



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Stephen Welch (Chair), Ray Pohl (Vice-Chair) absent, Abby Camp, Val Oliver, and Angus MacLeod

Associate Commissioners: Carrie Thornewill, Constance Patten, and Joe Paul

Staff: Holly Backus, Sarah Johnson and Fiona Johnson

~~ DRAFT MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, November 5, 2024
OLD BUSINESS

Call to Order:

Chair Welch called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm and with a reminder that recordings require chair approval. The meeting is being recorded for the Town's YouTube channel, so attendees should be mindful of what they say or display. All comments must go through the Chair, following open meeting laws.

Approval of the Agenda:

Voting: Angus MacLeod, Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Chair Stephen Welch, and Connie Patten

MOTION/VOTE: Camp made a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

I. COMMISSION DISCUSSION

1. Incomplete applications

Discussion: Staff has the authority to reject incomplete applications if missing required information. Commissioners were encouraged to clearly list what is incomplete to help staff efficiently process applications. Members agreed that incomplete submissions take up unnecessary time and should not be heard until fully completed.

Welch announced that under item V. Old Business 11/05/2024, properties 4 Mariner Way and 6 Mariner Way are postponed until next week due to the absence of Chair Ray Pohl. Applicants expecting Ray on their cases can choose to wait or proceed with available alternates.

II. OLD BUSINESS 10/29/2024 TO COME BACK BY NOON

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|----------|---------|-------------------------|
| 1. Drake & Steele | 3 Primose Ln | New gate | 40/47.1 | Gryphon Architect
AM |
|-------------------|--------------|----------|---------|-------------------------|
- Commissioners:** Welch, ~~Pohl~~, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp; **Alt:** Thornewill, Patten and Paul -- Last heard October 29, 2024

Voting: Welch, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp and Thornewill
Alternates: Patten, Paul
Recused: None
Absent: Ray Pohl
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documentation, and advisory
Representing:
Commissioners and Public Comments and Concerns: - Expressed concern that the proposed gate and posts appear overly formal for Nantucket, particularly in the Eel Point area. - The design does not align with the simple, natural aesthetic typically approved by HDC. - Unlike other approved gates further down Primrose Lane, this gate is visible from Hummock Pond Road, making its design more impactful. - A simpler, more natural design was suggested to better blend with its surroundings. - The preference was for natural wood or a muted gray tone if painted, to minimize visual impact.

- The existing posts with lighting contribute to the formal appearance, and adding another set of posts and a gate seems excessive.
- Simplify the gate design to match traditional Nantucket gates.
- Use natural or muted colors to blend with the surroundings.
- Consider integrating the gate with existing posts rather than adding more structures.
- Concern about the gate being placed on new posts set back from the current ones, making the structure feel disjointed.
- Preference for the gate to be attached to the existing posts, but only if the posts are moved further back into the driveway (at least 7 feet) to reduce visual impact.

The applicant will place temporary posts to mark a revised location to make sure that the gate is not visible from Eel Point Road. Commissioners will conduct a site visit to confirm visibility and finalize placement.

Motion: Camp made a motion to hold for revision and a site view

Roll Call Vote: Motion carried unanimously 5-0. (Camp, MacLeod, Oliver, Thornewill and Chair Welch)

III. OLD BUSINESS 10/8/2024

1. 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*

Voting: Acting-Chair Oliver, MacLeod, Paul and Patten

Alternates: Thornewill

Recused: None

Absent: Ray Pohl

Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documentation, and advisory

Representing: Mike McKay

Commissioners and Public Comments and Concerns:

- The Dormers overwhelm the roof and should be scaled down.
- They should be set back further from the walls and pulled down from the ridge by about a foot.
- The current 3.5 pitch does not meet the minimum requirement of 4 and must be adjusted.
- The north elevation (facing the road) is the least successful and appears too shingled and flat.
- The gang windows on the first floor should be spaced out more, possibly into three separate sections.
- The dormer windows should be reworked to feel less static and more proportionate.
- Pedestrian doors are too formal—consider glass doors with six lights to match the windows and provide a more appropriate aesthetic.
- Suggested that applications for secondary structures should **always include a reference to the main house** for better design continuity.
- The garage roof pitch might need to be steeper to balance the massing and avoid a squished appearance.
- The current design feels top-heavy, and a slight increase in pitch may help improve proportion.
- Adjust dormer placement and pitch.
- Modify fenestration on north elevation (split gang windows, adjust dormer windows).
- Consider less formal pedestrian doors (glass with six lights).
- Make sure garage references main house design in application materials.

Motion: Mr. MacLeod made a motion to hold for revisions.

