



Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 16, 2024

4 Fairgrounds Road and Remote Participation via Zoom
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

Commissioners: Stephen Welch (Chair), Ray Pohl (Vice-chair), Abby Camp, Valorie Oliver, Angus McLeod
Associate Commissioners: Connie Patten, Carrie Thornewill

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Welch called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm

Staff in Attendance:	Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist; Sarah Johnson , Administrative Specialist; Holly Backus , Preservation Planner
Attending Members:	Stephen Welch (Chair), Ray Pohl (Vice-Chair), Abbey Camp, Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod, Joe Paul, Connie Patten
Remote Participants:	Carrie Thornewill

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to approve the agenda (Made by: Pohl)
Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod (Aye)

I. CONSENT

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Garran Jennifer	36 Pocomo Rd	Renew COA Garage	14/79 NAG	RP
2. Garran Jennifer	36 Pocomo Rd	Renew COA Main House	14/79 NAG	RP
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve Consents. (Made by: Oliver)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod (Aye)			

II. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Ack MWG LLC	8 Silver Street	New Dwelling	55.4.1/197	EMDA SW
2. Matt O'Connor	22 Tashama	Pool fence	55/451	KMLD SW
3. Brian & Christine LLC	9 Salti Way	Garage	20/51.1	JB Studio SW
4. Eric Summer TR	46 Hummock Pond Rd	Outdoor kitchen, patio	56/288	LINK CP
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod			
Alternates:	Paul, Patten			
Recused:	Oliver			
Abstained:	Camp			
Public Comments:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve Consents with Conditions (Made by: Pohl)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul, Patten			

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. TON 19 Waite Dr Multifamily DU 67/927 J & J Contractors

Voting:	Welch (Chair), Pohl, Paul, Camp, Oliver
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Parker Helwig
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Requested that the beam underneath the porch be applied not only to the front porch but also to the side porch, on both the first and second floors. - While the white sash color is acceptable, there was concern that the white on all the doors might be too much. Paul - Agreed with Ray's comments regarding the door. - Expressed concern about the required railing by code, suggesting it should be a guardrail. - Recommended matching the guardrail to the design of the ramp, opting for a lighter rail. - Encouraged exploring options to eliminate the rail, as it feels out of place floating there. Camp - Eave overhang appears shallow; suggested extending it to better fit the shingle style. - Trellis on fire stairs improves design, making it less like a tenement building. - If the window sashes are white, recommended the door color be dark green or black. Oliver - Clarified that the eave band should integrate with the window, rather than sitting on top of it. Welch - No ballister required at the two-step locations; questioned the need for a guardrail at those locations due to height and riser requirements, which may not trigger the threshold. - Suggested downsizing the handrail, as it appears too wide (at least 4 inches), which doesn't meet building code for profile size. - Agreed with Ray on the beam fascia at the side porch, noting that the trees are important for screening the overall mass and should be included in any approval. - While the sash is white, expressed preference for Essex Green for both the sashes and doors, believing it to be more appropriate and attractive for the building. - Eliminate balls at first-floor entries. - Adjust guardrail posts and profile where possible. - Incorporate trees for screening as shown in the site plan. - Use Essex Green for both sash and doors.
Motion:	Motion to approve per Exhibit A. (Made by: Paul)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Paul, Camp, Oliver, Welch (Aye)

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

1. Ack Mid Island LLC	18-26 Sparks Ave	Rev Bldg A	55/307-308	LFW
2. Ack Mid Island LLC	18-26 Sparks Ave	Rev Bldg B	55/307-308	LFW

Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Camp, Paul, Patten
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Linda Williams, George Bergs
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Emphasized that the applicants have been responsive to the Commission's previous requests. - In Mr. Cohen's absence, noted that he had mentioned landscaping and hardscaping mechanisms would need to go back to the Planning Board for review as part of the MCD. - Requested that, if the board is inclined to approve this evening, the approval should include a condition for staff to follow up with Planning staff on landscaping and hardscaping as shown in the plans, ensuring it is included in the MCD.
Public Comments:	Val Oliver - Noted that there were no significant changes since the last meeting, only minor details, and that no changes to massing were planned. - Appreciated the 3D scans for helping visualize the current and proposed structures, which reinforced the need for smaller buildings to fit within the established neighborhood. - Acknowledged that while Mid Island patterns are evolving, it's important to respect the existing neighborhood character rather than drastically change it. - Commended the progress of the project since February 2021 but noted that further refinement is needed. - Recognized that larger structures exist in the area, but they are more municipal in nature, not fitting the mixed residential-commercial vernacular. - Emphasized that the project sets a precedent for future development, so it should be scrutinized to preserve Nantucket's small-town quality. - Suggested breaking the structure into smaller buildings and incorporating one- and one-and-a-half-story masses for a more traditional look. - Expressed concerns about the portrayal of parking in 3D images, requesting more realistic depictions of cars. - Urged fellow HDC Commissioners not to feel pressured into approval if the project is not right, emphasizing the need to address reservations from the last meeting. - Cautioned those swayed by housing components to carefully consider the impact, stressing that guidelines should not be overlooked to accommodate a building program. - Concluded by reaffirming the importance of upholding Nantucket's historic character and values in the face of housing needs. - Noted that the program (number of units) has not changed over time. - Suggested that reducing the number of units could allow for design changes, such as eliminating dormers or adjusting the scale. Graydon Ambrose - As a realtor, acknowledged that the project complies with CMI zoning constraints, and now it comes to the HDC for approval. - Referred to the HDC mission statement, highlighting its focus on preserving

