



Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, October 8th, 2024

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

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Welch called the meeting to order at 4:01 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), Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod, Connie Patten, Carrie Thornewill
Remote Participants:	
Absent Members:	
Late Arrivals:	Joe Paul @ 5:30pm
Early Departures:	

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Stephen)
Vote	Carried 5-0//Welch, Oliver, Pohl, Macleod, Thornewill

DISCUSSION & VOTE

Commission Announcements	Surf Side Crossing Architectural Review: Comments are due to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) by November 14th. - Unfortunately, the <i>Plus</i> building cannot be used on weekends. Plans are being made to meet on Thursday, October 17th at 3:30 PM in the Plus conference room. - There was a previous scheduling attempt, but it's now canceled because of venue issues. October 17th Meeting: Focus: Discuss Surf Side Crossing. The group plans to meet at 3:30 PM and will likely need more time to refine the notes afterward. - Staff presence: It's debated whether staff is required for HDC decisions, but staff may be requested to attend for administrative purposes. October 24th Meeting: Follow-up: The focus will be an organizational meeting for the Historic Commission (HDC) to discuss improving the efficiency of meetings, preparedness, and related topics. - The meeting will also cover Surf Side Crossing if necessary. It's planned for 3:30 PM. Commission Discussion: - The commission plans to review and potentially vote on their schedule for the rest of the year. It seems like the main objectives are to address Surf Side Crossing and prepare for future organizational improvements. The upcoming meetings are set for October 17th and 24th. Commission's Schedule: December Schedule:
--------------------------	--

Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

	- There are two Tuesdays in December that fall on Christmas Eve (December 24) and New Year's Eve (December 31). These are difficult to schedule meetings due to holidays, so it was proposed to cancel those dates. - The <i>Zoom link and venue availability</i> for meetings only go through December 17, leaving just three meetings in December. The commission needs to approve this. 2. Thanksgiving Week: - There was a concern about scheduling for the week of Thanksgiving. Thanksgiving falls on Thursday, November 28, but the Tuesday prior (November 26) was flagged as a potential issue. It was noted that the meeting may conflict with staff availability and attendance. - A commissioner mentioned they would be traveling on that Tuesday, which could lead to attendance issues. The idea is to review the schedule closer to the date and possibly cancel the meeting if there aren't enough members present. 3. Vote on the Schedule: - The commissioners agreed it would be impossible to hold meetings on Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve, and they're also willing to accept the November 26 meeting despite potential conflicts. - The motion was made to approve the schedule as presented, with the understanding that the Thanksgiving week meeting would be revisited later to ensure there's quorum. So, the schedule changes include: No meetings on December 24 and December 31. Possible rescheduling or cancellation of the November 26 meeting due to attendance concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve Schedule as it has been presented to the board. (Made by Stephen)
Vote	Carried 5-0//Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Macleod, Patten

V. SIGNS

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. 3 Step Lane LLC	3 Step Ln (Veranda House)	Projecting Sign (2) Revision	42.4.2/44	Plymouth Sign
<i>SAC recommended approval with the omission of "Sign B Nantucket Resort Collection" based on the historic materials and the previous approval from 2003.</i>				
Motion: The motion was made to approve the "projecting sign 2 revision", subject to the Sign Advisory Council's comments and their recommendation to omit the projecting sign (Sign B). (Made by Ray)				
Vote: Carried 5-0//Welch, Pohl, Macleod, Oliver, Thornewill (aye)				

VI. NEW BUSINESS 10/01/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. 14 Meadow Ln LLC	14 Meadow Ln	Change windows doors	41/405	Sanne Payne
<i>Commissioners: Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill, Patten; Alt: Paul -- Last heard September 24, 2024</i>				

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus expressed concerns about identifying the correct structure on the property card. There was no date associated with it, but she believes it pertains to the 1954 ranch-style structure. She requested that this information (the 1954 ranch) be included on the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group, he raised a concern about the west elevation, specifically around the front door area. The issue was with the gable near the front door appearing to be flush with the wall plane to its right. This results in a lack of a corner board, which he noted might look odd or out of place. He requested clarification on whether this area is visible and, if so, suggested the design might look strange if the wall plane is continuous without a corner board.

DISCUSSION:

Val: noted that it was unclear from the application exactly what was being added to the design. They suggested including dimensions to show the extent of the changes (e.g., "from here to here") to provide more clarity.

Angus: proposed adjustments to lower the gable to align with the door height. Modify the corner board to better fit the overall design. Consider a shed roof for the entry instead of a gable. Adjust the window proportions to maintain the style and balance of the existing windows.

Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

Carrie: agreed with the preference for 8-over-1 windows, is comfortable with the gable entry, and supports keeping the faux corner board.

Connie: agrees with what has been said.

Ray: not in love with the entry design, but since it's set back from the road, he felt it would have little impact on the overall look and might be inconsequential. The primary concern seems to be the pane size on the replacement windows. He suggested that instead of 6-over-1 windows, to go with 8-over-1, which would simplify the design and avoid confusion.

MOTION: Motion is to change the window design from 6-over-1 to 8-over-1, while keeping the same window size. made by Thornewill. – Carried. Thornewill, Oliver, Pohl, Patten (aye), MacLeod (opposed)

I. OLD BUSINESS 09/24/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
I. Monomoy Road LLC	39 Monomoy Rd	Pool hardscape	54/79	Ahern LLC
Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Oliver and Patten - Last heard May 14, 2024				

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus this property is part of the Monomoy Heights subdivision, established in the 1850s. The lot includes a Colonial Revival-style house built in 1924 by Ethel and Lewis Black. Holly acknowledges the reduction in scale of the project but raises concerns about the proposed boardwalk, noting that it doesn't align with the Colonial Revival style of the house. The removal of a hedge is praised as it reveals the character-defining features of the house that have been visible for 100 years. Holly recommends that, if the commission approves the application, conditions be placed on the pool and walls to ensure they are not visible, in line with prior recommendations.