Roll-call Vote: Motion carried unanimously 5-0. (Thornewill, Paul, MacLeod, Patten and Acting-Chair Oliver)

IV. OLD BUSINESS 10/22/2024

- | | | | | | |
|----|------------------|-------------------|------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Patience Killien | 1 Old North Wharf | Revs | 42.3.1/79 | Val Oliver |
|----|------------------|-------------------|------|-----------|------------|
- Commissioners: Welch, ~~Pohl~~, Camp, MacLeod and Thornewill; Alt: Patten, Paul -- Last heard September 24, 2024*

Voting: Welch, Camp, MacLeod and Thornewill
Alternates: Patten and Paul
Recused: None
Absent: Ray Pohl
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documentation, and advisory
Representing: Val Oliver
Discussion: Oliver stated to hold due to prior existing member not present.
Motion: Motion to hold due to prior existing member not present.
Roll Call Vote: None

- | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|--------------|------------|----------|----------|
| 2. | Born & Bread | 35 Center St | Solar Roof | 42.3.1/3 | AckSmart |
|----|--------------|--------------|------------|----------|----------|
- Commissioners: Welch, ~~Pohl~~, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp; Alt: Thornewill, Patten -- Last heard August 27, 2024*

Voting: Chair Welch, Oliver, MacLeod, and Camp
Alternates: Thornewill and Patten
Recused: None
Absent: Ray Pohl
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documentation, and advisory
Representing: No representative
Discussion: Temporarily hold until representative is present.
Motion: None
Roll-call Vote: None

V. OLD BUSINESS 11/05/2024

- | | | | | | |
|----|------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|---------------|
| 1. | Brandon Eldridge | 26 Arlington | Solar shingles | 76.1.3/281 | Isaksen Solar |
|----|------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|---------------|
- Commissioners: Welch, ~~Pohl~~, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver; Alt: Patten, Paul and Thornewill-- Last heard September 03, 2024*

Voting: Chair Welch, Oliver, MacLeod, and Camp
Alternates: Patten, Paul and Thornewill
Recused: None
Absent: Ray Pohl
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documentation, and advisory
Representing:
<u>Commissioners Comments and Concerns:</u>
- The Commissioners reviewed a sample of the proposed solar shingles. - Concerns were raised regarding the sheen of the shingles and how they would appear in different lighting conditions. - Images provided difficult to distinguish between active and passive solar tiles. - Concern about how cut panels would be integrated seamlessly into the roof. - Applicant confirmed that all flashing, valleys, and ridge caps would be made of the same black metal material to make sure it has a cohesive appearance. - Commissioners expressed interest in seeing how these solar shingles perform as a test case. - There was a discussion on whether atmospheric conditions (dust, wind, rain) would affect the sheen of the shingles. The applicant stated that minimal changes was expected over time.

- The installation would be limited to the main structure and not the smaller adjacent shed.
- The black color of the shingles aligns with existing guidelines.

Motion: Ms. Camp made a motion to approve the installation of the solar shingles as a test case, considering the location of the property and the potential impact on the historic district. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously

Vote: Motion carried unanimously 5-0. (Camp, MacLeod, Patten, Oliver and Chair Welch)

2. Knight, Mark 60 Nobadeer Ave Roof 88/10 Permits +
- *Commissioners: Welch, ~~Pohl~~, Camp, MacLeod and Paul; Alt: Patten, Thornewill -- Last heard October 01, 2024*

Voting:	Chair Welch, Camp, MacLeod, and Paul
Alternates:	Patten and Thornewill
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	
Discussion:	Hold for representation
Motion:	None
Vote:	None

3. Dustin Maury 32 Cannonbury Ln New Dwelling 73/24 Reid Yenor
- *Commissioners: Welch, ~~Pohl~~, Paul, MacLeod and Camp; Alt: Thornewill, Patten, Oliver -- Last heard October 22, 2024*

Voting:	Chair Welch, Paul, MacLeod and Camp
Alternates:	Thornewill, Patten and Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Reid Yenor
Discussion:	Yenor - Presented revisions to the proposed new dwelling on Cannonbury Lane incorporating feedback from the previous meeting. • House moved back 12 feet. • Right hand gable moved forward by 4 feet 6 inches, with the mass shifting 18 inches in. • Dormers on the right-hand mass to a single. • Left gable lowered 12 inches, right gable raised by 6 inches. • Modified to a 1 ¾ story structure as per prior recommendations. • Removed transoms over the northern elevation living space, relocated chimney to the exterior. • Reduced ridge height by 3.5 feet. • Second floor decking removed. • Additional windows added. <u>Commissioners' comments:</u> Paul – Concerns addressed satisfactorily, including secondary structure improvements. Supports revisions. MacLeod – Appreciates revisions however prefers smaller dormers and variation I second floor window sizes to reduce visual massing. Thornewill – Agrees with Angus. Smaller dormers would help minimize perceived size. Camp – Prefers shed dormers for a more informal appearance. Finds second floor fenestration too rigid and repetitive. <u>Additional Concerns:</u> • Chimney height excessive, whether it could be lowered. • Concerns raised over excessive glazing, potential impact on conservation land and visibility. • Debate over retaining original shed dormers versus current proposed changes.
Motion:	MacLeod made a motion for further revisions to address adjustments to second floor fenestration to reduce uniformity, reconsideration of dormer size and massing and review chimney height.
Vote:	Carrie unanimously 5-0 (MacLeod, Camp, Thornewill, Paul and Chair Welch)
Voting:	Chair Welch, MacLeod, Camp and Paul
Alternates:	Thornewill, and Patten
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	
Discussion:	Hold for representation
Motion:	
Vote:	

