



Minutes for October 22, 2024; adopted April 8, 2025

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, October 22, 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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Welch called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

I. CONSENT

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Squam Holdings LLC	25 Squam Rd	Rev 2024-06-10626	21/5	Botticelli & PohlSW
2. Meade, Julie	1 New St Sconset	New Shed	73.1.3/35	Permits + SW
3. Theroux, Stephen	26 Dartmouth St	New Roof	76.4.2/410	NAG SW
4. David & Dena Biddison	22 Cannonbury Ln	Deck extension	74/15	Val Oliver SW
5. Joanne Love	36 Hooper Farm Rd	Alterations	67/130	Val Oliver SW
Voting:	MacLeod, Camp, Welch, Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	Oliver, Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve consents (Made by: MacLeod)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // MacLeod, Camp, Welch, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

II. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Miller Bruce	4 Henderson Dr	New Fence	66/205	Self SW
2.				
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve due to lack of visibility (Made by: Oliver)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3. 156 Cliff Rd N.T.	156 Cliff Rd	Pool Hardscape	41/836	Atlantic SW
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion approved on the condition the pool not to be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application. Pool equipment to be enclosed. (Made by: Oliver)			

Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten
-------	---

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. 21 Pilgrim Rd Trust	4 Sophie's Wy	Pool Hardscape	41/213	Atlantic SW
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion approved on the condition the pool not to be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application. Pool equipment to be enclosed. (Made by: Oliver)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
5. Egan, James	15 Pine Crest Dr	New Pool	68/435	Self SW
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion approved on the condition the pool not to be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application. Pool equipment to be enclosed. (Made by: Oliver)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
6. Somersack	5 High Brush Path	Pool Rev's	56/388	KMLD SW
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion approved on the condition the pool not to be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application. Pool equipment to be enclosed. (Made by: Oliver)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
7. Changying, Sun	19A Waydale Rd	New Dwelling	67/866	K Megna SW
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve on the condition to eliminate fascia over windows by lowering 2nd floor top plate (bury window header into top plate & lower top plate height overall) resulting in one fascia (being at area of rafter tails. (Made by: Oliver).			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, Patten			

III. OLD BUSINESS 10/15/2024 FROM LAST WEEK

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. 3 Pops Lane Trust	3 Pops Ln	Demo/Move MH	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Mark Cutone			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - There is an HDC survey on file for the structure when it was located at 343 Madaket Road, and the structure is still extant. - The building, known as the Taylor House, was likely built by George Elmore Taylor (1907-1992) around 1940. - The structure was moved in 1994 by Gan Moran, with ZBA documentation available.			

	- The 1940s aerial from the town's records (emailed to the board) confirms the building's existence at the site. - The 1994 Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) confirms the move to its current location. - The dwelling should be preserved, and while it is desirable to relocate it, demolition would be a loss of valuable mid-century architecture in Nantucket. - Even if relocated, the structure will continue to contribute to the local National Historic District. - The HDC survey on file was conducted in 1988-89, which may list many structures as non-contributing. However, the National Historic Landmark designation was extended in 2012 to include properties up to 1975, meaning this structure is now considered contributing to the local National Historic District.
Public Comments:	Linda Williams - Represents the closest abutter; they have objections to the proposed project but are particularly concerned about the house. - Provided Holly with information on the property's history, including the title changes when Jee Moran sold the lot to Greg Keltz in 1994. - The house was moved in 1994; the 1938 aerial shows its original location. - The building has a rich history, dating back to Elmore Taylor and other families, with deeds dating back to the 1920s and a life right to Madaket Millie's family. - The massing of the house is more appropriate for the Hither Creek area, unlike the current proposal (which is not under review tonight). - Suspects that part of the house may have originated from one of the cottages removed from Smith Point, based on the shape of the structure. - This house, at 80-90 years old, should be preserved. If it cannot remain in place, it should be moved, not demolished. - The speaker agrees with Holly's position and will return with further concerns about the proposal.
Commissioner Comments:	- Preference is to retain the structure in place if possible. - If moved, it should remain in the same area, preferably Madaket, where similar structures exist. - If relocation is necessary, it should go to a prepared site with owner consent. - Demolition is the least favored option and should only be considered as a last resort. - More documentation on the structure's physical condition and historic fabric is needed before any demolition decision. - There is uncertainty about the structure's age and alterations from 1994, raising questions about its historic integrity. - The structure is listed as a 1940 ranch, categorized as non-contributing, and is not considered a quintessential Madaket cottage. - If demolition is ultimately necessary, it should be well-documented and only approved if minimal historic integrity remains.
Motion:	Motion to approve as move-off only. (Mady by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

