



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 11, 2024

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

Call to order at 4:02pm and announcements made by Welch

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

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

Remote Participants:

Absent Members:

Late Arrivals: Pohl (4:04pm)

Early Departures:

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion: Motion to Approve made by Oliver.

Vote: Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Patten (aye)

Public Comment:

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

- Community Preservation Committee (CPC) representative (last held by Diane Coombs)
- Section 106 (of the National Historic Preservation Act) representative (last held by Diane Coombs)
- Commissioner responsibilities regarding “Exhibit A” process.
- Commissioner discussion regarding the separation of New Business and Old Business agendas.

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 111 Cliff Road Trust	111 Cliff Rd	Hardscape	41/10	Jardins Intl
2. Starfish Ack LLC	1 Saccacha Ave	Pool Shed/Pavilion	82/23.1	EMDA
3. Mike & Darya Gault	52 Miacomet Ave	Addition	67/83.9	Thornewill
4. Arigo	5 Arlington	Hot tub & hardscape	76 1.3/47	Topham
5. Jem Cacique	36 Easton	Garage	42 1.4/19	EMDA
6. Dora & Amilcor Chacon	3 Enterprise	Door window changes	66/228	EMDA
7. Harold Brothers LLC	23 Walsh	Arbors	42 4.1/103	Val Oliver
8. Harold Brothers LLC	23 Walsh	Garage door	42 4.1/103	Val Oliver
9. NiSHA Inc	1 Evergreen	New educational facility	68/727	Emeritus
10. NT Property Owner	2 Indigo Dr	Rev Window Color	68/881	LFW
11. Houston Trust Co	5 Stone Post	Rev add gate	74/80	LFW
12. 27 Ellen's LLC	27 Ellen's	Rev 2023-03-8095	81/180	Brook Meerbergen
13. 54 Prospect LLC	4 Birdsong Ln	Rev 2023-12-9704	55 4.4/80.3	Brook Meerbergen
14. Maxey Pond Nom Trust	13 Maxey Pond Rd	Cabana gym	40/101	Hess/Topham
15. Maxey Pond Nom Trust	13 Maxey Pond Rd	Hardscape	40/101	Hess/Topham
16. Maxey Pond Nom Trust	13 Maxey Pond Rd	Pool rev	40/101	Hess/Topham
17. Powers Landscaping Inc	21 Clarendon St	Solar Rood Cottage	76 1.3/106	AckSmart

18. Squam Holding LLC	25 Squam	Fen Revs 03-10058	21/5	Botticelli & Pohl
19. Steve Cohen 39 Monomoy	39 Monomoy Rd	Rev Shed	54/79	WAPD
20. 7 New Street LLC	7 New St	Rev MH	55 4.1/37	WAPD
21. 7 New Street LLC	7 New St	Rev GH	55 4.1/37	WAPD
22. 7 New Street LLC	7 New St	Rev Studio	55 4.1/37	WAPD
23. 12 Sesachacha LLC	12 Sesachacha Rd	Move Demo garage	21/83	Botticelli & Pohl
24. John Ward	44 Monohansett	Window change garage	68/700	Self
25. John Ward	44 Monohansett	Window change MH	68/700	Self
26. NIR c/o NED	19 N. Water (lot 7)	Rev 2024-09-9197	42 4.2/3	Ahern LLC
27. NIR c/o NED	19 N. Water (lot 11)	Rev 2024-09-9203	42 4.2/3	Ahern LLC

Motion to approve consents made by Paul.

Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Patten Paul (aye) Oliver, Thornewill (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. Powers Landscaping Inc	21 Clarendon St	Solar Roof MH	76 1.3/106	ACKSmart SW
- Approved except for the east side of primary mass, which would be in a highly visible location facing the street. - SEE REVIEW BELOW				
2. 2538970 Ontario Inc	5 Coffin St Sias	Shed	73 1.4/21	Emeritus LTD SW
- Remove cupola, reduce top plate height by 2', reducing overall height to 14'; no grade change (vs. 6" life proposed); reduce fenestration unit proportionately to match cottage; reduce roof pitch to match cottage. - SEE REVIEW BELOW				
3. O'Spray LLC	25 Willard St	MH Rev 2023-12-9666	29/33	Emeritus LTD SW
East Elevation, rake fascia at porch w/proposed roof pitch change—decrease height of fascia board to match other, similar details of the structure. Add date of construction to the COA: "Salt Air" built c.1881-1882 by James H. Gibbs, builder & moved to site c.1938 from 45 Hulbert Ave.				
4. Naughty Cal LLC	26B Daffodil Ln	Rooftop Solar	67/738.2	ACKSmart JP
Provide a corrected roof plan that accurately depicts the panel locations as well as the ridgelines, valleys, and roof breaks. And provide a North elevation to illustrate the lack of visibility from Daffodil Lane (all 4 elevations should always be provided)				
5. Sabrina & Gavin Norton	17 Milestone Crossing	Addition to 2 nd DW	68/458	Val Oliver JP
Condition for approval with 1/1 (no muntins) to match existing MH on the lot.				
6. Melissa & James Emery	67 Starbuck Rd	Rev 2023-11-9484	59.4/67.1	Devon Murphy JP
Due to limited visibility – ok for NTW barn board.				

Motion to approve consent with conditions with number 1 and 2 held for hearings made by Camp.

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

1. Powers Landscaping Inc. 21 Clarendon St Solar Roof MH 761.3/106 ACKSmart

DISCUSSION: The board generally opposed the addition of solar panels on the main mass at the front of the house due to visibility concerns, particularly from the highly visible east side. However, there was some openness to adding panels on the smaller forward gable on the far side of the house, as well as on the porch, which could be obscured by surrounding trees. The consensus supported the current plan, with most panels being placed on the less visible west side, which hosts the largest array. It was also noted that the south side offers optimal exposure and could accommodate additional panels.

MOTION: Camp made motion to hold for revisions - **Carried unanimously**
Thornewill, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod, Welch (aye)

2. 2538970 Ontario Inc 5 Coffin St Sias Shed 73 1.4/21 Emeritus LTD

DISCUSSION: The board generally agreed that the height of the shed should be reduced, with some members suggesting a 4-foot reduction for better massing in relation to the guidelines, while others were comfortable with a 2-foot reduction, which was the original condition. Concerns were raised about the impact of lowering the structure too much, particularly

regarding the eaves and their alignment with doors and windows, as a 4-foot reduction could cause design issues. There was a preference for a balanced approach, keeping the shed's design proportional to the surrounding buildings. Members were open to resizing or omitting the south elevation window if needed. Ultimately, a 2-foot reduction seemed to be a compromise most were comfortable with.

STAFF COMMENTS: Preservation Planner Holly Backus expressed agreement with the chair's comments regarding revisions to the bungalow, specifically supporting the removal of the cupola and adjustments to the roof pitch. She had no concerns with these proposed revisions and appeared to be in favor of the overall direction of the changes to the main dwelling and shed.

MOTION: Motion to approve the shed revisions with a 2-foot reduction in the ridge height, maintaining the current roof pitch, and removing the four-light gable end window on the front elevation made by Pohl. – **Carried unanimously.**
Thornewill, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod, Welch (aye)

IV. SIGNS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	29 Center Street LLC	16.5 Federal Street	Temporary Sign Rev	42.3.1/70	Benton Austin
	• Recommended Approval as submitted				
2.	US Reif Marine Nantucket	4 Bayberry Court	Wall Sign Revision	55/704	Ciara McAvley
	• Recommended Approval as submitted				
3.	Amelia Drive LLC	5 Amelia Drive	Wall Sign (#1) Rev	67/435	Emeritus LTD
	• Recommended Approval as submitted				
4.	Amelia Drive LLC	5 Amelia Drive	Wall Sign (#2) Rev	67/435	Emeritus LTD
	• Recommended Approval of OPTION A				
5.	Amelia Drive LLC	5 Amelia Drive	Wall Sign (#3) Rev	67/435	Emeritus LTD
	• Recommended Approval as submitted				

MOTION: Motion approve as Sign Advisory Council Recommended. Carried unanimously.

