



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, July 2, 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, Historic Planner; Fiona Johnson, Administrative Specialist.

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

Remote Participants:

Absent Members:

Late Arrivals:

Early Departures:

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

Vote: Carried unanimously

Public Comment: none.

I. COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

1. Definition of "consent-able" applications.

DISCUSSION: The chair emphasized the importance of clearly distinguishing between old and new business in meetings, aiming for a more structured approach to discussions. They proposed establishing a common definition for "consentable" applications, highlighting the need to align with the principles of "Building with Nantucket in Mind." The chair encouraged members to consider the perspectives of others while determining what goes on the consent agenda, stressing that if there are doubts about an application, it should not be placed on consent. They acknowledged the challenges of lengthy agendas and the need for the commission to focus on future planning instead of getting bogged down in design discussions, urging a shift towards more efficient processes to enhance the effectiveness of the board.

II. CONSENT

1. 90 N. Liberty Pres Trust Botticelli & Pohl	90 N Liberty	Relocate Shed	41/22	
• <i>Commissioners: Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Paul, alt: Patten. Recused Pohl – Last heard February 20, 2024</i>				
2. Lloyd Arnold LFW	13 Somerset Rd	Color Change	56/96.3	
3. Alfred-Mary Novissimo LFW	13 Deer Run Rd	Move shed off	57/14.1	
4. Robert Grandgrade	17 Trotters Ln	Move shed off	67/285	LFW

MOTION: Motion to approve consent items made by Thornewill. *Camp, MacLeod, Welch, Oliver, Thornewill (aye) Pohl (recuse)*

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

1. John Wise 16.5 Williams St 2nd Dwelling 5/372 Normand Res
RP

- *Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Patten and Thornewill – Last heard May 28, 2024*
- Approved with windows to be consistent with the Main House approval: Green Mountain SDL

2. Wiggins 40 Vesper Lane Shed 55/123 LINK SW

- *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, and Patten – Last Heard May 28, 2024*
- Reorient shed so that door faces interior of the lot (driveway preferred, not required); pent roof (over door) to be reduced to fit within the space between gable rake boards.

MOTION: Motion to approve made by Pohl. *Carried unanimously.*

IV. NEW BUSINESS 05/14/2024

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

- *Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Pohl – Last heard June 25, 2024 – held for a VIEW*

MOTION: Motion to approve with the screening to remain in perpetuity and thereafter. Approval is based on lack of visibility – *carried unanimously.*

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

HOLD

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

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that last fall, the board approved a 48-square-foot shed with a roof pitch matching an existing cottage's 9:12 pitch. She explained that the current proposal is to reduce the shed's size from 48 square feet to 40 square feet, making it smaller than the zoning-required shed size, while maintaining the same pitch. As long as the pitch remains consistent, she expressed her support for the revised proposal.

MOTION: Motion to approve with exhibit A to lower the roof pitch to 9:12 – *Carried unanimously.*

V. OLD BUSINESS 05/21/2024

1. TACK3 LLC 3 Commercial St Dormer rev's 42.3.4/22 CWA

- *Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill; alt: Patten, Paul – Last heard March 26, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed a consensus against the proposed addition of a third shed dormer. One member highlighted that the design makes the structure appear massive and indicated that they wouldn't want similar applications for new constructions to be approved. Another member echoed this sentiment, stating that three shed dormers on the third floor are neither typical nor appropriate. While one member, Val, did not have concerns about the proposal, Connie agreed with the majority, supporting the view that the third dormer is excessive. Overall, the board leaned towards disapproving the application based on these observations.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus commented on the Crow's Nest structure, which predates the 1880s and has undergone various additions over time. She emphasized that the existing North Street side should remain unchanged. Notably, she referenced a historic photo from around 1918 that shows a gable dormer in the center of the building, rather than the shed dormer that replaced it between 1968 and the present. Backus stated that if the current design does not reflect the historical appearance, she does not consider it appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Roland, representing the Historic Structures Advisory Group, expressed concerns about the application to add a shed dormer in the middle of the structure. He stated that this addition does not comply with the "Building with Nantucket in Mind" guidelines, as it would conceal the main roof and effectively create a third-floor wall. Roland emphasized that this is like the issues associated with full shed dormers, which are not permitted under the guidelines.