OLD BUSINESS 10/8/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Riverview Crossing LLC	12.5 Pequot St	Garage	80/20	Michael McKay
Last Heard:	October 15, 2024			
Sitting Board:	Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul, Patten			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
	Application not heard due to lack of applicant.			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
----------------	----------------	---------------	------------	-------

2. 13 & 15 Nancy Ann LLC 13 Nancy Ann Ln Mixed use 68/137 Emeritus LTD

Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp
Alternates:	-Thornewill, Patten
Recused:	-
Representative:	Matt MacEachern
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	- Concerns about the two buildings appearing as one large structure due to reduced spacing and increased overall size. - Differentiating eave lines could help create a more additive massing effect. - A view of both buildings together is needed to assess their relationship and overall impact. - Appreciation for the inclusion of porches, though some have shallow roof pitches that should be adjusted to better align with typical approvals. - Standing seam metal roofing, especially on porch roofs, remains a concern. - The area is mixed in architectural style, but excessive parking, asphalt, and building mass should be reduced if possible. - Vegetation will be important in mitigating the scale of the project. - Underground parking is seen as a positive feature that allows for better landscaping opportunities. - Landscaping should focus on simplicity, with mature trees providing long-term benefits over excessive foundational plantings. - More perspectives of the buildings together are needed to fully evaluate the design's impact.
Motion:	Motion to hold additional information and revisions. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp

Property Owner **Street Address** **Scope of Work** **Map/Parcel** **Agent**
3. 13 & 15 Nancy Ann LLC 15 Nancy Ann Ln Mixed use 68/137 Emeritus LTD

Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp
Alternates:	Thornewill, Patten, Paul
Recused:	-
Representative:	Matt MacEachern
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	- The two buildings are nearly identical in size, creating the appearance of one large structure. - Adding one-story elements instead of just door overhangs could provide variety and better ground the design. - Previous applications had better depth between planes, with more substantial setbacks; current design appears too flush. - Concerns remain about standing seam metal roofing, particularly on porches. - First-floor porch roofs seem too steep and somewhat contrived. - The large block of color could make the building feel overly dark and heavy. - Thoughtful vegetation will be crucial in softening the commercial scale of the project. - Underground parking is beneficial for allowing more landscaping opportunities. - Landscaping should focus on mature trees for long-term impact rather than excessive foundation plantings. - Additional perspectives of both buildings together are needed to fully evaluate their combined impact.
Motion:	Motion to hold for more information, viewing perspectives, and revisions. (Made by:

	Camp)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp (Aye)

OLD BUSINESS 10/22/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Stephen & Kathy Lasota	8 Maple Ln	New Dwelling	67/303.4	K Megna
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Patten			
Alternates:	-Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Kristopher Megna			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- The left side of the structure still appears overwhelming; a wraparound porch could help ground the design. - The hip roof on the left competes with the flush dormer; a continuous roofline may be preferable. - The front door has too much glass; a transom or smaller six-light window with panels is recommended. - The chimney may need to be slightly taller and is missing on the right side in the gable area. - Concern about the two rear doors, though they are not visible. - Extending the secondary mass on the southeast to a shed roof instead of a U-shape could improve the design. - The primary concern remains the roof mass, but overall, the application is minor.			
Motion:	Motion to approve on the basis the Southeast elevation to extend the leftmost hip into a closed shed, extend the chimney to meet code, change front door to a six panel with the two top panels being glass, and change shower wrap to typical board. (Made by: Pohl)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Patten (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. Patience Killien	1 Old North Wharf	Revs	42.3.1/79	Val Oliver
Last Heard:	September 24, 2024			
Sitting Board:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
	Application not heard due to lack of applicant.			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3. Dex Dog LLC	6B Arrowhead Dr	Addition	69/58.1	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul, Camp			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matt MacEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- Concern about the mahogany turning gray over time, which may make the prominent lines at the top stand out more. If the wood grays out, it might blend better with the roof. - Preference for the previous design without a railing or high wall, as it was the least intrusive. - Preference for the shed roof with a shingled rail, as it simplifies the design and reduces			