DISCUSSION:

Stephen: expresses concern about the size of the proposed rear addition, noting that it may be visible but believes it likely won't be. He suggests adding a condition that the rear addition should not be visible at the time of inspection or thereafter. He also agrees with the earlier comment about the removal of the hedge, which improves the visibility of the front of the house. Stephen indicates that if the hedge removal has been addressed, he would be inclined to make a motion that the front and second floors of the house remain visible, both at the time of inspection and in the future. On a separate point, he asks about a tree placement between the three-car parking and walkway, noting that the tree is not labeled on the plan. He suggests it could be something like a local or plane tree to help frame and balance the architecture, although he doesn't have a specific tree in mind. He emphasizes that trees can significantly impact the overall presentation of the property but doesn't have concerns about the other elements mentioned.

Val: asks whether there is any intention to reinstall the picket fence in front of the house. The response is that there are no plans to put the fence back but is open to suggestions. Val also agrees with the previous comments about the boardwalk, stating that she don't think a boardwalk in front of the house is appropriate for the style of the home.

Connie: agrees with the previous comments about the boardwalk and expresses concern about the size of the pool, describing it as "massive." She acknowledges the intention to add a caveat that the pool won't be visible.

Ray: alternatives to the proposed wood boardwalk, suggesting using antique curbing set flat for walkways, with small gaps between them. This material could also be used on the front of the property if acceptable. He also notes that while the back of the house has a lot of formal landscaping, there is substantial screening on the left side of the building that should help obscure the large pool, which is long in the direction of sightlines. Ray is satisfied with this, provided a proviso is added to ensure that the pool and other structures are not visible at the time of inspection and thereafter.

Motion: Motion thru (Exhibit A) Replace the wood boardwalk with antique granite curbing. Replace the picket fence across the front section with small plantings, rather than shrubs. Ensure that the first and second floors of the house remain visible at the time of inspection and thereafter. Ensure that the pool, spa, and rear deck are not visible at the time of inspection and thereafter. Made by Welch. -Carried 4/0// Welch, Oliver, Pohl, Patten (aye)

Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

2. Doherty LLC 4 Mariner Way Pool 55.1.4/72.2 NSLLC
Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten; Alt: Paul -- Last heard September 24, 2024

DISCUSSION:

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus provided an update on revisions for pools in the OHD, focusing on the importance of screening for the neighborhood and following ConCom recommendations. They acknowledged the unique situation and highlighted that abutter comments had been received.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group **is** concerned that the proposed dense screening vegetation, such as red cedars and hollies, would not be in keeping with the traditional landscaping of the neighborhood, and could render the project inappropriate.

Amy Cohen urges the Historic District Commission (HDC) to uphold the standards of the area and deny the application for the pools, as they would create further visual disruption in a highly sensitive area.

In essence, Amy is advocating for the preservation of the historic character of the Mariner Way area, emphasizing that the pools would be visually disruptive and out of character with the neighborhood, and that efforts to screen them are insufficient. She argues that the HDC should deny the application to maintain the integrity of the historic district.

DISCUSSION:

Val: seems to advocate for simpler fencing, clearer details on the pergola, and better screening of the raised pool to make the overall project more compatible with the historic neighborhood.

Stephen: advocates for visual mitigation due to the raised pool's height, suggesting a living fence made of lattice and climbing plants as a preferable alternative to a solid 5-in-1 fence. He suggests that the pool could be downsized and relocated to a different area on the property (e.g., near the outdoor shower), which may improve the visual impact. He raises the idea of a pergola but is unsure about its effectiveness in blocking the visibility of people using the pool. Ultimately, Stephen's recommendations are focused on downscaling and reworking the pool design to ensure better harmony with the surrounding neighborhood. Stephen is advocating for the submittal of revised elevations to better visualize the impact of the pool. They are also pushing for a more definitive plan for how the pool will be screened and what happens if mitigation measures are damaged by environmental factors like flooding. A site visit to review the porch and pool together is suggested to help with final decision-making. This section highlights the need for more detailed information and clarity before the board can make a final decision on the pool project, particularly in terms of its visibility, screening, and potential environmental impacts.

Carrie: Carrie acknowledges the need for a fence and vegetation to screen the pool, especially given the pool's unusual ultimate balance between preservation and mitigation. She ultimately abstains from voting due to the complexity of the situation.

Connie: Connie **is** frustrated by the lack of changes to the pool proposal despite suggestions from the board at the previous meeting. She is concerned about the visual awkwardness of the fence and vegetation and is unsure about the usefulness of a pergola. Connie also suggests that the pool could be moved closer to the house **or** downsized to address some of the visual concerns. Overall, she is perplexed by the lack of revisions.

Ray: believes that if the pool and its surroundings are screened properly in perpetuity, the design could meet the board's standards. They are focused on ensuring that the pool won't be visible and that this screening is done in a way that respects the natural and historical context of the area. This discussion seems to hinge on how best to achieve visual mitigation for the pool in a manner that satisfies both historical preservation standards and environmental concerns, particularly near the wetland areas. The Chair is aiming for a clear, fair resolution by focusing on permanent screening that adheres to the board's guidelines.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions and additional information.

