



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 18, 2024

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

Call to order at 4:01pm and announcements made by Welch

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

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

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion: Motion to Approve agenda made by Pohl. *Carried unanimously.*

Vote: Carried unanimously

I. COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Vote for Community Preservation Committee (CPC) representative (last held by Diane Coombs)

DISCUSSION: Stephen Welch expressed his interest in participating in the Community Preservation Committee (CPC). He noted that he has deferred to Diane's involvement more recently. Welch clarified that he received an email regarding a potential conflict of interest but has cleared this with Massachusetts state ethics officials, confirming that he has filed the necessary forms and there are no conflicts. He emphasized that he does not have any direct or indirect financial interest in matters before the CPC and that his participation is approved by the select board.

Val Oliver nominated Welch and it was seconded by Pohl. – Carried unanimously.

Vote for Section 106 (of the National Historic Preservation Act) representative (last held by Diane Coombs) **HOLD UNTIL NEXT MEETING.**

Commissioner discussion regarding the separation of New Business and Old Business agendas.

DISCUSSION: The board discussed simplifying the agenda structure by separating old business and new business clearly, rather than alternating them weekly. They proposed a system where each agenda would have a heading indicating whether it pertains to new or old business, directing members to relevant sections below. This change aims to reduce the administrative burden on staff and maintain focus during the respective weeks. The board emphasized that while they want to stick to this format, they remain flexible and can adjust the agenda as needed to accommodate important discussions or projects. They noted that changes should be made judiciously and not for contentious matters, aiming for clarity and efficiency in their meetings.

Sequencing of agenda regarding absences (of applicants.)

The board discussed issues arising from applicants failing to show up for scheduled meetings, leaving neighbors waiting without resolution. They expressed that this situation is unfair and proposed implementing a "one strike you're out" policy, where applicants who miss a meeting would need to attend the next one or withdraw their application. The board considered removing the requirement for notifying abutters if an applicant postpones without notice, suggesting a penalty system for repeated absences, where a second absence would incur a greater penalty. They agreed to review best practices regarding repeated postponements and to discuss the matter further in the following meeting, ensuring everyone has time to consider the proposed changes.

II. CONSENT

1. Three North Gully Rd LLC 7 N. Gully Rd New Dwelling 73.1.3/123 Botticelli & Pohl
Commissioners: Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Oliver and Thornevill – Last heard June 11, 2024

2. Egilmez Nejat 41 Goldfinch Dr Add portico 68/584 JB Studio

MOTION: Motion to approve consents as submitted made by Oliver.
Camp, MacLeod, Welch, Oliver, Thornevill (aye) Pohl (recuse)

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. Town of Nantucket 19 Waite Drive Multi Family Dwelling 67/927 J&J Contractors

- *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, alt: Patten, Paul, Thornevill – Last heard February 13, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board discussed various aspects of a building proposal, providing both positive feedback and concerns. Members appreciated the changes made, particularly regarding height and the site layout, but raised issues with the overall massing and design elements. Abby suggested modifying the middle banding to align with a shingle style and simplifying the entry portico by removing the side porches. Val emphasized the need for more pronounced additive massing and expressed concerns about the rear elevation's hospital-like appearance. Joe pointed out that the most visible south elevation needed attention, particularly regarding its design and the stacked doors. Stephen noted the importance of the portico design, suggesting it should have a hip roof to match the overall structure, and proposed adjustments to the railings and stair enclosure. The board agreed on the need for further refinement and discussion to achieve a cohesive and contextually appropriate design.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus noted that the board's individual comments have been incorporated into the revisions, but some aspects still require further development. She suggested reconsidering the use of a belly band and emphasized the importance of retaining the additive massing on the side for the basement access. Additionally, she proposed flipping the design at the back to improve functionality. Overall, she expressed satisfaction with the current progress but highlighted the need for additional refinement based on the board's feedback.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Welch.
Pohl, Welch, Camp, Paul, Oliver (aye)

IV. OLD BUSINESS 04/23/2024

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

- *Commissioners: Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Welch, alt: Paul, Thornevill – Last heard April 2, 2024*