MOTION: Motion to deny because it's a typical and an inappropriate modification to this historic structure in this location and it overburdens the façade made by Oliver.

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

2. 2 Candle House LLC 2 Candle House Hardscape 55.4.1/1.1 LFW

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

DISCUSSION:

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus provided feedback on the hardscaping for an infill structure resembling a typical four-bay Nantucket design, which was previously approved. She appreciated the revised site plan and elevation adjustments to the main house, noting the improved details at the driveway corner. However, she suggested that the long driveway could benefit from further consideration and recommended using brick instead of granite and bluestone for the steps, as granite may appear too formal for the style. Backus acknowledged the concrete wall with parged finish and brick cap as a consistent feature in the neighborhood. While she had no concerns regarding this element, she reiterated her agreement with several concerns raised by the commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group expressed concerns about the driveway and retaining wall design. He noted that the driveway slopes down at about 10%, but the retaining wall awkwardly steps with horizontal increments, suggesting it should simply follow the natural grade without stepping up. Rowland criticized the brick-capped concrete wall as not fitting the traditional aesthetic of the historic district and recommended replacing it with something more natural in appearance. He also pointed out that the granite steps leading to the deck should be made of wood instead, and that the hard-edged square steppingstones should be more natural in shape. Additionally, he mentioned that the proposed Type Two fence should ideally be 32 inches high rather than 42 inches.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions and additional information made by Thornewill.
Welch, Paul, Thornewill, Patten – carried unanimously.

3. Brian & Christina LLC 9 Salti Way Revs photos 20/51.1 JB Studio

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

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed concerns about the visibility and height of the proposed structure, particularly from the street perspective. One member noted that the facade facing the street appears to be three stories tall, raising worries about its visual impact when viewed down the driveway. Another member echoed this concern, mentioning that the structure seems unusually tall at approximately 31 feet and questioning how the grade transitions to the pool area. Overall, they felt the design does not adequately respond to the site's topography. Abby highlighted a similar past approval that resulted in visibility issues, emphasizing her reluctance to approve a structure that presents a full three stories from the street.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions and VIEW with height poles made by Oliver.
Carried unanimously.

4. More Than Enough 30 Russells Way Rev decks height and fenestration 77/8.1 Chip Webster

•Commissioners: *Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver; alt: Patten, Thornewill - Last heard May 14, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed their appreciation for the revisions made to the application. Abby highlighted the importance of the reduced height, particularly given the structure's visibility at the corner. She suggested that the Juliet balcony with French doors on the south elevation looked overly busy compared to a previous design with two windows and recommended reverting to that simpler option. Additionally, she raised concerns about the deck on the west elevation, proposing it should end neatly against the house for a quieter appearance. Connie expressed general approval of the changes, while Stephen echoed Abby's concerns about the Juliet balcony, linking it to potential visibility from a proposed driveway that might run to Old Russell's Way. He supported the idea of returning to the original two-window design for better aesthetics. Overall, the board was largely in agreement on the need for further refinement.

MOTION: Motion to approve going back to the prior which was for two windows with exhibit A made by Camp. Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten – *carried unanimously.*

5. More Than Enough LLC 30 Russells Way New Guest House 77/8.1 CWA

•NEW BUSINESS 05/14/2024

DISCUSSION: The board expressed significant concerns regarding the height and verticality of the proposed structure, particularly noting that while 25 feet isn't inherently problematic, the low pitch of the gable roof creates excessive sidewall height, contributing to a towering appearance. The depth of the covered porch and the fascia beam height were also highlighted as issues, with members requesting a cross-section of the structure for clarity in future iterations. Additionally, questions arose about the extensive retaining walls indicated on the site plan, with a desire for more information on their design and placement. Overall, the comments reflected a consensus on the need to address the verticality, porch dimensions, and retaining wall considerations in the proposal.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions and a cross section viewing the gable made by Welch.
Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten – carried unanimously.

