



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

4 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

www.nantucket-ma.gov

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

~MINUTES~

Tuesday, April 30, 2024

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via ZOOM.

Call to order at 4:03 pm. and announcements by Pohl.

Staff in attendance: Holly Backus, Preservation Planner; Fiona Johnson, Administrative Specialist

Members Present: Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Pohl

Remote Members: Coombs

Absent Members: Welch, Thornewill

Late Arrivals:

Early Departures:

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion: Motion to approve agenda (Made By: Coombs) (02:56)

Vote: Camp, Oliver, Patten, Coombs, Pohl (Aye)

SIGNS:

1.	Eaghmon Banks	1 Sparks Ave	Wall Sign	55/180.1	self
•	SAC Recommends Approval (3-2)				
2.	NIR Retail, LLC	4 Harbor Square (straight wharf fish)	Wall sign	42.2.4//1	WorkshopAPD
•	SAC DOES NOT recommend approval (3-1). Applicant to present to full HDC Board				
3.	NIR Retail, LLC	4 Harbor Square (straight wharf fish)	Wall sign (2)	42.2.4//1	WorkshopAPD
•	SAC Recommends Approval (3-1)				
4.	30 North Beach St LLC	30 North Beach Street	Wall Sign (1 of 3)	29/130	Poyant Signs
•	SAC Recommends Approval subject to updated drawing to reflect edge detail and elimination of flag sign. (5-0)				
5.	30 North Beach St LLC	30 North Beach Street	Wall Sign (2 of 3)	29/130	Poyant Signs
•	SAC Recommends Approval subject to updated drawing to reflect edge detail and elimination of flag sign. (5-0)				
6.	30 North Beach St LLC	30 North Beach Street	Wall Sign (3 of 3)	29/130	Poyant Signs
•	SAC Recommends Approval subject to updated drawing to reflect edge detail and elimination of flag sign. (5-0)				
7.	30 North Beach St LLC	30 North Beach Street	Flag Sign	29/130	Poyant Signs
•	SAC Recommends Denial based on items 4-6 (5-0)				
8.	Anthony Odoardi	38 Center Street	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/66	Sign Here Nantucket
•	SAC Recommends HOLD FOR REVISIONS (5-0). Applicant to present to full HDC Board				
9.	Anthony Odoardi	38 Center Street	Window Sign	42.3.1/66	Sign Here Nantucket
•	SAC Recommends HOLD FOR REVISIONS (5-0).				
10.	Bruce Percelay	76 Main Street	Projecting/Freestanding Sign	42.3.1/111	Sign Here Nantucket
•	SAC Recommends APPROVAL. (4-1)				
11.	Bruce Percelay	19 Broad Street	Projecting Sign	42.4.2/75	Sign Here Nantucket
•	SAC Recommends HOLD FOR REVISIONS. (4-1) Applicant to present to full HDC Board				
12.	32 Bartlett Rd LLC	32 Bartlett Road	Wall Sign	66/19	Sign Here Nantucket
•	SAC Recommends Approval subject to serif font and elimination of sign lighting (not garage lights). (5-0)				
13.	NIR Retail LLC	5 Old South Wharf	Projecting Sign	42.2.4/2	Sign Here Nantucket

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

- **SAC Recommends Approval (5-0)**

14.	Zero India Street LLC	1 Cambridge St	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/130.2	Sara Jemison
-----	-----------------------	----------------	-----------------	--------------	--------------

- **SAC Recommends Approval subject to removal of copyright logo. (5-0)**

15.	NAC Conservation Inc.	32 Washington St	Wall Sign	42.2.3/1	Jascin Finger
-----	-----------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	---------------

- **SAC Recommends Approval subject to making it a projecting sign off front porch. (4-0)**

16.	US REIF Marine Nantucket FEE LLC	4 Bayberry Ct	Wall Sign	55/704	Walt Spokowski
-----	----------------------------------	---------------	-----------	--------	----------------

- **SAC Recommends HOLD FOR REVISIONS. (4-0)**

MOTION:

Coombs made the motion to accept SAC guidelines for all sign applications except for numbers 2, 8 & 11.

Camp, Paul, Oliver, Coombs, Pohl (aye)

1.	NIR Retail, LLC	4 Harbor Square (straight wharf fish)	Wall sign	42.2.4//1	WorkshopAPD
----	-----------------	---------------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-------------

SAC DOES NOT recommend approval (3-1). **Applicant to present to full HDC Board**

DISCUSSION: Applicant gave a brief overview of sign application.

