



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

4 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Stephen Welch (Chair), Raymond Pohl (Vice-Chair), Angus MacLeod, Abby Camp, Vallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten, Joe Paul.

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, June 4, 2024

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

Called to order at 4:02 pm. and announcements by Welch

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

Members Present: Welch, Oliver, Patten, MacLeod, Thornewill, Pohl

Remote Participants: Camp

Absent Members:

Late Arrivals: Joe Paul

Early Departures:

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion **Motion to Approve made by Oliver (00:25)**
Vote Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Patten (aye)

DISCUSSION: The chairman discussed the need for the commission to improve by more regularly following its approved best practices. He proposed starting future meetings by reading one of these best practices to benefit both the commission and participants. The first two practices to be reviewed are "Conduct of Application Hearings" and "Supplemental Application Materials." He emphasized the importance of focusing on determining whether architectural elements in applications are appropriate and avoiding redundancy to move through hearings more efficiently. Additionally, he mentioned that supplemental application materials should not be accepted at the table to prevent delays and confusion.

II. CONSENTS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	David & Dorothy Bailey	100 Baxter Road	Demo Portion 8216	48/42	LINK
2.	David & Dorothy Bailey	83 Sankaty Road	Stick build portion 8209	49.91/0	LINK
3.	Carolyn M Higgins Rev Trst	6 Fair Street	Historic Determination	42.3.1/151	Botticelli & Pohl
4.	A Novissimo	14 Deer Run Rd	New Garage	57/14.1	Sandcastle
5.	Ernie & Jamie Strang	7 Farmview Drive	New Dwelling	66/180	SMRD

Motion to approve consents made by Oliver (03:09)
Welch, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Patten (aye) Pohl (Recused)

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Lubin Richard K Trust	6 Hinckley Lane	Remove bulkhead walkout	30/78	Emeritus
	• Approvable due to minimal visibility. Date of construction added to the COA (NHL Data = c.1994)				
2.	West Chester St LLC	61 W. Chester St	Dormer Addition	41/222.1	BPC
	• Approvable due to minimal visibility. Date of construction added to the COA (NHL Data = c.1994)				
3.	Lubin Richard K Trust	6 Hinckley Lane	New Pool Cabana	30/78	Emeritus
	• Approval due to minimal visibility.				
4.	23 Sankaty Head Rd Trust	23 Sankaty Head Rd	Demo garage	48/4.1	BPC
	• Approve as a move-off only.				
5.	Andy Bender	2 Braeburn Way	Rooftop solar pool house	39/41	Acksmart
	• Panels appropriately located on secondary structure, but also due to limited visibility.				
6.	Steven L. Cohen, Trustee of Monomoy Trust	39 Monomoy	New garage	54/79	WAPD
	• Approve as revised. • Commissioners: Pohl, Thornewill, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, alt/ Welch (OLD BUSINESS 6/4/24)				

Motion to approve consent with conditions made by Oliver (3:39)

Camp, Pohl, MacLeod, Welch, Oliver (aye)

IV. NEW BUSINESS 05/28/2024 – VIEW

- ReMain LLC 54 Main Street Solar Roof 42.3.1/193 AckSmart

DISCUSSION: The board members generally agreed on the importance of a mockup to assess the visibility and impact of the solar panels on this prominent historic building, particularly given its location at a major intersection in downtown Nantucket. They acknowledged the effort to minimize visibility by positioning the panels near the inward chimney and supported Holly Backus's suggestion to use black materials for the mockup, with one member recommending a high gloss to simulate the reflective surface. Some felt that the panels would primarily be visible to pedestrians, while others expressed concern about seeing the entire roof from various vantage points. Additionally, one board member suggested using copper flashing that would patina over time to reduce the "new look" on the vertical plane. Overall, the board supported the idea of a mockup to better evaluate the visual impact.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that the structure in question is individually significant, built after the Great Fire of 1846. She mentioned that while the roof color wasn't specified, it appears to be black, possibly three-tab, which aligns with the guidelines. The roof is part of the main block with no additive massing, forming a square shape that will be visible from Orange Street, although primarily noticeable to pedestrians rather than drivers. Holly also highlighted that solar installations have been approved on other historic structures within the Old Historic District (OHD), referencing a similar project at 134. She suggested the board might want a mockup, as was done previously. Lastly, she requested that if the commission approves the project, the construction date be added to the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Mickey Roland, representing the Historic Structures Advisory Group, noted that the group includes several new and former members of the Historic Commission. Regarding the application, he acknowledged that the solar array would be visible from Orange Street. A suggestion from the group was to eliminate the first two vertical columns of the array to reduce visibility, leaving only a glimpse of the corner visible. He supported Holly Backus's idea of creating a mockup, possibly using plywood, to better assess the visibility from the street.