	Nantucket's historic character and promoting the general welfare of residents. - Emphasized the importance of providing spaces for year-round community gathering, noting that the project offers a healthy alternative and helps disperse traffic from downtown. - Expressed concern that limiting the project could hinder the creation of much-needed year-round housing. - Highlighted the positive impact of amenities like the bowling alley, which will be beneficial to the community. - Stated that, aside from Ms. Oliver's concerns, they have not heard any opposition to the project. - Advocated for the project's approval, believing it will be a significant asset to the community. John Fones - Questioned why the building needs to be three stories and expressed concern that it feels too large, especially compared to the nearby Stop and Shop. - Suggested that the building could be toned down while still maintaining the bowling alley and other amenities. - Inquired whether parking issues have been resolved, noting the need for additional spaces due to the 32 two-bedroom apartments, which would likely require more cars. - Suggested that reducing the size of the building could create more parking spaces, especially given the busy area. - Acknowledged the improvements made but suggested reducing the height to make the building less imposing. Angus MacLeod - Acknowledged that the project has come a long way but remains concerned about the height and the third-floor dormers. - Noted that the dormers on the third floor still haven't been adequately addressed and continue to be a major concern. - Pointed out that some of the tallest structures in the area do not have the full use of a third story, suggesting the project could work with fewer dormers. - Recommended exploring design adjustments to reduce the number of dormers and better fit the structure within the neighborhood.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - In favor of community development but concerned about the project's scale. - Suggested the massing should better align with nearby buildings like Housefitters and Combies, as the current design feels overwhelming. - Raised concerns about the height (36 ft on the north, 33 ft overall) being out of scale for the area. - Criticized the three dormers on Sparks Avenue, which make the building appear larger. - Noted that the large parking lot and associated traffic could be problematic, especially given the multi-use nature of the development. - Pointed out the incongruity with nearby residential ranch-style homes, suggesting the project feels more appropriate for a location like Cape Cod Mall. - Recommended reducing the size of the project to better fit the neighborhood. - Stated that the massing and scale haven't changed, which was a key concern from the beginning. - Reminded the group that the initial request was for three buildings, but now the design presents two large masses instead.

	Welch - Emphasized the importance of landscaping, particularly trees, for visual screening and reducing the building's massing. Acknowledged that oversized trees may not be feasible but should remain a priority. - Clarified that the application is focused on architectural elements, not the building's use, and stressed the HDC's role in ensuring designs fit Nantucket's historic character. - Highlighted that Nantucket's roof planes are key to its architectural identity and should be carefully considered. - Criticized the project as "overfill" rather than "infill," noting that its massing and design have not changed significantly in recent applications. - Raised concerns about the homogeneous design, which doesn't fit the surrounding area, especially compared to structures like Stop and Shop. - Argued that large, uniform structures are appropriate only for essential services, not mixed-use developments. - Stated that the building's scale is too large for the area and will likely be perceived as such. - Recommended providing renderings of the roof color to better assess its impact on the streetscape. Paul - Appreciated the streetscape and cross-section views, which effectively illustrate the project's scale and perspective. - Noted that the buildings are taller than the surrounding context, but the parking area provides a buffer, preventing the structure from being directly adjacent to other buildings. - Emphasized that the street perspective is key, as most people will experience the site as they move across it, not from a static, longitudinal view. - Acknowledged that the scale is not entirely congruent with the context but agreed that the reversed roof direction (with the gable not forward) was a positive move. - Suggested reducing the number of dormers on the street-facing side to simplify the roofline, as there are currently eight dormers (six facing the street). Proposed squeezing them or reducing their number to improve the roof plane's appearance. - Stated that the project would better align with the neighboring context if the third floor was removed entirely, though not requesting this change outright. - Recommended pushing back the dormers on the roof plane to reduce their visual impact, as the current design makes the roof appear overrun by dormers. - Concluded that simplifying the dormers would be a positive adjustment to the design. Patten - Acknowledged that the focus is on the building's architecture, not the use (bowling alley, apartments, etc.), and found the design appealing overall. - Expressed concern about the dormers facing Sparks Avenue, though didn't offer a specific solution. Echoed others' thoughts that while the building has come a long way, the dormers remain an issue. - Noted the building's height (36 ft), which is the tallest in the area, and compared it to the height of other nearby structures. - Mentioned the varying ceiling heights on the floors (9 ft on one, 8 ft on the others), which might explain the need for dormers, but concluded that overall, there were no major issues with the design presented. Pohl - Agreed with the concerns about the dormers, particularly in the perspectives, and
--	---

