



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 25, 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; Fiona Johnson, Administrative Specialist, Sara Johnson, Administrative Specialist.

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

Remote Participants: Pohl

Absent Members:

Late Arrivals:

Early Departures:

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion to Approve agenda made by Camp.

Vote: Carried unanimously

Public Comment:

I. COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

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

DISCUSSION: MacLeod volunteered for position.

MOTION: Motion to nominate MacLeod made by Camp. *Camp, Pohl, Oliver, Welch, MacLeod (aye)*

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

DISCUSSION: Will be implementing a system to segregate old business from new business by organizing our agenda into two distinct weeks: one dedicated to old business and the other to new business.

3. **Special Town Meeting Warrant Article discussion regarding amendment to Demo Delay.**

II. SIGNS 06/25/2024

Property owner name	Street Address	Type of Sign	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Nantucket Land Bank	204 Cliff Rd (1 of 2)	Public Info Sign	40/59	Elijah Holland
2. Nantucket Land Bank	204 Cliff Rd (2 of 2)	Public Info Sign	40/59	Elijah Holland
3. Nantucket Land Bank	Hummock Pond Rd	Public Info Sign	63/35	Elijah Holland
4. Nantucket Land Bank	Madaket Rd	Public Info Sign	38/8.1	Elijah Holland
5. Nantucket Land Bank	76 Millbrook Rd	Public Info Sign	57/24	Elijah Holland
6. Nantucket Land Bank	28 W Miacomet Rd	Public Info Sign	81/71	Elijah Holland
7. 29 Center Street LLC	16.5 Federal Street	Temporary Sign	42.3.1/70	Anna Riffle

III. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Phil Garufi	6 West Way	Roof	38/34	Val Oliver
2. Bellevue, Linda	68 Milestone Road	Rev to 61142	54/54	Val Oliver
3. 90 N. Liberty Pres Trust	90 N. Liberty St	Rev 01-9846	41/22	Botticelli & Pohl
4. David Bailey	83 Sankaty Road	Alterations	48/42	Design Associates
5. Elizabeth & Fred Singer	1 Windsor	Demo Foundation	49/195	Val Oliver
6. Tamara Wing	52 W. Chester	Rev 7510 Guest House	41/381	Emeritus
7. Ocean Ave NT	20 Ocean Ave	Cottage Addition	73.2.4/20	Normand Res
8. Ocean Ave NT	20 Ocean Ave	New Shed	73.2.4/20	Normand Res
9. Sharp, Randy	59 Polpis Road	New Garage	54/26.1	Thornewill
10. Richmond GT Point	21 Beach Grass	Rev mech enclosure/windows	68/387	KOH
11. 5 Luff Road LLC	5 Luff Road	New second floor deck	66/351	DTA
12. 23 Sankaty Head Trust	23 Sankaty Head Rd	Rev Fenestration	48/4.1	BPC

MOTION: Motion to approve consent as submitted minus number seven, 20 Ocean Ave made by MacLeod.
Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Patten (aye) Pohl, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Recused)

- Ocean Ave NT 20 Ocean Ave Cottage Addition 73.2.4/20 Normand Res

MOTION: Motion to have number 7 from consent, 20 Ocean Ave to track with the main house made by Oliver.
Oliver, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Welch (aye)

IV. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

1. Senecal	29 Pleasant St	ADA ramp	55.4.1/109	Topham	SW
• Ramp removal and replication of prior railing and balustrade are included in approval					
2. Nicole Barr	40 Baxter	Roof change	49/63	Jim Lydon	SW
• Date of construction added to the COA (HDC Survey NAN.2706 = c.1953)					
3. Manolo Mancia	10B Field Ave	Roof change	80/64	Manolo	SW
• Date of construction added to the COA (NHL Data = c.1998)					
4. Keegan Hodges	35 India St	Window door change	42.3.4/128	Thornewill	SW
• Submit a closer-up, straight on image of the window for the file.					

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

5. Tad Lee	39 Fair St	Deck expansion, color change	42.3.2/211	Emeritus RP
• Proper date of construction added to the COA (HDC Survey NAN.3143 = c.1829); approved due to limited visibility; provide color swatch of Hunter Green for the file.				