V. TEMPORARY SIGNS – COMMISSION REVIEW

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Nantucket Dreamland Foundation	17 South Water Street	Film Festival Sign Placement	42.3.1/11	Jaclyn Wohl
2.	4ACK LLC	12 Oak Street	Film Festival Sign Placement	42.4.2/27	Jaclyn Wohl
3.	Nantucket Theatre Project LLC	5 North Water Street	Film Festival Sign Placement	42 4.2/88	Jaclyn Wohl
4.	Nantucket United Methodist Church	2 Center Street	Film Festival Sign Placement	42 3.1/199	Jaclyn Wohl

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted with a caveat that they are taken down within two business days made by Oliver. Carried unanimously.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

1. ACK Mid Island LLC 18-26 Sparks Ave Rev Mixed Use Bldg 55 231.1-307-30 LFW

DISCUSSION: The board's comments on the proposed multi-use building development reflect a mix of concerns and appreciation for the design changes made. Members expressed that while the massing and height of the structure (up to 36 feet) are significant, the effort to break it up into a more visually appealing format has been recognized. Some members noted the oversized dormers contribute to a top-heavy appearance, while others believe the overall design could enhance the streetscape and serve as a positive edge for the area. There were calls for further refinement, particularly regarding architectural details and landscaping elements, to ensure the building harmonizes with the historic character of the neighborhood. Ultimately, while there is recognition of the project's potential benefits, the board remains cautious about its impact on the community and the precedent it may set for future developments.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that the project has evolved from one building to two, requiring a new Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and a future hardscaping plan. She appreciated the building section showing mechanical

wells on the roof and the gable end window change back to three as requested by the board. Holly acknowledged the new fence on the south side of the larger building, suggesting it could be a suitable spot for additional utilities if needed. She praised the inclusion of landscaping and hardscaping features in the site plan, though she requested a formal review with a detailed, illustrated, and colored hardscaping plan, especially to clarify different proposed brick materials. Despite concerns about massing, she recognized significant improvements in the project overall.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions and additional information (streetscape, ground-based utilities shown on the plans, roof plan noted no exterior roof decks for occupancy use) made by Welch. - **Carried unanimously.**

VII. OLD BUSINESS 04/23/2024

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

- *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten – Last heard March 12, 2024*

HELD FOR APPLICANT

2. Nantucket Historical Association 89 Bartlett Rd Roof Solar 66/410 AckSmart

- *Ratify vote from June 3, 2024, as this application was not reasonably anticipated by the Chair within 48 hours in advance of the meeting. Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver*

MOTION: Motion to ratify the vote of 89 Bartlett Rd of June 3, 2024, made by Welch. – **Carried Unanimously.**

3. 450 Greenpark LLC 2 Stone Alley Railings 42.3.1/102 Emeritus

- *Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, Paul; Alternate: Patten; Recused: Pohl – Last heard June 3, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board expressed overall disapproval of the proposed revisions, agreeing that the alternative design was overly complicated and inappropriate for the historic structure. Several members, including Carrie and Joe, found the different railing heights and details confusing and overly complex, preferring a consistent 24-inch railing all around, as initially approved or simplified with a shallow-pitched hip roof. Mickey's comments regarding simplifying the porch design and eliminating the multi-layered railing were echoed. There was a consensus that the simpler, previously approved design or a hip roof would be more appropriate for the structure's historic character.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus expressed concerns about the appropriateness of the proposed revisions to Eliza Cod's barn-turned-house, dating from circa 1858-1871, particularly the differing roof heights. She noted that the lower height seemed more appropriate and in line with the original structure. Holly recommended keeping the design simple, without the addition of caps, to better reflect the historical character of the building, as previously mentioned by several commissioners in the last review. Those were her primary comments on the revisions.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group criticized the proposed alternative for being overly complicated and contrived, stating that it detracts from the historic significance of the old house. He found the design, particularly the multi-layered porch railing, to be entirely inappropriate and out of character. Rowland recommended either maintaining the design as it was originally approved or improving it by adding a traditional shallow-pitched hip roof, like other sunrooms commonly seen throughout the town.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Oliver. **Carried Unanimously.**