5. Doherty ACK LLC 4 Mariner Way Hardscape pool 55.1.4/72 Paul Santos
 • *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Thornewill and Camp; Patten was alternate for Camp - Last heard October 08, 2024*
 • **HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 12th)**
6. Doherty ACK LLC 6 Mariner Way Hardscape pool 55.1.4/72.2 Paul Santos
 • *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver and Paul; Alt: Patten -- Last heard October 08, 2024*
 • **HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 12th)**
7. 85 Orange LLC 85 Orange St Dormer rear 55.4.1/27 Christopher Anderson
 • *Commissioners ~~Pohl~~, Welch, MacLeod, Paul, Thornewill; Alt: Patten -- Last heard October 08, 2024*

Voting:	Chair Welch, MacLeod, Paul and Thornewill
Alternates:	Patten
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Christopher Anderson
Discussion:	Anderson – Presented the revised plans, detailing modifications made in response to previous Commissioners comments. • Removal of the front fence and addition of a railings matching the style of a neighboring property. • Reduction in window sizes on both levels, particularly on the lower level to accommodate a kitchen countertop • Change of gutters from galvanized to copper • Adjustments to the rear dormer, including reducing its width by 12 inches on both sides and raising it from the roof edge • Refinements to the stoop and front door details • Window changes based on Commissioners recommendations. • Front stoop would remain brick • Rear stoop would have a granite block leading to the courtyard • Foundation would also be brick. <u>Commissioner's comments and concerns:</u> • Expressed appreciation for the changes especially the improved gable and front door details. • Concerns were raised regarding the rear dormer facing York Street • Dormer seems large for its placement • Reducing the number of ganged windows may improve it proportionality • Suggestion of breaking up the dormer for better integration. • North elevation fenestration recommendation for a more linear pattern • Placement of shingle line was questioned • Discrepancy in floor height measurements, possible misalignment in drafting. • Clarification regarding the story pole data and its impact on the final structure. <u>Mickey Rowland – Historic Structure Advisory Group:</u> • While the rear dorm is improved, it still appears large. Breaking it up would be preferable. • The rear elevation fenestration should be more linear for a cohesive design.

	Clarification needed on shingle line's accuracy and whether there was a mud sill present.
Motion:	MacLeod made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions, to be documented in an "Exhibit A", adjust the left side front window to match the adjacent right side window, reduce the number of windows from six to four, arranged with two center windows flanked by singles, lower the shingle line by six inches from the current proposed placement, and make sure that the floor height measurements are corrected and aligned with actual conditions.
Vote:	Carried unanimously 5-0 (MacLeod, Paul, Thornewill, Patten and Chair Welch)

BREAK: The Chair announced a **15-minute recess** at **5:14 PM** to allow members to take a short break before continuing with the agenda. The meeting reconvened at **5:29 PM**.

8. 85 Orange LLC 85 Orange St Reno guest house (garage) 55.4.1/27 Christopher Anderson
- *Commissioners: ~~Pohl~~, Welch, MacLeod, Paul, Thornewill; Alt: Patten -- Last heard October 08, 2024*

Voting:	Chair Welch, MacLeod, Paul and Thornewill
Alternates:	Patten
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Christopher Anderson
Discussion:	Anderson – Presented proposed revisions for the renovation of the existing garage into a guest house. He provided three elevation views, reflecting changes made based on prior HDC feedback. The initial submission included two applications: one for demolition and reconstruction, and another for converting the garage into an accessory dwelling. Based on previous Commissioner's guidance, they chose to retain and renovate the existing structure. - On the North Elevation adjusted window sizes, added details to the doors, copper gutters, and confirmed roof pitch details. - On the South Elevation modified windows for better proportion to the structure, added details to doors and gutters. - On the West Elevation reduced window size to align with the existing structure and neighboring property lines <u>Holly Backus – Preservation Planner:</u> The renovation of the guest house, originally a workshop/garage structure predating 1955. Appreciated the retention and reuse of the structure, as well as changes to the pitch and fenestration. Expressed no significant concerns but sought clarification on the visibility of the revised windows. <u>Mickey Rowland – Historic Structure Advisory Group:</u> - Questioned whether the drawings accurately reflected the existing garage, particularly regarding roof pitch and door heights. He stated that the roof pitch seemed closer to 8/12 rather than the depicted 6.5/12. <u>Commissioner's comments and concerns:</u> - Needed verification of existing conditions before making design decisions.