Made by Stephen. – Carried. Welch, Thornewill, Oliver, Pohl, (aye),

3. Doherty LLC 6 Mariner Way Pool 55.1.4/72.2 NSLLC
Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver and Paul; Alt: Thornewill, Patten-- Last heard August 27, 2024

MOTION: Motion to Track. (Additional information, revisions also)

4. Dober Richard P Trust 10 Silver St Hardscape 55.4.1/187 Ahern LLC
Commissioners: Welch, MacLeod, Patten, Paul and Thornwill; -- Last heard July 30, 2024

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus points out that this is a part of a typical Nantucket infill site. She notes that the site has a 2% chance of flooding according to FEMA, referencing a slight dip in the elevation. She appreciates the revisions made, particularly the reduction in parking as previously discussed. However, she suggests that the driveway width could be reduced slightly, even though it appears to meet the zoning requirements. She finds brick to be an appropriate material for this area, especially within the OHD, and feel this material should extend to the walkway as well. She has concerns about the type of paving or surface material, suggesting it might be too rigid for the property, she proposes a more informal, flexible option. Holly mentions a concern about additional patios and runoff in the neighborhood, though she acknowledges that runoff may not fall under the commission's purview, she points out that this issue has been a concern in the area.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group - a narrower driveway both in the front and back would be more traditional for the OHD, aligning better with the area's historical character. He also notes that leveling out the front yard to create a parking space would look unnatural and recommend keeping the existing grades as much as possible. This would help reduce the height of the retaining wall, or possibly eliminate it altogether. He agrees with Holly's earlier comment about the front walkway, preferring it to be made of brick to maintain consistency.

DISCUSSION:

Joe: expresses appreciation for the revisions made to the project, acknowledging that it is a challenging property. They feel that this latest iteration of the design looks the most organic and least forced. They agree with the previous comments regarding the brick walkway in the front, suggesting a change from the proposed Goan stone.

Carrie: raises a concern about the retaining wall material, describing it as too large, monolithic, and heavy for an in-town property of this size. She feels it is incongruous with the scale and character of the property. Regarding the driveway, she agrees that it should likely be narrower, but she express a desire for it to be back-to-back (a more traditional arrangement for in-town properties). However, she acknowledges that with the way the house is situated, this may not be feasible.

Angus: reference a previous comment about the north-south running screen of trees on the east side of the house. Initially, it was a straight line of trees, but now it appears to be two rows or alternating trees. Angus expresses concern about this, especially given that the house will be somewhat isolated, and the screening may feel like a wall of hedges and evergreen plantings on both the east and west sides of the house. He appreciates the reduction in parking from being directly in front of the house but agrees that front-to-back parking makes more sense. He acknowledges that the design of the house has limited options for a more appropriate parking solution, particularly since it was already approved in its current form. While he would prefer front-to-back parking, he is unsure if there's enough room to accommodate it. Angus asks the applicant for the distance from the house to the street, which is about 20 feet from the property line, with an additional 10 feet possibly available. He notes that the area is quite tight—approximately 9 feet—which makes fitting two cars and allowing enough room to open doors difficult. He expresses concern about whether the parking will be functional given the limited space. He suggests that following the existing grade for the parking area, with a lower retaining wall, would be preferable to creating a raised platform for the cars. This would help avoid an awkward height relationship between the parked cars and the house. He reiterates their preference for front-to-back parking because parking in front of the house feels awkward in the OHD. He feels that parking on the side of the house would be more visually appropriate and would allow for more of the front yard to remain as it typically would in the district.

Connie: agrees with Angus concerns about the trees or shrubbery being used in the project, feeling it doesn't fit the character of Silver Streets. She suggestion that the landscaping should not line the houses completely with trees or shrubs. She also prefers brick materials instead of the proposed stone (possibly "Goan Stone") for the project. The visibility of the retaining wall is a concern.

Stephen: suggests that the parking should remain, but it needs to be adjusted, particularly in how it integrates with the retaining wall on the right side of the driveway, he proposes planting vining material around the retaining wall to make it blend in naturally and look like it has been there for a long time. The idea is to soften the appearance of the wall by covering it with greenery, making it less noticeable and more harmonious with the landscape. The front yard should have grass, emphasizing that while the plantings are nice, they are too abundant for this specific lot and location. There's a preference for a simpler, more balanced design with fewer plants. His recommendation to reduce the size of the parking spaces (from 7 by 17 feet) and fit two smaller ones. This change might necessitate repositioning the retaining wall slightly to accommodate the smaller spaces and maintain the integrity of the design and to adjust the grade and/or move the retaining wall depending on how the parking and driveway adjustments are made. The retaining wall might need to be shifted to the left side of the current driveway location, due to the slope of the land, this change could reduce the height of the retaining wall while still serving its function, using brick for the retaining wall and other structures. When transitioning between the new driveway and retaining wall, Stephen suggests the design should blend in and not become the focal point. The goal is for it to be subtle and integrate seamlessly into the landscape.

Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions and additional information.

Made by Stephen. – Carried. Welch, MacLeod, Paul, Thornewill, Patten (aye)

5. Bernie Blaney

6 Marion Ave

Pool Hardscape

82/137

Ryan Blaney

Commissioners: Welch, Thornewill, MacLeod, Paul and Patten; - Last heard July 30, 2024

DISCUSSION:

Carrie: Feels the cabana is positioned incorrectly and should be relocated to the street side to better conceal the pool. She also proposes elongating the cabana slightly to improve the layout. The pool should align with the house, the cabana would help hide the pool. She believes a fence would be beneficial for further privacy or concealment.

Joe: agrees with Carrie's suggestion regarding the cabana's location and is open to moving it closer to the house. He also supports the idea of adding a fence between the house and the parking area near the archway gate for added privacy. He asks about the placement of the cedar fence, confirming it seems to run south from the house, and express no further concerns. Overall, he is in favor of using the cabana to help screen the pool.