4. Cohen Steven TR. Co Area 51 TR 51 W. Miacomet Rd Pool 81/52 Ahern LLC

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

HELD FOR FULL BOARD

VII. NEW BUSINESS 04/30/24

1. Anthoney & Jane & Tomasiallo 13 Bank St Replace 3-4 Windows 731.3/68 Richard Pruniar

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the appropriateness of window replacements for the historic structure in the Old Historic District. Holly Backus confirmed she was not opposed to simulated divided lights (SDLs) if they had the proper profile, but true divided light (TDL) double-pane windows raised concerns due to their thick muntins, which look inappropriate. The board agreed that TDLs with single-glazed windows would be the best option for this property given its location. Rob Bentley from the Sconset Advisory Group confirmed that there were no further comments from the group. The board recommended moving forward with the approval of single-glazed TDLs and suggested the homeowner consider appropriate storm windows, such as wood-framed triple tracks, though these don't require HDC approval.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that the property is located within the Old Historic District of Wisconsin and is a circa 1960s structure with an HDC survey on file. She reviewed the proposal to replace two-over-two windows and mentioned that additional photos of the entire dwelling would have been helpful. Holly had concerns about the use of Anderson 400 series windows with simulated divided lights (SDLs), stating that they are not appropriate for a historic dwelling in the OHD due to their lack of proper profile. She recommended that, if SDLs are desired, the applicant should consider alternatives such as Boston Sash or Green Mountain, which provide more appropriate profiles.

MOTION: Motion to approve as TDL windows made by Pohl.

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

2. Courtney Gault 8 New Mill St Add Dormers 42.3.3/33.2 Concept Plan Design

DISCUSSION: The board unanimously expressed opposition to the proposed dormer design at 8 New Mill Street. They found the large dormers, especially having both a front and back dormer in the same location, to be inappropriate for the historic district. One member mentioned that this type of design is rarely seen in the area. Suggestions were made for a more suitable alternative, such as eliminating the front dormer altogether and using a shed dormer on the back, set back from the roof edge by two or three feet, instead of the proposed gable design. All members agreed that the current proposal is not fitting for the house or the neighborhood.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that the structure is a circa 1980 non-contributing infill dwelling, with an HDC survey on file. While it was designed as a typical Nantucket four-bay house, she found the proposed cross dormers inappropriate. Holly cited guidelines from the "Building with Nantucket in Mind" document, specifically page 109, which states that dormers must be placed on the front roof, with gable dormers preferred. The dormers should resemble the main roof in character and be set back at least one foot from the roof's edge, both front and ridge. She emphasized that the proposed dormers must be recessed to align with these guidelines.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group echoed Holly Backus's concerns, stating that the proposed front dormer is inappropriate and does not meet the guidelines. He recommended that the front dormer be eliminated entirely. For the rear dormer, Mickey suggested it would be more appropriate as a shed dormer but emphasized that it needs to be set back at least one foot from the face of the building.
- Ann Davis, an abutter to 8 New Mill Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed dormer design. She expressed concern that the dormers are too large and boxy, going from ridge to ridge, which is unusual for two-story Quaker-style homes in the RO district. Ann emphasized that no two-story houses on Mill Street have dormers, and the one-and-a-half-story houses with dormers have smaller, set-back dormers. She is worried about the visibility of these dormers from both New Mill Street and the open public land. Ann also raised concerns about the

precedent this design could set, leading to more homeowners expanding their attics in a way that compromises the traditional Quaker form of the neighborhood. She urged the Commissioners to reject this inappropriate proposal.

- Pat Bateman, speaking on behalf of herself and her husband David, both abutters living at 17 Mill Street, expressed strong opposition to the proposed dormer at 8 New Mill Street. She highlighted two main concerns: the dormer's mass and its inconsistency with the guidelines from "Building with Nantucket in Mind". According to the guidelines, dormers should not be placed on the front of a house with a distinct facade and should be scaled and positioned to complement the house's roof without overwhelming it. Pat noted that the proposed dormer is significantly bulky, occupying a full third of the roof and measuring 28 feet in length and 10 feet in width, which is out of proportion with the house and the surrounding neighborhood. She emphasized that the dormer's design contradicts the Quaker aesthetic of simplicity and balance in the area, urging the Commissioners to consider the neighborhood's character and guidelines.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Pohl.

Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Oliver, Pohl – Carried unanimously.

3. 12 Sesachacha LLC 12 Sesachacha Rd New Garage 21/83 Botticelli & Pohl

DISCUSSION: The board reviewed the proposal for a single-story addition at 16 Eastern Street, intended to house a bathroom and closet. They had no significant concerns about the addition. Questions were raised about whether the 10/12 roof pitch matches the main house, and it was confirmed that it does. There were minor revisions to the windows and door, including adding more glass to the door and adjusting window proportions. The board had no objections, and a motion to approve as submitted was carried without opposition.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus commented that while the inbound chimney is an improvement, it bisects the dormer in a way that is not ideal. She recommended that the dormer should have more shingle space and avoid using four ganged windows. Holly referred to the previously approved west elevation, which featured three ganged windows with shingle space, as a preferable design.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Paul.

Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Patten, Oliver (Aye)

4. Stark Point LLC 16 Easton St Studio Addition 42.4.1/11 Botticelli & Pohl

DISCUSSION:

MOTION:

5. Skyline Drive, LLC 6 Woodland Dr Cabana 79/209 Stow MT Builders

DISCUSSION:

MOTION: Camp, Pohl, MacLeod, Welch, Oliver

6. Dan Driscoll 15 Madaket Rd Rooftop solar 41/299.3 Acksmart

DISCUSSION: The board reviewed the proposal, focusing on the roof replacement, which was clarified to be a black roof, despite initial appearances of wood. Val and the others had no major additional concerns. Angus expressed concern about the guidelines, which advise against roof changes on the street-facing or front side of a building, stating this as his primary issue. Abby and Ray agreed with Angus but had nothing further to add. The general sentiment was that changes should align with existing guidelines regarding the front of the structure.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Camp.

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

7. Dukes Road Trust 2 Dukes Road New Guest 41/187 Botticelli & Pohl
HOLD
8. Dukes Road Trust 2 Dukes Road New Garage 41/187 Botticelli & Pohl
HOLD
9. Schneider Family 10 West Dover St New Dwelling 55.4.1/192 Val Oliver

DISCUSSION: The board offered several suggestions to improve the design, focusing on scale, roof pitch, and massing. They agreed that the second-floor dormers were too close to the facade and should be pushed back for a better balance with the first floor, possibly by 12 inches or more. Some members proposed steepening the roof pitch to reduce visible wall space and moving the second-floor program to the rear to maintain interior space while reducing bulk on the front. There was also debate over the front roof pitch, with some suggesting it should match the main roof, while others proposed lowering both pitches to a uniform nine. Additionally, a saltbox design was proposed as a way to honor the original structure's characteristics and simplify the rooflines, creating a less visually competitive design. The board emphasized maintaining the integrity of the original fenestration and trim details, with particular focus on balancing the structure's overall appearance.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus provided feedback on a proposal to replace a 1940s garage. She appreciated the effort to replicate fenestration details, particularly using the existing doors, but noted that the new windows appear larger than the originals and should be scaled down slightly. She suggested adjusting the flush dormers to align with the meeting rails and moving them up, if possible. Her main recommendation was to add a chimney, even a faux one, as the original building had one. When asked about the massing, she recommended keeping it the same as it currently is.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland's comments focused on improving the design's scale and massing. He noted that the front shed roof is too narrow to serve as a proper additive mass and suggested pushing the second floor back by about five feet to give the front porch more depth. This change would enlarge the shed, making it feel more like an enclosed front porch and reducing the overall bulk of the main mass. He recommended using four-over-four windows on the front to reference the old building's eight-light casements but suggested more traditional six-over-six windows for the rest. He also asked for clarification on the window manufacturer, as it was not specified.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Camp.

Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Paul, Ray (aye)

10. Patience Killen 1 Old North Wharf Addition 42.3.1/80 Val Oliver

DISCUSSION: The board expressed broad agreement with the concerns raised about the proposed addition. They emphasized the importance of maintaining the scale, setting, and historical integrity of the structure, noting that the proposal dramatically alters these aspects. Members appreciated the preservation of the original structure but felt that the massing and height need significant reduction to maintain a natural transition to the taller cottages by the water. They also suggested simplifying elements like the left-side shed on the first floor, which blocks the original building, and reconsidering or reducing the size of the balcony. Concerns were raised about the chimney not meeting code requirements and the roof pitch being inconsistent with the original building. One board member proposed detaching the new structure entirely and creating a simple boathouse, like those found on nearby docks. Overall, the board emphasized the need for a less imposing design that better respects the historic context.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus, the preservation planner, expressed concerns about a proposed addition to a 1940s structure in the Historic District. While there's no definitive construction date, the structure contributes to the area's character. The addition must comply with "Resilient Nantucket" design guidelines from 2021, requiring an elevation certificate due to its location in a FEMA AE flood zone (A9). Backus criticized the addition for being too tall (26 feet, 9 inches), dwarfing the existing one-story cottage and altering the streetscape, particularly in a prominent corner of the district. She recommended reducing the size and scale of the project to better align with the historic context and the surrounding one-and-a-half to two-story Wharf Cottages.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland and his group raised additional concerns about the proposed addition. They noted that the project significantly alters the appearance of a prominent corner lot, giving it a vertical feel. To reduce the height and scale, they suggested changing the design to a story and a half with dormers. They also recommended reducing or eliminating the small grade-level shed that blocks the front of the original building, as well as simplifying the solid shed-like structure over the front door of the apartment, which they found awkward. Rowland criticized the cantilevered balcony overlooking Easy Street as inappropriate for the area and recommended its removal. He also expressed concerns about whether the chimney would meet building code standards.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Pohl.