	visual clutter. - Dislike for the hip roof with railing, as it feels too busy and exposes too much of the door and windows in the gable. - Concern that the original design with a hidden rail has an overly commercial look and that the steep hip wrapping around is problematic. - If an exposed railing is used, it should be all cedar and match other vertical elements rather than using horizontal rails. - Open to either the shed roof or the lowered hip with an exposed railing, with no strong objections if a consensus is reached. - General agreement that simpler solutions are preferred over more complex rail and hip designs.
Motion:	Motion to approve Option Two that shows the shed roof with the shingles wall balcony as proposed. (Made by: MacLeod)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul, Camp (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. Robert & Amy Finzi	26 Pocomo Rd	Addition	14/74	Smith/ Hutton
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Patten			
Alternates:	-Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Chris Deemer			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- No major concerns with the revisions. - The front porch over the door appears too visually dominant, with a suggestion to change it to a hip roof to reduce prominence. - Concern about alignment issues in the fenestration: the existing front door and dormer are misaligned with the picture window and side windows, while the proposed design improves some alignment but disrupts others. - Front porch columns feel heavy, and a slightly wider porch might help balance the composition. - Acknowledgment that the design should center elements on the front of the house rather than relying solely on the door and dormer as focal points. - No objections to changing the shed roof to a hipped entry, but it's not necessary for approval. - General agreement that the current design is acceptable, with some minor refinements suggested for better balance.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver)			
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten (Aye) Camp (No)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
5. Robert & Amy Finzi	26 Pocomo Rd	New garage	14/74	Smith/ Hutton
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Patten			
Alternates:	-Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Chris Deemer			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- No objections from any board members.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Made by: Camp)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Patten (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
6. Born & Bread	35 Center St	Solar Roof	42.3.1/3	AckSmart
Last Heard:	August 27, 2024			
Sitting Board:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
	Application not heard due to lack of applicant.			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
7. Dober Richard P Trust	10 Silver St	Hardscape	55.4.1/187	Ahern, LLC
Voting:	Paul, Thornewill, Patten, MacLeod, Welch			
Alternates:	-none			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - This is an infill within the Fish Lot subdivision in the OHD. - Appreciate the changes to the driveway and walkway; the front yard aligns better with the historic neighborhood character. - Concern about the impervious surfaces at the bottom of the hill (stone and steppers), especially given the property is in a FEMA flood zone (2% area). - No concerns about visibility from the public way; the design is typical with brick and stacked parking spaces. Mickey Rowland, Representative for Historic Structures Advisory Group - Appreciate Mira changing to stacked parking front and back, a significant improvement. - Current U-plan shows parking too wide at the front; suggest narrowing it at the street side and going straight back. - The outdoor shower is visible halfway down the side of the building; if possible, moving it further back would be appreciated. - The retaining wall to raise the grade behind the parking could be reduced if the parking slopes more.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- Concern about the 19-foot-wide driveway, with a suggestion to narrow it by a couple of feet. - Retaining wall at the end of the parking area could be reduced by following the grade and sloping the parking to minimize obstruction of the building. - Questioned the location of the retaining wall and the privet hedge planted directly on top of it; suggested placing the privet outside the wall if possible. - The outdoor shower is in a high-visibility area; suggested moving it further back or replacing it with a foot wash and relocating the shower to a more private area. - Driveway should maintain a consistent width from front to back for better proportion. - The retaining wall should be New England stone rather than PT, as it will be visible and more appropriate for the historic district.			