The board discussed the proposed sign for the fish market at the harbor, which was not approved by a vote of 3 to 1. The board felt that the new sign, featuring the business name over an awning, resembled a billboard and did not fit the historic waterfront aesthetic. They were concerned about setting a precedent for large, prominent signs along the waterfront. Suggestions were made to redesign the sign to be more in keeping with the character of the old lobster sign, perhaps incorporating simpler, nostalgic elements like "Fish" or "Fried Clams." The board recommended revising the sign to better reflect the traditional look and feel of the area while maintaining an appropriate scale.

MOTION: Camp made the motion to hold for revisions.

Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Paul, Pohl (aye)

Anthony Odoardi	38 Center Street	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/66	Sign Here Nantucket
-----------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------	---------------------

- **SAC Recommends HOLD FOR REVISIONS (5-0).** **Applicant to present to full HDC Board**

Anthony Odoardi	38 Center Street	Window Sign	42.3.1/66	Sign Here Nantucket
-----------------	------------------	-------------	-----------	---------------------

- **SAC Recommends HOLD FOR REVISIONS (5-0).**

DISCUSSION: Applicant gave a brief overview of sign application.

The board reviewed the proposal for a new double-sided projecting sign at 38 Broad Street. The sign, featuring black lettering on a white background, was found to be too contemporary and did not harmonize with the building's existing cream color. The board members preferred a cream background to match the building's trim and suggested adjusting the size and shape of the sign to minimize the stark contrast and large white space. They also recommended adding a border to integrate the sign more seamlessly with its surroundings. The board decided to hold the application for revisions to address these concerns.

MOTION: Paul made the motion to hold for revisions.

Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Paul, Pohl (aye)

17.	Bruce Percelay				
-----	----------------	--	--	--	--

- **SAC Recommends HOLD FOR REVISIONS. (4-1)** **Applicant to present to full HDC Board**

DISCUSSION: Applicant gave an overview of sign application.

The board reviewed the sign proposal for 19 Broad Street, which is intended to match the existing sign at 21 Broad Street. The main concern was ensuring that the sign's color harmonizes with the building's architecture. While there was some hesitation about using identical signs for adjacent properties, the board acknowledged the need for branding consistency. Members agreed that the proposed colors should reflect the building's architecture, and the signs' simplicity was acceptable. Given the context and subtle differences, the board expressed willingness to approve the sign if it aligns with the architectural color scheme of the building.

MOTION: Coombs made the motion to approve

Camp, Paul, Oliver, Coombs, Pohl (aye)

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

CONSENT:

1.	Land Bank	15 Commercial Wharf	Move off demo	42.2.4/9	Eleanor Antonetti	HB
2.	6 Clara Dr LLC	6 Clara Drive	New Deck OD shower	66/283	NAG	RP
3.	89 Easton St Trust	89 Easton Street	Rev#9938; Dormer Revision	42.4.4/21	BPC	RP
4.	Blanchfield Thomas	67 Tom Nevers Rd	Roof change	76/52	Muto Inc	JP
5.	Emil Malfati	6 White Whale	Hardscape	66/536	LFW	JP
6.	Drake RE LLC	5 Davis Lane	Shed	82/72	LFW	JP
7.	Tood Raisch	13B Witherspoon	Shed	68/477.2	LFW	JP
8.	Cynthis Roche	34 Sparks Ave	Roof change	55/232.2	LFW	JP
9.	21 Sankaty Head Trust	21 Sankaty Head Rd	Rev	48/4	BPC	VO
10.	21 Sankaty Head Trust	23 Sankaty Head Rd	Rev windows - gazebo	48/4.1	BPC	VO
11.	Sea Daze LLC	27 Baxter Road	Historic Determination	49.2.3/10	Botticelli & Pohl	DC
12.	Welton Family Trust	6 Lyon St	Deck stairs	55.4.1/73	Caleb Kardell	CT
13.	White Elephant Hotel	50 Easton St	Reno canopy	42.4.1/23	Bill O'Brien	RP

DISCUSSION: Pohl & Paul recuse.

