the pool from extending from one end of the triangular space to the other. - Emphasized that bringing the pool size down would help it fit better within the area and blend into the surroundings, particularly since Tashama Lane has spots with less vegetation, making the pool more visible. Thornewill - Agreed with the idea to minimize the fencing in both directions and supported reducing the pool size to around 16 by 30 feet to better fit the space. - Suggested keeping the spa within the pool area. - Acknowledged that the property backs up to several neighbors, making the six-foot fence a good choice for privacy. - Supported the five-foot fence on the street side, as long as it's moved back to the basement stair entry on the east side. Welch - Agreed with the idea of evening up the depths and widths of materials around the apron, as the current design looks odd. - Supported the fence being moved back in accordance with guidelines, which specify that a tall fence should be no closer than the midpoint of the side elevation. - Approved downsizing the pool as suggested and expressed concern about maintaining sufficient vegetation. - Recommended using vining material like Climbing Hydrangea every other section of the fence and ensuring that any exposed fence is complemented with indigenous plant material. Camp - Suggested bringing the five-foot fence with a one-foot lattice (5'1") to the corner of the house where the basement steps are located and installing a gate there.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Coombs) (00:43:00)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. Bessey, James & Laura	9 Correia	Primary Dwelling	80/58.2	Brook Meerbergen
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Stated that it is appropriate and has no concerns. Coombs - Acknowledged that the design of the buildings is good and couldn't really express any concerns about placing four buildings on the site. - Overall, seemed to be in favor of the proposed design. Thornewill - Agreed with the previous comment, expressing appreciation for the height of the primary dwelling being kept at 24 feet. - Described the design as charming and cute, further emphasizing support for the project.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	Patten - Stated no concerns. Welch - Expressed no concerns about the project and complimented the work done, noting that it was well-executed and straightforward, making the review process simple.
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Camp) (00:48:50)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
5. Bessey, James & Laura	9 Correia	Secondary Dwelling	80/58.2	Brook Meerbergen
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Expressed that the design doesn't read as easily as the previous one, noting that the asymmetry is acceptable but finding the left side a bit heavy and high in comparison. - Suggested considering lowering that side to improve balance. Patten and Thornewill - Stated no concerns. Coombs - Agreed that the design will be fine, noting that it's only 21 feet in height, which contributes to its suitability. Welch - Suggested that if the west side needs to be lowered, it should probably not be reduced by more than six inches to maintain the overall balance and design integrity.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Patten) (00:52:09)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
6. Bessey, James & Laura	9 Correia	Tertiary Dwelling	80/58.2	Brook Meerbergen
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen			
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. (Made By: Camp) (00:53:13)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
7. Bessey, James & Laura	9 Correia	Studio/Garage	80/58.2	Brook Meerbergen
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	Oliver			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