Angus: agrees with the previous comments about relocating the cabana and adjusting the pool's orientation. He emphasizes that the pool should be behind the house or structure, not on the street side, as it is currently proposed. He also notes the challenge of the long, open view from the beach and road, which lacks the typical landscaping that would help conceal the pool. Angus suggests that care must be taken in how the screening is done, ensuring it doesn't appear unnatural. He mentions a similar situation nearby, where a solution involved sinking the pool into the landscape rather than building up around it for screening.

Connie: agrees with what has been said.

Stephen: suggestions about relocating the cabana and adjusting the pool. He expresses concerns about the pool being at grade level and the proposed plant materials. Specifically, he believes a perimeter of privet around the area is inappropriate, as it doesn't align with native, natural landscaping typical for the location. He recommends using more indigenous plants like scrub oak, which are larger and more spreading. He also suggests reducing the extent and volume of plantings by bringing them closer to the pool and eliminating the privet. Stephen criticizes the current planting plan, which relies heavily on beach rose (primarily white and pink) and suggests incorporating a wider variety of native plants like bayberry, beach plum, and viburnum. He emphasizes the importance of showing how the plants will mature and present over time, rather than just focusing on a filled-in perimeter.

Carrie adds that the pool is too large at 20 by 40 feet, which seems disproportionate to the size of the house. She proposes downsizing the pool to achieve better balance, stressing that these recommendations will lead to a more thoughtful design with material adjustments.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions, made by Stephen – Carried. Welch, Macleod, Paul, Thornewill, Patten, (aye)

6. Martin House LLC

61 Center St

Rev Stairs Accessible Lift

42.4.3/67

Emeritus LTD

Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp; Alt: Thornewill, Patten -- Last heard August 27, 2024

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus acknowledges the revisions made to address the steps and railings, she has concerns about the loss of the straight-on stairs, which are a key historic feature. A request for a Harding and fence plan to complete the package, which was a point raised by others as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group - No concerns

DISCUSSION:

Val: No concerns.

Carrie: No concerns.

Connie: No concerns.

Angus: supports the revisions so far but has reservations about the double rail and prefers a simpler single top rail. Matt clarified the rationale behind the double rail and are open to feedback from the board on whether to keep it or simplify to a single rail.

Ray: Highlights that in the case of the Greydon House, the design approach of using a double rail helped visually balance the height, preventing the posts from looking too skinny or out of proportion. The double rail essentially bridges the gap and makes the 42-inch height more aesthetically acceptable.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Angus – Carried. Macleod, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Pohl (aye)

7. Gregory Giles

48 York St

Rev COA addition

55.4.1/55

LINK

Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, MacLeod, Paul and Patten; Alt: Thornewill -- Last heard July 30, 2024

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus mentions that the property in question is a 1950s structure.

The proposed changes seem to be severe, particularly the transformation of a Cape Cod style into a two-story structure.

She suggests that a gable-ended structure might be more appropriate than the proposed gambrel roof design. The dormers on both sides of the ridge are seen as excessive, potentially altering the character of the building too much. The changes in elevation due to the topography of the area need to be considered, as they impact the visual consistency with surrounding buildings, most of which are one to three stories. There's some confusion or lack of clarity about which parts of the original 1950s structure will be demolished versus what will be retained in the proposed design. The current height of the eave, especially on the first floor, could be reduced to avoid excessive height, potentially bringing it closer to the neighborhood's existing scale. A better understanding of how the proposed design fits into the streetscape would be helpful, with particular focus on building heights in relation to the existing houses.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group advocates for a more traditional, compact design, possibly a saltbox style, with carefully considered rooflines, window placements, and ceiling heights. The goal is to create a building that blends seamlessly with the surrounding neighborhood, avoiding modern or oversized elements that might feel out of place.

DISCUSSION:

Stephen: compares the proposed design to a structure on West Street, suggesting that a "tight saltbox" style would be a much better fit. A saltbox design is a traditional New England style known for its simple, rectangular shape and steep, asymmetrical roofline, which is generally lower and more compact. He feels this style would be more appropriate and visually appealing for the site, he suggests adding traditional elements, like plank frame windows, to give the building a more authentic and classic look, also recommend "burying" the second-story windows into the roofline by integrating the top plate (the horizontal beam that supports the roof) more naturally into the design, this approach would create a more traditional, less disruptive appearance. He emphasizes the importance of understanding ceiling heights in the design and also suggests that the first-floor ceiling could be 7 feet, while the second floor could be just under 7 feet (e.g., 7 feet or 7 feet 6 inches), he also notes that building codes allow for certain areas to be under 7 feet, which can count toward the total square footage but won't affect the perception of height, by lowering the height of the upper floors, the design would avoid the visual bulk of a taller building, creating a more proportionate and fitting structure for the neighborhood and expresses a strong preference against a "farm-style" design, believing it's not suitable for the area, even though there is a similar design down the street, he feels that a simpler, more traditional style (such as the saltbox) would blend better with the surrounding homes and community character. He suggests adjusting the roof design, particularly on the back side of the house and propose extending the roof plane down to the platform of the first floor or to the top plate of the first floor. This change would soften the building's overall appearance, making it feel more integrated and less imposing.

Joe: While he is generally positive about the improvements, he suggests focusing on the proportions of the porch and dormers, possibly revising the roofline to incorporate the saltbox form for better balance. The revisions so far seem to be heading in the right direction, and you're confident that with a few tweaks, it can be a much more cohesive and visually appealing design.

Connie: seems to favor the saltbox roofline for its charm and potential to help the house blend better with its visible location. She's also open to simplifying the structure, possibly eliminating front dormers or considering a two-story approach, to achieve a more balanced and appealing design.

Angus: have a mixed view on the saltbox roof—while it could simplify and clean up the front elevation, he is concerned that it might lead to visual inconsistencies, particularly with the back dormer and the low rooflines that could stand out too much. His suggestions focus on adjusting the dormers and ensuring the upper part of the house balances better with the lower porch, looking for a design that maintains the prominent location's dignity while respecting the neighborhood's scale.