6. Behrend, Dean & Maryellen 12.5 Pequot St Main house 80/20 Mike McKay
• *Commissioners: Pohl, Paul, Oliver, Camp, Coombs; alt: Patten – Last heard April 30, 2024*

DISCUSSION: The board members provided a range of feedback on the proposed infill structure, expressing appreciation for the simplifications made while highlighting concerns about overall size and massing in relation to the neighborhood. Val noted the need for a more traditional design of the roof walk, while Connie questioned the addition of an exterior fireplace and expressed that the design might be overly complex for the area. Joe praised the direction of the gambrel roof but suggested further adjustments, particularly regarding the roof walk and dormer placement. He emphasized the importance of providing comparative elevations and reconsidering the visibility of the garage. Abby echoed concerns about massing and suggested using six-over-one windows for a more cohesive shingle style. The board collectively agreed on the need for revisions to the chimney design and column details, with some advocating for shingled bases to reduce formality. Overall, the board's comments focused on refining the design to better fit the historical context and aesthetics of Nantucket.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus expressed concerns regarding the proposed infill structure, emphasizing that while she appreciates the simpler details, the gambrel roof design is not suitable for the neighborhood's context. She noted that the chimney material should adhere to the guidelines outlined in "Building with Nantucket in Mind," specifying that it should be brick. Backus also requested revisions to the front door to ensure the pane sizes match the six-over-six double-hung windows and urged the commission to review the previously submitted elevations for the northwest and south sides to identify changes. Additionally, she recommended reconsidering the design of the main home to eliminate the garage, suggesting a reevaluation of that aspect of the program.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Camp.
Pohl, Paul, Oliver, Camp, Patten – carried unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS 05/28/2024

1. Thomas & Kelly Donovan 104 Surfside New Dwelling 67/349 EMDA

DISCUSSION: The board expressed general support for the proposed house, noting its suitability for the location and appreciating the low elevation and natural color palette. Angus commented on the anomalies but felt they wouldn't be noticeable unless the lot was cleared, which isn't allowed due to a buffer owned by the town. Ray echoed similar sentiments, stating that while some windows might not meet guidelines, their low and screened nature mitigated concerns. Connie acknowledged the atypical architectural elements but agreed that their placement, being screened, was appropriate. Overall, the board found the design acceptable given its context and visibility limitations.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted.
Patten, Pohl, MacLeod, Welch, Oliver – carried unanimously.

2. EDP c/o Peter Carey 28 Union St Color change 42.3.2/179 Betsy Carey

DISCUSSION: The board members generally expressed approval of the proposed Coventry Gray color, with some noting that they did not perceive it as blue but rather as gray. Val, Abby, Angus, and others indicated they were fine with the choice, while one member preferred Wickham Gray, which is slightly lighter. Overall, the consensus leaned towards accepting the Coventry Gray, acknowledging that it would complement the white trim well despite concerns about it appearing darker once applied.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus provided historical context for the property, noting that it dates to circa 1806 and is attributed to Francis Barker, a fur trader who built the structure on the east side of Union Street. While a circa 1890 black-and-white photograph shows the house, the exact colors remain unknown, though the clabber is described as grayish with white trim and the door as a darker shade. Holly expressed no concerns about

the proposed changes but recommended that the commission include the historical information and construction data in the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) documentation if approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group expressed concern that the proposed Coventry Gray color appeared too blue, describing it as a very light blue that seems unusual for a downtown setting. He suggested that shades closer to gray would be more appropriate for the location.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Oliver.

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

3. Mark Cook
CS

37 Cato Ln

Rooftop Solar 56/40

Karen Alence

DISCUSSION: The board members expressed general agreement on the proposed solar panels, noting their minimal visibility from Hiawasse, as they are situated on the lower roof plane and not on the front of the house. Carrie and Ray voiced no concerns, while Angus and Abby also supported the proposal but acknowledged it as atypical for a garage-front layout. One member raised concerns about the contrasting gray roof and suggested planting a deciduous tree near the driveway to visually screen the solar panels from Hiawasse. Overall, the board was mostly in favor, with a recommendation for the addition of landscaping to enhance visual appeal.

MOTION: Motion to approve subject to exhibit A made by MacLeod.