Motion to conduct a mockup as discussed by the board, allow for potential revisions, and have the matter heard the following Tuesday, provided the mockup is delivered to staff by the Thursday of the prior week made by Pohl. (34:55)

Camp, Pohl, MacLeod, Welch, Oliver (aye)

V. OLD BUSINESS 05/14/2024

1. ACK Mid Island LLC 18-26 Sparks Ave Rev Mixed Use Bldg 55 231.1-307-310 LFW

DISCUSSION: The board appreciated the significant changes made to the project, noting that it has evolved into a more pedestrian-friendly design with improved massing and differentiation between buildings. There was general agreement that the removal of dormers from certain areas and the addition of trellises were positive steps. However, concerns remained regarding the overall massing, particularly with the repetitive gables and the height of the structure, which was deemed too prominent for the area. Several board members felt that the third-story dormers drew too much attention to the building's height and suggested reducing or redesigning them. There was also discussion about blank walls on the south and east elevations, which could appear stark without sufficient vegetation or detail. Overall, the board acknowledged the improvements but emphasized the need for further refinement to address concerns about massing, visibility, and architectural details like window arrangements and roofline treatments.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus emphasized that two Certificates of Appropriateness (COAs) will be needed, one for each building now that the project has evolved from a single structure to two. She appreciated the distinct color schemes for the buildings, moving away from a monochromatic palette, with Building A featuring a cobblestone trim color and Building B a platinum gray trim color. Backus praised the decision to eliminate the dormers on the rear and west sides and to include trellises as recommended by Commissioner Paul. She acknowledged the window revisions on the east side of Building A but suggested that if the two smaller flanking windows are not appropriate, it might be better to have just two windows instead of three. Additionally, she noted that the detailing has historical precedent on the island. Backus also mentioned that the updated video provided a better understanding of how the new structures relate to the surrounding buildings, which was helpful for the review process.

Motion to hold for revisions with the stipulation that if they're in by Friday it will be heard the following Tuesday made by Joe Paul (03:09:39)
Pohl, Camp, Patten, Paul, Welch (aye)

VI. NEW BUSINESS 04/12/2024 – NOW OLD BUSINESS

1. Timothy & Susan Grell 21 Field Ave Pool 80/41 LINK

DISCUSSION: The board members generally supported the application, with Stephen suggesting that the roadside fence should include vining material on alternating panels, recommending climbing hydrangea for its non-invasive, attractive, and easy-to-maintain qualities. Val agreed, emphasizing the importance of maintaining the screening in perpetuity due to the visibility of the location. She appreciated the provided pictures, noting that if the pool is screened, it's acceptable. Connie and Abby both agreed with the previous comments, though Abby expressed concerns about the new fencing, feeling it clashed with the natural, wooded character of the area and chose to abstain from the decision.

Motion made by Welch proposes that the application materials in Exhibit A reflect alternating vine-type plant material on the fence. (01:20:36)
Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Patten (aye) Camp (abstain)