	• Smaller windows on the north elevation—larger windows would be more appropriate for the front of the house. • The door design should resemble a front door rather than a side-entry style door. • The six-light window in the gable end appears isolated and may need reconsideration. • The revised 12 light windows were appropriate as there were not visible from a public way. • Submission of revised elevation drawings correcting inconsistencies in roof pitch and alignment. • Consideration of larger front facing windows and a more traditional front door design. • Reevaluation of the gable window placement for better visual balance
Motion:	• MacLeod made a motion to hold for a final set of minor revisions, clarification of the roof pitch to match the existing structure, setting the grade relative to the structure and aligning the shingle line accordingly and final review of fenestration sizes and locations.
Vote:	Carried unanimously 5-0 (MacLeod, Patten, Thornewill, Paul and Chair Welch)

9. 85 Orange LLC 85 Orange St Front addition (MH) 55.4.1/27 Christopher Anderson
- *Commissioners: ~~Patt~~, Welch, MacLeod, Paul, Thornewill; Alt:Patten -- Last heard October 08, 2024*

Voting:	Chair Welch, MacLeod, Paul and Thornewill
Alternates:	Patten
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Christopher Anderson
Discussion:	Anderson – Presented updated elevations, incorporating requested modifications. • Modifications to the existing door details to align with historical references. • The addition of a proposed rooftop deck with cedar materials. • Incorporation of copper gutters for enhanced aesthetics and durability. • Refinements to measurements and scaling for accuracy. • Inclusion of bulkhead doors to the exterior of the addition. • Replacement of an existing deteriorating deck with a screened-in porch. <u>Mickey Rowland – Historic Structure Advisory Group:</u> • Questioned whether the drawings accurately reflected the existing garage, particularly regarding roof pitch and door heights. He stated that the roof pitch seemed closer to 8/12 rather than the depicted 6.5/12. <u>Commissioner's comments and concerns:</u> • Needed verification of existing conditions • The new addition's foundation and siding meet the appropriate historical and architectural standards. • The appropriateness of the proposed window sizes and placements. • Concerns about the front door style, some suggest being more prominent entrance rather than a side-entry style door. • Recommendation made to simplify the fenestration by reducing one window while maintaining a balanced design. • Revised 12 light windows appropriate not visible from a public way.

	- Concerns about the smaller windows appearing out of proportion - There was a debate whether the gable forward orientation was appropriate. - Suggested turning the roof ridge parallel to the street to create a more traditional cottage style structure. - If roof being constructed should match the original pitch rather than a misrepresented version in the drawings. Holly Backus – Preservation Planner: Front addition to the Circa 1834 three to five bay half house with an L shaped addition. Concerns raised: roof walk appeared incorrect and required further refinement, the rear addition's height on the north side should be lowered so that the eave does not align with the historic main block, making sure that it is an appropriate additive massing in keeping with Building with Nantucket in Mind. The screened in porch was not deemed architecturally appropriate for this structure mostly on the south elevation facing Cottage Court. The matching eave lines on the south elevation required adjustment. Requested that the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) be included in the revised submission, given the time elapsed since the original application. Clarification requested on the color scheme and window specifications.
Motion:	MacLeod made a motion to hold the application for revisions, verification of existing roof pitch and door height, revised drawings to reflect accurate dimensions and a possible reconfiguration of the roof orientation and consideration of a middle ground on window sizes for all elevations.
Vote:	Carried unanimously 5-0 (MacLeod, Patten, Thornewill, Paul and Chair Welch)

10. 85 Orange LLC	85 Orange St	Front hardscape	55.4.1/27	Christopher Anderson
• TRACK				
11. 85 Orange LLC	85 Orange St	Rear hardscape	55.4.1/27	Christopher Anderson
• TRACK				

NOTE: Confirmed that the Applicant for 60 Nobadeer Avenue and 25 North Pasture Lane was not present. Per standard procedure, agenda items for applicants who have not been heard will remain on the agenda and roll over to the next Old Business meeting.

12. Ack Koda LLC	42 Shimmo Pond Rd	MH move/demo	43/126	Botticelli & Pohl
• <i>Commissioners: Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp and Patten; Alt: Paul -- Last heard October 29, 2024</i>				
• HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 19th Old Business)				

VI. 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. Robert Jepson	32 Hinsdale Rd	As-built Shed	68/19.2	Ryan Jepson VO

Voting:	Chair Welch, MacLeod, Paul and Thornewill
Alternates:	Patten
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	None

Discussion:	Backus – This was the fourth hearing without the Applicant’s attendance and that the project involved as-built condition. <u>Commissioners’ comments and concerns:</u> • A formal letter to be sent to the applicant stating that the project remains an as-built condition requiring remedy. • the applicant has had multiple opportunities to address the Commissioners, a deadline will be set for attendance within two additional meetings. • Failure to appear will result in the levying of an additional fine. • The application will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting for a Commission vote.
Motion:	None
Vote:	None

PUBLIC COMMENT: Attorney Sarah Alger asked for confirmation that the Commissioners will not be revisiting 25 North Pasture Lane application during the meeting. Chair Welch confirmed that it had already been called three times and would not be addressed again that evening.