PUBLIC COMMENT: Abutter Thomas Barada expressed concerns about the placement of a proposed pool at 39 West Miacomet, stating that it is positioned in the front yard rather than the back, which he believes contradicts the intent to cluster pools together. He noted that the house has a walkout basement, which further complicates the layout, making it unclear what constitutes the front of the property. Tom raised issues regarding the need for railings on walls exceeding eight feet, referencing a discussion with planning that highlighted this requirement, despite the Historical Commission's stance. He criticized the proposed squared wire railing as inappropriate for the setting, describing it as industrial and not in keeping with the area's character. Additionally, he expressed concerns about the extensive fenestration, particularly an 18-foot-long accordion door that could create excessive light pollution, emphasizing that there are no plans detailing the type of lighting to be used. Overall, he called attention to safety issues and the overall layout of the house and pool, arguing that it does not make logical sense.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions and additional information made by Thornevill.
Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Thornevill (aye)

V. NEW BUSINESS 04/30/2024

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

DISCUSSION: Board member Angus expressed support for reverting to the originally approved plans, emphasizing the importance of adhering to the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) process. The board highlighted the potential consequences of constructing without a COA, noting that the Historic District Commission (HTC) could have required the complete removal of any unauthorized structure. Board members encouraged applicants to follow the proper procedures for the benefit of the community. A proposed motion to hold the application for further review and suggested setting a deadline for the applicant to return with a COA by October 15th. This timeline would ensure clarity and accountability for both the board and the applicant regarding the expected course of action.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Abutter Ed Lemberg voiced his concerns regarding construction near his property, noting that he had observed carpenters working on ceiling joists that appeared improperly curved, contrary to the approved plans which specified an 8:12 pitch. He expressed frustration that the building department had not addressed this discrepancy, asserting that there was no precedent for such a design change. Ed emphasized the importance of visibility in assessing the impact of the building, referencing a recent case where visibility was a key issue for a barn proposal. He argued that the current project lacks any historical context or examples to validate its design. Furthermore, he raised concerns about the potential for future property owners to clear the lot, which could increase visibility of the structure, and highlighted environmental issues, such as the infestation of pine beetles affecting nearby trees. Ed concluded by suggesting that if he were to clear his own property, it would also lead to increased visibility, stressing the need for careful consideration of the building's placement and impact.

MOTION: Motion to hold pending further review made by Pohl.

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

2. Dukes Road Trust 2 Dukes Road New Guest House 41/187 Botticelli & Pohl

DISCUSSION: The board discussed concerns about the visibility of the proposed guest house, particularly regarding the Nano doors facing Dukes Road. Members sought clarification on the height of the structure and whether landscaping would adequately screen it from view. Joe expressed no concerns about the site plan, noting improvements with the driveway's relocation. Angus confirmed that vegetation would help screen the structure, while Abby suggested making approval conditional on ensuring the Nano doors are not visible during inspections. Carrie raised concerns about relying solely on landscaping for screening and suggested additional hardscape elements.

MOTION: Motion to approve subject to the nano doors not being visible during inspection or thereafter and plant materials that blend with the indigenous and blends with the rural landscape made by MacLeod.

Welch, Paul, MacLeod (aye) Thornewill (abstain) Camp (nay)

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

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the visibility of the proposed structure from Dukes Road, particularly concerning the Nano doors facing the road. Questions were raised about the screening provided by landscaping and the height of the building. Members noted that the driveway's relocation would enhance vegetative screening. There was a consensus that the design of the guest house was generally appropriate, though some members suggested potential adjustments to better conceal the Nano doors from view. Angus expressed a preference for a smaller dormer but acknowledged it met setback requirements.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Paul.

Welch, Thornewill, Paul, MacLeod (aye) Camp (nay)

4. REDHORSE LLC 88 Quidnet Road Rev 2021-06-4059 2 6/109 Ahern LLC

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the landscaping plans for a project, agreeing that while the rear patio using blue stone was acceptable due to its limited visibility, the formal steppers were inappropriate for the dirt road setting. Members emphasized the importance of a more naturalistic approach, favoring the use of Goshen stones and

irregular edges to align better with the indigenous plants in the area. There was a consensus to encourage the applicant to self-edit the landscaping materials to enhance the natural aesthetic.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that the structure in question is a rehabilitation of the circa 1900 Rickerson House. She referenced an earlier approval involving go stone and stated that the current changes are more appropriate for the project.

MOTION: Motion to soften the edge of the steppers and approve through staff. *Thornewill, Welch, Camp, Welch (aye) MacLeod (nay) Pohl (recused)*

VI. OLD BUSINESS 05/14/2024

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

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

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the proposed modifications to the design, expressing appreciation for the updated rendering and the use of Turtle glass, which they believe will help mitigate light emissions from the structure. Members noted that the fenestration of the design makes the building appear more residential rather than a continuous wash of light. While some members, like Abby, remained concerned that the design still conveyed a modern aesthetic with blocks of light, others felt that the overall changes represented a positive direction. There was also a recognition that the application materials should have included the relevant plans and elevations for clarity, but the board was generally supportive of the proposal as it stood.