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus expressed concerns regarding the color choices for the project but acknowledged the rationale behind them. She noted that the application is slightly older than the date indicated and that an updated survey will be added to the file. Backus referenced a photo in the packet showing the view from TLE Court, highlighting the limited visibility of the existing rear deck, which is partially obscured by vegetation. She suggested that additional vegetation could be added to enhance screening, should the commission be open to that idea.

MOTION: Motion to approve with the skirt board being natural to weather and foundation to be Essex green made by Oliver. *Oliver, Pohl, Welch (aye) Camp, MacLeod (abstain)*

6. McDonough, John Susan 5 Moby Way New Entry Porch 65/59 Gryphon Arch. RP
 • Date of construction added to the COA (NHL Data = c.1983)

7. Elizabeth & Fred Singer 1 Windsor Demo Garage 49/195 Val Oliver RP
 • Move off / Demo approval

8. Elizabeth & Fred Singer 1 Windsor Demo dwelling 49/195 Val Oliver RP
 • Move off / Demo approval

MOTION: Motion to approve 1 Windsor garage & dwelling subject to conditions move off demo approval made by Pohl. Pohl, Patten, Camp, MacLeod, Welch (aye)

9. Fornes Management Tr 12 Wannacomet Rd Color Change M H 40/103 Main St Const. JP
 • Date of construction added to the COA (NHL Data = c.2004), keep roof walk NTW.

10. Leslie Johnson 281 Madaket Rd Rev Pool 59.4/292 LFW JP
 • Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.

11. KF Lincoln LLC 14 Lincoln Ave Rev Garage door ODS 30/182 MCA JP
 • Add the original HDC Survey to the file (HDC Survey NAN.1664)

12. Lorna Denhametal 3 Rosaly Fenestration 73.3.1/34 Brook Meerbergen JP
 • Date of construction added to the COA (HDC Survey NAN.2584 = c.1930)

13. Tyler Destefano 8 Curlew Ct Shed window door change 68/523 Jacob Martinson JP
 • Provide existing drawings of the shed for the file.

14. EDC Properties Peter Carey 28 Union St New Shed 42.3.2/179 Peter Carey JP
 • Approve with the fenestration as TDL wood, not SDL.

15. Sixteen N Beach St LLC 16 N Beach St New shed 42.4.1/102 Gryphon Arch. VO
 • Separate windows from the door.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted with the eave lowered to the head casing of the doors per exhibit A made by MacLeod. Oliver, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul (aye) Welch (recuse)

16. Sixteen N Beach St LLC 16 N Beach St Shed Demo 42.4.1/102 Gryphon Arch. VO
 • For a Move off / Demo. Add date of construction to the COA (c.2003)

MOTION: Motion to approve as a move off demo made by Oliver. Oliver, Camp, MacLeod, Paul (aye) Welch (recuse)

17. Sharp, Randy 59 Polpis Rd Pool 54/26.1 Thornewill VO
 • Pool not to be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.

18. HMSW LLC 25 Sankaty Head Rd Garage 48/4.1 BPC AM
 • Lower eave plate height to door header height and change pent roof from shed to hip.

19. Suni & William Harford 60 Wanoma MH fen, dormer add walkout 92/13 Emeritus AM

- West dormer to remain as approved and no door/balcony on North gable. No color change of shutters. Add photos and previous approval in file.

MOTION: Motion to approve all but items 4, 5,7,8,15 & 16 with a stipulation that number 18 is changed from 25 to 23 Sankaty Head Road made by Pohl.

Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Patten, Pohl (aye) Oliver, Paul (recused)

V. OLD BUSINESS

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

- *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, alt: Patten, Paul, Thornewill – Last heard June 18, 2024*

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus appreciates the cottage corners and no banding. She also appreciates the porch hip and side porch.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Welch. Revisions include adding a proportionate freeze board around the second-floor eaves, raising the flare above the faux beam fascia on the covered porch, and eliminating the balustrade on the first floor. The depth of the hip entryway will be increased by a minimum of two feet, and the post width will be extended to obscure the jog in the elevation view. The sidelights on the door will revert to a previously proposed half-height design, and the second-floor windows will be changed to a three-over-three configuration instead of six-over-six. Additionally, treatments under the stairs will be natural to weather, and the utility enclosure will match the height and style of the existing structure. The site plan will also be updated to include street trees, specified as a minimum of three-and-a-half inches in caliper, noted as a mitigation measure for the building's mass.