VII. NEW BUSINESS 10/15/2024

2. Henderson Barbara 6A Silver St New shed 55.4.1/187.1 JB Studio VO

Voting:	Chair Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill and Patten
Alternates:	Paul
Recused:	Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Juraj Bencat
Discussion:	Yari – Proposed a small shed • 100 square feet, 11 feet tall • Located on a steep slope, near the pool. • Matching materials and colors with the main house. • Designed to reduce pool equipment noise. <u>Commissioners concerns and comments:</u> • French doors are not appropriate for a shed in this location. • Round windows should be replaced with square windows. • Visibility concerns from West Dover Street. • The shed appears too complex for its size and should be simplified. • Modify design to a traditional gabled shed • Remove round windows and use square windows with kick panels.
Motion:	Camp made a motion to create an “Exhibit A” with the removal of larger gable structure and adjust the shed to a smaller gable, replace round windows with six light or six over six square windows and make sure that the French doors include kick panel. The motion was duly seconded by MacLeod for discussion. Commissioners debated between six lights versus six over six windows however agreed either would be acceptable.
Vote:	Carried unanimously 5-0 (Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill and Patten, and Chair Welch)

3. Orange Swordfish 28 Orange St Parapet 42.3.2/175 Emeritus LTD VO

Voting:	Chair Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill and Patten
Alternates:	Paul
Recused:	None
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Matt MacEachern
Discussion:	MacEachern – Adjust the parapet spacing to align with existing roof rafter framing while maintaining symmetry. <u>Holly Backus – Preservation Planner:</u> • Originally part of the Tupper-Folger House (1775), with the parapet added in 1827 by housewright John B. Nicholson. • Recognized as a significant historic structure, documented by the Historic American Building Survey. • A typical of five Bay Greek Revival mansions • The proposed parapet bay spacing differs from the previously approved version due to the existing rafter placement. • Debate over whether the proposed adjustment maintains historical accuracy and architectural integrity. <u>Mickey Rowland – Historic Structure Advisory Group:</u> No comments and concerns <u>Commissioners concerns and comments:</u> • The revised parapet spacing does not perfectly line up with the building’s historic proportions. • Some Commissioners felt the parapet should better coordinate with window spacing and shutters.
Motion:	Oliver made a motion to approve with an understanding that a minor adjustment, if possible, no Exhibit A required, and approval granted on the honor system.
Vote:	Carried unanimously 5-0 (Oliver, Paul, MacLeod, Camp, and Chair Welch)

4. FP 4 N Water 4 N Water St Add ADA Lift addition 42.4.2/90 Emeritus LTD VO

Voting:	MacLeod, Thornewill, Oliver, Camp, and Chair Welch
Alternates:	Paul and Patten
Recused:	None
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Matt MacEachern
Discussion:	MacEachern – Proposal is adding an ADA lift and a rear stair addition to the historic Obed Joy House. • Adding an accessible lift to the rear of the historic structure.

- A one-story rear addition will house a stairway providing access to the basement.
- The existing rear section of the structure, which was historically separate, will remain intact.
- The proposed lift addition is designed to be minimally invasive and set far back to reduce its visibility from the street.
- The new building next door was approved, and the applicant initially planned to connect the two structures with a deck, which would have required a variance.
- Since the adjacent building won't be completed for a few years, accessibility is needed in the existing building now.

Holly Backus – Preservation Planner:

- The Obed Joy House, built circa 1846, is an individually significant Carpenter Gothic/Gothic Revival structure designed by Edward Easton, a housewright.
- The structure has been documented by HABS and has an HDC survey on file.
- The proposed project includes a rear ADA lift addition and a rear stair addition to improve accessibility.
- The Commission previously approved a new building adjacent to the Obed Joy House, and the current discussion focused on how the additions relate to both structures.
- Given the building's significance, Backus requested that the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and elevations clearly distinguish what has already been approved.
- There have been multiple prior approvals for alterations, and clarification would help make sure continuity in review.
- The rear addition, dating to the late 1800s, was previously approved for retention as a significant historical feature.

Mickey Rowland – Historic Structure Advisory Group:

He stated that they had no major concerns however requested to review the north elevation briefly. He pointed out a potential issue with the drawings, stating that a corner board appeared to be missing on the gable and that it should match on both sides.

McEachern acknowledged the observation and confirmed that it was a drawing error.

McEachern responding to Backus's comments and stated that two elevations had been provided, one showing the existing condition and another displaying the most recent approved changes for comparison. Regarding the question of the new building and the necessity of the lift, MacEachern explained that the same approach would be taken, with the intent for the lift to serve the new building. MacEachern confirmed that a revision to the previously approved building would be brought back to the commission for review.

Chair Welch acknowledged this clarification, confirming that the previous approval had already accounted for a bump-out to accommodate the ADA lift.

Commissioners concerns and comments:

- Questioned if the proposed structure would be connected to the adjacent building to the north by any deck or structure. McEachern response confirmed that it is not currently connected, it is designed to allow for a future connection via a deck.
- Concern about the gable on the north side
- Recommended minimizing the volume or mass of the addition, or ideally eliminating it by incorporating a deck connection between the buildings.
- Clarification on whether the north side could eventually be connected to the adjacent structure.
- Overhang distracting and suggested reducing it while maintaining the architectural detailing.