2. Quarter Mile Hill 2 Quarter Mile Hill New Wav Surface 42.3.3/4 Gryphon Arch

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed general approval of the application, acknowledging it as an as-built situation. Val and Connie agreed that the application is appropriate, especially since the cobblestones will remain at the apron, which they consider the most important element. Connie added that the ownership and application process for the lane, which appears to be an abutters' way rather than town-owned, is complex but common on the island. The board agreed that the responsibility for the application shouldn't fall on one individual. Connie also noted that historical photos suggest the lane was dirt in the 1960s, while Main Street was likely asphalt, reinforcing the appropriateness of the current plan.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus reviewed historic and aerial photos of the driveway, noting that while cobblestones are visible at the entrance, it's unclear what material is used further along. She appreciated the historic photos provided but found it difficult to determine the exact material. After checking Sandborn Maps from 1923 and 1949, she found that Quarter Mile Hill is noted, but without specifics on ownership or material details. Based on the aerial images, it's evident that there is a track, though the material is unclear. Holly expressed that cobblestones would be more historically appropriate, and suggested that if a different material is used, it could include a grass strip down the middle to maintain a traditional look, as the current use of full-on shell gives the driveway a very contemporary appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Mickey Roland's comments aligned with Holly Backus, noting that while it's unclear when the cobblestones were introduced on the lane, it has historically been a tracked road with grass down the middle. He suggested that the cobblestones have likely been there for 50 to 75 years, making them historic. The advisory group proposed a compromise to restore the cobblestones with a grass strip in the middle for the first 100 feet of the lane, then transition to natural-colored pea stone. This approach would maintain the historic appearance from Main Street, while subtly blending the materials beyond that point.

Motion to approve as submitted made by Camp. (57:17)
Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten (aye)

VII. OLD BUSINESS 04/23/2024

1. Mariela Oviedo 12 Wappossett Circle Solar 67/572 Incite LLC

• *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten* •

2. Brian Davis 108 Surfside Road Roof Solar 80/5 Sunwind

• *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten* •

DISCUSSION: The board expressed concerns about the placement of the solar array on the front of the house, with Abby, Connie, and Stephen all agreeing that it would set a bad precedent. Abby emphasized that while vegetation might temporarily screen the panels, it's unreliable in the long term, and the array would negatively impact the house's appearance if the vegetation were lost. Connie agreed, stating that even with the driveway changes, the panels would still be too prominent. Stephen supported their points, noting that the current design is inconsistent with guidelines and suggesting the possibility of installing a ground array instead. He also mentioned that the structural pipes could be disguised with cedar casings for a more aesthetic solution. Ultimately, the board was not in favor of the solar array on the front of the house without significant revisions.

Motion to hold for revisions made by Pohl. (01:16:16)
Welch, Camp, Pohl, Patten (aye)

3. Nantucket Historical Association 89 Bartlett Road Roof Solar 66/410 AckSmart

• *Not anticipated by the Chair within 48 hours*

• *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver*

DISCUSSION: The board members generally supported the application, with Val noting that additional screening, such as trees, would help mitigate the visibility of the solar panels, particularly since the structure is set far back from the road. Abby agreed, suggesting that trees would help block the view from the nearby golf course. Stephen proposed a more strategic approach to planting, recommending three deciduous trees be placed to not only screen the solar panels but also reduce solar gain on the front dwelling. He emphasized that the trees should be placed further back from the road to break up the visual plane effectively. Val also mentioned that the placement of the panels, pushed to the right, seemed less visible and more appropriate. Stephen concluded by making a motion to approve the application, contingent on the addition of three deciduous trees as part of the landscape plan.

Motion to approve subject to exhibit A made by Welch (01:08:02)

Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver (aye)

4. Tomack LLC 38 Chuck Hollow Road MH – Roof/Fen 75/66.1 JB Studio

• *Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill - Last heard April 2, 2024*

DISCUSSION:

Motion to approve as subject to the application being revised to track the approved drawings made by Oliver (17:23) Welch, Oliver, Patten (aye)

5. Tomack LLC 38 Chuck Hollow Road Garage – Roof/Fen 75/66.1 JB Studio

• *Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill - Last heard April 2, 2024*

DISCUSSION:

Motion to approve subject to the prior motion made by Patten (20:53)

Welch, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill

6. Josh Leffler 22 Pleasant St Addition 42.3.2/50 Oliver

• *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver - Last heard April 9, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board expressed mixed opinions on the proposed changes to the garage and front door design. Val had already addressed a suggestion to center the door in the addition, while Mickey pointed out that two windows on the west elevation should match in height. Carrie appreciated the design's attempt to tie the new elements to the original garage with similar cladding and found the hip roof on the elevation more proportional than in the 3D rendering. Abby, however, was concerned that the garage's new design did not retain enough of its original character, particularly criticizing the hip roof over the front door as looking awkward. Despite her reservations, she acknowledged other positive aspects of the design, like the clipped roof and ganged windows. Overall, the board appreciated certain improvements but remained uncertain about whether the design sufficiently preserved the character of the original garage.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus raised concerns about the existing circa-1949 garage on the site, noting that while the main house is a 1923 Craftsman, the proposed changes to the garage involve significant alterations. She questioned whether anything characteristic of the 75-year-old garage would be retained in the new design. Specifically, she inquired if the current structure, which includes a change from a gable to a hip roof, would preserve anything meaningful or if the garage would essentially be demolished and rebuilt. Backus emphasized that if only the front façade and a few feet of the sides are being kept, it raises the question of whether

the board should discuss the possibility of relocating or demolishing the garage, given that very little of the original structure would remain.