MOTION: Motion to approve the April 9, 2024, submission made by Welch.

Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Patten (aye) Camp (nay)

2. Bessie, James & Laura 9 Correia Lane Garage 80/58.2 Brook M

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

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Paul.

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

3. 3 Pleasant St. Nom. Tr. 3 Pleasant Street Addition 42.3.3/155 Emeritus

• *Commissioners: Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill (Mullen), alt: Patten, Paul – Last heard April 30, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board expressed significant concern regarding the front gable dormer on the historic circa 1804 Nantucket house, with multiple members agreeing that it feels like a foreign element. Carrie emphasized that the dormer is the only one of its kind on the building and should be removed or replaced with a simpler design. Joe suggested that a shed dormer with a single window would be more appropriate, while Connie and Val supported omitting the dormer entirely. The board discussed various options, including lowering the eave line and centering the windows, ultimately leaning toward a design that incorporates either a lower shed dormer or no dormer at all, enhancing the building's historical integrity and visual harmony. The applicant was encouraged to present these adjustments for further review.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner, Holly Backus provided feedback on the circa 1804 Nantucket house she noted that the proposed addition has been reduced to 668 square feet, which is an improvement. However, she expressed concern regarding the east dormer on the facade, describing it as inappropriate and overly complex, particularly as a flush shed. Backus emphasized the need for further simplification in the design, in line with previous requests from the commissioners, stating that despite the reductions made, the proposal remains ambitious in both size and complexity.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Roland, representing the Historic Structures Advisory Board, echoed concerns like those of Holly Backus regarding the design of the circa 1804 Nantucket house. He specifically noted that the front gable dormer appears unusual and out of place on the structure. Roland suggested that eliminating the dormer entirely or replacing it with lower windows just below the eave line could improve the design. This adjustment would help reduce the visible shingles above the lower windows, creating a more cohesive appearance for the building.

MOTION: Motion for minor revisions made by Paul.

Oliver, Thornehill, Camp, Patten, Paul (aye)

4. Big Patch LLC 69 Hummock Pond Road New Main Dwelling 56/320 Emeritus

•Commissioners: Welch, Coombs Camp, Oliver, Paul, alt: Patten, Thornehill - Last heard April 23, 2024

DISCUSSION: The board discussed their concerns regarding the design of the property, particularly focusing on the visibility and elements of the south elevation. Val noted that removing the dormer over the living room would greatly simplify the facade, and Abby agreed that overall visibility is a concern. Joe appreciated the changes made, especially the reduction of French doors, but echoed the sentiment that the dormer should be eliminated, or its fenestration centralized. Connie expressed uncertainty about the breezeway but trusted Val's assessment that it would be minimally visible. The chair raised issues about the vegetation that blocks the view, emphasizing its importance in maintaining the character and setting of the area, and suggested that any approval should include measures to supplement this vegetation. The board expressed a willingness to support modifications, including the removal of the dormer and reducing the width of the covered porch, to align with their collective vision for the project.

MOTION: Motion to approve with exhibit A made by Oliver.

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

5. Big Patch LLC 69 Hummock Pond Road New Garage 56/320 Emeritus

•Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Paul, alt: Patten, Thornehill - Last heard April 23, 2024

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the garage doors, expressing concerns about their size and appearance. Abby noted that the white color of the doors might be too stark and suggested they could appear overwhelming, while Val agreed the doors look oversized and resemble a farmhouse style. Abby proposed pulling the doors in to create more shingle space on either side, enhancing the charm of the design. Joe highlighted a potential drafting error regarding the height of the garage doors, noting that they seemed to be drawn at an incorrect elevation, which might affect the overall structure. Connie reiterated her reservations about the connector piece, indicating it still did not sit well with her. Overall, the board emphasized the need for adjustments to ensure the garage integrates better with the main house and surrounding aesthetics.

MOTION: Motion to approve with exhibit A made by Paul.