MOTION: Coombs made the motion to approve all consent items except for number 13 (50 Easton St – White Elephant Hotel)
Patten, Camp, Oliver, Coombs (aye)

1.	White Elephant Hotel	50 Easton St	Reno canopy	42.4.1/23	Bill O'Brien	RP
----	----------------------	--------------	-------------	-----------	--------------	----

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland raised concern about the proposed replacement of traditional French door panels, characterized by their wide styles, bottom rails, and transoms, with more modern Nano doors. These Nano doors are frameless, likely metal, with very narrow styles and large, plain glass panes, standing eight feet tall. The key issue is the significant change in style, which could create a stark visual contrast along the same wall, particularly when viewed from the harbor. The concern emphasized the potential visual impact, as the Nano doors could appear as a large, dark void in the façade, altering the historic aesthetic.

DISCUSSION: Pohl suggested this item be held for representation.

MOTION: Coombs made the motion to hold for representation.
Patten, Oliver, Camp (aye)

CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS:

1.	Jeffery Akseizer	14 Moores End Ln	Dormer & Front Porch	43/216	EMDA	RP
	• Date of construction to be added to the COA (c.1994)					
2.	Hugh Gorman Trust	10 Sheep Pond Rd	Rev#10070; addition & move-on	63 / 27	LINK	RP
	• Date of construction to be added to the COA (c.1977)					
3.	Monomoy Acquisitions	30 N Liberty	Roof change	41/160	Muto Inc	JP
	• Date of construction to be added to the COA (c.1938 – HDC Survey NAN.601)					
4.	Todd & Kelly Broderick	17 Starbuck Rd	MH addition	60/111	BPC	VO
	• Trim to be NTW or Grey as its immediate neighbors; add date of construction to COA (c.1967)					
5.	Todd & Kelly Broderick	17 Starbuck Rd	garage	60/111	BPC	VO
	• Trim to be NTW or Grey as its immediate neighbors					
6.	Todd & Kelly Broderick	17 Starbuck Rd	shed	60/111	BPC	VO
	• Trim to be NTW or Grey as its immediate neighbors & second COA to be submitted for second shed					
7.	Todd & Kelly Broderick	17 Starbuck Rd	pool	60/111	BPC	VO
	• Pool not to be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.					

DISCUSSION: Joe Paul recused.

MOTION: Oliver made the motion to approve all consent with conditions
Coombs, Camp, Patten, Oliver, Pohl (aye)

VI. NEW BUSINESS 04/02/2024**1. Dean Behrend 12.5 Pequot Move Demo MH 80/20 Michael McKay**

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Pohl
Alternates:	-
Recused:	
Representative:	Michael McKay/ Dean Behrend
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	- The Commission reviewed the proposed demolition or move of a house built around 1976, which is considered non-contributing to the historic district. The applicant mentioned efforts to preserve the structure by finding a party interested in moving it, rather than demolishing it. The Commission was in favor of moving the house off-site, noting its good condition and potential for reuse. Preservation Planner Holly Backus expressed a preference for relocation over demolition and emphasizing the need to advertise the house for a move to comply with Zoning and Building codes. The Commission approved the move-off, while encouraging the applicant to continue preservation efforts.
Motion:	Motion to approve a move off. (Made By: Coombs) (00:52:17)
Vote:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Pohl (Aye)

2. Dean Behrend 12.5 Pequot Dwelling 80/20 Michael McKay

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Pohl
Alternates:	-
Recused:	
Representative:	Michael McKay/ Dean Behrend
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	- Preservation Planner, Holly Backus commented on the proposed gambrel-style dwelling in Surfside, noting that while the design is attractive, it does not fit well within the neighborhood, which primarily features Gable-style homes with additive massing and six-over-six fenestration, as outlined in <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> . She expressed concerns about the appropriateness of including both a roof walk and a cupola on the same structure, as neither element is typical for the area. Backus recommended further review of the neighborhood context and pointed out that the two driveways associated with the project will require Planning Board approval.
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	- The commissioners expressed significant concerns about the proposed Gambrel-style home, agreeing that it is overly detailed, out of scale, and does not fit the simpler, more conservative architectural style of Surfside or Nantucket in general. Several noted that the house's height, nearly 30 feet, was too tall for the area, with complex massing and excessively heavy trim. The inclusion of a roof walk, cupola, and mismatched window styles (such as four-over-one "chicklet" windows) were deemed inappropriate. Suggestions included simplifying the rooflines, paring down the detailing, removing the roof walk and cupola, and reconsidering the garage integration. Overall, the Commission recommended a substantial simplification of the design to better align with the context and architectural norms of Nantucket. and Building codes. The Commission approved the move-off, while encouraging the applicant to continue preservation efforts.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Camp) (01:09:10)
Vote:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Pohl (Aye)