Ray: Suggestion to increase the roof pitch focuses on solving the issue of a shallow eave line and improving the massing of the dormers. A steeper roof would create a more harmonious design and ensure the second floor maintains adequate space for the master bedroom. This approach would likely address the concerns of top-heaviness and improve the overall balance of the structure.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Stephen – carried. Patten, Paul Pohl, Welch, Macleod (aye)

VII. OLD BUSINESS 10/08/2024

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Alexandra Ripley	92 Washington St	Main House	42.2.3/22	Marshall Harris •
Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Thornewill; Alt: Patten -- Last heard August 27, 2024				

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus this application is for replacing an existing 1960s structure on the lot. There's a mention that the renewal for the current structure may be nearing expiration, and Leo is encouraged to check on this detail. She appreciates the changes that have been made to the design, particularly the **windows** have been revised, though you're unsure about the placement as they seem to be raised into the fascia board, she suggests revisiting this aspect. The size changes are appreciated, though it's unclear what specific changes these refer to. She expresses concern about the glazing on the harbor side, which has been a common concern among other commissioners. The glazing may be too prominent or out of scale with the design of the house. She appreciates the kick panels on the French doors, which align with the commission's typical practices for structures in the historic district, showing consistency with existing properties in the area. She mentions that the elevation certificate and flood map are missing from the application, which are required to assess the elevation of the structure. These documents need to be provided for the application to be complete.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group: his main concerns focus on ensuring the proportions and details of the design are more cohesive, particularly with the middle dormer and the windows on the left gable. He also suggests practical adjustments, like altering the pin roof over the stairs, replacing one of the front doors with a window, and reducing the glazing on the rear elevation. Lastly, he highlights that the kick panel on the French doors still needs to follow more traditional design principles. These changes would help improve the overall clarity and harmony of the design.

DISCUSSION:

Carrie: emphasizes improving the traditional character and proportions of the design. She suggests adjusting the left gable windows, shifting the dormer, and removing the extra office door to streamline the design. She recommends revising the east elevation's French doors to a more traditional form with kick panels. These changes would make the building feel more balanced and contextually appropriate while maintaining a clear, traditional aesthetic.

Ray: suggestions focus on improving coherence and proportion on the front elevation, especially with the windows on the left gable and the bathroom/closet area. He also suggests that the pent roof over the side door be enlarged and more functional. While he's less concerned about the water side glazing, you still emphasize the kick panel for the French doors to keep the design grounded in traditional architectural practices. These changes would further enhance the building's overall aesthetic and practicality.

Angus: suggests stepping back the front dormer, as it is currently too aligned with the left gable, he suggests reducing the dormer to just trim and a window and reducing the window size to two lights high instead of three. This would help the dormer feel more like an accent element above the door rather than a continuation of the second floor, improving its visual balance. The shed dormer on the rear elevation looks more proportionate compared to the rest of the structure. He raises a concern about the middle gambrel appearing disproportionate, especially when considering the height of the doors and railing on the deck. The relationship between the deck height and the door height seems off. The apron in front of the door might be contributing to the discrepancy in appearance, making the doors look too tall. He feels that the gambrel might be too high, which makes the design feel a bit unbalanced. He suggests that the break in the gambrel could be lowered to align with the eave height of the other shed dormers on the sides, making the proportions more consistent. He agrees with the idea of reducing the eaves slightly, as it would make the design feel more in line with the proportions of other structures in the area. This would also help avoid the overly thick appearance of the rooflines and improve the overall aesthetic, he also mentions the lack of kick panels on the French doors, emphasizing that they should have three lights high with one panel below, which aligns with traditional detailing. This would help reduce unnecessary glass and provide a more refined, consistent design.

Val: Has nothing to add and likes the changes.

Stephen: feedback is centered on proportional adjustments, especially in relation to the gambrel, dormers, and doors on the East elevation, to achieve a more balanced design. He also emphasizes addressing the floating landings visible from the water to avoid a peculiar visual effect. Ultimately, his main concern is ensuring that any changes to the roof mass, particularly regarding the gambrel and dormers, maintain the integrity of the overall design.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Ray – carried. Oliver, Pohl, Welch, Macleod, Thornewill (aye)

Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

2. Alexandra Ripley 92 Washington St Garage 42.2.3/22 Marshall Harris •
Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Thornewill; Alt: Patten -- Last heard August 27, 2024

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus comment focuses on the west elevation of the structure, particularly the gable form. You suggest that the pitch of the roof appears squat and recommend reducing it or adjusting it to give it a more balanced proportion. Additionally, you propose lowering the eave to improve the overall appearance, she expresses satisfaction with the fact that the structure retains a gable form, indicating that you believe this design approach is positive.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group: recommends breaking up the garage mass, simplifying the roof design with smaller masses, reworking the balcony brackets to better support the structure, and providing clearer elevation views of the pent roof over the garage.

DISCUSSION:

Ray: The brackets supporting the second-floor deck (which faces the water) may not be highly visible. Ray express concern about their design or size. It's implied that the brackets should be appropriately scaled to the deck, but the visibility of this detail will depend on sight lines. The pent roof, you prefer the way it appears on the West and East elevations, as opposed to the South elevation. He does not like how it looks on the South side and feel it does not add to the aesthetic or functional purpose of breaking up massing. He suggests that the pent roof may be unnecessary in this context. In similar cases, a pent roof is typically used to break up a large mass or to cover a shingled wall above garage doors. However, since this design does not feature such a wall, he believes the pent roof feels superfluous and adds unnecessary bulk to the building.