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

VI. NEW BUSINESS 05/14/2024

1. Kenneth & Lis Dias 27 Rugged Road New Main House 67/916 Normand Res

MOTION: Motion to hold for review made by Pohl.

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

2. Derek Taff 16 Paul Jones Rd Deck Hardscape 41/97.1 R Newman

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Oliver.

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

3. Center of Town LLC 35 Center Rooftop solar 42.3.1/3 Acksmart

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the installation of faux solar panels, particularly at the edge visible to the public, suggesting a similar approach for the current project. They agreed on the importance of creating a mockup to visualize the changes, proposing to install a row of panels to provide a sense of the profile, even if it wouldn't show the full extent of the installation. Additionally, they mentioned a separate application for the Mitchell's building, where vent pipes are scheduled to be moved, noting the challenge of coordinating this with the solar installation. The board expressed enthusiasm for the mockup, highlighting that the visibility of the current building would allow for a clearer assessment of the project's impact.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus emphasized the importance of including construction dates on applications for historic structures, particularly noting that the building in question was constructed after the Great Fire of 1846. She expressed a need for a visual representation of the proposed changes, especially concerning the black roof, which she did not see reflected in the application. Additionally, she pointed out that while solar installations have been approved in other areas of the OMD, this project would be one of the first in the core area, highlighting the significance of reviewing its impact carefully.

MOTION: Motion to put up some mockup panels on the edge closest to Center Street. It will be heard the week after.

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

4. Romano 55 Easton St Hardscape pergola 42.4.1/86 Julie Jordin

DISCUSSION: The board expressed concerns primarily regarding the visibility and materials of the proposed walkway and patio, emphasizing a preference for brick over bluestone, especially at the entrance. There was also discussion about maintaining historical continuity and the relationship between private and public spaces in the landscape design. Suggestions included dropping the deck stairs from the current application to simplify approval and ensuring that any pergola is softened with vines to enhance aesthetics. The board seeks clarity on the consensus regarding materials and visibility before proceeding with revisions or final decisions, with a suggestion to evaluate the surrounding area for consistency with existing structures.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus provided feedback on a circa 1912 Radford Bungalow kit house, known as Winward, emphasizing the need for the application to reflect previously approved resilient design guidelines. She advocated for the use of brick, which was historically present on the site, instead of bluestone, citing the need for a less formal appearance. Backus highlighted the importance of including elevations and revisions to the approved addition, as the structure is significant in the Brant Point area. She expressed concern about the visibility of the built-in grill from the public way, recommending it be screened. Additionally, she noted that the existing driveway was historically brick and suggested it be reinstated, with modifications to the proposed shell apron. She also raised questions about the gate and trellis details, recommending adjustments to align with traditional styles and materials, reiterating that brick would be the most suitable choice overall.

MOTION: Motion to approve for review and revisions made by Oliver.

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

5. Jacobs Amanda Kevin 4 Rays Ct Fence rev 43.3.2/3 Julie Jordin

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner, Holly Backus, raised concerns about the proposed elevated fence at the George Ray house, built in 1797 with an addition in 1835. She questioned its historical appropriateness within the context of the historic district, noting that such a feature likely would not have existed in that location. While acknowledging the presence of fencing in the area, she emphasized that the current design blurs the distinction between a traditional fence and an elevated structure, which could detract from the historic character of the site.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted with the fence height reduced to match the neighbor relative to grade made by Oliver. ***Oliver, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Welch (aye)***

6. XXII Years LLC 3 Maxey Pond Tennis court 40/106 Ahern LLC

DISCUSSION: The board's comments reflected mixed opinions on the proposed fence at the site. One member expressed support for the sunken court design and the chain-link fence, acknowledging visibility concerns but ultimately finding the design acceptable. Another clarified that while part of the fence is four feet, the majority is six feet tall, which will be more visible. However, Abby expressed strong reservations, deeming the location inappropriate and suggesting a reconfiguration of the driveway to push the fence further from the street. She emphasized that the introduction of visual mitigating plant materials near the street could set an undesirable precedent for the area. Overall, there was a consensus on the need to carefully consider the fence's placement and its impact on the streetscape.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted and no night lighting made by Pohl.