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

11. St Mary's Church 3 Federal Railing 42.3.1/174 Hollister Consulting

DISCUSSION: The board had mixed opinions on the proposal for white railings at St. Mary's Catholic Church. While some members supported the white railings, feeling it would brighten and uplift the appearance, others were concerned about the potential maintenance challenges and the risk of the railings detracting from the architecture. Angus emphasized the simplicity of the original design, favoring unpainted elements to preserve focus on the building itself. There were suggestions to potentially incorporate dark green accents, like those on the windows, for a more harmonious look, especially at the lower levels. One member also expressed hope that the design could eventually return to its more minimal, original form in the future. Overall, the board was generally open to the white railings but encouraged careful consideration of visual balance and long-term upkeep.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus commented on a CPC project for St. Mary's Catholic Church, circa 1896. She appreciated the historical photos but noted differences between past and present configurations. In the 1960s photo, there was no deck, and masonry stoops with metal railings existed at each entrance, which was also visible in the 1930s photo. Historically, the only white balustrade was for the ADA ramp with a crossbar design. Now, the church has more entrances, potentially all with white railings, which raises concerns about an excess of white not historically accurate. She suggested a proposed rendering to better visualize the impact.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Camp.

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

12. Three North Gully Road LLC 7 N. Gully Road New Dwelling 73.1.3/123 Botticelli & Pohl

DISCUSSION: The board expressed general approval of the design, especially the main mass facing North Gully Road, which several members described as "perfect" and "Charming." However, there were concerns about the secondary mass and its Dormers. Carrie suggested creating more differentiation between the two masses by slightly adjusting their heights, while Abby and others noted that the Dormers felt large and could be reduced or inset into the roof to make the middle mass less prominent. Board members also emphasized the importance of making the secondary mass more subservient and ensuring that the overall design reads as additive without increasing the ridge height. The applicant acknowledged these suggestions and agreed to revisit the Dormer design to reduce its visual weight.

MOTION: Motion to hold for minor revisions made by Camp.

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

13. 48 Hulbert LLC 48 Hulbert Ave Handicap access 29/63 Mark Avery

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus commented on the infill dwelling from circa 1980, noting that there is an HTC survey on file. She mentioned the need for a revised plan that specifically reflects the current lot, aligned with discussions regarding 47 W, which is a separate matter. Additionally, she requested a detailed representation of the new ADA door.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland expressed general approval of the proposal, although he noted that the drawings lack clarity regarding the final appearance. He pointed out the absence of elevations and detailed information, but despite these concerns, he indicated that he is likely okay with moving forward.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted - noting that 47 Hulbert landscape plan is not part of this application made by Oliver. Welch, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver (aye)

14. Sankaty Head Golf Club Inc. 18 Hoicks Hollow Road Demo structure 23/9 Emeritus

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the Sankaty Head Golf Club Beach Club and expressed a desire to preserve the historical significance of the existing structures rather than demolish them due to erosion concerns. Members highlighted the emotional and historical value of the buildings, mentioning personal experiences and the embodied energy of the materials. They agreed that understanding the age and history of the structures is essential before any decisions are made, cautioning against wiping the site clean for new constructions. There was a consensus on the need for more historical information and photographs, as referenced by Holly. Some members suggested retaining the existing cabanas, while others acknowledged the challenges posed by erosion. Ultimately, the board emphasized the importance of documenting the history and requested that all relevant information be included in the record for future hearings.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus commented on the San Head Golf Club Beach Club, noting that while the NHL data indicates it dates to circa 1940, the application lacks historic documentation, including photographs. She recommended that the commission request additional historical information, mentioning that she found a 1950 aerial image showing the site's extensive size. Backus highlighted the absence of an HDC survey on file and expressed the need for more data, suggesting that the Sanity Head Golf Club may have relevant historical information to share. She acknowledged the necessity of relocating the structure due to erosion but emphasized the importance of documenting its history.