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

4. Linda Meredith

3 Whero whero

Fence

67/471

Self

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the proposed fence, noting its extensive length but minimal visibility from surrounding areas, which led to a consensus in favor of the design. Abby expressed a preference for a traditional wood fence over vinyl, emphasizing the extensive nature of the installation. Angus highlighted the atypical horizontal rail in the middle of the two sections and suggested that removing it for a continuous board might improve the appearance. Stephen agreed with the lack of visibility and deemed the fence acceptable for the location, stating that the guideline for alternating panels might not be necessary due to existing vegetation. Overall, the board was supportive, with minor suggestions for improvement.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Linda Williams, who is familiar with the property, emphasized that there is a substantial no-disturb buffer between the 40B development and the yard, which cannot be cut. She noted that this buffer, along with existing screening and two houses nearby, makes the fence nearly invisible from the 40B area. Linda highlighted her experience on the property, stating that even with the fence's design, whether it includes the horizontal piece or not, it remains out of sight from all angles.

MOTION: Motion to approve that it includes a request a couple images of the fence after installation. Camp, Pohl, MacLeod, Welch, Oliver (aye)

5. Karen Mehra

10 Orange

Fence Replace 42.3.1/103

Self

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the proposed fence related to a historic property, emphasizing the need for a complete application that includes height specifications, materials, and a detailed site plan. Members expressed support for replicating the fence configuration shown in a 1936 photograph, with some suggesting a return to a picket design on Stone Alley for historical accuracy. Concerns were raised about the current fence's height and design, particularly its angular jog and lack of uniformity, with recommendations for adjustments to improve its appearance. Overall, the board agreed on the importance of providing a comprehensive application to facilitate future reviews and potential approvals.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus provided historical context for the property, noting that the house, built around 1802 for Captain Nathaniel K. Y., is recognized in a 1970s historic survey. She suggested that a detailed site plan showing the proposed location of the six-foot fence, measuring 40 to 42 feet long, would be beneficial. Holly referenced historic photos that indicate a board fence on top of a stone wall and questioned whether the current proposal replicates this previous design. She highlighted the importance of understanding the transition from a picket fence, which is typical for the Old Historic District, to a board fence, and emphasized the need for more information and the site plan for clarity.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from HSAG expressed concerns about the height of the proposed fence, particularly as it will sit atop a wall, making it seem tall. He acknowledged that if the existing fence has been pre-approved, the new proposal would merely extend that. However, he noted that he might have missed details about the material of the fence, inquiring specifically about the type of wood being used, whether it is pressure-treated, cedar, or another option.

MOTION: Motion to hold for more information and complete application made by Camp.

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

6. Christopher Hurd 25 E Lincoln Ave Move demo 42.4.1/2 EMDA

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the proposed demolition and rebuild of a circa 1949-1950 mid-century cottage, expressing mixed views. Ray noted that the previously approved renovation obscured the original structure, suggesting that with the full demolition, there might be merit in re-evaluating the design of the new building. Abby appreciated elements of the design but called for enhancements to the east and west elevations, while Angus agreed with the need for adjustments. However, another member cautioned against requiring changes to the design as a condition of approval, highlighting potential legal issues. They emphasized the importance of documenting the structure's current condition and maintaining clarity regarding the transition from a renovation to a complete rebuild. Overall, the board acknowledged the complexities of the situation and the necessity for thorough documentation and communication in the approval process.

STAFF COMMENT: Holly Backus clarified that the COA currently under review pertains to a mid-century cottage built between 1949 and 1950, which has undergone previous additions in the 1970s and 1980s. She noted that the age referenced in the COA is incorrect and based on tax assessor data. Holly confirmed that the intention is to demolish the existing structure and replace it with the newly approved design. She recommended that if the board approves the demolition, it should also revise the previously issued COA to accurately reflect that the new construction will replace the existing structure for clarity and historical purposes.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland, from HSAG, expressed concern regarding the design of the new structure, noting that it was initially approved as an addition and renovation, which allowed for some unusual massing and a front door that is nearly invisible under a sideways-facing porch. Now that the project involves a full demolition, he suggested that the design should be reconsidered to better conform to expectations for a structure facing East Lincoln Street. He urged the board to evaluate whether the proposed design is appropriate for the location, given that it will be a completely new building.

MOTION: Motion to approve the move off demo of the existing and to reaffirm the previous approval with a letter form as stated prior in the meeting and attachments made by Oliver.