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

7. XXII Years LLC 3 Maxey Pond New garage 40/106 CWA

MOTION: Motion to approve made by Thornewill.

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

8. Peaches Lou LLC 11 Green Ln Fenestration Trim 42.3.3/87.2 Emeritus LTD

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed a range of opinions on the proposed design changes. One member noted that the little diamond door on the west elevation will become the new front door, which was a positive change. However, concerns were raised about the garage doors; one member wished they could be retained as part of the exterior aesthetic, emphasizing their charm and the character of the street. Another member suggested that the ganged windows could be spaced more evenly to better fit the wall area. While some found the proposed design charming and suitable for the area, others felt that the proximity of the

garage doors to the street was overpowering, detracting from the dwelling's appeal. Overall, there was a consensus on maintaining the scale and charm of the structure while considering creative solutions for incorporating the garage doors.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus noted that the structure in question, originally the Russell Fost Bender garage from circa 1930, has an HTC survey on file and has only undergone slight changes since that time. She inquired whether the existing windows will be reused, to which it was confirmed that existing windows will remain while new ones will be added. Backus expressed concerns about the appropriateness of the south-facing windows, which may be visible from Milk Street, despite facing internally. She also pointed out that the application lacked a date, which should be added to the file.

MOTION: Motion to approve with exhibit A.

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

9. 111 OSR LLC 111 B Old South Rd Mixed use structure 68/167 Emeritus LTD

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed a generally positive view of the proposed building design, appreciating its attractive aesthetics and suitability for the evolving neighborhood. Concerns were raised about the overall massing, particularly regarding the height of the second floor and roof plane. One member suggested lowering the second-floor windowsills and modifying the roof structure to break up the mass. Another highlighted the need for design adjustments, such as raising the header beam of the covered porch to better align with the window heights. The discussion included a consideration of maintaining a balance between scale and visual appeal, with some members expressing a desire for creative solutions to enhance the building's integration into the area. Overall, there was support for the project, coupled with suggestions for refinement.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions.

Camp, MacLeod, Patten, Pohl (aye)

10. Ted Silva 14 Harbor View Way Rev MH 8887 42.4.1/26 LFW

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed shared concerns regarding the steep roof pitch on the bay, suggesting it be lowered to a four, five, or six-pitch for better aesthetics. Val highlighted the oddity of the current pitch, while Angus and Joe agreed that the bay windows appear under-fenestrated, recommending either bringing the existing windows closer together or incorporating a third window, although Joe cautioned against adding a fake window due to the presence of a fireplace. There was also consensus on adjusting the front door's height to match the surrounding windows, with some members noting that it's acceptable for doors to be lower than adjacent windows in historic contexts. Additionally, a suggestion was made to use lattice between the bay windows on the east elevation to fill the visible gap and enhance the design. Overall, the comments emphasized a need for refinement to ensure the building's design is cohesive and visually appealing.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus noted that the structure in question is a circa 1930 bungalow that previously received approval for an elevated addition in line with resilient design guidelines. She appreciated the preservation of the original front door and the reduction in scale of the proposed addition. However, she expressed concern about the alteration of the pitch on the east side of the building, suggesting it should remain consistent with the original design. Backus emphasized that while there may be varying pitches on the proposed design, maintaining the historical integrity of the building is crucial, especially considering its construction in the 1930s.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from HSAG raised concerns about the proposed changes to the south elevation, specifically noting that the front door being introduced is not the original. He suggested that a taller door should be used to align with the head height of the adjacent windows for a more cohesive look. On the east side, he found the bay windows to be too widely spaced and recommended bringing them closer together or adding a third window in the middle to enhance the design. Additionally, Rowland argued that the roof pitch could be lowered from an eight to a shallower angle, as he saw no reason for the steeper pitch in the new design.

MOTION: Motion to approve through exhibit A made by Pohl.