Representative:	Brook Meerbergen
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Expressed concern that the building is a bit too tall, especially since the rest of the buildings are essentially the same size. - Suggested reducing the height slightly to better align with the surrounding structures. Camp - Expressed concern about the three windows in the dormer on the south side, feeling that they seem out of place compared to the rest of the design, which has been described as "sweet" and fitting with the Sconset style. Coombs - Agreed with the concern about the three windows, finding them too heavy for the dormer. Felt that the current roofline cuts off the movement of the house. - Suggested bringing the dormer in and reducing the number of windows to two, which would improve the overall look. Aside from that, expressed no other issues with the design. Patten - Supported reducing the height and agreed with the idea of bringing in the dormer and reducing the number of windows to two. Welch - Supported a 12-inch height reduction and expressed ambivalence about modifying the dormer, noting that it might not be necessary. - Felt that first-story plant material or taller landscaping would likely mitigate the visibility of the roofline and emphasized that the view on paper doesn't fully represent how it will look in reality. Thornewill - Suggested flipping the design upside down to move the door to the opposite side, away from the street. This would maintain the current design while repositioning the door for better street-facing aesthetics without needing to make significant changes to the structure.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Camp) (00:48:40)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye) // Welch (Nay)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
8. Bessey, James & Laura	9 Correia	Pool Hardscape	80/58.2	Brook Meerbergen
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Approved of the design, noting that it appears well-covered with good vegetation around it. - Felt that the size is appropriate and had no issues with the proposal. Camp, Patten, Thornewill - Stated no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with the condition that that pool will not be visible at the time of inspection or thereafter and there be no grade change from the prior existing a time of application. (Made By: Coombs) (01:00:51)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
9. Bessey, James & Laura	9 Correia	Pavilion	80/58.2	Brook Meerbergen
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Brook Meerbergen			
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. (Made By: Coombs) (01:02:13)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
10. Zero India St LLC	1 Cambridge	Ramp Revision	42.3.1/130.2	Emeritus
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Discussed revisions to previously approved work on an individually significant structure, noting that the brick section was built after the Great Fire of 1846, and the wood section had earlier reconstruction approval. - The revisions were deemed simple, with a focus on preserving original windows and removing an old kitchen exhaust. - The character-defining brick chimneys are retained. - The main concern was ensuring that all Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) numbers are accurately reflected, particularly given multiple revisions since 2020.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Stated no concerns.			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Expressed no concerns and viewed the revisions as a net benefit, particularly appreciating the removal of the shed addition on the east elevation. This change was seen as a significant improvement, as it reveals the gable end of the existing brick building, enhancing its appearance. - Overall, had no issues with the proposed revisions.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted with the revised COA number. (Made By: Oliver) (01:06:36)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
11. Fernandez	13 Academy Lane	Reduce/Replace Hardscape	42.4.3/112	Gryphon Architects
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ethan Griffin, Gryphon Architects			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Clarified that the main dwelling on the lot is a 1981 infill and noted that the current application involves reducing and revising previously approved landscaping, which should be recorded as a revision on the COA.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	- Emphasized the importance of comparing the newly proposed changes with the original approved plans, especially concerning the placement of the patio and yard, which were previously adjusted to enhance the site layout. - Suggested that the yard and patio should be switched back to their earlier positions for better coherence with the initial design.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed concerns about the granite material and the sawtooth configuration of the patio, finding it too modern for the setting. - Preferred a more natural material like brick or stone. - Additionally, felt that the Belgian block apron used for Academy Hills was out of place and suggested replacing it with cobblestone or brick to better fit the historical character of the area.
Commissioner Comments:	Griffin - Explained that the current application was intended to be a fresh submission due to revisions made to the house that rendered the previous approval less relevant. - Noted that the earlier hardscaping design focused more towards the head of the driveway, but with almost 12 feet less space now available, adjustments are necessary to accommodate the new layout. Paul - Acknowledged the comparison between the existing and proposed hardscape, noting a 500-square-foot reduction. - Observed that there's minimal buffering between the existing house and Academy Lane, with the combination of brick and asphalt. - Although having the patio extend towards the street might not be ideal, the sawtooth configuration seems intended to soften the effect. - Suggested introducing grass between the pavers on the front patio for a better transition. - Agreed with using brick for the apron, considering it appropriate and fitting with the design. - Agreed that softening the patio towards the street would be ideal, but overall, considered the proposal an improvement over the previous design. Oliver - Agreed with previous comments, acknowledging that the planting of trees in a straight line is out of the commission's purview, though it's a common and somewhat unnatural practice. Coombs - Agreed with the idea of making the outline smoother and more adaptable to vegetation. - Suggested that if the trees on the bottom left-hand side are planted in a line, varying their height and thickness could create a more relaxed and natural look, preventing it from appearing overly structured or "chopped up." Camp - Commented on the historical significance of the streetscape and expressed that a brick apron would be more appropriate. - Felt that the patio on Academy Lane seems out of place and should be heavily vegetated to blend in better. - Suggested using more historically fitting materials, like brick, and mentioned that the modern design contrasts with the old-fashioned feel of the area. - Recommended steering the design in a direction that better aligns with the historic character of the location. Welch - Suggested using cobblestone instead of brick for the driveway if native gravel is being used, as it would be a better match. - Acknowledged that while the modern design may be relevant if not visible, ensuring plant materials like slow-growing yew are included along Academy Lane is important to maintain

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	privacy and avoid creating an "alleyway" effect. - Emphasized the need for specific plant heights at the time of inspection to ensure effective screening. - Expressed flexibility regarding the choice between cobblestone and brick, but leaned towards using brick for the apron to maintain a traditional look. - Suggested simplifying the patio by eliminating the staggered edge and opting for a more traditional square design. - Additionally, recommended applying a traditional approach to both the pathway and patio, possibly including the use of more standard-sized stones leading to the front door.
Motion:	Motion to approve with an Exhibit A, making the apron cobblestone, traditionalizing the patio and the lines. (Made By: Oliver) (01:19:55)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) // Camp (Nay)