Motion to approve the architecture based on the elevations as submitted with the application revised to reflect what is going on in the drawings made by Thornewill (01:32:35)

Thornewill, Welch (aye) Camp (abstain)

7. 450 Greenpark LLC 2 Stone Alley Railings 42.3.1 /102 Emeritus

• *Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul; Alternate: Patten; Recused: Pohl, Oliver - Last heard April 9, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board generally agreed that the proposed deck on the historic structure was too large and out of scale with the building. While some members found Option A more acceptable than Option B, concerns persisted about the mass and visibility of the deck, particularly from Stone Alley. Several members, including Carrie and Joe, suggested a simpler or more decorative railing, with some advocating for eliminating the deck altogether in favor of a smaller, more utilitarian space. There was support for reducing the deck to cover only part of the roof or using a lower, natural-to-weather railing to minimize the visual impact. Overall, the board favored a more subtle, scaled-back approach.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation planner Holly Backus acknowledged the significance of the Eliza Cod structure, an 1850s barn converted into a house. She appreciated the slight reduction in the proposed alterations but emphasized that the new railing should resemble the previous natural weathered, simple railing in both size and style, consistent with what existed before the renovation. Holly disagreed with the comparison to 18 Orange Street, noting that it was from a different time period and vernacular, and reiterated the importance of keeping changes in line with the original design.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland expressed concern that the proposed changes to the original historic balcony on the building would significantly alter its character. He emphasized that the original balcony was small in scale and functioned as a true balcony, not a deck. The previously approved design maintained this smaller scale and expanding it into a larger deck would be excessive and incompatible with the building's character. He argued that the expansion should be eliminated entirely and that the second option (Option B) overly changes the design, making it unsuitable for the historic structure.

Motion to hold for revisions made by Oliver (03:25:28)

Welch, Patten, Thornewill, Paul, Oliver (aye)

8. Cohen Steven TR. co Area 51 TR. 51 W Miacomet Road Pool 81/52 Ahern LLC

• *Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten - Last heard April 2, 2024*

9. Turk Family LLC 15 Marsh Hawk Ln Pool/Patio 56/113.6 LINK

• *Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill – Last heard April 9, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the need for a fence to ensure the pool is properly screened from the street and surrounding vegetation. Carrie suggested that a fence between the pool and the vegetation would be a fail-safe way to guarantee privacy. The board agreed that the fence should be solid, with alternating sections of vine-covered material to enhance the screening. They also confirmed that there should be no visible pool lighting and no change in grade from the prior existing conditions. The board debated between a 5-foot or 6-foot solid fence, ultimately leaning towards a 5-foot option combined with heavy vegetation to adequately hide the pool, while reviewing an alternate proposal with a 6-foot fence.

Motion to approve with exhibit A made by Thornewill (01:59:01)
Thornewill, Oliver, Welch (aye)

10. Great Harbor Yacht Club Inc. 96 Washington Street Add/alter 55.1.4/8 Emeritus

• Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver - Last heard April 9, 2024

DISCUSSION:

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus expressed support for the proposed changes to the building, specifically praising the success of the gable porch roof with a hip design. She acknowledged that the depth of the porch was already existing, as clarified in a previous discussion. Given these details, she conveyed no concerns about the proposed modifications to the structure, referencing the circa-2007 building of the Great Harbor Yacht Club.

Motion to approve as submitted made by Welch (02:02:15)
Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver (aye)

VIII. NEW BUSINESS 04/30/2024

1. Durham Station LLC 76 Pocomo Rd Move off demo dwelling 15/38 Mark Avery

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that the building in question is from circa 1985 and is considered non-contributing. However, she pointed out that the application package was missing important tax assessor information regarding the building's dimensions, which is typically required in such submissions.