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

11. Buttrick NT Trust 34 Warrens Landing Relocate dwelling additions 38/11 LFW

DISCUSSION: The board members discussed the proposed addition to the circa 1870 building, expressing mixed opinions. Val acknowledged the unusual nature of the building but felt the proposed shed roof was acceptable, as it wouldn't overwhelm the original structure. Angus and Connie supported the idea of a "broken back" design, proposing a lower eave on the east-facing addition to create a more harmonious roof pitch that would not overshadow the existing gable. They emphasized the importance of ensuring the addition complements the original structure rather than swallowing it up. The consensus was to explore a roof design that maintains the integrity of the historic building while accommodating modern needs.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus expressed concerns regarding the proposed roof pitch of the addition, noting that it may not be appropriate for the vintage of the structure, which dates to the 1870s. She referenced the NHL data and the application information provided by Linda, suggesting that a softer box element could be a more fitting architectural choice. Backus emphasized that the proposed roof configuration appears atypical for a building of this style and era, indicating a need for alignment with the historical character of the original structure. Overall, her primary concern centered on ensuring that the addition harmonizes with the existing architecture.

MOTION: Motion to approve with minor revisions made by Camp.

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

12. North Liberty Street LLC 13 N Liberty St Garage Move on reno 42.3.4/3 SMRD

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed general approval of the proposed changes, particularly the return of the hip roof on the garage, which they found appropriate and sensitively done. However, some concerns were raised about the pergola; one member felt it appeared too modern compared to the historic nature of the hip roof and suggested incorporating more traditional rafter details. Another member noted that since the pergola is facing into the yard, its visibility might be limited, making the need for detail less critical. The consensus was that if the pergola is constructed from natural mahogany, it should enhance the overall aesthetic while remaining discreet.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus referenced a 1933 aerial photo and recalled that the original garage had been knocked off its foundation by a tornado and subsequently restored, which may explain some of the changes to the site. She expressed satisfaction with the proposed hip roof design, noting that it harmonizes well with the main structure on the lot. Backus voiced no concerns about the modifications and appreciated the sensitivity shown in the design, particularly regarding the panel on the French doors. She urged the committee to take note of these considerations for future reference within the historic district.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from HSAG expressed no concerns regarding the proposed changes to the hip roof and the relocation of the garage. However, he noted that the pergola appeared somewhat plain and suggested it could benefit from additional detailing to enhance its visual appeal.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Oliver.

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

13. Elizabeth Holby 19 Low Beach Cottage Solar roof 74/83 Acksmart

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed mixed feelings about the visibility and appropriateness of the proposed solar panels on the secondary structure. Joe noted the visibility from the street and reflected on the previous approval of solar panels on the main structure, suggesting that if those were acceptable, the current proposal might be too. Other members echoed this sentiment, acknowledging the challenge of approving visible solar installations while questioning the rationale behind the earlier approval. While some recognized the potential for the lower roof panels to be as visible as the upper ones, there was no clear consensus, with several members expressing reluctance to support the new installation, especially given their earlier stance against the first proposal. Abby clearly stated her opposition to the new solar panels, adding to the overall uncertainty among the board.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus acknowledged that the proposed changes involve a new structure covering the porch on the secondary structure, which she noted is a positive aspect of the design. However, she expressed curiosity about the visibility of this new structure from the road, indicating a desire for clarification on how it would be perceived in the context of the surrounding area. Overall, her comments highlighted an appreciation for the project's alignment with historic preservation principles while seeking further insight on its visual impact.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions in by Thursday heard the following Tuesday.

Camp, Paul, Patten, MacLeod, Pohl (aye) Oliver, Welch (recused)

14. Wolfram Family Trust 7 Folgers Ln MH Addition 42.4.4/33.3 WAPD

DISCUSSION: The board expressed general support for the proposed changes, viewing them as improvements to the building. While there was a consensus on the benefits of adopting a monochrome look with plank frame windows, which aligns with regional styles seen in places like Salem and Portsmouth, concerns were raised about specific design elements. One member noted the awkwardness of a gable shape on the west elevation, suggesting that it would be better to maintain a hip roof. Additionally, there were remarks about the lack of detail in the front elevation, though trust was placed in the designer's aesthetic judgment. Overall, the board appreciated the proposed alterations, with some minor reservations about certain aspects.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus noted that the structure is classified as non-contributing based on a 1989 HDC survey, with some changes made around 2000. She expressed support for the proposed alterations, which aim to enhance the building's appearance by adopting a five-bay Federal style, emphasizing the retention of the six-over-six windows and plank frame. Holly appreciated the unique color choice for the building, stating it stands out in New England's typical palette. She commended the new front door and mantle while criticizing the previous portico as inappropriate. Her only concern was regarding the existing second-floor deck and door configuration, suggesting that any such installations should include a kick panel to align with typical guidelines within the Old Historic District.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland echoed Holly Backus's comments.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Oliver.