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	acknowledged that the building(s) will be large. - Expressed uncertainty about how much is "enough" in terms of scale, reiterating concerns raised in previous meetings. - Highlighted that even those in favor of the project have reservations about the dormers. - Stated that there are ways to make the building feel less massive, and many of these suggestions have already been discussed. - Expressed reluctance to be a tiebreaking vote and emphasized the need for further revisions before proceeding.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions with options for shingles, illustrations, and sample boards for both Building A and Building B. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Paul, Patten

IV. NEW BUSINESS 05/14/2024

1. Cohen Steven L Trust 19 Austin Locke MH Dormer Rev 82/57 Shelter 7

Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Jason Olbres
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Paul)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul (Aye)

V. OLD BUSINESS 06/04/2024

1. 88 Pocomo Trust 88 Pocomo Rd Rev 5885 15/42 Emeritus LTD

Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Matt MacEachern
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noticed that Matt's office has submitted an application referencing the previous Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) from 2022, which outlines revisions to the building design. Matt has indicated changes using red lines, but it might be helpful to have a clearer distinction between what was previously approved and what is now being revised. - I recommend requesting that Matt provide a more definitive breakdown of what has been constructed versus what is being changed, especially since this is being presented as a "revision."
Public Comments:	Graham Goldsmith - Expressed concern about the excessive amount of fill used in the previous project, where multiple truckloads were brought in, raising the grade significantly. - Questioned whether this should be considered in the current project, as it feels excessive and wasteful.

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	- Acknowledged that the previous project resulted in a good house, but the scale of filling and rebuilding seems out of control and might need a different approach moving forward.
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - The existing building qualifies as a "structure" under zoning, not a "dwelling," which is why a demolition permit is required, rather than going through the demolition delay process typically used for dwellings. - In cases where a historic structure is rendered uninhabitable (e.g., through neglect), it's still considered a "structure" and would require a demo permit under the HDC's purview, even though it's no longer a habitable dwelling. - My main concern is with the fenestration on the first floor, particularly the oversized transom lights above the three doors. These are out of scale relative to the door lights and feel non-traditional. - Additionally, the window layout on the west elevation doesn't seem to align with the interior program, especially in the living and porch areas. The fenestration elements don't relate well to the French doors or other windows on the second floor. - The bay windows might be a bit of a stretch, but they could work. Overall, I think the other elevations, especially the ones that are not as visible, are less of an issue. It's really the west elevation that concerns me. - Otherwise, I find the massing and overall design to be appropriate and handsome. The other fenestration elements are attractive and fit well. - Mention the use of turtle glass to reduce night light pollution. - Note its relevance for future projects. - Refer to a previous structure with less fenestration that required turtle glass. Pohl - While the building may have a Certificate of Occupancy due to prior work, there are many old homes on Nantucket without a CFO, and they are still considered structures. - If an existing building is completely removed, with a new foundation and framing put in place, it's essentially a demolition and rebuild, not a renovation. The entire structure is being replaced. - Agrees with Joe Paul's perspective on the design. - Thinks the proposal is well done. - Considers it to be more benign than the previous approval. Paul - The previous approval still matters, especially regarding the west elevation. The original design had 16 French doors on the first floor and 6 on the second, but the new proposal reduces the glass area, which diminishes the intended openness, particularly on the second floor. - I agree with Steven's concerns about the transoms, though they're somewhat mitigated by the pergola shown in the rendering. - The north elevation features a dormer that may not meet setback guidelines but overlaps two masses, so it could be permissible. - Overall, I support the revisions. Matt's improvements from the initial design, including color adjustments and a less formal appearance, are appropriate. - Oliver - No new points to add beyond what's already been discussed.