Motion:	Camp made a motion to approve with revisions with modifications to be submitted as “Exhibit A”.
Vote:	Carried unanimously 5-0 (MacLeod, Thornewill, Oliver, Camp, and Chair Welch)

5. Hightide Homes LLC 45B Vestal St Pool hardscape 41/591 Atlantic AM

- **HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 12th New Business)**

X. NEW BUSINESS 10/29/24 – VIEW

1. Hodges, Keegan 35 India St Change windows 42.3.4/129 C. Thornewill SW
 2. Callen Miller Inc 1 Cherry St Add porch & French door 55/377.1 EMDA SW

Discussion: Oliver stated that the Ethan McMorro requested to hold 1 Cherry Street. No abutters present or had any comments and concerns.

XI. NEW BUSINESS 10/29/24

1. Greg Coffee 1 Lowell Place New Dwelling 41/858 NAG SW

Voting:	Chair Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp, and Paul
Alternates:	Paul
Recused:	Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Stephen Theroux
Discussion:	Theroux – Proposed an infill dwelling in the historic district. Proposed structure is a full two-story structure intended to complement the surrounding house. <u>Holly Backus – Preservation Planner:</u> Holly stated that the existing structure was already approved for removal and that the new design was consistent with nearby approvals. <u>Mickey Rowland – Historic Structure Advisory Group:</u> • Expressed concerns regarding the height of the proposed dwelling. • Proposed plate height is higher than any other house on the street • Significant change to the streetscape and does not align with the existing character of the neighborhood. • Recommended that the height should be reduced to be more in keeping with the surrounding structures. <u>Public Comments:</u> <u>Attorney Arthur Reade</u> – Representing on behalf of B. Smith, a property owner on Lowell Place raised concerns regarding the full two-story height and echoing the concerns from the Historic Structure Advisory Group. the house almost entirely covers the lot, leaving only setbacks and a parking area in the front. parallel parking space across the entire lot frontage, which was described as anomalous and inappropriate for the area. suggested that the parking be

incorporated into the structure, potentially as a garage, to better align with the neighborhood's existing design. current parking layout lacks sufficient depth, making it difficult for vehicles to maneuver properly.

Commissioners concerns and comments:

- A Commissioner had originally placed the project on the consent review list however felt a full review was necessary for a new dwelling.
- The proportions and window placement (penetration) were seen as appropriate.
- Concerns were raised that the height might be out of character for the street.
- Issue is the full two-story massing.
- Recommended modifying the design to better reflect Low Place's character rather than Main Street.
- Suggested adjusting second-floor windows for better alignment with the main gable.
- Requested a site visit
- Suggested that a gable-forward design or further study of local architectural styles might be beneficial.
- Recommended additive massing by making the secondary mass distinct from the primary structure.
- Suggested lowering second floor and windowsills to better align with the shed roof on the front.
- Recommended removing the bracket element to the left of the door in favor of a covered porch with a post, which would be more in keeping with the area.

Motion:

Camp made a motion to hold for revisions and a site visit.

Vote:

Carried unanimously 5-0 (Camp, MacLeod, Oliver, Paul and Chair Welch)

2. Robert Edward 6 Celtic Dr New Cottage 67/633 JB Studio SW

Voting:	Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill, Patten and Chair Welch
Alternates:	Paul
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Edward Roberts
Discussion:	Roberts – Proposed for a two-story small studio. Building height is 23 feet and 7 inches, color is white and for board and shingle siding <u>Commissioners' comments and concerns:</u> • Concerns raised about the narrow width of the structure, window sizes, and the need for a second egress. • Suggested adding one additional foot to the width to better fit within the neighborhood context. • Second-floor windows should be larger for a better proportion with the first-floor windows. • Second-floor windows should also be taller • structure requires a second means of egress, which could be addressed either through a side door or a finished basement with an exit. • Suggested a pent roof over the front door • cardinal points on the elevations need correction for accuracy, the north and south elevations were mislabeled.

Motion:	Camp made a motion to approve with the following revisions, increase the width of the structure by one foot, modify the second floor windows on the north and south elevations to a large size (Type B) making sure that the sill heights remain appropriate for interior layout, adjust elevation labeling to reflect the correct cardinal directions, provide a second egress, either a side door or a finished basement exit and consider adding a pent roof over the front door.
Vote:	Carried unanimously 5-0 (Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill, Patten and Chair Welch)

3. Holly Hock LLC 42 Chuck Hollow Rd Color change 76/65.1 EMDA RP

Discussion: Request to hold per applicant.

4. Capaldo/ Carracciola	19 Union St	As Built Move Arbor	42.3.2/136	Topham RP
• HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 12th New Business)				
5. Capaldo/ Carracciola	19 Union St	Color change clapboard	42.3.2/136	Topham RP
• HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 12th New Business)				
6. Alice Lewis	24 Meadow View Dr	Pool	56/139	Jess Dutra JP

Voting:	Chair Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Oliver and Paul
Alternates:	Patten and Thornewill
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Jess Dutra
Discussion:	Dutra – Proposing a pool and patio area on a corner lot. The property contains many mature trees, some scraggly trees are being removed. Separated pool and patio to allow for additional green space around the pool. Courtyard patio including a grilling area will be next to the house and garage. A small lounging area at one end of the pool. Double row of privet hedge, Evergreens for year-round screening, and additional shrubs and grasses to enhance privacy. <u>Commissioners' comments and concerns:</u> • Adequate screening to minimize visibility from the street. • Clarification on which trees would be removed and which would remain. • Concerns about the pool's proximity to the road and whether the mature trees would provide enough screening. • Suggested incorporating additional landscape buffers or fencing to improve privacy.
Motion:	Oliver made a motion to approve the pool, contingent on the standard "not visible at time of inspection or thereafter in perpetuity" stipulation.
Vote:	Carried 4-1 (Chair Welch, Camp - Nay, MacLeod, Oliver and Paul)