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

6. NIR 19 N Water St, Lot 8 New Dwelling 42.4.2/3 Emeritus

• Commissioners: Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Paul, alt: Patten – Last heard April 30, 2024

DISCUSSION: The board expressed overall approval of the latest design, appreciating the changes made to the house. Val praised the improvements but recommended narrowing the bay window to avoid conflicts with the stairs and removing the brackets, which were deemed inappropriate for the context. Joe echoed this sentiment, suggesting that shifting the stairs to the side of the porch could integrate them better and eliminate the conflict with the bay window. Connie also expressed her appreciation for the revised version, supporting the minor tweaks suggested.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus commented on the infill lot within the Old Harbor House complex, expressing concerns about the reintroduction of the porch brackets, which she feels are inappropriate and give the structure a more rural appearance that doesn't fit the town's character. She noted that the design was improved when the brackets were removed. However, she acknowledged and appreciated the overall changes made to the project, particularly the adjustments to the rear pitches.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Board expressed agreement with Holly Backus regarding the porch brackets, deeming them inappropriate for the context. He focused his comments on the bay window, noting that its overhang over the front steps creates a crowded and conflicting appearance. He suggested that ideally, the steps should be oriented forward, like other houses, to enhance their prominence and avoid the current awkwardness. Additionally, he recommended narrowing the bay window by ganging the windows together, which would reduce its width and improve the overall design.

MOTION: Motion to approve the design with the omission of the brackets, allowing for the possibility of returning with a more suitable design in the future. Including flipping the stairs to the other side of the porch and integrating them into the design. Also, that the FEMA information and relevant map should also be included in the approval documentation made by Paul. *Camp, Oliver, Paul, Patten, (aye)*

VII. NEW BUSINESS 05/14/2024

1. Olsen Family 28 Prospect St Hardscape 55.4.4/77.1 Val Oliver

DISCUSSION: The board discussed various concerns regarding the property at 28 Prospect Street, emphasizing the need for adjustments to the retaining wall, driveway, outdoor shower, and overall landscaping. Members agreed that the retaining wall should be reduced in height and potentially screened with plantings, while also suggesting a transition to a more organic shape for the adjacent patio. There was consensus that the outdoor shower should be relocated from its current elevated position on the deck to a more discreet location at grade, and the existing grill station should be simplified. The board highlighted the importance of not having cars parked directly in front of the house and recommended that the driveway be shortened to minimize visual impact. Additionally, they suggested that the gate be reduced to a maximum height of four feet and made less ornamental to better fit the historic context.

Overall, the board appreciated the owners' flexibility and willingness to accommodate feedback while expressing the need for a cohesive design that respects the character of the neighborhood.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus, the preservation planner, expressed her approval of the decision to remove the proposed fire pit, noting that it aligns better with the neighborhood's character. She emphasized the importance of screening the grill from the street to maintain visual integrity. Additionally, she remarked on the appropriateness of a cobblestone apron in the historic district but suggested that a bluestone patio might be more suitable than brick.

Holly recommended considering views from neighboring public streets, particularly as seen from uphill, to ensure the design is harmonious with the surrounding area.

PUBLIC COMMENT: **Joan Taylor**, representing herself and 14 other families from the Mill Street visual corridor, expressed concerns regarding two as-built conditions and one proposed element related to the Olsson property at 28 Prospect. Firstly, she addressed the treated lumber retaining wall along the eastern property line, which is about 4 feet high and has affected the grade, creating additional footage on the building lot. Joan emphasized the need for accurate as-built documentation or measurements to understand the relationship between the wall and the house, noting discrepancies in the visual representation. Secondly, she raised issues with a large structure on the deck, identified as an outdoor shower, which was built contrary to HDC-approved plans. She requested that the Olson's consider relocating this structure to a less visible area and reducing its size to better fit the character of the surroundings.

Geraldine Mueller, representing herself and her husband Henry, expressed concerns regarding the Olson property at 28 Prospect Street. She noted that they were not consulted about the excavation that led to the grade change and the construction of the retaining wall. Geraldine appreciated that the wall would not be extended but voiced concern about the proposed solid wall of plant material, suggesting that lower plantings would better preserve the cherished open views of the landbank from public areas and neighboring homes. She mentioned a verbal agreement with the Olson's to share costs for planting trees and naturalized shrubs along their shared border, which was not reflected in the submitted plan. Additionally, she expressed relief that the proposed fire pit would not be included but questioned the scale of the proposed 15x20 ft patio, suggesting that it may be too large for the backyard and asking for suggestions on creating a fire pit-free patio that is more appropriate for the property size.

Anne Dewez expressed her frustration regarding unauthorized construction projects at the Olson property, emphasizing that she had raised concerns about these issues multiple times over the past year with Val. She stressed the importance of adhering to approval processes and not overlooking inappropriate changes simply because they had already been made. Anne urged the HDC to uphold their standards and responsibilities, stating that it is unfair to both the board and the community to accept unauthorized alterations without proper scrutiny. She underscored her support for the board's challenging role while advocating for accountability in maintaining Nantucket's character and integrity.