Motion:	Motion to approve based on a New England stone wall, top of wall 24", relocate exterior shower to the previous location, screen the retaining wall, and change the parking area to taper from where the 9' parking space meet the 7' parking space of couple of feet on the Western bound side. (Made by: Patten)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Paul, Thornewill, Patten, MacLeod, Welch (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
8. Alexandra Ripley Petrillo	92 Washington St	New Main House	42.2.3/22	Hammond Wilson
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Thornewill, MacLeod, Oliver			
Alternates:	-Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Leo Wilson			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - For the record, the existing 1960s dwelling on the site is to be removed; want to verify its COA status, which may be close to expiration. - Appreciates the changes to the Gambrel design, particularly the kick panels on the French doors. - The only pending request is for the elevation certificate and FEMA map to be provided, in line with the resilient design guidelines and best management practices. - If the commission approves this evening, requests that this be a condition of approval.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Representative for Historic Structures Advisory Group - On the water side, the triple French doors (especially the upper one) have too much glass for the second floor. Suggest replacing with a door and flanking windows. - On the front, the windows on the left-facing gable could align better for improved symmetry. - The roof overhang on the left side has awkward detailing; the bracket is unusual, and cheek walls are needed on the sides.			
Commissioner Comments:	- Concern raised about the misalignment of windows on the front facade. - Small side roof above the door appears to "float" and may need adjustment. - Second-floor row of three doors on the east (water-facing) elevation is problematic; a single door flanked by two windows was suggested instead. - The pent roof over the side door has unusual detailing that should be refined. - The elliptical curve bracket over the side door was criticized, with a preference for an alternative design. - Overall, the front elevation lacks symmetry, particularly with the right-side gambrel, and should be adjusted for better balance.			
Motion:	Motion to approve through an Exhibit A to create alignment on the front of the building change out the back second floor to a French door plus two windows and to drop the eve of the um pen roof on the side porch. (Made by: MacLeod)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Thornewill, Oliver, MacLeod, Welch, Pohl (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
9. Alexandra Ripley Petrillo	92 Washington St	New Garage	42.2.3/22	Hammond Wilson
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Thornewill, MacLeod, Oliver			
Alternates:	-Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Leo Wilson			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Acknowledged the height reduction and the effort to simplify the design. - Dormers are atypical and not consistent with <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i>. - The only consistent dormer element is their distance from the ridge, but their overall design is not in line with island precedent. - Concern that this dormer style has not been seen before, raising questions about its appropriateness.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Representative for Historic Structures Advisory Group - Agreed with Holly's concerns about the dormers, describing them as busy and chaotic. - Suggested simplifying the dormers to two small, symmetrical dormers for a more			