7. Henry Spitzer 1 Sconset Ave Hardscape 73.4.1/8 Greyson Keller JP

Discussion: No representation

8. Cassidy, Padraic 4 Sleepy Hollow Rd Cabana 66/107.2 Self JP

Voting:	Chair Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Oliver and Thornewill
Alternates:	Patten and Paul
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Padraic Cassidy

Discussion:	Cassidy – Proposed cabana, adjacent to a newly constructed primary dwelling. Cabana and pool positioned towards the rear of the lot. <u>Commissioners' comments and concerns:</u> - Concerns about the visibility of the cabana from public ways - Clarification whether additional vegetation or topographic adjustments to reduce exposure. - Questions were raised about the materials, roof pitch, and finishes to make sure that the cabana blends well with the property. - Suggest a view with a stake showing the corner of cabana - concern that cabana too close to Somerset Road (11 feet away). - Questioned whether it should be repositioned for better screening. - Suggested flipping the cabana to act as a buffer between the pool and the road. - A site visit was necessary to assess visibility concerns. - The applicant was asked to place a stake with marking tape at the westernmost corner of the cabana at the proposed height. - Commissioners will determine if the structure will be visible from the street. - The applicant will place the stake by Tuesday and notify staff. - A site visit will occur before the next hearing where the proposal will be reviewed again.
Motion:	A site visit in which the applicant will place stake by Tuesday and notify staff. (3:44:21)
Vote:	None

9. Cassidy, Padraic 4 Sleepy Hollow Rd Pool 66/107.0 Self JP

Discussion: Pool review to track with cabana. The proposed pool will also be reviewed alongside the cabana after the site visit.

10. Kim Glowacki 5 Meader St New dwelling 42.2.3/37.1 P. Quigley AM

Voting:	MacLeod, Camp, Paul, Patten and Chair Welch
Alternates:	Thornewill
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representative:	Patrick Quigley
Discussion:	Quigley – Proposes to create a structure that complements the existing houses, which have similar rooflines, dormers, and fenestration. <u>Holly Backus – Preservation Planner:</u> - Proposed dwelling needs to comply with the resilient anti-design guidelines because it is within the Old Historic District (OHD). - Elevation Certificate is required, missing from the submission ☐ The windows should be TDL (true divided light) and not Anderson windows. - The dormers on the north side, do not line up properly and fail to meet design guidelines. - Discrepancies in the elevation measurements—one shows 29 feet 3.5 inches to the ridge, while another shows 21 feet 11 inches. - Needs to be consistent in the measurements, and the elevation certificate should match the ferment map elevations. - Comments from abutters have been received and are in the queue for review. <u>Mickey Rowland – Historic Structure Advisory Group (HSAG):</u> - The proposed dwelling appears to be very tightly squeezed between the required setbacks and the building in front. - The porches and stairs of the two structures look as though they are nearly touching each other, which could result in too much density in the area.

- Building feel too large for the space and should have a more secondary structure feel compared to the front house.
- It may benefit from being lower and more diminutive.

Public Comments and concerns:

Kathleen Bowen at 15B Meader Street - Expressed concern about the proximity of the proposed large two-story house to the existing large two-story house, with only 8.5 feet between them. Both buildings appear out of sync with the smaller cottages in the surrounding neighborhood. New structures do not seem to reflect the guidelines and making sure that its compatible with adjacent structures and contribute to the harmony of the street.

The location at the corner of Francis and Washington is a visible gateway into Town and is concern that the design could set a troublesome precedent for future developments. Urged to ask for a revision of the plans to make sure that a more appropriate design for the site that better aligns with the surrounding environment.

Susan Wagner - Echoed the concerns of HSAG and Kathleen. The size and height of the proposed structure are out of context with the surrounding neighborhood and may not be compatible with the existing character of the area.

Commissioners' comments and concerns:

- Question was raised about whether a demolition of the existing structure had been approved. It was clarified no demo has been approved yet and that the existing cottage on the property needs to be either moved or demolished before proceeding with the proposed new structure.
- Size of building inappropriate for the space, small structure more appropriate
- More separation between the two buildings to avoid feeling of overcrowding and to preserve the neighborhood character.
- Zoning and setback requirements were in question
- Floodplain elevation requirements, needs to follow the FEMA regulations

Motion:

MacLeod made a motion to hold the application for further revisions and additional information, including making sure that the project tracks with the demolition of the existing structure.