12. 100 Cliff Rd LLC	100 Cliff	Addition	41/14	MCA+
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Doug Mills, Mark Cutone Architecture + (MCA+)			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - For the circa 1920 Colonial Revival, acknowledged that the original structure was just the main block, with a later one-story addition. - Appreciated the new addition being subordinate and styled as a Gambrel to match the original. - Suggested that reducing the height from 23 feet 8 inches would make it more appropriate and prevent it from overwhelming the main Gambrel. - Recommended that the side dormers not run into the existing dwelling and that the south dormer be reduced to two windows instead of three, to better match the existing architecture.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Stated no concerns. Coombs - Suggested reducing the number of windows on the right side of the south elevation from three to two. - Recommended separating the windows to align with the design of the first-floor windows below. - Noted that the middle window grouping, which is not under consideration, cannot be separated. Camp - Expressed ongoing concern about the front elevation, specifically regarding the extension. Welch - Acknowledged the use of a triple-gang window on the dormer to match the existing one, recognizing the validity of the concern but accepting the design choice for consistency. - Noted that while the existing structure has a faux Gambrel roof, the addition is a true Gambrel, and the execution of the original design was done well. Overall, expressed comfort with the current design as it stands.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Oliver) (01:41:27)			
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye) // Camp (Nay)			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
13. 47 Walsh St LLC	47 Walsh St	Extend drive and walkways	29/64	Mark Avery
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Mark Avery, Thirty Acre Wood; Ron Winters, Thirty Acre Wood			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Noted that the dwelling was constructed as an infill in 2014. - Planning Board approved a second curb cut on April 8th. - Expressed concerns regarding the proposed paved driveway due to flooding in the area. - Recommended using permeable materials for the driveway, as encouraged by the Resilient Nantucket design guidelines. - Suggested that the ramp and railings should match the house's details but remain simple. - Assumed that the Conservation Commission might share concerns about the extensive impervious surface, considering the area's flood zone designation.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Suggested that the brick ramps are acceptable as they are flush with the grade and not obtrusive. - Assumed the wooden ramps would be similar, though possibly raised slightly from the grade, and noted the lack of detailed architectural views. - Proposed using shells or pea stone for the driveway instead of asphalt, as those materials are more typical in the Brant Point area. - Highlighted that the existing brick loading area could suffice for accessibility needs. - Recommended that the driveway curves be smoothed out, as they currently appear sharp and unrealistic.			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Questioned the height of the flat areas in the back and the height of the ramp, expressing concern about how elevated the decking is above grade. - Noted that if the deck is significantly raised, a lot of railings will be required, which could impact the design. - Suggested that natural weathered wood might be more cohesive than brick, blending better with existing structures. - Recommended providing more detailed elevations, especially regarding the height of the decking above grade, to better understand the impact and ensure appropriate railing design. - Agreed with the suggestion to keep the driveway as shell, acknowledging that having a designated loading area is sufficient. - Supported maintaining the driveway material in line with the area's character - shell. Coombs - Questioned the details of the brick ramp, particularly its length, which was confirmed to be 30 feet. - Expressed concerns about how to better illustrate the ramp for easier understanding. - Suggested providing a paved pathway if necessary, but emphasized the need for more explanation regarding the transition from the driveway to the ramp, especially given the user's reliance on it for accessibility. Camp - Commented that the amount of driveway is substantial, and asphalt would be inappropriate. - Supported keeping the driveway as shell but raised concerns about the appearance of the brick section, especially how the sides will look. - Suggested that an elevation view could clarify this.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	- Recommended maintaining the driveway width at the minimum possible, rather than expanding it, to reduce its overall impact.
Oliver	- Expressed no major concerns, noting that the flat brick area and wood ramp behind the garage, which connects to the other property, are fine. - Found the brick on the side of the porch acceptable, especially with the simple railing. - The only potential issue raised was the use of asphalt for the driveway, suggesting that it might not be the best choice for the overall design.
Welch	- Highlighted the importance of providing detailed elevations, especially for the brick ramps and their side structures, which may involve wood. - Emphasized the need to see how the ramp and railing assemblies look in these elevations. - Supported the brick base and didn't have concerns about the mix of materials but wanted visual clarification. - Suggested incorporating a cobblestone apron and two-track cobblestone pathways for the paved service, balancing functionality with aesthetic appropriateness. - Clarified that decisions are based on aesthetic and architectural considerations, not just material guidelines.
Avery	- Clarified that the only wood ramps are directly at the porch, which leads to the rear deck. - Explained that the lot slopes upward from the road, so the brick walkway follows the natural grade, not rising as a ramp until it reaches the porch. The slope is indicated by the elevation markers on the plan. - Expressed openness to alternative driveway materials if asphalt is deemed inappropriate, and confirmed a willingness to address any issues the board has. - Confirmed that the deck is above grade, approximately six feet at the front of the house, though slightly less. By the time it reaches the back porch, the deck is only about 20 inches above grade. - Confirmed that the actual ramp slope will primarily be within the wood ramp at the rear of the property. The brick walkway will follow the natural topographic lines, so a railing will only be necessary on the wood ramp. - Clarified that the brick will be maintained by using a vertical brick edge where required.
Camp	- Supported keeping the existing Belgian block and matching the other apron with Belgian block as well. - Suggested using shell for the driveway.
Thornewill	- Supported the idea of extending the flat surface across the driveway to create a landing area, allowing easy access for getting in and out of the car. - Agreed that this area doesn't need to be entirely brick or paved but could include a section of hard surface within the shell driveway.
Coombs	- Supported the idea of creating a flat landing area for easy access when getting out of the car.
Winter	- Noted that the owner has more issues with the Belgian block than the shell but is flexible as long as the ramp can be installed next to the house. - Highlighted that the ramps have very slight inclines, with only two to three steps up to the deck. - Confirmed that railings are only needed in those specific areas, and the rest of the brick walkway will be edged with steel and lie flat against the ground, following the existing grade. - Proposed revising the driveway to create a more gracious entry and exit, while ensuring