Carrie: that by reducing the number of dormers, adding a secondary mass at the porch area, and rearranging the dormers, the building's scale could be better balanced, creating a more harmonious overall design. This would help to address the current perception of the building as feeling a bit oversized and lacking in additive massing.

Val: No Concerns

Angus: a more simplified, less vertical design with a focus on maintaining the elegance of the gable roof form, adjusting the dormers to create a more balanced, less busy appearance. He recommends removing the pent roof to avoid adding unnecessary complexity.

Stephen: advocates for a reduction in height of about a foot and a half, as well as simplifying the ornate detailing to make it more practical and fitting for the overall size and massing of the building. These adjustments would create a more proportionate, functional design without sacrificing the structure's aesthetic integrity.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Angus – carried. Oliver, Pohl, Welch, MacLeod, Thornewill (aye)

3. Alexandra Ripley 92 Washington St Shed 42.2.3/22 Marshall Harris •
Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Thornewill; Alt: Patten -- Last heard August 27, 2024

DISCUSSION:

No concerns

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted made by Val – Carried. Oliver, Welch, Pohl, MacLeod and Thornewill

4. Orange LLC 85 Orange St Add Dormer reno R.H 55.4.1/27 Chris Anderson
Commissioners: Welch, MacLeod, Paul and Camp - Last heard July 16, 2024

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus comments: she's happy with the new facade, particularly the door and dormer changes. These revisions seem to improve the design in a positive way. The rear door acceptable as a secondary door, which is in line with typical Nantucket designs, she's slightly concerned about the Craftsman style influence of this rear door, as it introduces a different architectural feel compared to the rest of the building. Has concerns how this style choice aligns with the overall design, which seems more in keeping with Nantucket's traditional aesthetic.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group: He suggests that the rear dormer be divided into smaller elements, the windows in the dormer be reconfigured for better proportions, and more clarity be provided regarding the grade and floor levels. For the front elevation, he recommends adding a window and door schedule and trim details to make the design clearer and ensure better proportions, especially for the front door.

DISCUSSION:

Joe: emphasizes the need for careful detailing and proportions to make the design more cohesive. Specifically, he suggests larger casings for the front elevation, better proportioning of the gable windows, a simpler rear door, and the split dormer or potential refinement of the single dormer. All these adjustments aim to make the house feel more balanced and fitting for its style.

Angus: emphasizes the importance of traditional detailing and proportions, particularly with the gable window and front porch stair design, he agrees with the consensus on the rear dormer but advocate for proportional adjustments to the windows and roof to prevent it from feeling like an overly dominant third floor.

Stephen: primarily focuses on drafting clarity (like the window/door schedule and grade line) and design refinement (such as the roof shingle pattern and front door trim). He also suggests bringing back the chimney, agreeing that it would contribute positively to the design of both the front and rear elevations and emphasizes the importance of accurate details in the drawings for clarity and approval.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Stephen – carried., Pohl, Welch, Macleod (aye)

5. Orange LLC

85 Orange St

Renovate Garage

55.4.1/27

Chris Anderson

Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul, Thornewill - Last heard July 16, 2024

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus comments about converting the existing structure into a guest house, which is a positive step. She also mentions the need to withdraw the guest house application, noting this for the record. She expresses that you haven't reviewed the specific details of the plans thoroughly and therefore, have no additional comments on the designs. She also mentions the discrepancy between what you're seeing online and what is being presented in the meeting, specifically regarding the front elevation, which seems to differ from the online version. This observation indicates a need for further clarification or updated materials.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mickey Rowland from the Historic Structures Advisory Group: He mentions that the forward gable of the existing building feels awkward. He is uncertain about what exactly to call the issue, but it seems to create an imbalance or discomfort in the overall design. He suggests that centering the door might improve the appearance and help balance the structure. However, he still feels that the roof should turn in the opposite direction for better visual harmony.

DISCUSSION:

Ray: Is pointing out a significant inaccuracy in the drawings for the front building. The drawings suggest that the roof pitch is 6:12, but based on the photograph provided, the actual pitch appears to be closer to 9:12 or even higher. You specifically note that you can tell this from the location of the current eave. He also references the guideline from *Building with Nantucket in Mind*, which specifies that 7:12 is the minimum acceptable roof pitch for this type of construction, and the drawings, as they stand, do not meet that standard. His conclusion is that you cannot provide further feedback until accurate drawings are presented. He also makes clear that this issue applies not just to the front building, but to the main house as well.

Stephen: There is a need for updated drawings that reflect the true proportions and details of the building, including accurate roof pitch (likely closer to 9:12 rather than 6:12) and adjustments based on previous comments. There's concern about the size and quantity of the windows on the Gable ends. The current windows appear too large and overwhelming, and a reduction in their size or number may be necessary to better balance the overall design. As discussed, the roof pitch needs to be corrected to at least 9:12, as per Nantucket's guidelines and to match the existing roof more accurately. It would be helpful to include a detailed window and door schedule to clarify the design choices for all components. The grade line and door trim details need clarification to ensure the design is consistent and well-detailed. His suggestion is to proceed with the revisions, including the accurate depiction of the roof pitch, updated window and door details, and any other necessary adjustments before moving forward.

Carrie: The current window design appears too large and prominent, especially on the Gable ends. Reducing the size or adjusting the number of windows could create a more balanced and aesthetically pleasing design. There's agreement that the roof pitch needs to be corrected to a 9:12 pitch for consistency with Nantucket design guidelines. The current roof pitch shown as 6:12 doesn't align with the existing structure, and the new design must reflect this accurate slope.

Angus: is urging the designers to take these comments seriously and make the necessary revisions to avoid further delays or confusion in future reviews.