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	- Normally, a 6-foot bump-out would seem unnecessary, but in this case, it helps define the gable. - The bump-out may not be noticeable from a distance. Camp - Agree with the penetration (likely referring to fenestration). - The pergola helps offset the transoms. - Recommend reducing French doors and glazing, particularly on the West, South, and possibly North elevations. - The East elevation seems fine and traditional.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

VI. OLD BUSINESS 06/04/2024 VIEW

1. Michele Kolb	27 N Liberty St	Rev 1051 Door	41/452	Michele Kolb
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Michele Kolb			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Believes the previously approved 12-light kick panel is more appropriate.			
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Acknowledgment that visibility is a key issue for the project. - The Landbank is planning to significantly improve and expand trails within Lily Pond Park; a new trail will run northwest of existing pathways, near the back of 27 North Liberty. - Wetland restoration and invasive species management will be part of the project, likely improving visibility within the park. - The proposed door may become more visible from within the park due to these changes. - The proposed door is deemed inappropriate and cannot be realistically modified to meet the building guidelines. - The originally approved two-section French door with kick panels should be retained.			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Agreed with Holly's statement that the 12-light kick panel is more appropriate. - Decisions should be based on legally tenable grounds, not on speculation about future events. - In the spirit of compromise, a suggestion was made to consider vegetative screening along the property line for the future. - The structure is historically significant, having been debated at length. - While visual screening cannot be required for something not visible, the commission asked for it to be voluntarily offered. Paul - The proposal is acceptable due to the limited visibility. Camp - The speaker walks the area daily and sees the back of the building from the boardwalk, so they disagree with the limited visibility assessment.			

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	- Prefers the original French doors with the kick panel. Oliver - The speaker prefers the original design over the 12-light door, as the pane configuration is completely wrong. Pohl - The speaker believes the project is not visible. - They pointed out that the property has a large wetland in the back, and cutting vegetation in wetlands is not allowed. - While a lawn in the wetland was previously allowed, it wouldn't be approved today. - Wetland vegetation surrounding the lawn cannot be disturbed. - The speaker is okay with the proposal.
Motion:	Motion to approve with the six-light per door panel configuration, subject to the as-built fee of the application, and plant some young screening material as close to the rear border as the applicant can. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Paul (Aye) Camp (Opposed)

VII. NEW BUSINESS 06/11/2024

1. 41 Hulbert Trust	41 Hulbert Ave	Rev 9472	29/18	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Camp, Paul, Oliver			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - For the record, the project is a 2005 infill within the BR Point neighborhood. - The speaker agrees with Lisa's proposal of option B, as it is more symmetrical. - While there is still a lot of glazing on this elevation, option B is considered a better compromise than the previously submitted design. - The speaker also agrees with retaining a double door instead of a single, as it maintains symmetry.			
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Feels that option B is the best.			
Commissioner Comments:	MacLeod - Agrees that option B is the best. Paul - Agrees that option B is the best. Oliver - Agrees that option B is the best. Camp - Agrees that option B is the best. Welch - Agrees that option B is the best.			
Motion:	Motion to approve option B as submitted (Made by: MacLeod)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, MacLeod, Camp, Paul, Oliver (Aye)			

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

2. Cheese & Crackers LLC 39 Cliff Rd Demo Dwelling 42.4.4/3 MCA

Voting:	Welch, Thornewill, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Doug Mills
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - The structure is pre-1881, with an HDC survey on file. - It was split from 41A Cliff Road in 1915 and later enlarged, demolishing earlier sections. - The Tax Assessor's records incorrectly date the structure to the 1990s, but the HDC survey and photos match the current structure. - A sister structure next door also matches the one in question. - Demolishing a contributing structure over 140 years old is considered highly inappropriate.
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - The speaker fully agrees with Holly's statement. Lisa Botticelli - The speaker recalls that the new structure was based on an existing Gambrel that was previously there.
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Hold for additional information (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Thornewill, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod (Aye)

3. Cheese & Crackers LLC 39 Cliff Rd New Dwelling 42.4.4/3 MCA

Voting:	Welch, Thornewill, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Doug Mills
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to track with the Demo Dwelling application. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Thornewill, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod (Aye)

4. 85 Orange LLV 85 Orange front Demo structure GARAGE 55.4.1/27 self

Voting:	Welch (Chair), Camp, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	PJ Antonic
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Reviewing Miss Williams' 4181 L application, it was noted that her extensive history research, including Sandborn maps from 1923 and 1938/57 aerials, shows the garage/workshop predates 1955. - There is no HDC survey on file, as indicated in her documentation.