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

3.	Dean Behrend	12.5 Pequot	Move demo shed	80/20	Michael McKay
4.	Dean Behrend	12.5 Pequot	Move demo studio	80/20	Michael McKay
5.	Riverview Crossing, LLC	12.5 Pequot	Pool & Hardscape	80/20	Michael McKay
6.	Riverview Crossing, LLC	12.5 Pequot	Garage	80/20	Michael McKay

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Pohl
Alternates:	-
Recused:	
Representative:	Michael McKay/ Dean Behrend
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to hold to track items 3,4,5 & 6. (Made By: Camp) (01:09:21)
Vote:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Pohl (Aye)

7. Amelia Drive LLC 5 Amelia Drive Material Change 67/436 Emeritus

Voting:	Camp, Combs, Oliver, Paul, Patten
Alternates:	-
Recused:	
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	- The commissioners discussed the color options for the clapboards, with a preference for maintaining the clapboard style over switching to shingles. Val favored a 50% muted tone, which was supported by Joe, who appreciated the subtlety and believed clapboards would enhance the design. Connie was open to any option, while Diane preferred the 100% color but was flexible. The board considered a middle ground of 75% color to address the varying preferences. Overall, the consensus was to go with a subtle, muted tone for the clapboards, ensuring a harmonious look.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Main Street Yellow 75 (Made by: Oliver) (1:27:00)
Vote:	Camp, Patten, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

8. Carolyn & Daniel Haley 8 Ipswich St shed 71.3.2/275 JB Studio

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten
Alternates:	-
Recused:	
Representative:	Juraj Bencat
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Oliver) (01:28:57)
Vote:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten, Pohl (Aye)

9. Brian & Christine LLC 9 Salti Way New Dwelling 20/51.1 JB Studio

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Pohl
Alternates:	-
Recused:	
Representative:	Juraj Bencat
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	- The board discussed an application for a new garage cabana in front of an existing approved pool and house. Concerns were raised about the structure's relationship to the main house and surrounding landscape. The steep grade change, which created an underground garage and elevated cabana, was noted, but the board requested additional materials to make a more informed decision. Specifically, they requested site photos, pictures of the main house, and existing and

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

	proposed contour plans to better assess the scale, visibility, and impact of the new construction. The applicant agreed to provide the requested documents.
Motion:	Motion to hold for more information. (Made By: Camp) (01:37:16)
Vote:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Pohl (Aye)

10. ACK Mid Island LLC 18-26 Sparks Ave Rev Mixed use building

Voting:	Camp, Paul, Pohl, Patten
Alternates:	-
Recused:	Oliver, Coombs
Representative:	- Daniel Najarian, Stephen Cohen, George Berg
Staff Comments:	- Holly Backus, the Preservation Planner, began by noting that the Planning board has already reviewed and approved the site and its use. She appreciated the architectural changes since the last meeting, such as the lowered connector, removal of the shed dormer, addition of gables, and the introduction of six-over-one double-hung windows. Holly also praised the new storefront windows, which evoke a more traditional downtown appearance similar to those on Broad Street. She confirmed that both structures are less than 40 feet in height and noted that the longest ridge is on the east side of Building A. For constructive criticism, Holly suggested ensuring that all dormers are set off the ridge (as some are, but others are not), adding small windows in the gable ends of the third floor for a more traditional Nantucket look, and reconsidering the French doors with transoms, as that style is atypical for a façade on Sparks Avenue. -
Public Comments:	- Val Oliver acknowledged some positive changes in the project, particularly appreciating the reduction in the middle section to 31 feet and the simplified look with fewer dormers. However, she noted that the overall building height is still closer to 40 feet, and while the square footage has fluctuated, the current structure is still larger than the original submission. Despite the positive adjustments, Val emphasized that the structure's scale remains large and doesn't relate well to the surrounding area. She urged the Commission to consider further scaling it down and reminded them that they have the opportunity to make a decision after four reviews. - Dalton Frazier expressed strong support for the project, describing it as a great-looking building that addresses significant needs in the area, particularly for year-round housing. As a real estate broker, he highlighted the high demand for year-round apartments, which far exceeds supply. He also pointed out the building's convenient location, close to amenities like the Stop & Shop, the post office, and public transportation. Dalton further emphasized the benefit of adding a bowling alley, which he believes would provide a much-needed indoor activity for residents and visitors, offering a family-friendly social space that is not centered around a bar. He urged the committee to view the project favorably. - The public comments reflected mixed views on the project. Chris Perez, speaking as a parent, expressed excitement about the bowling alley, emphasizing its value as a place for children to enjoy and release energy. He also supported the inclusion of year-round housing, considering it crucial for the community. Mary Ley, on the other hand, acknowledged some improvements to the project but felt it was still too large. She expressed concerns about the bowling alley being associated with a bar, stating that Nantucket already has more liquor licenses than necessary. Mary also questioned the necessity of a bowling alley for children, as she feels there are plenty of activities available. Additionally, she raised concerns about the building's size, parking capacity, and height. Diane, another speaker, agreed that the project had improved but urged for a reduction in the building's height to 30 feet, emphasizing the importance of fitting into the surrounding area and maintaining Nantucket's historic character.
Commissioner Comments:	- The Commissioners expressed appreciation for the design changes, particularly the improved fenestration, reduced ridge heights, and the separation of the buildings, which helped mitigate the original monolithic appearance. However, concerns remain regarding the overwhelming mass of the buildings, especially their shadowing effect on Sparks Avenue. The importance of Hardscape and Landscape plans was emphasized, as the greenery and pedestrian-friendly elements are crucial to softening the building's impact on the street. While there was some debate about micromanaging specific design details, the Commissioners agreed that any approval should