Joe: To proceed smoothly, the applicant should clarify whether they intend to demolish and rebuild or make modifications to the existing structure. Once clarified, the conversation could shift to focusing on the new design direction, including whether the gable orientation fits the overall character of the project.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions, additional information made by Stephen – carried., Pohl, Welch, MacLeod, Thornewill (aye)

Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

6. Orange LLC	85 Orange St	Addition reno Main House	55.4.1/27	Chris Anderson
Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul and Camp; Alt: Thornewill -- Last heard July 16, 2024 TRACK				
7. Orange LLC	85 Orange St	Hardscape Front	55.4.1/27	Chris Anderson
TRACK				
8. Orange LLC	85 Orange St	Hardscape Rear	55.4.1/27	Chris Anderson
TRACK				
9. Katie Holohan & Adam Kates	12 Pilgram	New Dwelling	41/476	Emeritus LTD
Commissioners: Pohl, Paul, MacLeod, Thornewill and Patten; -- Last heard July 23, 2024				

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus comments: It seems that there is a request to approve the project tonight, with a specific adjustment to the height as part of the approval process. The adjustment was made based on feedback, and there is an email from a neighbor (Kristen, one of the abutters) expressing appreciation for this change. The request to the board is to incorporate this height adjustment into the (COA) as part of the approval motion, which would officially document and acknowledge the change.

DISCUSSION:

Carrie: No Concerns

Connie: No Concerns

Joe: No Concerns

Angus: It seems that there is general appreciation for the revisions made to the project, with the applicant potentially preferring a steeper roof. His suggestion here is that the front Gable could be steeper, but starting at the current peak height and only adjusting the eave downward could help retain the original intention of the design.

Ray: No Concerns

MOTION: Motion to approve with changing the COA to reflect 2511 versus 297 made by Carrie – Carried. Macleod, Patten, Thornewill, Pohl (aye)

10. Dali Kovacevic	3 Aster Ct	Solar Rooftop	68/373	AckSmart
Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Connie; Alt: Paul -- Last heard September 3, 2024				

DISCUSSION:

Angus: is referencing Photo B as a key image from a visit, describing how it showcases the main mass of the structure that faces the street. The speaker also expresses a desire to see the Richmond area transition to solar energy and become net-zero. However, they point out that solar installation on the current building does not meet the existing guidelines. He suggests that if the commission is to approve solar installations in situations like this one, where the guidelines are not followed, there should be special guidelines established specifically for neighborhoods like this one. This would help to balance the desire for sustainability with design consistency.

Val: reflects on a previous discussion where she initially felt that the proposed solar installation was acceptable. She suggests that the reason for this approval was the potential for more consistent guidelines to be established. She acknowledges that while the main mass of the structure faces the street, it is a flat side and the solar panels would span across the side, which they thought was appropriate given the circumstances.

Ray: reflects on a previous solar installation on Hummock Pond Road, which initially bothered him but has since become less noticeable as they've grown accustomed to it. He points out that the solar panels on a solid black roof, facing Cisco blend in more over time, even though it's on a two-story roof. He sees mitigating circumstances in the current application, as the roof form is solid and not chopped up, even though the back side of the house might have more complexity. He approves of the vent pipe being moved and he is comfortable with this specific solar panel installation.

Connie: concludes that she would concede and be okay with the installation, perhaps accepting the visibility on the side as a reasonable compromise.

Stephen: Is reflecting on the solar panel installation and seems to be in favor of the idea but is also weighing the factors that would justify its approval. He mentions that this is a test case based on the shallowness of the roof, the dark color of the roof, and its placement on a secondary mass. He also suggests a tree planting to mitigate the visual impact of the panels and seems open to approving the application with these conditions in mind.

MOTION: to approve as submitted, subject to some kind of plant material to be provided along the western property line, this is based on the fact it's a black roof, and that the main mass is perpendicular to the street address made by Val – Carried. Macleod, Oliver, Pohl, Patten, Welch (aye)

Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

11. Wayne Elliot 106 Squam Rd Shed 12/37 Self
Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill; -- Last heard July 09, 2024

DISCUSSION:

Val: The shed appears too tall and narrow, which makes it look somewhat out of proportion. Additionally, the two gable dormers may be excessive for the size of the structure. The shed is located at the back of the property, so it shouldn't be highly visible from the main views, however, if any part is visible, it's likely to be the side of the shed (which may be the most prominent side when viewed from the property or nearby areas). She suggests remove the lattice treatment over the door, which could be seen as an unnecessary design element that might not fit well with the overall aesthetic.

Joe: The shed is different from typical, "boring" shed, he appreciates that it's not just utilitarian, but it still fits with the other elements of the property. It's placed in the back corner, meaning it's not going to be the focal point of the property, which could be a factor in its design, there is one element that stood out a bracketed feature on the north elevation (likely a structural or decorative detail), he suggests that if the brackets were slightly adjusted—either pulled inward by a foot or a few inches, rather than hanging over the door or protruding across the entire facade—it would create a more cohesive visual connection to the doors below.

Carrie: Nothing to add.

Stephen: The zoning shed needs to comply with the specific size and height regulations to avoid penalties regarding the ground coverage of the property. The height and application plans must align for the approval to proceed smoothly, it must be 200 square feet or less, it cannot exceed 16 feet in height, it cannot have a full basement.

Ray: The visibility of the shed and pergola will likely be limited due to their location being far from the road. This reduces his concerns for their aesthetic impact on the property's streetscape. The pergola is considered an interesting design element, not "boring." While there is a bit of hesitation about whether it fits well, the distance from the road seems to make its inclusion more acceptable, there's a discussion about the colors used for the shed and the pergola. The trim of the structure will be painted gray (matching the other dwellings on the property), not white as initially thought. The pergola will be made from clear cedar, which will weather into a natural gray over time, contributing to a more organic look. The final approval appears to depend on ensuring the height of the shed remains under 16 feet, as this would satisfy the zoning requirements and avoid impacting the property's ground coverage.