Motion to approve the move off/demo with the stipulation that the record will receive the tax assessor map showing the floor plan for anybody who's interested in potentially moving made by Pohl (02:07:50)
Pohl, Patten, Oliver, Welch (aye) MacLeod (opposed)

2. Durham Station LLC 76 Pocomo Rd New dwelling 15/38 Mark Avery

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the proposed design for both the main structure and a new studio on the same property, with a focus on visibility and the appropriateness of the design. Ray noted that the main structure is well-hidden behind the bluff and not visible from public roads, with the only potential view being from a distance across The Creeks, where the southern gable, designed to look barn-like, would be visible. Several board members, including Holly and Angus, raised concerns about the fenestration, pointing out that some windows seemed more residential than barn-like. However, given the limited visibility, they felt the southern elevation was appropriate. Mark confirmed that visibility from the surrounding roads and driveway is negligible due to the height of surrounding trees. Regarding the new studio, Holly appreciated the size and scale but found the fenestration, especially the odd skylight, inappropriate, though the board acknowledged that if the building is not visible, these concerns may be less critical.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus expressed concerns about the proposed design, noting that while the simple barn-like form is appreciated, the structure is unusually tall and long without the recommended additive massing. She pointed out that the windows appear to "float" in a large expanse of shingles and that the chimney, large pane windows, and stone veneer are atypical for Nantucket architecture. Backus also requested information on the glazing percentage and emphasized the importance of photos to assess visibility from the road and harbor, echoing similar concerns raised by Mark.

Motion to approve with the condition that the sky light isn't visible from any publicly traveled way made by Pohl (02:20:07) Carried unanimously

3. Durham Station LLC 76 Pocomo Rd New studio 15/38 Mark Avery

DISCUSSION:

4. Barnes Curtis & Joan Trust 12 Sunset Hill Addition 41/450 NAG

DISCUSSION: The board expressed a consensus on the proposed design, emphasizing the need for adjustments to enhance its compatibility with the neighborhood. Val appreciated the story-and-a-half structure instead of a full two-story design and suggested considering a reverse saltbox approach to maintain the existing roof pitch while having a full-height wall at the back. Members echoed concerns about the flush alignment of the secondary mass with the main facade, arguing that this should be more differentiated in height and setback. The prominent front-facing dormer was also critiqued for being inconsistent with design guidelines. Overall, the board members agreed that the proposed modifications could benefit from several tweaks to better align with traditional architectural elements and neighborhood aesthetics.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus commented on the proposed addition and window replacements for a circa-1948 contributing structure. She acknowledged that adding a second floor to a simple Cape is common but expressed concern that raising the eaves would detract from the dwelling's simple character. She recommended retaining the original roof pitch, noting that while the current 12/12 pitch seems steep, it is preferable to a full two-story addition. Backus also observed that there appears to be significant space between the floors and suggested that preserving the original design elements would help maintain the structure's historical integrity.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Mickey Rowland expressed concerns like Holly's regarding the steepness of the 12/12 roof pitch, noting that it feels too prominent and out of place for the neighborhood, which is highly visible from the street. He suggested reducing the pitch to a 10/12 for better integration. Rowland also criticized the front dormer for overwhelming the roof plane, recommending smaller gable dormers that are split up, as is typical in such designs. He pointed out that the front door, a 12-light design, could be more traditional. Additionally, Rowland noted that the secondary mass, which has been pulled forward to be flush with the front of the house, should be set back several feet to maintain a proper visual hierarchy. This would also help lower the ridge line of the secondary mass, creating better separation from the main mass.

Motion to hold for revisions made by Oliver. Carried unanimously. (03:25:26)