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

	include a commitment to the landscaping and Hardscape shown in the renderings to ensure the project's aesthetic integrity.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Camp) (02:25:12)
Vote:	Camp, Patten, Paul, Pohl (Aye)

11. NHA 15 Broad Street New freight door 42. 4.2/61 LFW

Voting:	Camp, Pohl, Patten, Oliver, Coombs
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	- Linda Williams
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	- The Commissioners generally agreed that the barn-type doors are necessary but emphasized the need for a smaller, more historically appropriate design. They suggested muted or neutral colors like putty or gray to avoid clashing with the brick, as matching red would be difficult. There was consensus that the doors should be flush with the brick and align with the lentils of the surrounding windows. The importance of seeing a detailed sketch before final approval was noted, with the decision to finalize details through staff review.
Motion:	Motion to approve through staff with Ray Pohl giving the sign off. (Made By: Oliver) (02:41:36)
Vote:	Camp, Pohl, Oliver, Patten, Coombs (Aye)

12. K22S LLC 126R Main St New Dwelling 42 3.3/98.1 LFW

Commissioner Comments:	- Ray Pohl noted that this has been stricken.
-------------------------------	--

13. K22S LLC 126R Main St New Shed 42 3.3/98.1 LFW

Commissioner Comments:	- Ray Pohl noted that this has been stricken.
-------------------------------	--

14. 41B Cliff Rd LLC 41B Cliff Road Driveway 29/40 LFW

Voting:	Camp, Paul, Pohl, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	-
Recused:	
Representative:	- Linda Williams
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	- Mickey Rowland from HSAB expressed concerns about the extensive use of brick in the design, emphasizing that it could feel overwhelming given the adjacent brick wall and the neighbor's brick driveway. He suggested maintaining a planting bed next to the building to introduce some green space and soften the hardscape. Additionally, he recommended incorporating a grass strip or cobblestones down the middle of the brick to help break up the large expanse and reduce the dominance of the brickwork.
Commissioner Comments:	- The Commissioners generally supported the brick material but emphasized the need for a design that breaks up the large expanse of hardscape. Val suggested incorporating cobblestones in the middle, possibly in a trellis design with some greenery to soften the appearance. Several agreed that a mix of brick and cobblestone would enhance the aesthetic, particularly given the extensive brickwork in the surrounding area. The Commissioners also discussed the potential benefits of adding some greenery or a trellis for visual relief, though they acknowledged limitations due to property lines.
Motion:	Motion to approve through staff with the cobbles strip in the middle (Made By: Oliver) (02:47:35)
Vote:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Pohl (Aye)

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

15. 61 Fairgrounds LLC 61 Fairgrounds Road Lot C Fencing 67/173.1 LFW

Voting:	Paul, Pohl, Patten, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	-
Recused:	
Representative:	-
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to hold for complete information (Made By: Oliver) (02:58:13)
Vote:	Paul, Pohl, Patten, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Motion:	
Vote:	