MOTION: Motion to hold for additional historic information made by Pohl. Welch, MacLeod, Pohl, Camp, Paul (aye) Oliver (Recused)

15. REDHORSE LLC 88 Quidnet Road Rev 2021-06-4059 26/109 Ahern LLC

HOLD

IX. OLD BUSINESS 05/14/2024

1. Steven L. Cohen, Trustee of 72 Pocomo Trust 72 Pocomo Road New Primary Dwelling 15/37 Workshop APD

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

NOT DISCUSSED

2. Matt O'Connor 22 Tahama Lane Fence, Pool, Driveway 55/451 KMLD

• *Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Camp, Paul, Thornewill – Last heard April 23, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the visibility and appropriateness of the proposed six-foot fence in a residential neighborhood, expressing concern about the prevalence of such tall fences. Members acknowledged the need for some screening due to the pool but suggested minimizing the use of six-foot fences. Joe recommended replacing the five-foot fence in the front corner with a four-foot board fence for better aesthetics and compliance with guidelines, emphasizing that it should not be visible from the street. The board also noted issues with the current fence placement near air conditioning units, suggesting that taller fences should be moved back, and small enclosures could be used to shield the units. Overall, the board sought to balance functional needs with the visual character of the neighborhood.

MOTION: Motion to revise the drawing consistent with the exhibit A made by Paul. Welch, Camp, Paul, Thornewill (aye)

3. Dukes Road Trust 2 Dukes Road New Dwelling 41/187 Botticelli & Pohl

• *Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Camp, Paul, Patten - Last heard April 23, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the need for a comprehensive site section that includes the pool and cabana to better understand the grading changes on the lot. While members expressed no concerns about the house itself, they emphasized that the site section is crucial due to the fill being brought in and the drop in grade towards the neighboring property. They agreed that this information should be included in the cabana application for clarity and context. Approval of the house was noted as contingent upon future submissions regarding grading. Joe's comments about the significance of understanding the grade were highlighted as relevant and important by the board.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that the proposal involves replacing a circa 1940 and 1996 Colonial Revival structure, with at least one of the original buildings previously relocated on the island. She expressed appreciation for the design choice to break up the long ridge line with flanking chimneys, suggesting that they could evoke a typical corbelling style reminiscent of the 1940s main home. Backus acknowledged that Commissioner Paul had requested contextual information regarding the site plan, which she believes has now been addressed. Overall, she found the revisions to be appropriate.

MOTION: Motion to approve this grade subject to review under the other applications made by Camp. Camp, Patten, Paul, Welch (aye)

4. Nancy Holmes 3 Eagles Wing Way Solar 80/229 Empower Energy

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

5. Lord Family, LLC 15 Coffin Street Sia Hardscape, Driveway 73.4.1/34 LFW

• *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul – Last heard March 26, 2024*

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that the house on the lot is a circa 1938 structure called "Habetrot," and there is a survey on file. She mentioned that while a plan with dimensions was received, it did not appear to have been modified as requested, particularly regarding the curve. Backus also highlighted that the proposed vegetation flanking the parking area is intended to be year-round.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Lynn Filipski, an abutter from across the street, provided context regarding South Road, which has existed since before 1990, noting its access by neighboring properties. She described South Road as being nine feet wide with 12-foot setbacks for adjacent property owners on Coffin Street, where she has a six-foot setback on the north side. Filipski explained that zoning allows for head-in parking with a maximum size of 27 by 20 feet, whereas the proposed driveway for the Lords is significantly larger at 40.25 by 22.8 feet, potentially accommodating up to six cars in a commercial-like setup. She pointed out that the application lacks the requested drone photo of the parking area and noted no changes to the proposed fluting. Filipski urged the HDC to ensure that if the curb cut is approved, it includes a condition for the removal of the Coffin Street driveway to comply with zoning regulations, while acknowledging the Lords' need for adequate parking following the sale of an adjoining lot. She emphasized the importance of considering zoning parameters and maintaining the bucolic character of the small private road.

MOTION: Motion to approve minus the parking area on Coffin Street and red lines of the parking area and provide as built after made by Welch. Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Paul (aye)

Motion to adjourn at 8:30pm – carried unanimously.

[Nantucket Historic District Commission - June 11, 2024](#)