	cohesive design. - Noted that the balcony posts facing the water appear too heavy and recommended simpler detailing or possibly narrowing the balcony. - Observed that the pent roofs over the garage doors are more in line with expectations compared to those on the house, highlighting a discrepancy in design consistency.
Commissioner Comments:	- Dormers are too chaotic and feature three different styles, which is not working. - Recommended simplifying the dormers to two similar-sized, symmetrical dormers. - Noted that the 3.5 pitch of the dormers is below the guideline minimum and should be increased to at least a 4 pitch. - Agreed that the pent roof detailing on the garage is more appropriate and suggested applying a similar approach to the house. - Acknowledged the garage's reduced stature as an improvement over the existing larger garage. - The small rear balcony is not a major concern, as it will have minimal visibility. - Consensus that the dormers are the primary issue and should be revised for approval.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Thornewill, Oliver, MacLeod, Welch, Pohl (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
10. The Whole Spread LLC	332 Madaket Rd	Rev 2023-01-7660	60/100	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Thornewill, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates:	-Paul, Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matt MacEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged that the circa 1960s dwelling, known as The Seagull, was once a candy and cake shop in Madaket. - Appreciated the reduction of the covered porch, as previously noted concerns included visibility from the beach. - Still concerned about the elevation facing Madaket Road and what is visible from that direction. - Noted that the building has received prior approvals but requested clarification on the existing conditions compared to previously approved and proposed revisions for better context.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- Fine with the revisions but noted concern about the removal of the porch roof, which previously helped integrate the French doors. Now, the doors feel more prominent and less balanced. - The previously proposed porch may have been too large, but eliminating it entirely makes the French doors stand out awkwardly. - Concern about the large west-facing windows (A windows), which resemble doors and feel oversized for the small structure. Suggested resizing them to better fit the scale of the building. - Recommended bringing back a smaller version of the removed porch element to provide balance without overwhelming the façade. - Agreed that the large windows are inconsistent with the rest of the fenestration and suggested finding a compromise in size and design.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with an Exhibit A. (Made by Thornewill)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Thornewill, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver, Welch (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
11. Sam & Craig Cordts-Pearce	76 Pleasant St	Rear Dwelling	55/367	Sanne Payne
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Patten			
Alternates:	-Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Sanne Payne			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that this is an infill project behind an 1850s four-bay, one-and-three-quarter-story structure with historical significance. - Concern that the rear dwelling's facade feels incomplete and lacks a defining architectural element, despite having a front door. - The roof walk appears too wide and should be narrowed to align with <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> guidelines. The length may be appropriate but requires further review. - The two-over-two windows are consistent with the front dwelling and are appropriate. - Acknowledged that roof walks exist in the neighborhood, but this proposal is on the borderline of what is acceptable. - Expressed difficulty in fully assessing the elevation but appreciated the street view rendering, which helps provide better context. - The original main mass functioned more as a front entry, while the proposed side gable approach changes that relationship.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Representative for Historic Structures Advisory Group - Concern that the design is moving in the wrong direction, with the previous massing feeling more appropriate. - The front door was originally in the main mass but is now tucked behind a shed roof on a side addition, which is not ideal; it should be placed on the main mass. - Multiple gang French doors may not be a major visibility issue, but the road runs directly along the side of the property, making them more exposed. - The roof walk is too wide and should be adjusted. - Overall, the previous massing was considered more appropriate than the current proposal.			
Commissioner Comments:	- Concern that the design is moving in the wrong direction, with the previous massing feeling more appropriate. - The front door is now placed behind a shed roof on a side addition, making it feel secondary rather than a focal point of the main mass. - The roof walk is too wide and does not follow guidelines, as it sits on top of the dormers. - The east elevation has a chaotic window configuration, with concerns about the dormer lacking sufficient fenestration. - The bulkhead or basement stair access is located directly along the road, raising concerns about its visibility. - The north elevation could benefit from replacing the shed roof with a gable, which may help establish a more traditional front entry. - The west elevation features four French doors in a row, which may be excessive and could be reduced for better balance. - The overall percentage of fenestration is a concern, as it feels inconsistent with typical Nantucket massing. - General agreement that the design should be refined to improve the relationship between the front entry, massing, and fenestration.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revision. (Made by: Pohl)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Patten (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
12. Big Patch LLC	69 Hummock Pond Rd	Pool Hardscape	56/320	Atlantic
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Patten			
Alternates:	Thornewill, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Lindsay Congleton			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- Requested clearer site plan showing both existing and proposed topography for better understanding of grading changes. - Design does not integrate well with natural topography; driveway, pool, and hardscaping feel too formal and rigid. - Hardscaping extends fully to the property line and should be reduced for a more natural approach. - Retaining walls, particularly on the south side, remain a concern; clarification needed on visibility and materials. - Granite curbing and steps feel unnatural; steps should blend into the landscape rather than appear constructed. - Pool screening should be done close to the pool with native plantings rather than extensive hardscaping. - Raised elevation on the northern side (34-36 feet) should be reduced to better match the landform, keeping grading changes minimal. - The front of the property should remain untouched to preserve its natural character.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Patten (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
13. Bernard Blaney	6 Marion Ave	Pool	82/137	Ryan Blaney
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-none			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ryan Blaney			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- Appreciated the placement of the shed in front of the pool and the shift towards a more naturalistic planting approach. - Concern that the planting is primarily along the perimeter rather than placed closer to the pool and shed to provide better screening. - Suggested enhancing plantings around the shed to better mask the pool, especially given its unusual location. - Requested additional information, such as a before-and-after comparison, site sections, and elevation views from the road, to clarify visibility impacts. - The contour lines on the site plan need clarification, including spot elevations on the lawn and top of berms to better understand height variations. - Noted potential openings in the berm, raising concerns about visibility from the street. - Emphasized the need for a site visit to assess the effectiveness of the proposed screening. - Questioned whether the driveway is part of this application or a future submission, as its straight design contrasts with the more organic approach seen in the area.			