16. 61 Fairgrounds LLC 15 Parker Lane Lot B Fencing/Pool 67/173 LFW

Voting:	Paul, Pohl, Patten, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	-
Recused:	
Representative:	-
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to hold for complete information. (Made By: Oliver) (02:58:13)
Vote:	Paul, Pohl, Patten, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Motion:	
Vote:	

VII. OLD BUSINESS 04/09/2024

□. Youngman, Robin 32 York Street Window Replace 55 4.1/101 Val Oliver

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Pohl
Alternates:	
Recused:	Oliver
Representative:	
Staff Comments:	- Holly Backus thanked Val for her deeper archival research, which revealed that the structure dates back to 1881-1892 and was built by Mr. Everick Gibbs for Joseph Lewis on the former site of the Zion Church in the New Guinea area. She expressed her appreciation for clarifying the location of the church, noting its historical significance. Regarding the window replacement proposal, Holly stated that Anderson SDL windows are not appropriate for a historic structure within the Old Historic District (OHD). She recommended that if the commission approves replacement windows, they should consider more historically appropriate options such as Green Mountain or Boston Sash, which have a more accurate net profile.
Public Comments:	- Mickey Rowland from HSAB echoed Holly's concerns about the appropriateness of Anderson SDL windows for the historic house, which is prominently visible from two streets. He agreed with Holly's suggestion of using more suitable window options like Boston Sash or Green Mountain. Mickey recommended that true divided light (TDL) windows be used on the front and main section of the building, while SDL windows could be acceptable on the rear and less visible areas of the structure.
Commissioner Comments:	- The commission discussed the window replacement options for the historic house and agreed on rejecting Anderson windows due to their inappropriateness for the historic district. They were open to using Green Mountain, Boston Sash, or Brosco windows, with a preference for maintaining a

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

	consistent window type across the building. The majority favored True Divided Lights (TDLs) for the prominent front elevations and suggested SDLs could be acceptable for the less visible areas. The commission leaned towards having a uniform window style and approved using SDL windows from either Green Mountain or Boston Sash, noting that Brosco's current offerings may not include insulated glass units.
Motion:	Motion to approve with SDL Green Mountain or Boston Sash house wide. (Made By: Camp) (03:13:04)
Vote:	Paul, Patten, Coombs, Camp, Pohl, (Aye)

□. Amy & Ted Orenstein 5 Crow's Nest Way Windows/Doors 12/22.2 Sandcastle Cont.

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Patten
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	- Rob Newman
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	- In this meeting, the speaker discusses proposed modifications to a building's elevations, focusing on updates to the front and side views. The front elevation was revised to move the door and adjust the windows for better symmetry, based on a request. On the south elevation, the chimney was corrected, and trim and paint details were aligned with the main house. Minimal changes were needed for the other elevations, except for the rear, where too much glass was originally present. Three new design proposals were offered, with the second initially preferred by the owner and speaker. However, after discussion, Connie and Diane both agreed that option three was the best solution, providing a balance between views and aesthetics. All other elevations were deemed well-executed by the group.
Motion:	Motion to approve including number 3 - east elevation. (Made By: Coombs) (03:21:03)
Vote:	Patten, Coombs, Camp (Aye)

□. 1 N. Swift Rock Tr 1 N. Swift Rock Pavilion 40/2 Emeritus

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Combs, Oliver
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	-
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	- Lisa Burger, a neighbor at 27 Eel Point Road, expressed concerns about recent changes to the proposed building design. While she appreciated the effort to reduce the size and comply with porch adjustments, she was troubled by the addition of a chimney pot, which she felt made the structure taller and less visually appealing. Additionally, she raised concerns about the amount of light from the windows, particularly from the bathroom, questioning the necessity of two windows in that space. She also inquired about the landscape plan, noting that trees originally shown around the building and garage were not included in the current presentation and asked if they would be addressed later.
Commissioner Comments:	- The board discussed the proposed structure's roofline and overall design. One member preferred the original hip roof design, feeling it better minimized the building's visual impact, while expressing concern over the large roof covering open space compared to enclosed space. In response, the applicant noted that they had reduced the structure's length by three feet and scaled down the windows on the south elevation to smaller four-light windows. They also added a chimney cap based on previous feedback. Despite some reservations, most of the board members, including Val, Abby, and Diane, expressed approval of the revised design, with one final note about not being particularly fond of the chimney cap design.
Motion:	Motion to approve through staff without the owl and adding another layer of corbelling around the chimney. (Made By: Camp) (03:41:39)
Vote:	Camp, Coombs, Pohl (Aye) Oliver (Nay)