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	- Photographs of the structure's interior show older trim, windows, siding, beams, and sheathing, suggesting the building contributes to the character of the OMD and neighborhood. - It would be preferable to retrofit the existing structure for the proposed dwelling rather than demolishing it, unless significant rot makes retrofitting unfeasible.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - The speaker notes that they did not have the information Holly just mentioned but agrees with her comments.
Commissioner Comments:	MacLeod - Agrees with Holly's comments. Camp - If demolition occurs, the speaker would like to see a similar structure to maintain the historic streetscape and relevance. Paul - Nothing else to add. Pohl - Discussed the renderings and size of the garage. Welch - The speaker is okay with the proposal, subject to the typical approach. - The new structure should reflect the profile of the previous one. - Reusing historic materials, where possible, would be beneficial and consistent with past practices on Lincoln A and Basset Road. - The speaker expresses concern and requests photo documentation of the structure's condition, especially if it won't be reutilized. This could be a condition of approval.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Paul, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod (Aye)

5. 85 Orange LLV	85 Orange Rear	Dormer	55.4.1/27	self
Voting:	Welch (Chair), Paul, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	PJ Antonic			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - The speaker previously mentioned that it would be nice to renovate the existing garage. - While appreciating the scale of the new structure, the speaker feels the windows are oversized. - The dormer should comply with building guidelines and not fill the entire space. - While acknowledging the nod to the two-over-two windows on the main historic structure, six-over-six windows would be more appropriate and are recommended instead.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - If the garage is fully demolished and replaced with a new building, it will likely need to be reshaped to meet zoning setbacks. - The Gable Forward design does not fit well into this historic neighborhood.			

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	- The speaker suggests a smaller, shorter three-bay facade, similar to those found on York and Prospect Streets. - An eave-forward design would be more appropriate than a Gable-forward design. - The speaker agrees with six-over-six windows, but the dormers do not appear appropriate. - More accurate drawings are needed, as the current plans lack details like trim.
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - The current elevations make it appear as if the building is on a slab, but the plan shows a 4-foot crawl space, which is a positive development. - The door threshold appears to be on the ground, which seems to be a drawing issue that can be corrected. - Elevating the first-floor windows will help, as they currently appear to sink into the ground; the next iteration will likely show the door raised by 1.5 to 2 feet. - The speaker supports Mickey's suggestion of an eave-forward design, as the gable-forward design feels too aggressive. - Switching the building's orientation would be beneficial. Camp - The speaker feels the Gable-forward design is off in proportion, with a shallow pitch and vertical fenestration that doesn't feel cottage-like. - While the scale is good, if starting from scratch, the speaker would prefer an eave-forward design. - The dormers need to be correctly rendered and proportioned to match the style of a small, historic cottage. MacLeod - The speaker agrees with most of the comments made. - The dormers do not meet the guidelines and would need to be significantly reduced. - The eave-forward design is preferred. - The roof pitch works for a shop or garage but is too shallow for a dwelling. Paul - The speaker has nothing further to add. - Corrected drawings will allow for a more detailed discussion. - The renderings appear more to scale and more representative of reality than the 2D elevations. - The speaker will wait for the next iteration. Welch - The speaker agrees that better representation of scale is needed in the drawings. - It's advised not to add CAD layers for roof materials (e.g., shingles) if they're not accurate in proportion or texture, as this can detract from the design and presentation. - While the orientation of the Gable may be adjusted, the speaker suggests that transitioning away from the original profile could open up new design possibilities. - If reducing the scale of the existing structure, the speaker believes it may result in an overly simple "Cape" style, which could conflict with the area's character. - The speaker proposes that if the structure is going to be altered, it should take a more fitting direction with a scaled-down version of a home that aligns with the area's design vocabulary, including roof planes, massing, and fenestration. - If the building no longer reflects the long-standing character of the area, it may open the door for more significant changes.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Paul, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod (Aye)

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

6. 85 Orange LLV	85 Orange Front	Renovation	55.4.1/27	self
Voting:	Welch (Chair), Patten, Camp, Paul, MacLeod			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	PJ Antonic			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - For the record, the structure dates to around 1970 and is within the OHD. - The dormer must comply with building guidelines, with a 3-foot setback from the edge and 6 feet from the ridge. - Windows and shingle spacing should be adjusted accordingly. - The proposed four-light window configuration is not appropriate; a 3-over-3 design would be more in keeping with the OHD.			
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - The speaker fully agrees with everything said but adds that the roof pitch of the dormer is too shallow and should be raised slightly off the ridge.			
Commissioner Comments:	MacLeod - Agrees with previous comments. - Suggests making a motion for revisions to comply with building regulations. - Notes that the dormer does not meet the required standards (setbacks, height, pitch, ridge alignment). - Proposes holding the matter for revision and corrected drawings. Paul - Fully agrees with Angus' comments. - Suggests the applicant consider a gable dormer, but not as wide. - Believes a shed roof dormer may not be compliant due to plate height being too low (around 2 feet off the floor). - Unsure if the applicant is present for another application with options. - Thinks it would be worth exploring other options. Welch - Notes the need to see the rate board FA, showing the vertical board at the bottom termination of the roof plan. - This change will affect the perception of the design. - Mentions that the foundation is exposed, among other details.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions and a view. (Made by MacLeod)			
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Patten, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod (Aye)			