	- Overall concern that while the design is intended to appear natural, the implementation may still feel too formal for the setting.
Motion:	Motion to hold for a view and revisions (Made by: MacLeod)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Paul, MacLeod, Patten, Thornewill, Welch (Aye)

NEW BUSINESS 09/03/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Robert Jepson	32 Hinsdale Rd	As-Built Shed	68/19.2	Ryan Jepson VO
	Application not heard due to lack of applicant.			

NEW BUSINESS 09/17/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. John Murray	75 Fairgrounds Rd	New Dwelling	67/180.1	J Martinez VO
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod			
Alternates:	-Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Esmerelda Martinez			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- Concern about the blank area in the front dormer, suggesting either adding a window or reducing the dormer size. - Dormer runs the full width of the building, which feels unusual; suggested breaking it up or reworking it. - Lack of fenestration on the west and north elevations needs to be addressed. - Front porch could be deeper to better align with the second-floor windows and improve proportions. - Suggested extending the front porch around to the side door to better integrate the masses. - The projecting gable could also be better tied into the porch for a more cohesive design. - Overall, minor refinements needed to improve balance and integration of architectural elements.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod (Aye)			

NEW BUSINESS 10/01/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Red Mill Lane LLC	8 Red Mill Ln	New Dwelling	55/928	LFW VO
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates:	- Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:				
Public Comments:				
Commissioner Comments:	- Concerns about grading changes, particularly in the southeast corner where the proposed elevation is significantly higher than the existing. - Need for a clear existing and proposed topography plan to understand the extent of cut and fill. - Retaining wall on the south side must be screened with naturalized vegetation to mitigate visibility. - Suggestions to allow a slight grade slope instead of a fully leveled platform to reduce the			

	need for excessive retaining walls. - Questions about the height and visibility of the south-facing Cabana, particularly the number of French doors and their exposure to the land bank property. - Request for a cross-section showing the Cabana, pool, terrace, and retaining wall to clarify visual impact. - Additional details needed on fencing or barriers to prevent safety hazards from elevated areas. - Recommendation for a site visit to assess the visibility of the project in context with neighboring properties. - Hold for revisions with additional information on grading, landscaping, and mitigation measures.
Motion:	Motion to hold pending additional information and grade changes. (Made by: MacLeod)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 //

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. Red Mill Lane LLC	8 Red Mill Ln	Hardscape pool	55/928	LFW VO
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates:	- Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Track with New Dwelling Application			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3. Red Mill Lane LLC	8 Red Mill Ln	New Cabana	55/928	LFW VO
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates:	- Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Track with New Dwelling Application			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. Dustin Murray	32 Cannonbury Ln	New Dwelling	73/24	Reid Yenor VO
Voting:	Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Pohl, Paul			
Alternates:	Thornewill, Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Reid Yenor			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The design feels very formal for a neighborhood that has been revitalized since the 1970s. - A less formal approach would be more appropriate for the setting.			
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley, Sconset Advisory Group - The multiple second-floor decks on the west elevation seem overpowering, though they are not visible. - The amount of patio space in the rear could be reduced. - These were the primary concerns for this application.			
Commissioner Comments:	- Concerns about the imbalance of the front gables; the left gable is too tall, and narrow compared to the right one. - The front elevation would benefit from more proportional gables and two windows in the upper level, similar to neighboring homes. - The reverse saltbox design in the center is highly atypical for Nantucket and should be			