MOTION: Motion to approve with an Exhibit A made by Stephen – Carried Oliver, Paul, Thornewill, Welch, Pohl (aye)

12. Riverview Crossing LLC 12.5 Pequot St Garage 80/20 Michael McKay
Commissioners: Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul and Patten; Alt: Thornewill -- Last heard August 13, 2024

13. 13 & 15 Nancy Ann LLC 13 Nancy Ann Ln Mixed use 68/137 Emeritus LTD
Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Camp; Alt: Thornewill, Patten; -- Last heard August 27, 2024

V. NEW BUSINESS 09/03/2024

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Bittersweet East N LLC	5 Mattapoisett Ave	Deck expanded	82/371	Val Oliver

Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Thornewill and Camp; Alt: Paul

DISCUSSION:

Ray: The deck is described as a "cut-in deck", which typically means a deck that's recessed or inset into the structure, possibly making it look like it's carved or set into the building, instead of trying to make the deck appear "cut in," the speaker suggests it might be better to embrace a more straightforward design. Ray notes that there's no shortage of large decks in the neighborhood, implying that a larger, more visible deck wouldn't be out of place.

Carrie: the deck is located on a large property, there's nothing behind it, meaning the deck will likely be visible from a distant view. This helps reduce any concerns about its impact on the site or surrounding area. She mentions a concern about whether the posts for the structure might be located within the setback. However, upon reviewing the plans, it seems that the posts are a foot or so away from the setback, which is good news. Carrie was initially worried that the posts might be in violation of setback regulations, but the plan appears to meet those requirements.

Angus: Is concerned about the size of the proposed deck, particularly because it's 10 by 26 feet and is being added to a second-floor deck. Larger decks, especially those on higher floors, can stand out more and create a significant visual impact. He seems to favor decks that are partially integrated with the roof, meaning those with some form of roofing that helps blend the structure into the building, making them feel less intrusive, one specific concern is the white railings on the deck, which the speaker feels could make the deck stand out too much against the natural background, especially in the context of the surrounding landscape. The white railings may contrast

Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

sharply with the natural environment, drawing attention to the deck in a way that a more natural material (like shingle or wood) might not, he is concerned about the overall size of the deck, how far it projects from the building, and the exposure of the railings, especially if they are to be painted white. These elements could make the deck feel too dominant visually.

Stephen: approves the deck and the overall design, with the condition that the house maintains a consistent color scheme of gray and natural weathered wood, as shown in the most recent photos.

MOTION: to approve with color being as per the front of the building which is gray and natural made by Ray – Welch, Pohl, Macleod, Thornewill and Camp.

2. Orenstein 5 Crow's Nest Wy Window door revs 12/22.2 R. Newman
Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Paul, MacLeod

DISCUSSION:

Angus: HDC got it right the 1st time.

Val: Thinks the 3 are too much and could live with 2.

Ray: Is comfortable with the design due to its limited visibility and is open to the board's decision on whether the structure should have three levels or two. He is prepared to approve it but are willing to follow the board's consensus.

Joe: is okay with the proposed changes, feeling that they won't greatly affect the public's perception of the project. He believes that the railing and grade change will help mitigate the impact of the changes and is ok with the way it was submitted.

Stephen: is comfortable with the proposal because of its **low visibility** and the fact that it won't be a focal point for people in the area.

MOTION: to approve as submitted with the important stipulation that the second-floor design remains unchanged from its original approval made by Angus – Mcleod, Oliver, Paul (aye) Welch, Pohl (no)

3. LM Kelly 81 Cliff Rd New Garage 30/165 R R. Newman
Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, MacLeod

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus comments expressing concerns about the height and atypical features (like voids) of the garage design, while also acknowledging the renderings as helpful. She feels that the height could be reduced and question the necessity of the French doors, even though they recognize the design's visibility limitations.

DISCUSSION:

Val: has no significant problem with the garage design, especially given its location and the fact that the voids will likely be hidden. She also understands the need for the height and feel that it fits with the site's context.

Carrie: raises concerns about the visibility of the voids, the lack of design cohesion between the buildings, and the siding of the garage. She finds the design a bit mismatched but still leave some room for approval, acknowledging that the garage is a simple structure with some potentially quirky design choices.

Ray: No Concerns

Angus: proposes lowering the height of the structure to create a more balanced relationship between the buildings and reduce its visual impact, especially from the nearby street Sherburn Way, he believes this adjustment would improve the overall design and make the structures feel more cohesive.

Stephen: is generally supportive of the new structure, finding it more appropriate in terms of design, but they feel the Cabana doesn't quite fit with the overall design language and may need to be addressed in the future.

MOTION: to approve as submitted made by Ray – Pohl, Welch, Oliver, McLeod, Thornewill (aye)

4. LM Kelly 81 Cliff Rd Hardscape arbor 30/165 R. Newman
Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, MacLeod

STAFF COMMENT: Preservation Planner Holly Backus comments the need for a detailed plan of the wall to ensure it fits with the existing design and to clarify its construction. She references an existing wall that features cut rectangular stone, which she suggests for the new design.

MOTION: to hold for revisions and more information made by Ray – Welch, Pohl, McLeod, Oliver, Thornewill (aye)

Minutes for October 8, 2024; adopted January 21, 2025

MINUTES

Voting:	May 21 st Minutes	
Documentation:		
Motion:	Approved	
Vote:	Pohl, McLeod, Patten (aye) Welch, Oliver (abstention)	

POTENTIAL ITEMS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8.30 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 7-0 // : Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Thornewill, MacLeod, Paul, Patten