7. 85 Orange LLV	85 Orange Rear	New guest house	55.4.1/27	self
Voting:	Welch (Chair), Patten, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	PJ Antonic			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions and additional information and view. (Made by: MacLeod)			
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Patten, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod (Aye)			

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

8. 85 Orange LLV	85 Orange front	Hardscape	55.4.1/27	self
Voting:	Welch (Chair), Patten, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	PJ Antonic			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Track			
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Patten, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod (Aye)			

9. 85 Orange LLV	85 Orange front	Hardscape	55.4.1/27	self
Voting:	Welch (Chair), Patten, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	PJ Antonic			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Track			
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Patten, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod (Aye)			

10. Stuart Bell	4 Cabot Ln	Hardscape	30/254.2	Julie Jordan
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Camp, Pohl, MacLeod			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Julie Jordan			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Formerly known as the Phillips Cottage, a circa 1939 shop converted to a cottage in the 1960s. - A brick apron would better suit the neighborhood and the dwelling's age. - A 6-foot board fence may not be appropriate, though board fences exist in the area. - The granite stepping stones and patio appear too formal; suggests a softer, less rigid hardscape.			
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - The 6-foot board fence is too solid a barrier between properties; typically, properties in this area are more open and separated by landscaping. - Suggests lowering the type 2 fence across the front of the building to 32 inches (currently listed as 3 feet in the application). - Notes that in the Building with Nantucket in Mind guide, a type 2 fence is typically 3 feet 2 inches or 38 inches, but that measurement actually refers to a type 3 fence. - Recommends reviewing the guidebook carefully, as the dimensions for type 2 fences should be lower, ideally less than 3 feet.			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - The 6-foot board fence wrapping entirely around the property seems excessive; some fence is fine, but not all around. - The granite stones in the hardscaping look too formal and squared off; suggests softening the design. MacLeod - Agrees with the comments about the fencing. - Agrees with Holly's remarks.			

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	- If a 6-foot fence were used, it should be placed much further back than the proposed location. Pohl - The fence abuts John Everett's cottage at the corner of Cabin and Grant, which already has a 5-6 foot board fence, though it doesn't continue the whole way. - There is also a stockade fence in the back near the lawn chairs, which is on the property line. - Agrees with Holly and Mickey that the granite stepping stones in the front are too formal, but is unconcerned about the back. - Suggests scaling back the tall fence on the south/southwest side, moving it further away from the road. Welch - Agrees with Holly that brick is more appropriate. - Finds white granite abrasive and not native; suggests using Berkshire granite, which is more fitting for the area's natural colors (pinks and grays). - Thinks Berkshire granite would be more appropriate, and would be fine with using shell. - Creeping thyme will be charming. - The 6-foot fence is within guidelines; agrees with its placement on the northern, western, and southwestern borders. - Normally would agree with Ray, but the proposed plant materials will provide needed relief. - Believes the landscape changes will be a significant aesthetic improvement, making the 6-foot fence placement closer to the front of the house on the southwest acceptable. - Supports the proposal as it is. - Believes the 6-foot fence is more appropriate than a 5-foot fence, as it's necessary for privacy in the tight conditions near a sidewalk. - Agrees that the front steps should be less formal, as they will be visible. - Asks if plants will be placed on both sides of the fence, as this is usually required.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver)
Vote:	4-1 // Welch, Oliver, Camp, Pohl (Aye) MacLeod (Opposed)

11. Amy Rowland	3 Pawguvet	Hardscape	30/128	Julie Jordan
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - For the record, one structure was built in the 1920s and the other in the 1930s; proposed changes to them have been reviewed. - Notes part of Mickey's family is involved. - Glad to hear the apron is not planned, as it's unnecessary for an unpaved road and not required by the zoning bylaw. - Main concern is with the retaining wall and granite steps; there is no plan to assess the grade changes, especially with the three steps. - No other concerns with the plans.			
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group			