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	there is adequate room between the stairs and the driveway. - Preferred reducing the driveway width from its existing 14 feet to 11 or 12 feet, to achieve a better balance and maintain a more functional space. Welch - Proposed limiting the tar area to just past the right side of the porch and no further left than the left side of the stair to create a functional space for vehicle access and pedestrian movement. - Suggested using shell for the rest of the driveway and adding a Belgian block apron. - Recommended cleaning up the drawing for clarity, ensuring that the final plan reflects the actual layout with navigable corners, and that it accurately represents the completed project. Winter - Agreed to forfeit the tar and keep the driveway as shell with a brick walkway.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with an Exhibit A, as stated. (Made By: Camp) (02:12:19)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
14. Dukes Road Trust	2 Dukes Road	New Dwelling	41/187	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Oliver, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated the HDC approved the move of the circa 1940 and 1996 Colonial Revival structure, noting that the new dwelling is longer but has a lower height of 26 to 28.7 feet based on grade. - Although the new structure is unlikely to be visible from Duke's Road, it was suggested that some design elements, such as fenestration and dormers, could pay homage to the previous 1940 Colonial Revival that occupied the lot, to maintain a connection to the site's architectural history.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Noted that the design looks a little long for the area, where houses often seem to have been gradually put together. Otherwise, had no major problem with it. Paul - Wished the design included a roof walk or dueling chimneys. - Noted that the ridge line feels a bit stretched. - Acknowledged the minimal visibility due to the setback but suggested breaking up the ridge line could improve the design. - Mentioned that while there's a rear chimney, it's not visible above the ridge. - Expressed concern about a plateau being created for the pool house and recommended including full property line-to-property line elevations for better context, appreciating the effort to flatten the area. - Found the overall design of the house appropriate. - Noted that the wraparound porch helps mitigate the height and anchors the house to the hill. - Suggested that existing context photos would be helpful for a better understanding, especially since there's unfamiliarity with this particular lot. Patten - Agreed with the suggestion to break up the long ridge line, as it would help balance the house's design. Even though the ridge may not be highly visible, making this adjustment			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	would enhance the overall appearance. Welch - Appreciated the restraint in design, noting the house's relatively low height for its style, which doesn't compromise the interior. - Agreed with the suggestion to break up the long ridge line, possibly with chimneys or a roof walk. The distance from the street serves as a mitigating factor, reducing concern. - Assumed that if plant material is cleared, landscaping will be added for both presentation and practical use, ensuring the home maintains its aesthetic appeal. Camp - Acknowledged that the main concern is the long ridge line. - Suggested bringing the two gables closer together or making other adjustments to break up the extended line, enhancing the overall design and visual balance of the house.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Camp) (02:23:10)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
15. Little Big Building LLC	9 Orange St	Renovation	42.3.1/150	NAG
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Stephen Theroux, Nantucket Architecture Group, LTD			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Highlighted the significance of the circa 1774 P. Legg Coggeshall house, a typical Nantucket 3-bay structure. - Noted its historical value, including HDC surveys and a marker from the Nantucket Preservation Trust. - Mentioned a small 54-foot addition and some cosmetic changes, suggesting the reuse of the original 6-over-6 window and the existing simple rear railing. - Expressed concerns about the width of the proposed rear stoop and the inappropriateness of the eight-light door. - Appreciated the overall scale and proposed materials while seeking clarification on certain repairs, especially as the west side is visible from Fair Street.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Expressed no major concerns but focused on the view of the west elevation from Fair Street. - Suggested that the addition distorts the gable towards Fair Street and recommended dropping the plate down by a foot to better define the gable's shape, preserving its traditional appearance.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Stated no concerns Thornewill - Agreed that Mickey's suggestion is a good one, emphasizing the importance of retaining the gable's simplified shape to preserve its traditional appearance. Coombs and Camp - Agreed with Mickey's comments and suggestions. Welch - Stated no concerns			
Motion:	Motion to approve with an Exhibit A, specifying that the new gable on the second floor's top plate be dropped approximately a foot. (Made By: Thornewill) (02:33:55)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
16. Dean Behrend	12.5 Pequot	Move/Demo Main House	80/20	Michael McKay
17. Dean Behrend	12.5 Pequot	Move/Demo Shed	80/20	Michael McKay
18. Dean Behrend	12.5 Pequot	Move/Demo Studio	80/20	Michael McKay
19. Riverview Crossing, LLC	12.5 Pequot	Pool & Hardscape	80/20	Behrend
20. Riverview Crossing, LLC	12.5 Pequot	Garage	80/20	Behrend
Motion:	Motion to continue Items 16 -20/12.5 Pequot until April 30, 2024. (Made By: Coombs) (02:35:15)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
21. Conway Family	11 Western Avenue	Pool & Hardscape	87/117	Oliver
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Val Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners - Stated no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made By: Camp) (02:38:52)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
22. 90 N Liberty Pres. Tr.	90 N Liberty St	Driveway & retaining wall	41/22	Jardins
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Camp, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Elisabeth O'Rourke, Jardins International			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Stated that this is an individually significant circa 1724 Major Josiah Coffin House, a lean-to structure. - Recently approved historic determinations and changes to the accessory structures were noted. - Suggested that a cobblestone apron would be more appropriate for a dwelling of this age, rather than Belgian block. - Appreciated the proposed New England fieldstone wall, finding it suitable for the vintage of the house, despite such walls being more common in other parts of Massachusetts rather than on Nantucket.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Expressed that the retaining wall is acceptable as long as it serves its purpose and isn't visible from the street, not projecting above the elevation when viewed from the road. - Noted that the part intersecting with the house will likely be freestanding, which is less appropriate since freestanding walls typically aren't approved, only retaining ones. - Agreed with the suggestion to replace Belgian block with cobblestone for a building of this age. - Recommended retaining the existing driveway width on Cliff Road, allowing for two cars to park by pulling to either side.