5. Smiley 15 N Water LLC 15 N Water St House reno 42.4.2/50 Normand

DISCUSSION: The board expressed several concerns about the proposed changes. Key points included the inappropriateness of the transom windows over the French doors, which should be reconsidered. The size and positioning of the deck, particularly the angular section, should be reduced and squared off. Many members suggested relocating the AC units to the rear or a less visible location to avoid impacting the historic façade. The scale and placement of columns should also be aligned for a more balanced appearance. Some members supported exploring the idea of glassing in the porch area to lighten the structure's massing. Additionally, concerns were raised about maintaining the historic character of the building and ensuring any new elements are in keeping with its original design. There was also a recommendation to indicate clearly what parts of the existing deck would be altered and to consider lowering the deck to eliminate or reduce the need for railings.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus provided detailed feedback on the historic Hussy House, built in 1795. She emphasized the importance of preserving original features, such as the thick historic shingles, and expressed concerns about the proposed double French doors with transoms, stating they were inappropriate for the structure. She appreciated the retention of the original fenestration but suggested minimizing the width of the porch steps. Backus noted that the relocation and resizing of windows should be clearly marked, and while a formal window survey wasn't necessary, proper labeling would help. She questioned the odd shape and size

of the new deck, suggesting it be reduced, and raised concerns about the visibility of the AC units on the gable end, recommending they be relocated to a less visible area.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland provided several recommendations for the proposed renovations. He suggested exploring the idea of glassing in the first-floor enclosure on the south elevation to lighten the massing and alleviate the negative space created by the design. Rowland found the transom window over the French doors inappropriate for the building's historic character and recommended downsizing the fence around the AC units, as it seemed too large. He also advised reducing the size of the elevated first-floor deck by pulling it back from the building's corner, squaring off its angular section to avoid a modern look, and lowering the deck by a riser or two to potentially eliminate or reduce the need for a tall guard rail.

Motion to hold for revisions made by Pohl (03:42:38)

Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Oliver, Welch (aye)

6. Smiley 15 N Water LLC 15 N Water St landscaping 42.4.2/50 Normand

DISCUSSION: The board expressed general agreement that the parking space is wider than necessary and should be reduced to around 18 feet. Several members supported the historical appropriateness of the existing tall fence, with some suggesting it should be kept consistent in height around the entire parking area. Others proposed lowering the fence or simplifying it, with one member suggesting the idea of a wide gate to maintain visual continuity. While opinions varied on the fence design, most agreed it was beneficial in obstructing the view of parked cars. The board also requested more details on the brick pattern for the driveway, while some expressed a preference for limiting the fencing around the parking area.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus raised concerns about the proposed driveway and its impact on the streetscape of the 230-year-old dwelling. She questioned whether the subdivision was proposed or completed and found the driveway's location next to the main block inappropriate. While she had no issue with the fence being reduced in height, she emphasized the importance of maintaining the same color. The driveway was considered too large and should be reduced in size, with a closer detail of the proposed brick parking spot requested, including dimensions and patterns (such as running bond, which matches the nearby sidewalk). She also referenced the zoning bylaw for further considerations and recommended integrating any new curb or sidewalk elements with existing materials to maintain consistency.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland expressed concern about the width of the proposed parking space, noting that a single-car width would be preferred to minimize its impact, although he acknowledged that other wide spaces exist on SE Street. He recommended reducing the parking space to the minimum width possible, around 18 feet. Regarding the fence, he suggested lowering it from its current height to a more appropriate three-foot fence, which is more typical for the area. He supported the idea of replacing the fence but emphasized the need to reduce its height to fit the historic character of the town.

Hold for revision made by Pohl. (03:52:48)

Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Oliver, Welch (aye)

7. Eloise N.T 1 Sandy Dr Ext Stair Rev 29/73 Thornewill

DISCUSSION: The board members had mixed views on the proposed use of friendship stairs. Several members, like Abby and Angus, preferred the straight stair design, finding the friendship stairs awkward and less fitting for the location. Abby pointed out that the top of the stairs was particularly tight and suggested widening it, while Angus felt it would be better to wait until surrounding buildings and landscaping were in place before making a final decision. On the other hand, Joe supported the friendship stairs, arguing that they were appropriate given the limited space and oblique view from the side, making it a suitable solution for the site plan. Ultimately, there was

recognition that while the design might be atypical, its limited visibility mitigated concerns for some members, leading to a split in opinion.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus expressed concerns regarding the proposed use of "friendship stairs" in the architectural design of an infill project in the BR Point area. While the project, previously approved and involving modular construction, aligns with the area's architectural style, the addition of the friendship stairs is deemed inappropriate. Backus argues that these stairs introduce an architectural element that does not fit with the character of the design. Instead, Holly believes that the previously approved street-out stairs, even if repositioned to be more centered, are a more suitable choice for the project, which is located outside a floodplain but was elevated.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland expressed general approval of the proposal but agreed with Holly Backus's concerns regarding the use of friendship stairs. He acknowledged that the friendship stairs do not fit well with the design and supported Backus's assessment. Rowland indicated that the issue mainly comes down to visibility, suggesting that the stairs' design doesn't align with the overall architectural context of the project. Beyond this point, he had no further objections.