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

7. Francis Baskett 2 Charter Window replacement 42.3.2/167 Seth Gottlieb
HOLD

8. Mahn, Fredrick 50 Eel Point Rd Deer fence 32/25.1 Atlantic

DISCUSSION: The board expressed concerns about the proposed fence's placement and height. Ray noted that the fence runs almost entirely along the property line, which raises issues since the board prefers setbacks to allow for vegetation screening rather than relying on town or neighboring plants. Val highlighted concerns about visibility from Eel Point Road, given the spotty vegetation in the area, and Angus echoed the need for a setback, questioning the standard distance for vegetation buffer. Connie also found the proposed 8-foot height excessive. Overall, the board emphasized the importance of a setback to enhance the aesthetic and ecological impact of the fence.

MOTION: Motion to approve with the fence post being painted invisible green, the fencing will run along the front & side yard setback lines. On Eel Point Roadside, aka the front, there will be supplemental vegetation added to make the fence invisible from Eel Point Road. Noted in the approval that this is a test case to see how effective this method will be making these fences invisible. (By Pohl)

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

9. Stuckey, Darla 22 Woodland Dr Fence 79/207 Self

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the proposed fence's location and height, emphasizing the need for it to be set back from the road. Angus suggested that the fence should start at least halfway back from the house. Carrie agreed, noting that understanding the neighbor's house location would help determine an appropriate setback for privacy without an 8-foot fence being too close to the road. Joe requested an updated site plan that includes the neighbor's house and existing trees to assess the best placement for the fence while maintaining vegetation. He also recommended transitioning the fence height to a lower level as it approaches the road. Ray and Steve both echoed the sentiment that the fence should not extend fully to the front property line and should instead be set back to

prevent it from becoming an eyesore while still providing privacy. Overall, the board agreed that adjustments are necessary for compliance with guidelines and to enhance the visual impact.

MOTION: Motion for approval subject to exhibit A made by Thornewill.

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

10. Chervin, Stan & Erin 4 Meadow View Raise roof create 2nd floor 56/149
Sanne Payne

DISCUSSION: The board expressed general approval of the proposed design but recommended some adjustments for better architectural balance. Val suggested slightly lowering the secondary mass to create a clearer differentiation between the main and secondary masses. Angus echoed this concern, noting that the current massing appears too uniform, particularly on the facade and north elevation. Connie recommended examining the door trim and window sizes to address the shingled space issue and proposed dropping the left side mass by about a foot to achieve a more aesthetically pleasing silhouette. The board also discussed enhancing the trim around the door to reflect a more traditional Nantucket style. Overall, they emphasized the importance of maintaining visual harmony in the design while making minor adjustments.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus noted that the structure in question is a circa 1981 non-contributing Cape, emphasizing the need to include accurate dates on the Certificates of Appropriateness (COAs). She expressed concern about the proposed addition of shingle space between the window and door headers, as it alters the character of the Cape. Additionally, she highlighted the absence of dimensions regarding the height from the ground to the eave and the proposed pitch of the second floor. Lastly, she raised questions about the visibility of the atypical, shed dormer on the rear, recommending that its design adhere to the principles of building with Nantucket in Mind.

MOTION: Motion to approve through staff made by Oliver.

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

11. '13 AND 15 Nancy Ann LLC' 13-15 Nancy Ann Mixed use building 68/137&138
Emeritus LTD

DISCUSSION: The board expressed significant concerns about the design of the proposed building, emphasizing that its large size and uniform eave heights contribute to a stark, industrial appearance that lacks a human scale. Members noted the shallow roof pitch and the need for architectural differentiation, suggesting more open space and varied design elements to enhance the aesthetic. While recognizing the building's function in a designated industrial area, they stressed that it should not compromise the visual character of the neighborhood, particularly given its proximity to residential structures. Overall, the consensus was that the design requires a thoughtful redesign to better align with community guidelines and expectations.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Pohl.

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

12. Schiable, Cherrie 3 Maxey Rd Fenestration Porch & Chimney 40/106 CWA

DISCUSSION: The board's comments were largely positive regarding the proposed revisions, with Angus stating that the changes seemed benign and represented an improvement. Abby echoed this sentiment, expressing that she had no concerns about the updates. Overall, the board appeared to support the revisions and felt they enhanced the design.

MOTION: Motion to approve with chimney corbeling made by Oliver.