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - No further concerns as long as the Belgian block is replaced with cobblestone. Patten - Supported using cobblestone instead of Belgian block and suggested narrowing the driveway. Paul - Liked the idea of a cobblestone apron and agreed with reducing the driveway width. - Confirmed that narrowing the width to 14-16 feet at the point where it meets Cliff Road would make a significant difference, aligning with the previous suggestion to retain a more traditional and appropriate scale for the area. - Acknowledged the effort to find a material that meets both ergonomic needs and ties into the existing hard materials on the residence. Coombs - Agreed with the previous comments, emphasizing the importance of keeping the driveway opening smaller in consideration of the house's historic significance. - Stressed that the property, being one of the oldest houses, should not be overly modernized to accommodate multiple cars. - Supported the suggestion to reduce the driveway width to a more traditional size and align with the historic character of the property. Welch - Had no issues with bringing the apron in a bit, agreeing that 16 feet is fine. - Preferred brick but was open to Belgian block, particularly if it matches the native stone colors of Nantucket rather than the imported silver-gray granite. - Thought this approach would be appropriate for both the road and garage areas, respecting the home's 300-year history.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with the condition that the aprons be made of native-colored Belgian block, 16 feet in width, as specified in Exhibit A. Both aprons will use the same material. (Made By: Paul) (02:51:03)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
23. Jacqueline Moss	36 Shell Street	Roof Change	73.1.3/44	Richard Abreu
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Camp, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Eric (last name not given)			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Supported changing the structure's material from three-tab to architectural shingles or red cedar shingle, given its 1940 vintage. - Found both the red cedar shingle and the existing Mory black to be appropriate choices and expressed no concerns with the proposed material change.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Stated for the record, the existing application is for dual black three-tab shingles. The proposed change is to either Morie black architectural shingles or red cedar shingles. The decision is to go with either Morie black or cedar.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, with an Exhibit A, allowing the applicant to have the discretion to choose between Morie Black architectural shingles or red cedar shingles. (Made By: Oliver) (02:56:16)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
24. Steve Duro	11 Alexandria Drive	Driveway Apron	67/414	Self
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Camp, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Steve Duro			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Mentioned that the application will also need to go to the Planning Board due to the size of the driveway apron. - Clarified that the current discussion is focused on the appropriateness of the material, but wanted to ensure that the additional requirement for Planning Board review was clear.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver, Patten and Thornewill - Stated no concerns Coombs - Expressed concern that the proposed wide opening for the driveway may not be in keeping with the surrounding area, even if others believe it will fit. Welch - Expressed concern about the overall width of the driveway and suggested narrowing it by moving the parking area three feet closer to the house. - Recommended reducing the existing apron by half its width, allowing for adequate parking and access while decreasing the overall driveway width.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, with an Exhibit A, as described by Chair Welch. (Made By: Oliver) (03:04:10)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
25. Michelle & Darren Black	28 Eel Point Road	Breezeway	40/44	Emeritus
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Specifically recalled removing the connector during the initial proposal to create separation between the two structures due to the substantial amount of building mass. The decision was made to maintain some visual and structural distinction between the buildings. MacEachern - Acknowledged that the initial submission included a breezeway, which was removed to create separation between the structures due to the significant building mass. Now that the house is built and vegetation is in place, the impact is clearer. - While the garage reads as a separate structure, the one-story breezeway could still maintain the appearance of two distinct buildings. Coombs - Found the proposed breezeway inappropriate and felt it did not align with the architecture of either structure. - Preferred to retain the original design without the breezeway.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	Camp - Respected fellow board members' opinions but felt that the pediment draws unnecessary attention. - Suggested that a simple pitched roof would present a cleaner and simpler appearance. Paul - Liked the idea of simplifying the structure. - Agreed that removing the gable, as suggested, would help maintain the perception of the house and garage as separate structures. - Supported the move to keep the connection while simplifying the design.
Motion:	Motion to hold for a view. (Made By: Oliver) (03:10:00)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
26. Big Patch LLC	69 Hummock Pond Road	New Primary Dwelling	56/320	Emeritus
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Clarified that the existing structure on the lot, which had a previous application for relocation, is being retained and will be incorporated as an independent, freestanding structure on the site. - Confirmed that this structure, located furthest north on the site plan, is identified as the guest house. - Noted that this structure has character features, including a glazed porch, which were specifically valued for retention. MacEachern - Stated that the goal is to retain the existing structure in its current condition, with some fenestration adjustments. - Mentioned the importance of preserving the character-defining wraparound porch. - Explained that the structure is intended to stand alone, presenting itself as an original building distinct from the new constructions. - Noted that some design elements, like the existing rake detail, have been incorporated into the new structures. - Emphasized maintaining a distinct architectural language between the old and new, ensuring a clear contrast between them.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Suggested providing elevations across the site at an 8-inch scale to better illustrate the 5-foot drop from north to south. - Noted that the east elevation appears flat and recommended a before-and-after contour plan or site section for better context. - Expressed concerns about the massing of the building, particularly the height and the complexity added by small, shed dormers, which might be unnecessary. - Praised the classic farmhouse elements of the main east elevation but advised simplifying the roofline and reducing height to calm the overall design. Oliver - Expressed concern about the view from Hummock Pond, preferring the house's rear to			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