Vote:

Carried unanimously 5-0 (MacLeod, Camp, Paul, Patten and Chair Welch)

11. Gilis, Konstantin 25B Clifton St Hardscape Curb Cut 73.4.1/3 Natalie Cowger AM

DISCUSSION: No representation

12. Thirty-Nine Hulbert LLC 39 Hulbert Ave Fenestration Revs 29/19 Botticelli & Pohl
AM

- **HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 12th New Business)**

13. Eleven Lincoln Ave Trust 32 Jefferson Ave Garage revs 30/132 Botticelli & Pohl
AM

- **HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 12th New Business)**

14. Alexander Woodley 3 Newtown Ct Rev 2022-03-6065 55/210.2 Val Oliver AM

DISCUSSION: Oliver requested to hold for further revisions. Continued to accommodate those changes.

15. Daniel Murphy 8 Golf View Dr Demo Move 66/192 Gryphon CT

Voting:

Chair Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Oliver and Thornewill

Alternates:

Patten and Paul

Documentation:

Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.

Representative:

Ethan Griffin - Agent

Discussion:	Griffin – Proposed demolition and move-off of an existing house. The house likely constructed in 1984. Have a potential buyer for a property at 21 Pequot and believe this house could be moved relatively easily and want to get the process rolling. Commissioners' comments and concerns: House hasn't been advertised yet, will serve as a catalyst for doing so.
Motion:	Camp made a motion to approve move-off/demo
Vote:	Carried 5-0 unanimously (Camp, MacLeod, Oliver, Thornewill and Chair Welch)

16. Jeff & Nicole Barden	1 Hedgebury Ln	Addition	41/594	MCA CT
17. Jared & Kim Mitchell	50 Hummock Pond Rd	Window well	56/286	Chacon Homes CT
18. 18 Bishop Rise LLC	18 Bishop Rise	New Gate	40/126	Atlantic VO
19. Voulgaris Nick & Kristine	7 Farmer St	Driveway change	42.3.2/108	Atlantic VO
20. 20 N Pasture Ln NT	20 N Pasture Ln	Main House Revs	44/86	JB Studio VO
21. 20 N Pasture Ln NT	20 N Pasture Ln	Pool hardscape	44/86	JB Studio VO
22. Madaket Road LLC	74 Madaket Rd	New dwelling	41/810	Emeritus LTD SW
23. 1 N Swift Rock Trust	1 N Swift Rock	Garage	40/2	Emeritus LTD VO
24. 33 Cliff Rd LLC	33 Cliff Rd	New dwelling	42.4.4/5	Botticelli & Pohl CP
• HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 12th New Business)				
25. Three North Gully Rd LLC	7 N Gully Rd	Revs dormer fens	73.1.3/123	Botticelli & Pohl CP
• HOLD PER APPLICANT (to November 12th New Business)				
26. Jennie Esti	6 Goldfinch Dr	Addition & deck/patio	68/599	Emeritus LTD CP
27. Geoff Smith Nantucket AP LH	33A Bunker Rd	Quonset Hut 1	78/99.1	LFW CP
28. Geoff Smith Nantucket AP LH	33A Bunker Rd	Quonset Hut 2	78/99.1	LFW AC
29. McCarthy	16 Ridge Ln	Addition in rear	38/120	Gryphon AC
30. Stephen Jacobs	13 Walsh St	New Roof	42.4.1/52	Vasil Marinov AC

Approve Minutes -	June 25, 2024 MacLeod made a motion to approve the set of minutes of 06-25-2024. The motion was carried 3-0 (Camp, MacLeod, and Thornewill) (Abstained – Oliver and Chair Welch)
Review Minutes -	- June 4, 2024. - June 18, 2024. - June 25, 2024. - July 2, 2024. - July 9, 2024; August 20, 2024; - August 27, 2024. - September 3, 2024

	Discussion: Chair Welch request that the Commissioners review the minutes, with appreciation for the staff's work on them.
Other Business -	• Next HDC Meeting: November 12, 2024, NEW BUSINESS * HYBRID & IN PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS ROAD in COMMUNITY ROOM. • Organizational Meeting: November 6, 2024 *HYBRID & IN PERSON @ 2 FAIRGROUNDS ROAD in CONFERENCE ROOM. Discussion: Confirmed that the organizational meeting, originally scheduled for tomorrow, has been postponed to the following week due to the absence of a key person, Ray. The meetings are now set for November 12th and 14th, with the 14th dedicated to organizational topics and efficiency discussions. • Also mentioned an appeal in front of the Select Board on Wednesday, which will make for a busy week. • PLEASE NOTE – there will <u>NOT</u> be an HDC meeting the week of Thanksgiving.
Future Action Items-	• Discussion on distinguishing between solid and veneer brick on chimneys and foundations. • Classification of street trees & vegetating mapping • Discussion of Wind Turbines • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings and historic dwellings • Hardscaping • Discussion of salvaging demos • Discussion of options for house moves • “Value of Written Submission & Submission Deadlines”

Adjournment: Camp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 PM.

The motion was carried unanimously. 3-0 (Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill, Oliver and Chair Welch)

YouTube Link for the 11-05-2024 meeting:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J98gqiDXMCK>

HDC Link to the Viewpack:

https://www.nantucket-ma.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/_11052024-14437?html=true

Submitted by: Catherine Ancero