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

15. Wolfram Family Trust 7 Folgers Ln Accessory dwelling 42.4.4/33.3 WAPD

DISCUSSION: The board expressed a mix of appreciation and concern regarding the proposed design. While they praised the massing and integration of the building into the landscape, concerns were raised about the large glass doors, which one member likened to a "Barbie house" compared to the historic aesthetic of the main house. There was a suggestion to frame the door opening to visualize its impact, as the substantial glass could dominate the view, especially at night when illuminated. A member noted the pergola's potential for shading but shared worries about the nighttime glow from the extensive glass. The board considered using stakes to mark the door's dimensions for a clearer assessment of visibility and aesthetics, emphasizing the importance of ensuring the design remains sensitive to its surroundings.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus expressed her appreciation for the lean-to style of the proposed design, noting its compatibility with the main house and its context within the Old Historic District. However, she raised a concern about potential visibility from Coffin Park, a public space, particularly regarding the east elevation, which features atypical window placement. While acknowledging that views from private properties are not under the commission's jurisdiction, she emphasized the importance of considering sightlines from public areas, especially given the historic significance of the Sunset Hill area. Overall, her comments highlighted the balance between design appreciation and awareness of public visibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland expanded on Holly Backus's concerns regarding the east elevation of the proposed design, emphasizing its over-fenestration with six large French doors facing that direction. He noted that a site plan identifies a footbridge that leads directly into Coffin Park, and a photograph clearly shows that standing on the far side of this bridge provides a direct line of sight to the building. This visibility from a public park raises concerns about the impact of the design on the views from Coffin Park, reinforcing the need to consider the aesthetic implications from that location.

MOTION: Motion for a view with ridge poles made by Thornewill.

16. Wolfram Family Trust 7 Folgers Ln Shed 42.4.4/33.3 WAPD

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed comments regarding the proposed shed design. They noted the need to clarify the cardinal points on the elevations, confirming that the doors would face west. Mickey suggested that the batten doors should be simplified to a more traditional design without framing, and he emphasized that the shed should maintain a simple appearance with shingle siding. The board also recognized the ample space on the property, suggesting the shed could be relocated further back from the street for a more traditional placement. Overall, there was consensus on prioritizing simplicity and appropriateness in the design.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus expressed that while the design is straightforward, the fenestration could benefit from being more typical to align with the changes being made to the main house. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that the windows and other architectural details are appropriate, especially given the full visibility of the structure from the surrounding area. Overall, she suggested that adjustments to the fenestration would enhance the coherence of the design with the historic character of the main house.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland emphasized the need to verify the cardinal points on the elevations, noting that the doors face west. He suggested that if the doors are visible, they should be designed as traditional batten doors, which are typically simple boards without framing. Mickey expressed concerns that the current design of the shed is too formal and recommended simplifying it by using shingles and avoiding unnecessary details. Additionally, he pointed out that the shed's location is somewhat unconventional and proposed relocating it to a more traditional spot at the back of the driveway, where it would be better suited.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by MacLeod.

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

17. Wolfram Michelle Lavin Tr 7 Folger Ln Hardscaping Deck 42.4.4/33.3 Ahern LLC

• **(New Business 5/28/24)**

DISCUSSION: The board expressed general support for the proposed hardscaping changes, particularly appreciating the use of irregular stone for its organic feel. Mickey noted that while blue stone is being used, a more natural option like Goan stone could be more appropriate. Carrie raised a question about the existing structure beneath the deck, confirming that the new design would simplify access to the lower level without the need for steps. Overall, board members agreed on the aesthetic improvements and functionality of the proposal, leading to a motion for approval with the potential reconsideration of materials.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus expressed her appreciation for the use of irregular stone in the proposed hardscaping, noting its organic feel. However, she questioned the choice of blue stone, suggesting that using Goshen might be more appropriate for the project. She emphasized the importance of maintaining an organic aesthetic rather than opting for a more rigid material and even proposed considering Goshen for the pavers as well.