resemble a farmhouse rather than a modern structure with a lot of glass.

- Mentioned that while the view from Brent Swamp is not an issue, the view across the sweeping plain of Hummock Pond is significant.
- Suggested the east elevation, with its classic farmhouse design, should face Hummock Pond instead.
- Opposed connecting the garage, found the height too tall, and emphasized the importance of a more traditional appearance in this open area.

Camp

- Shared similar concerns about the design, particularly regarding the garage, which has significant issues.
- Found the main building generally good but noted that the main gable, at 29 feet 6 inches, is quite high.
- Suggested reducing the fenestration on the back of the house, especially the modern elements like the three French doors and balcony, if visible from a public way.
- Appreciated the size of the additive massing on the far left and preferred it as a garage location over the current proposal.

MacEachern

- Believed that the distance from the lot to Hummock Pond Road could be closer to 1,000 feet at the furthest point.
- Noted that the land south of the dotted line has an agricultural restriction, meaning no structures or landscaping can be added, though it can be used for livestock.
- Emphasized that the intention is to preserve the openness of the parcel, possibly with some vegetative screening, and explained that the massing of the house was intentionally stepped down towards the rear to maintain the property's natural beauty.

Welch

- Agreed with Val that the front of the house should traditionally face the street, though noted that the distance from the street mitigates this concern.
- Expressed less concern about the fenestration on the rear due to the significant distance from Hummock Pond Road.
- Supported the idea of a breezeway but shared concerns about it becoming a signature detail if it affects visibility.
- Highlighted that the garage structure might pose a bigger issue, but again, the distance from the road could mitigate this concern.

Oliver

- Noted that the aerial view shows a wide, open sweeping field, making the structure highly visible despite its distance from the road.
- Mentioned that when driving down Hummock Pond Road, the existing houses are clearly visible, and this proposed structure is significantly larger than those currently in the area.