Mickey Rowland from HSAG raised several concerns regarding the proposed design. He suggested that the 6-foot board fence on the front of the building should be pushed back from the front wall to create visual relief. He expressed that the wooden pressure-treated retaining wall adjacent to the fence is inappropriate for the Old Historic District (OHD) and should be reduced in height or replaced with stone, as it will be visible from Prospect Street and the Landbank property. Regarding the outdoor shower, he recommended lowering it to grade and significantly reducing its size. Lastly, he advised against parking cars directly in front of the house, suggesting that the driveway be designed to allow for backing in without obstructing the view of the front door.

Ashley Olson, the property owner, provided a brief background regarding the project, acknowledging that the current situation stems from receiving incorrect information about initial approvals. She expressed her willingness to be flexible in adjusting based on feedback from the Historic District Commission (HDC) and the neighbors. Ashley noted that there have been discussions about the outdoor shower, with Val suggesting that certain proposed changes did not make sense. She highlighted the challenge of balancing various neighbor concerns regarding visibility of the back porch and shower while maintaining views along North Mill Street. Additionally, she mentioned a gate designed to obscure the retaining wall from the front and expressed openness to further suggestions to ensure the project aligns with community expectations, emphasizing her desire to move forward and enjoy their home.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Camp.

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

2. Nelson, Carl & Karen 21 Wigwam Gate 77/5.9 CWA

DISCUSSION: The board expressed concerns regarding the proposed fence height and design at the property, noting that the suggested 6.5-foot height is too tall compared to existing fences in the area, which are typically around 5 feet. Members advocated for a shorter, more natural weathered fence that aligns with the lighter aesthetic of surrounding fences, emphasizing that the current design appears heavy due to wider boards and narrow spacing. While acknowledging the need for a deer barrier, they suggested alternative solutions, such as using cattle grates or wire to keep deer out without compromising the fence's visual appeal. Ultimately, the board leaned towards approving a revised design that incorporates a lower height and more appropriate spacing, referencing a specific image as a guideline for the desired outcome.

MOTION: Motion to approve a fence that is the same height, material & detail as number three made by Pohl. Welch, MacLeod, Pohl, Oliver, Patten (aye)

3. Ripley 92 Washington New Dwelling 42.2.3/22 Marshall Harris

DISCUSSION: The board expressed a consensus that while the proposed design is beautiful, it is too formal for the neighborhood, which traditionally features simpler, less detailed beach cottages. Members agreed on the appropriateness of the Gambrell roof style but suggested it should be less complex and reduced in height, with simpler massing and detailing to better fit the local context. Specific concerns included excessive glazing, the design of the cut-in windows over the porch, and the overall heaviness of the architectural details. Suggestions for improvements included lowering the ceiling height, simplifying the roof lines, and reconsidering the design of the chimney. Overall, the board encouraged a more straightforward design that aligns with the neighborhood's simpler aesthetic.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus, the preservation planner, highlighted several key points regarding the proposed structure. She noted that while the existing building slated for demolition is from the 1960s, any previous approvals may need to be renewed, as they expire after three years. She expressed concerns about the introduction of

a gambrel roof design, which is not typical for that side of the harbor, although there are some precedents in the area. Backus emphasized the importance of mitigating height and ensuring the design remains consistent with the historic context. She advised careful consideration of the glazing on the harbor elevation, recommending that its percentage be reviewed. Additionally, she mentioned a preference for interior chimneys in the Old Historic District and suggested that the French doors should feature 12 lights with a kick panel. Overall, she encouraged adjustments to enhance the design's compatibility with the historic district.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from HSAG expressed concerns that the proposed design conflicts with the existing neighborhood context, describing it as overly complex for the area, which typically features simpler beach cottages. He noted that this design would be more suitable for Brant Point rather than the current neighborhood. Rowland criticized the height of the structure and the dormers facing the water, pointing out that the design includes odd connectors and excessive glazing. He emphasized the need for simpler massing and detailing to align better with the character of the surrounding cottages.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions and track the garage and shed made by MacLeod. *Welch, Oliver, MacLeod, Pohl, Thornewill (aye)*

Motion to adjourn at 8:27pm made by Pohl. – Carried unanimously.

[Nantucket Historic District Commission - June 18, 2024](#)