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	- Aside from conflicts, the rest of the board reviewed the proposal. - Julie mentioned the arbor in the front, which was deemed possibly inappropriate. - Concerns were also raised about the Belgian apron. - No other concerns were noted.
Commissioner Comments:	MacLeod - In the photograph, there appears to be a steady slope from the house to the road that almost flattens out. - Believes the character would change if there were a terrace with multiple steps rising from the driveway. - Suggests tapering the wall down, as shown in the provided photograph. Pohl - Finds the presented acceptable. Patten - Finds the presented acceptable. Oliver - Finds the presented acceptable. Welch - Suggests a hybrid approach: taper the wall down to the grade, and where the steps are, level it off. - If an extra 3 inches of stone is visible due to leveling over a 4-foot span, it seems appropriate. - Has no concerns about the arbor; everything else is fine.
Motion:	Motion to approve through an Exhibit A. (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten (Aye)

12. Kathryn Graham	11 Priscilla Ln	Rev 2023-11-9435	67/477	DTA
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Anton Dimov			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Made by: Oliver)			
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten (Aye)			

13. Kathryn Graham	11 Priscilla Ln	New shed	67/477	DTA
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Anton Dimov			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Made by: Oliver)			
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten (Aye)			

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

14. FP Martin House LLC		61 Center	Rev stairs accessible lift	42.4.3/67	Emeritus LTD
Motion:	Hold				
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, McLeod (Aye)				
15. Krall, Kathleen		15 Masaquet	Porch Revs 2022-12-7535	80/141	Botticelli & Pohl
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Motion:	Hold				
16. Steve Cohen 39 Monomoy		39 Monomoy Rd	Rev Cabana	54/79	WAPD
Motion:	Hold				
17. NiSHA Inc		1 Evergreen	New main facility	68/727	Emeritus
Motion:	Hold				
18. Charles Bruno		10 Monohansett	Rev Sports Court	79/142	LFW
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Linda Williams				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Pohl)				
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul (Aye)				
19. Michael Pearlstein		20 Derrymore	Rev change fenestration	41/112	LFW
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver, Patten				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Linda Williams				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Believes this is an improvement, as the current approval for the north elevation to the right of the proposed includes two doors and a walkway. - Fills out the first floor better by adding two windows flanking a door, which is a more aesthetically pleasing and less shingle-heavy design. Patten - Is okay with it. MacLeod - Is okay with it but would prefer the windows to be a bit farther from the door. - Doesn't need them centered, but the current placement feels a bit crowded in the middle. Welch - Is fine with it.				
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Made by: Pohl)				
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver, Patten (Aye)				

20. NT Property Owner 6 Beach Grass

Rev Sash

68/860

LFW

Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Linda Williams
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill

VIII. OLD BUSINESS 06/18/24

1. 450 Green Park LLC 2 Stone Alley

Railings

42.3.2/211

Emeritus LTD

Motion:	Hold
----------------	-------------

2. Smiley 15 N Water St LLC 15 N Water St

Driveway & Fencing

42.4.2/50

Normand Res

Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Ben Normand
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The Hussey House, built circa 1795 for Robert Brighton, was part of the Ross family and served as a bed and breakfast for many years. - Appreciates the changes to the porch dimensions and the reconfigured layout. - Believes the proposed fenestration changes on the south side, particularly the additional windows on the first floor, are not appropriate and unclear in intent. - Thinks it would be better if the first floor mimicked the second floor in design. - Appreciates the change to the deck dimensions. - Notes that the property is highly visible and located on the historic L, not the Contemporary L, which raises concerns. - Has no other concerns with the other changes.
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Believes this is an improvement over the last submission. - Suggests making the new 12-over-12 windows for the porch area larger to reduce the busy appearance. - A larger, less busy pane, such as a six-over-six, would be more suitable for a more contemporary porch conversion.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Agrees with Mickey on the window suggestion. - Believes the 12-over-12 windows are trying to make the structure look historic, but larger panes would give the appearance of evolving over time. - Suggests using large two-over-two windows or something similar, which could reflect a style from the 1940s. - Is fine with the other changes.
Motion:	Hold
Vote:	- Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

3. Smiley 15 N Water St LLC	15 N Water St	Porch Deck	42.4.2/50	Normand Res
Motion:	Hold			

4. Smith, Geoffrey	22 Coffin St Sias.	New Structure	73.4.1/36	Topham
Motion:	Hold			

5. Breskman	34A Grove Ln	Pool/ Relocate Driveway	41/433.1	LINK
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Camp, Thornewill, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Tori Ewing			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Would be comfortable with this, subject to clarifying that the pool is no higher than the existing deck surface. - Doesn't have a problem with the top of the pool side being 4 feet tall at grade. - Wants to finalize and agree on an appropriate maximum elevation for the finished top of the pool. Thornewill - The fence says it all; everything is hidden behind a 6-foot fence. Patten - Is good with what is being proposed. Camp - The fence would need to remain in place permanently, along with the screening, as you can see directly into the area from Grove. - Is having some concerns with this.			
Motion:	Motion to approve subject to Exhibit A. (Made by: Welch)			
Vote:	4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Thornewill, Patten (Aye) Camp (No)			