Coombs

- Recalled that the location used to have a single, simple Nantucket building with an open front facing Hummock Pond Road, which had the best views in the spring.
- Expressed sadness over how the land has been developed into a more built-up and busy area, losing its original simplicity and charm.

Welch

- Commented on the busyness of the structure and suggested addressing these concerns if visibility is an issue.
- Proposed placing poles on-site for a better visual assessment before making a decision.
- Acknowledged that the responsibility for development lies with the HDC and noted that property owners have rights within zoning laws.
- Emphasized the importance of having an area plan to guide expectations, rather than relying on past simplicity to dictate current developments.

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	- Stressed the need for balanced decision-making while respecting property rights.
Motion:	Motion to hold for a view and revisions. (Made By: Camp) (03:30:30)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
27. Big Patch LLC	69 Hummock Pond Road	Garage	56/320	Emeritus
Discussion:	MacEachern agreed to track.			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
28. Amelia Drive LLC	5 Amelia Drive	Material Change	67/436	Emeritus
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul, Welch			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Recommended a more muted yellow.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Suggested choosing a more muted color for the front of the building, such as a soft gray, instead of yellow. - Felt that yellow doesn't fit the building's character. - Mentioned that while the architecture remains unchanged, the screened porch was previously a nice feature, offering privacy when needed without being overwhelming. - Questioned the necessity of the porch depending on how the building will be used. - Recommended keeping the porch as it was, with removable screens, if it will serve a functional purpose. Oliver - Supported the porch, finding it more appropriate than the temporary awning currently in place. - Agreed that the color should not be yellow and suggested a gray instead. - Liked the idea of using Essex Green with white trim but emphasized that yellow is not suitable for the building. Thornewill - Agreed that yellow is more suitable for a classic 5- or 4-bay townhouse rather than this structure. - Suggested using a light gray instead. Patten - Supported the use of clapboard siding, appreciating the look, but emphasized the need for a much more muted color. - Agreed with others on favoring Essex Green for the door. Camp - Supported a cheerier yellow color, acknowledging it as a personal preference but was open to considering a more muted tone. - Asked about the possibility of adding windows to the screened porch, which was confirmed as an option for the future. - Thought that adding windows would complement the farmhouse style and enhance the overall look.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

Motion:	Motion to hold for swatch samples, including Main Street yellow. (Made By: Oliver) (03:41:26)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
29. Candle House 2 LLC	2 Candle House Lane	Hardscaping	55.4.1/1.1	Linda Williams
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Oliver, Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Noted that this project is an infill in the OHD, approved last year as a 4-bay typical Nantucket design. - Suggested that the driveway should have corner rounding, and while a cobblestone apron is acceptable, an entirely brick driveway involves too much hardscaping. - Acknowledged that runoff is not within the HDC's purview but mentioned that neighbors have previously raised concerns about impervious surfaces. - Recommended considering alternative materials to reduce the amount of impervious surface, as less hardscaping would be more appropriate in this case. - Expressed no concern with the retaining wall, noting that parged retaining walls are a long-standing part of the neighborhood. - Suggested that vegetation should be planted on both the neighbor's side and the subject property for a more neighborly approach. - Recommended using brick rather than bluestone or granite to better align with the typical Nantucket aesthetic the structure is trying to emulate.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Williams stated her objections to Rowlands' comments. - Mentioned that the top of the wall is marked at 35, but there's a discrepancy with the site's finished floor elevation also marked at 35. - Highlighted that the house appears lower than 35 on the elevation, raising concerns about the accuracy of the steps, decks, retaining wall, and grade relationships. - Suggested that the site plan and elevation need clarification to ensure consistency. - Found the concrete retaining wall too large and visible, recommending a more natural slope for the parking area and minimizing the retaining walls.			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Reminded Commissioners that the house was approved with the concept of the driveway requiring retention on the right side to manage the slope from the road. - Noted that this prior approval was based on the condition that the driveway would have retaining walls on both the right and left sides to ensure proper height transition from the road to the house. - Confirmed that the current presentation aligns with this prior discussion and includes the rest of the hardscape elements as initially envisioned. Paul - Suggested that adding color to the plans would be helpful for better visualization, applying this recommendation to all applicants. - Proposed moving the retaining wall 18 to 24 inches closer to the house to reduce its height and create a slope down to the neighbor's property, allowing for better placement of plants on the neighbor's side. - Mentioned the need for a site visit to ensure fairness and requested clarity on the distinction between greenery and hardscape in the plans.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