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

□. **1 N. Swift Rock Tr** **1 N. Swift Rock** **Garage** **40/2** **LFW**

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions and additional information about the other building (main house) (Made By: Oliver) (03:50:05)
Vote:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Pohl (Aye)

□. **White Elephant Hotel** **50 Easton Street** **Reno/Canopy** **42 4.1/23** **Bill O'Brien**

Voting:	Paul, Pohl, Patten, Oliver, Coombs
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Staff Comments:	- Holly Backus, the preservation planner, reviewed the proposal with the architect and provided feedback, which was incorporated into the final design. She confirmed that the glazing in the updated drawings has decreased, as recommended, and expressed that the changes are successful. She noted the historical significance of the building, known as the White Elephant, originally constructed in 1930 and expanded in 1965. Backus had no concerns with the proposed design, emphasizing that the awning is typical of the historic district and aligns with its character.
Public Comments:	- Mickey Rowland expressed concerns about the proposed replacement of French doors with transom windows, noting that the new 8-foot tall, narrow-style solid glass doors represent a significant change. He highlighted that the new doors lack a bottom panel or style, making them very different from the existing design. While he had no objections to reducing the size of the openings or even using Nano doors, he emphasized that the new doors should match the adjacent ones, possibly including transom windows to maintain consistency. He also pointed out that although the doors will be less visible during the day due to the awning, at night they will be highly visible from areas like the Steamboat and the town launch ramp, further reinforcing the need for consistency with the current design. -
Commissioner Comments:	- The board generally agreed that the proposed changes, including removing the bump in the awning and creating a straight roofline, were a net benefit to the overall design. Val and Joe both appreciated the tidier look, with Joe noting that the new roofline improves aesthetics by eliminating the unattractive hump. Abby expressed some nostalgia for the varied roof heights but did not object to the doors, feeling they would be obscured by the awning. Diane was more hesitant, acknowledging the old design's historical character but ultimately agreed with the proposed changes, though not enthusiastically. The board collectively felt that, given the porch's shading and activity, the lighting impact from the new doors would be minimal.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made By: Oliver) (03:34:21)
Vote:	Camp, Paul, Coombs, Oliver, Pohl (Aye)

□. **3 Pleasant St Nom Tr** **3 Pleasant Street** **Addition** **42 3.3/155** **Emeritus**

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Staff Comments:	- Holly Backus, the Preservation Planner, reviewed the circa 1804 Nantucket home proposed for a 700 square foot addition. She appreciated that the addition was made smaller, subordinate in size, and placed off the main block, but expressed concerns about the ambitious design. Specifically, she felt that the wide porch columns and flush dormers did not align with the simple, historical

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

	character of the home. While she acknowledged the reduction in height and the removal of the pergola and brackets, she recommended further simplifying the scale and design of the addition. Backus also noted that despite being set back, the side porch competes with the simple 18th-century façade. She compared nearby properties, highlighting that one and five Pleasant Street are Greek Revivals, built in the 1830s, decades after this home. Lastly, she mentioned forwarding comments from a direct abutter to the commission for review.
Public Comments:	- Mickey Rowland agreed with Holly Backus, emphasizing that the proposed addition is still oversized for a house of this historical period and should be further scaled down. He noted that the additive massing is not traditional and detracts from the historic main structure, particularly the flush dormers facing the street, which he deemed inappropriate. While the provided perspectives show trees that partially obscure the addition, Mickey pointed out that from the sidewalk and driveway, the addition will be clearly visible. He specifically mentioned that the French doors on the north side, visible from Pleasant Street, should be replaced with windows. Additionally, the long series of steps on the north side is untraditional and should be simplified to a basic stoop.
Commissioner Comments:	- The board expressed concerns about the front and north elevations, with several members agreeing that the design needs simplification to better align with the historic character of the house. Val and Diane both criticized the flush dormer, calling it too modern and out of place, with Val suggesting a simplified porch over the door to avoid a suburban look. Mickey's recommendation to simplify the steps and replace the French doors with windows was well-received. Diane suggested reducing the width of the addition to avoid overpowering the original structure. The board also felt the second-floor deck's railing was too ornate and should be simplified to match the house's Federal style. While they were more flexible with the back of the house, they emphasized the need for a less intrusive and more historically consistent design overall.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Coombs) (04:02:43)
Vote:	Oliver, Coombs, Camp (Aye)