6. Brian Davis	108 Surfside	Rooftop Solar	80/5	SunWind
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Tim Holmes			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Commissioner Comments:	Patten - Believes the solar panels will be visible on the front of the house. - Notes that the guidelines state solar panels should not be on the front of the property or house. Camp - Not in favor of solar panels on the front of the house. - Sees an option for placing them on the garage or the back of the house, and would not be opposed to that. Welch			

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	- Agrees that, according to the guidelines, solar panels shouldn't be on the primary roof facing the street. - Wonders if there's time in the process to explore how the garage fits into the equation. - Suggests considering pergolas or outdoor patios with a rainproof roof as an alternative, where the solar panels and framework could serve as the structure, while also enhancing the design with cedar posts and beams. - Questions what the alternative is, aside from using the garage, and mentions that visibility is the main issue. Pohl - Suggests using the unbuilt garage roof for the solar panels.
Motion:	Motion to approve subject to Exhibit A (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Patten (Aye)

7. Doherty ACK LLC 2 Mariner Way Pool 55.1.4/72.4 Nantucket Surveyors

Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Camp, Oliver
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Paul Santos
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Is glad to hear the shingle deck will not be used, as it was inappropriate and inconsistent with Nantucket's vernacular and building guidelines. - Believes the infill structure should follow typical Nantucket vernacular. - With an appropriate landscaping plan, doesn't believe the pool at 2 Mariner Way will be visible, as shown in Paul's rendering and presentation. - Suggests supplementing vegetation on both sides, in line with ConCom requirements, and considering lattice instead of open railing to maintain privacy and aesthetic consistency, similar to other approved features like utility enclosures.
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Visibility may be addressed, but it's unclear if the fence will be fully effective, so that needs to be confirmed. - Another consideration is the impact on the historic character of the neighborhood. - Even if the pool is not visible, swimming pools can affect the historic character and should not be permitted. Amy Cohane - The speaker and their husband live at 76 Union Street and represent nine properties and neighbors opposing the Mariner Way pools since April 2023. - While the developer focuses on visibility, the board should also consider the appropriateness of placing three pools in the dense Gateway to the OMD. - Cites <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i>, emphasizing designs that align with the island's identity and sense of place, which the pools do not respect. - The HDC has the authority to rule on appropriateness, as shown by previous decisions, including rejecting the garage apartment and M Hill spa.

Minutes for July 16, 2024; Adopted January 14, 2025

	- Refers to Mary Bergman from the Nantucket Preservation Trust, stating the OHD should reflect traditions before 1846, with no precedent for pools. - The pools don't harmonize with the land or traditions and threaten the historic character of the area. - Concerns are raised about Nantucket's National Historic Landmark status, which is under scrutiny due to development. Approving the pools could worsen this risk.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - The speaker is concerned about setting a precedent, as this is one of only three or four buildings in the area. - They are not in favor of this application. Oliver - The speaker is concerned about visibility but doesn't believe the issue should be solved by a 5'1" board fence, as none exist in the area. - They are not in favor of wrapping lots with fences to hide the elevated pools. - More detailed information on the hardscape is needed, including vegetation on both sides of fences, as this is typically required. - The speaker is opposed to cutting up the area with tall fences, as it would be out of character. Welch - The speaker is concerned that the fence detail is atypical and would require plant material to mask it, which might conflict with concomm's free-flow area requirements. - They agree with Val that the solution should be landscape-oriented, not reliant on fencing along boundaries. - Any fencing should be used for screening only, and it needs to be aesthetically and historically appropriate. - Character and site integrity are key concerns. Patten - The speaker agrees with using vegetation instead of fencing. - They also compliment the comprehensive and well-done presentation. Pohl - The speaker prefers vegetation over fencing, noting that extensive fencing in the area wouldn't work well. - They emphasize the importance of visual impact from public ways, focusing on character and setting rather than noise or nuisance.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver
Adjournment:	
Motion:	Motion to adjourn.
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod

Link to 07-16-2024 HDC YouTube meeting: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IKYu7aGIde8>

Link to 07-16-2024 HDC Agenda: www.nantucket-ma.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/07162024-14060