Motion to approve as submitted made by Camp (03:58:49)
Welch, Camp, Paul, (aye) Oliver, MacLeod (nay)

8. Anthony & Jane & Tomasiallo 13 Bank St Replace 3-4 Windows 73.1.3/68 Richard Pruniar

DISCUSSION:

9. Geoff Smith 22 Coffin St Demo move off 73.4.1/36 Topham

DISCUSSION: The board expressed a range of views on the proposal to demolish the existing structure and build a new one, which closely resembles the original. Several members appreciated the charm of the current building but felt more comfortable with its demolition knowing the new design would retain many similarities. Concerns were raised about roof pitches, with some preferring the existing seven-and-12 pitch, typical of mid-century Ranch style, over the proposed eight-and-12 pitch. While some members, like Ray and Abby, were generally supportive of the new design, they pointed out minor issues such as the shed roof over the front door and driveway placement. Angus and others voiced concerns about demolishing a structure that may predate 1938 and urged respect for preservationist views. The board agreed to seek further documentation, including a structural engineer's letter, before finalizing the decision. Despite mixed feelings, there was recognition of property rights and an understanding that the existing building has structural issues, making its preservation challenging.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus emphasized the importance of not relying on outdated surveys, particularly the 1989 surveys that label certain structures as non-contributing. She highlighted the need for regular updates to historic and cultural resource surveys, noting that the historical commission has been working on this as a Certified Local Government (CLG). Backus pointed out discrepancies in the dates for a property on C Street in Sconset, referencing conflicting information from the 1938 HDC survey and more recent data suggesting a construction date in the 1950s. She expressed concern about the differing time frames, noting that the Period of Significance had been expanded to 1975 in 2021 with the update to the National Historic Landmark (NHL) designation. Backus also referenced *Building with Sconset in Mind*, which identifies the structure as an example of mid-century Ranch architecture, and mentioned support from Rob Bentley, who agreed that anything constructed before 1975 should be considered contributing. While she appreciated efforts to preserve older sections of the structure, she expressed concern over the potential demolition of a contributing building.

Motion to hold for more information made by Pohl (04:17:02) Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill, Pohl (aye)

10. Geoff Smith 22 Coffin St New dwelling 73.4.1/36 Topham

DISCUSSION: The board provided several suggestions and concerns regarding the proposed design. While members generally supported the size and scale of the new dwelling, they raised specific issues. The roof pitch was a recurring topic, with some recommending reducing it to a seven-and-12 pitch to better align with the original structure. There was also agreement that the single shutters on the "walleyed" windows looked odd and were not appropriate for the design. Several members suggested extending the porch across the front of the house for better symmetry, which would enhance the aesthetic and add continuity. Concerns were raised about parking in front of the house, with a preference for parking alongside instead. Additionally, they advised considering lowering the plate height of the bathroom wing and porch to reduce the overall scale. Overall, the board appreciated the low-profile design but encouraged refinements for a more cohesive and historically sensitive appearance.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus supported the size and scale of the proposed new dwelling, noting that it appropriately resembles the existing structure. She suggested considering Joe's idea of extending the front entry for a more cohesive design. Backus also pointed out that the property is located within or near the Sconset Old Historic District, which adds significance to its architectural treatment. She emphasized the importance of the building's profile, particularly in relation to the request for simulated divided light (SDL) windows, highlighting the need to maintain historical accuracy in such details.

**Motion to hold for revisions made by Pohl (04:24:03)
Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill, Pohl (aye)**

Approval of Minutes:

Motion to approve minutes of March 19, 2024

Motion to approve made by Pohl (04:24:30)

Camp, Pohl, Welch (aye) MacLeod, Oliver (abstain)

Motion to adjourn at 8:28pm made by Pohl

Welch, Oliver, MacLeod, Pohl, Patten (aye)

YouTube: [Nantucket Historic District Commission - June 4, 2024](#)