□. **2538970 Ontario Inc** **5 Coffin St (Sias)** **Exterior Alterations** **73 1.4/21** **Emeritus**

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Staff Comments:	- Holly Backus reviewed the proposed changes to a 1930s Bungalow-style structure within the old historic district and expressed concerns about alterations to the west elevation, particularly the dormer. She appreciated the use of true divided light windows, given the home's contributing status in the district, but felt that modifying the west elevation, visible from Lindberg and Coffin Street, would alter a character-defining feature of the bungalow. She supported replacing the existing French doors with a true front door but emphasized that the changes to the dormer were her primary concern.
Public Comments:	- The Sconset Advisory Group expressed concerns that the most recent changes to the proposed work at 5 Coffin Street are inappropriate for the Sconset Old Historic District. They noted that at the March 26, 2024, meeting, the board had requested minor revisions, specifically to the west elevation porch roofline. However, the current proposal significantly alters the original bungalow features, including the removal of the admired dormer and the addition of a second-floor deck with French doors. The group believes this change is a major departure from the commission's earlier preferences and argues that second-floor decks are inappropriate in the Sconset District, urging the board to reject the proposal. -
Commissioner Comments:	- The board expressed concerns about alterations to the historic 1930s bungalow, particularly regarding changes to the west elevation. They were troubled by the addition of a second-floor deck and French doors, which they felt detracted from the simplicity and character of the original structure. Several members suggested reverting to the original design, with a hipped roof porch on the first floor and retaining the six-window dormer on the second floor. They also noted that removing the second-floor deck and simplifying the columns would better preserve the structure's

Minutes for April 30, 2024; adopted October 15, 2024

	historic integrity. Ultimately, the board favored restoring the original design elements, with a pergola and fenestration changes that reflect the building's original style.
Motion:	Motion to remove the deck (Made by: Camp) (04:15:07)
Vote:	Oliver, Coombs, Camp, Pohl (Aye)

□. **Nantucket Island Resorts 19 N Water St Lot 8 New Dwelling 42 4.2/3 Emeritus**

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Staff Comments:	- Holly Backus, the preservation planner, provided comments on an infill project in the Old Historic District (OHD), previously the site of the Harbor House Cottages. She appreciated the changes made to the porch, including the removal of its rural feel and the improvements to the AC enclosure. Holly also commended the removal of the Tudor-style elements with brackets but suggested that the remaining brackets could be reconsidered. Additionally, she noted that the rear one-story roof pitch is atypical and mentioned that as a point for further consideration. Overall, her comments were minor adjustments to the design.
Public Comments:	- Mickey Rowland expressed concerns about the front Portico's integration with the main roof plane, which he feels is unusual and out of character for the Old Historic District (OHD). He suggested that the Portico should be isolated from the main roof. Mickey also noted that the unequal roof pitches on the building are uncommon and could be noticeable, and he agreed with Holly's concern about the shallow pitch of the rear roof, recommending it be modified to better fit the historic context.
Commissioner Comments:	- The board expressed mixed feelings about the proposed design changes. Key concerns included the integration of the front Portico with the main roof, which members found awkward and atypical for the Old Historic District (OHD). Joe suggested exploring options to separate or adjust the rooflines to improve the design. Diane recommended adding a chimney to enhance the building's historical character. Members agreed that minor revisions were needed, including adjustments to the roof pitch and the potential inclusion of a chimney. The board motioned to hold for revisions and to review the updated design in the future.
Motion:	Motion to approve with clarification that the sash is white (Made By: Paul) (04:26:52)
Vote:	Oliver, Diane, Camp, Paul (Aye)
Motion to approve minutes of March 5, 2024 (Coombs) (04:27:18)	
Camp, Patten, Coombs, Pohl (Aye) Oliver (Abstain)	

Motion to adjourn at 8:30pm (Coombs) (04:28:25)
Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Pohl (Aye)

Minutes by Jakie O'Brien

YouTube: [Nantucket Historic District Commission - April 30, 2024 \(youtube.com\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...)