	reconsidered. - The connector between the main masses should be at least one and three-quarter stories to provide a more traditional appearance. - The dormers above the front door appear overly modern; consider modifying their configuration. - The west elevation is overly fenestrated with too many second-floor decks and patio space, which could be reduced. - The north elevation should have better-balanced fenestration, particularly in visible areas. - The heavy use of wraparound porches creates an atypical courtyard-like feel that should be addressed. - The deck areas and fenestration on the back elevation are excessive, but visibility may be limited. - The fence-like wall on the porch feels irregular and should be reconsidered. - Additional sections and views would help clarify the design's impact.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Pohl, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
5. 450 Green Park LLC	2 Stone Alley	Alterations/rev COA 8882	42.3.1/102	Self AM
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The structure is Eliza Cod's Barn turned house, designed by one of Nantucket's first female architects between 1858-1871. - The application contained incorrect historical information, contradicting previous HDC reviews and documentation from HABS and HTC surveys from the 1980s. - Visibility from Union Street is limited due to the white trim, but the railing can still be seen from further along Union Street and Candle Street. - The mockup was installed without prior notification to the HDC or staff before the application was submitted. - Abutters have expressed concerns regarding the proposal. - The proposal is inconsistent with Eliza Cod's original design and does not align with <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> guidelines regarding decks. - A recommendation was made to maintain the original design as it was before recent HDC-approved modifications.			
Public Comments:	Nina King - A direct abutter to the south voiced concerns about the expansion of the railing, which initially started as a small corner and later extended fully. - The house has significantly increased in size, with the first-floor deck tripled and now a proposed expansion of the roof into additional outdoor living space. - Unlike the Orange Street properties, which have single decks, this property has multiple decks, further exacerbating massing concerns. - Previous efforts to mitigate massing are being undone by this proposal, which effectively adds back bulk in the form of outdoor living space. - Concerns were raised about the visual impact of furniture, umbrellas, and occupants, which would make the space more prominent than just the railing itself. - The proposed change is viewed as inconsistent with the neighborhood character and contrary to the prior mitigation efforts. Mickey Rowland, Representative for Historic Structures Advisory Group - The proposed alteration appears awkward and out of place, particularly with the flat roof			

	deck. - Cutting through the deck midway makes the flat roof feel even more awkward and disjointed. - The railing does not align with the windows, creating an unbalanced and uncoordinated look. - The deck appears to be an afterthought rather than an intentional design element. - The structure will be visible from both Stone Alley and Union Street, increasing its visual impact. - Ideally, a shallow pitched hip roof would have been a more appropriate design solution for the site.
Commissioner Comments:	- The proposed railing extending only halfway across the roof appears awkward and inconsistent with traditional architectural elements. - While decorative railings exist on Orange Street, they are typically only about 2 feet high and ornamental rather than functional as decks. - If any railing is approved, it should be a low, decorative feature aligned with the building's architectural details, such as extending pilasters rather than creating usable outdoor space. - The railing, as proposed, is highly visible from multiple locations, making its impact significant. - The post size and decorative caps are disproportionate and more intricate than previously approved designs, drawing unnecessary attention. - There is general opposition to the proposed design, with a preference for either no railing or a significantly reduced decorative version that does not encourage use as a deck.
Motion:	Motion hold for revisions. (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
6. 1010 Wins LLC	10 Lincoln Ave	Rev 2023-06-8669	30/184	Emeritus LTD AM
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod			
Alternates:	- Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matt MacEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - The Kimble House has been reviewed multiple times. - A survey from 1989 does not show a chimney, suggesting it is not historic. - Without photographic evidence of a pre-1989 chimney, the existing one is likely a later addition or replica.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	- Objections to the application.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod (Aye)			

MINUTES

Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod
Motion:	Motion to hold September 10, 2024, minutes for review. (Made by: Camp)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod (Aye)

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:27pm. (Made by: MacLeod)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod (Aye)