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

13. Ack 71 Orange St LLC 71 Orange St New picket fence 55.4.1/167
LINK

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the proposed type two fence, agreeing that a height of 32 inches is preferable to 38 inches. Members expressed no concerns about the fence itself but raised issues regarding the gate's visibility and location. There was consensus that if the gate were positioned closer to Orange Street, it would improve the design by minimizing visibility of the atypical stone wall and patio from Silver Street. Tori confirmed that the previously approved six-foot privet hedge has been installed, which helps screen visibility during summer but loses leaves in winter. The board supported relocating the gate to a position that allows for a clear walking path and minimizes the visibility of the stone wall, ensuring that the design aligns with earlier approvals while enhancing the aesthetic.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus noted that a typical Nantucket-style two-cat picket fence is appropriate for the Orange Street and Fish Lots area. She referenced a previous hardscaping approval

from 2021 that included a driveway apron and patio, alongside a private hedge along Silver Street, although the hedge was not installed. Given that some elements of the approval have been implemented, she recommended incorporating these changes into an updated site plan. Backus also raised concerns about the visibility of the installed hardscaping materials and inquired about what vegetation would be used to screen them, highlighting the importance of maintaining the area's historic character.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from HSAG expressed no major concerns about the type two fence but recommended reducing its height from 38 inches to around 32 inches. He noted that the proposed stone wall, visible from Silver Street, is quite unusual in materials and design, raising the question of whether it was previously approved. Rowland suggested checking past approvals to confirm the wall's status before allowing an opening that would increase its visibility. He also pointed out that the earlier approval included dense cypress tree screening along Silver Street, which has since been replaced by privet, further complicating the visual impact of the current proposal.

**MOTION: Motion to approve subject to exhibit A made by Pohl.
Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Paul, Pohl (aye)**

VII. OLD BUSINESS 06/04/2024

1. Servants Heart Ministries	42 Monohansett	Revision	79/55	Val
------------------------------	----------------	----------	-------	-----

Oliver

- **Commissioners: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Paul, Patten – Last heard May 14, 2024**

DISCUSSION: The board expressed strong support for the revisions to the proposed building, praising elements like the cupola and the six-over-six windows for their Nantucket character. Members appreciated the clever use of trellises and arch forms, with some suggesting additional clerestory windows to enhance the design. While acknowledging that the structure is not a typical residential building, they recognized its appropriateness as a religious structure and discussed the potential for a wider, taller window in the steeple to emphasize its architectural significance. Overall, the board felt the changes addressed their concerns and aligned with the building's intended purpose, marking a positive step in their approval process.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Abutter Matthew Peele acknowledged the building's religious purpose but emphasized that it will also serve as a year-round residence for several people. He expressed concern that this dual function should be considered in the design discussions, as it impacts the community. Peele appreciated the efforts made regarding the building's siting and its potential to minimize noise and disruption, particularly in relation to music and events that may take place. Overall, he urged the board to keep the residential aspect in mind while evaluating the project.

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

2. Squam Holdings LLC	31 Squam Rd	Reno add move 21/3	Botticelli & Pohl
-----------------------	-------------	--------------------	-------------------

- **Commissioners: Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill; alt: Patten, Paul – Last heard May 21, 2024**

DISCUSSION: The board expressed appreciation for the changes made to the building's design, particularly noting improvements to the east elevation and the reduction of glazing. Members voiced concerns about the remaining fenestration, suggesting further reductions to enhance the building's integration with its surroundings. While some advocated for the return of picture windows seen in the original estate, others recognized the need for operational windows and proposed a compromise by reducing the number of doors in the connectors from four to two. There was a consensus to approve this adjustment and revisit the glazing options after the building is relocated, with the understanding that visibility from the beach should be carefully considered. Overall, the board aimed for a balance between aesthetic appeal and practicality in the design.

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation planner Holly Backus acknowledged the historical significance of the structure as part of the Hutton Family Estate from the 1930s and expressed appreciation for the changes made to the proposed design, including the context photos and the existing conditions. She noted the proposed demolition plan, which retains the existing main mass with the fireplace while removing the smaller flanking masses. However, Backus raised concerns about the proposed glazing, specifically questioning the percentage of glazing in the design, indicating that she seeks clarification on this aspect.

**MOTION: Motion for exhibit A showing the four door connectors change to two doors made by Oliver.
Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten (aye)**

Motion to adjourn made by Thornewill at 8:31pm. Carried unanimously.