MOTION: Motion to approve with Goshen in place of Blue Stone.

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

18. Thomas Rhoder 125 Main St Rev shed 42.3.3 49 Structures Unltd

HELD FOR REPRESENTATION

VII. OLD BUSINESS 05/21/2024

1. Goran & Melinda Puljic 14 Almanack Pond Rd Alteration & Addition 25/12 Self

• ***Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul – Last heard April 2, 2024***

DISCUSSION: The board expressed overall support for the proposed changes to the quirky building, noting that the reduction in size significantly improved its appearance. While there were concerns about visibility, particularly from the west elevation, members acknowledged that the dense vegetation in the area likely obscured views. Some members suggested that the design might benefit from a bit more glass and thinner proportions to enhance its aesthetic. There was a consensus that the visibility of the structure from the road would not prevent approval, provided that the existing screening is maintained. Overall, the board seemed open to the proposal with conditions related to visibility and screening.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Paul.

Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul (aye)

2. Farhood & Cyndi Azime 20 Liberty Street Addition Revisions 42.3.4/143 SMRD

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

DISCUSSION: The board expressed significant concerns about the proposed addition, emphasizing that it feels overly massive and out of character for the neighborhood. Joe noted that while the T-shape design aims to preserve the facade of the existing house, it extends too far and lacks modulation. He suggested simplifying details like the numerous pent roofs, which seem to dominate the design rather than harmonize with the existing structure. The board agreed on the need for the addition to be subordinate in scale, with suggestions to possibly separate the garage structure. Members highlighted the importance of simplifying textures and materials for better visual clarity and readability. Overall, there was a strong consensus that the design needs to be more compatible with the historic context and proportions of the original house.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus provided comments on the circa 1885 Mary G. Wilbur house, emphasizing the need for the site plan to clearly indicate the square footage of the existing historic structure in relation to the proposed addition. She expressed concerns that the addition does not adequately address the guidelines for building with Nantucket in mind, arguing that it should be more subordinate in size, scale, and height. Backus suggested that simplifying the design and treating the garage as a separate structure would better align with the historic character of the neighborhood, noting that garage additions are not typical features within the Old Historic District.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Paula McLoud, co-owner of 31 Liberty and owner of 29 Liberty, expressed strong concerns about the proposed addition, stating that it is out of context with the setting of Liberty Street and does not adhere to the guidelines outlined in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." She emphasized that the integrity of the historic building should be maintained and that additions should be inconspicuous, noting that past comments from the Commission regarding the overwhelming nature of the proposed design have not been addressed. McLoud highlighted visibility issues from both Liberty and Winter Streets, arguing that a more typical approach would involve extending the addition to the rear or side rather than its current design. Kathleen Cannon, a resident of 26 Liberty Street, supported McLoud's comments, sharing her own experience of adhering to historic guidelines and expressing appreciation for the Commission's work. Angus MacLeod, speaking as a member of the public, echoed the concerns of the preservation planner, the Sconset Advisory Group, and neighboring residents, stating that the proposed massing is out of scale and inconsistent with the guidelines in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." He emphasized that the design requires more than just minor adjustments; it needs to be significantly downscaled. Deborah Spear, a resident at 22A Liberty, expressed her worry that the proposed addition would encroach on her backyard space, contributing to a sense of loss of privacy and outdoor area. Mickey Rowland from the Sconset Advisory Group expressed concerns that the proposed addition does not relate well to the existing structure, describing it as boxy and overly massive. He emphasized that the scale of the rear structure should be more subordinate to the main house, as the current design significantly increases the footprint and would loom over the property line due to the flush dormers. Rowland suggested that the main mass of the addition should be narrower to better complement the proportions of the original house, highlighting that the size of the addition feels excessive and disproportionate.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Camp.

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

Motion to approve March 26, 2024, minutes made by Camp. Carried unanimously.

Motion to adjourn made by MacLeod at 8:42pm. Carried unanimously.

YouTube: [Nantucket Historic District Commission - June 25, 2024](#)