	- Noted that graphic distinctions would be valuable in the absence of a 3D drawing. Coombs - Agreed that the plans are confusing regarding what is greenery and what is hardscape. - Noted that some plants expected to be present are missing from the plan, making it difficult to understand. - Suggested that it might be better to conduct a site viewing to clarify the situation rather than trying to resolve the confusion with the current materials. Camp - Commented that the use of green emerald trees in a row along the left-hand side is out of place in a historic neighborhood like this one. - Mentioned that such lined plantings aren't typical, where privet might be seen instead, making the choice of green emeralds seem inappropriate for the area. Thornewill - Expressed concern over the extensive use of parging, finding it too tall and exposed. - Suggested moving the wall closer to the house and planting on the other side. - Found the 5-in-1 fencing excessive, preferring more of the lower type 2 fence along the left side. - Questioned whether there is a fence on the retaining wall along Candle House Lane. - Recommended using shell for the driveway with a brick apron instead of all brick. Had no issues with the bluestone patio or Stepping Stones in the rear. Welch - Requested a site plan that accurately reflects the elevations, showing the relationship between the wall and the house's first floor. - Asked for inclusion of any stairs leading into the house to ensure a complete understanding. - Suggested that during the site visit, the retaining wall be staked at key transition points from 35 inches to 33 inches. - Emphasized the need to account for potential grade issues with the neighboring property, 21 Pleasant, which might require additional retainage depending on how that situation is resolved. - Requested a simplified landscape plan that includes only the essential elements, removing any unnecessary details that may cause confusion.
Motion:	Motion to hold for a view and additional information. (Made By: Paul) (04:10:10)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
30. William Coling TR	22 Westchester	Addition to garage	42.4.3/119.1	Linda Williams
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs , Patten, Thornewill (<i>Coombs dropped off zoom – Paul activated</i>)			
Alternates:	Oliver, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that the main house was built in 1976, with an HDC survey on file, and the garage added in 2013. - Highlighted that the concept of additive massing makes sense but criticized the proposed massing and height for creating a "cake-like" appearance with different eave heights. - Stressed that the North elevation should be simpler, with no flush dormers. - Recommended focusing on achieving a design where the exterior is not dictated by the interior layout, particularly concerning the appearance of the gable ends on the facade.			

Minutes for April 23, 2024; adopted August 27, 2024

Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Described the building as awkward-looking, with chaotic massing and side elevations. - Criticized the flush dormers for being at different elevations, causing too much stepping up and down along the eave line. - Recommended simplifying the design, aligning with earlier comments about needing more traditional additive massing.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Suggested that the design doesn't fit with anything on Westchester Street. - Mentioned that building up creates a "rocket ship" effect, making the structure awkward. - Advised that there may not be enough room to achieve the desired design, and the only viable option could be to build back rather than up. Thornewill - Agreed that the design is not appropriate, particularly noting that the East Elevation will be visible and is currently too messy. - Suggested that any additions should be kept to the rear half of the building, avoiding the front and eliminating dormers. - Emphasized that a two-story building is not suitable, which might limit window space, but considered this necessary to achieve a more appropriate look. Patten - Agreed with previous comments, finding the design awkward and lacking a solution that fits well. - Noted that the current approach doesn't work but didn't have additional suggestions beyond what was already discussed. Paul - Suggested rethinking the approach, noting that while Wetlands may limit footprint expansion, adding a shower, deck, and exterior stair does increase the footprint. - Considered the possibility of expanding the first floor to incorporate the deck area and perhaps reducing the second-floor intervention by 50%. - Removing the exterior stair and deck could simplify the design and potentially accommodate the needed space on the ground floor. - Emphasized that a "paradigm shift" might be necessary to make the design work within the existing constraints. Welch - Suggested that if there will be a second floor and the first story mass is extended as discussed, the top plate of the existing structure should be lowered by at least a foot, with the roof also lowered. This adjustment would create more space between the first-floor gable and the second-floor gable, which currently appear too close together. - Emphasized that the current design lacks differentiation and looks odd, and these changes would help improve the overall proportions. - Agreed with the other comments regarding the need for adjustments. Paul - Suggested changing the small gable section to a shed roof to avoid having two gables, which would allow for a window in the gable end of the addition. This adjustment could reduce the need for dormers on the front part of the structure. - Emphasized the importance of lowering the top plate on the first floor but noted that the current gable design is problematic and could be improved by the suggested change.
Motion:	Motion to hold for significant revisions. (Made By: Camp) (04:24:35)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

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

MINUTES

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill
Documentation:	Draft Minutes.
Motion:	Motion to approve minutes of February 6 and February 13, 2024. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Camp, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye) // Welch (Abstain)

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 30, 2024, at 4pm ***HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 4:25 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=0tNG_YT6zU8&t=10621s