



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

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

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

Associate Commissioners: Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten, Joe Paul

~~ MINUTES ~~

01/28/2025

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via ZOOM

Called to order at 4.00pm, and announcements by Stephen Welch, Chair

Staff in attendance: Cathy Flynn, Land Use Specialist; Holly Backus, Preservation Planner; Fiona Johnson, Administrative Specialist

Members Present: Welch, Oliver, Camp, Paul

Remote Participants: Pohl, MacLeod

Absent Members:

Late Arrivals:

Early Departures:

Town Representative:

Adoption of Agenda: 4:01pm

Motion: Motion: to Approve

Vote:

Made by: Oliver

Carried 4-0

I. COMMENTS BY CHAIRMAN

II. COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION AND VOTE

Feasibility Study and Design for Flood Mitigation – Easy Street, Downtown Nantucket

DISCUSSION: The board is discussing the importance of early and ongoing involvement from the Historic District Commission (HDC) in two major projects—the one on Francis Street and another related to the town's coastal resiliency plan and flood mitigation efforts. The main takeaway seems to be that the HDC should be included early in the design and material selection stages, especially in projects involving structures visible from public ways, as their authority extends to these types of developments. This ensures that there are no surprises later in the process, especially when town funds are involved, and helps avoid significant design changes later, which could be costly or contentious. They also emphasizing the value of coordination between project teams, public feedback, and ongoing communication, so that all parties are aligned on the project's goals and outcomes.

III. OLD BUSINESS 01/21/2025

1.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
	12 Pond View LLC	12 Pond View Dr	Pool hardscape	81/9	Atlantic

Sitting: Pohl, Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Paul

Alternates: None

Public Comment:

John Devaney, 10 Pond View

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The garden area with wire mesh fencing and a gate is being evaluated for its impact on the surrounding environment, especially the trees and landscaping. The concern is that if the fencing is properly screened, it won't negatively affect the natural surroundings. The garden's placement is in a rural area with heavily treed lots, which help with screening the garden and elements like the pool. The focus is on

Approved HDC Minutes January 28, 2025; adopted March 18, 2025

maintaining the aesthetics and blending the development into the natural environment. In the southwest corner, where the pool is located, existing vegetation provides some screening but isn't dense enough to fully obscure the pool from certain angles. Additional planting is being proposed to provide more screening where it's needed. The southwest corner is considered sufficiently dense to create a visual barrier. Concerns are raised about expanding the pool to include a spa and kitchen, as this additional hardscaping could disrupt the rural environment. There's a particular focus on minimizing the visibility of the spa and kitchen from the driveway, maintaining the rural aesthetic, and advocating for a restrained approach to keep the development in harmony with its natural surroundings. Emphasizing the rural character, it's noted that houses are set far back with long driveways and often hidden behind gates, contributing to the area's charm. The proposed gate should be positioned further from the road, in line with other driveways, to preserve the rural setting and avoid disrupting the quiet, secluded feel of the area. Concerns about the gate's visibility from Pond View Drive are also expressed, with the suggestion that the granite post and gate design are unsuitable for the rural environment. The gate should not be visible from the road to maintain privacy and the natural aesthetic. There's agreement with the concern that the overall project feels too large, but it could be considered if it remains discreet and doesn't alter the existing grade. Changes in grade, not reflected in the town's topo map, should be scrutinized closely to avoid unnecessary alterations to the landscape.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted minus the gate and posts. Pool, spa, fire pit not visible at the time of inspection and thereafter. Made by Macleod. -Carried 4/1// Welch, Pohl, Macleod, Paul (aye) Camp(no)

2.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
	12 Pond View LLC	12 Pond View Dr	Bocce Court	81/9	Atlantic

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Paul

Alternates: None

Public Comment:

BOARD DISCUSSION:

No concerns from board members.

MOTION: Motion approve as submitted.

Made by Camp. – Carried. Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul, Camp (aye)

3.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
	12 Pond View LLC	12 Pond View Dr	Sports Court	81/9	Atlantic

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Paul

BOARD DISCUSSION:

There are concerns about the amount of hardscaping already present on the site, especially given the rural character of the area. The additional hardscaping elements, like the pool, spa, and fire pit, are seen as excessive for the site. There are also worries about the proximity of these elements to the property line, with concerns that it may not be respectful to the neighbors or the environment. However, it's acknowledged that the screening elements already in place, such as the guest house and pool, will ensure that the proposed features won't be visible from Pond View Drive. An interesting point is raised about the balance between hardscaping and preserving natural vegetation. While the hardscaping elements like the pool and bocce court are visible in the site plan, it's noted that people can remove trees or change their yards into manicured lawns without needing approval, which could have a bigger environmental impact than the proposed developments. The visual impact of hardscaping is more apparent in a site plan, but the key is maintaining a balance between preserving vegetation and integrating new elements. A suggestion is made to move the pool elements 10 feet closer to be more neighborly. While noise mitigation isn't under the jurisdiction of the Historic District Commission (HDC), it's recognized that the visibility of the project meets the approval criteria. To ensure the project remains in harmony with its natural surroundings, it's suggested that the approval motion include language that emphasizes maintaining existing vegetation and natural plant material. This would help ensure that the screening elements remain intact, and possibly even enhanced, to preserve the rural character of the area. Including this condition in the approval would help manage the landscape properly and ensure the development continues to blend well with the natural environment after construction.

MOTION: Motion approve with plant material (shown on Google image) to be maintained & augmented, as necessary. For the sport court to not be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. Motion made by Joe – Carried (4-1)

Welch, Macleod, Paul, Pohl (aye) Camp (no)

4. NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
Heller Mary W Trust	37 Ocean Ave	Solar	73.3.2/49	Emeritus LTD

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Paul

Alternates: None

Public Comment:

Holly Backus: provides some historical context for the property, identifying it as a Colonial Revival designed by Green and Wix Architecture in 1882, with some alterations in the 1990s. She also seems to be addressing concerns about the visibility of the project, particularly from Ocean Avenue and the southwest elevation of the building. The additional photos provided were helpful, but she feels it would have been beneficial to have more images specifically from Ocean Avenue to better assess potential visibility. She also recommending that the roof be black to minimize the visibility of the new structure and blend it more effectively with the surrounding environment. This seems to be part of your effort to ensure that the new elements of the property don't detract from its historical character or visibility from public ways.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The assessment of the visibility of the solar panels, particularly from key vantage points, reveals some concerns, especially from the southwest elevation of the property. However, after walking the site and reviewing the existing vegetation on Lyne Street, it's felt that the trees help obscure the panels enough to make them acceptable. The black asphalt roof will also help minimize the visual impact, particularly from the angle in question. Despite concerns about the iconic nature of the house, the combination of the roof's color and the surrounding landscape will help integrate the solar panels without detracting from the historic character of the property. There is still a concern about how the solar panels might affect the historic nature of the property and the Old Historic District. While there is full support for solar energy, there's a worry about how these panels might be visible from key viewpoints like Lyne and Karu Streets. The building, despite alterations over time, still retains its historic presence, and the fear is that the panels could disrupt this. However, there's also recognition that other modern elements, such as condensers and vents, have been integrated into historic properties without compromising their character, so solar panels might eventually fade into the background as part of the building's evolving narrative. This house being exposed on three sides, is more visible than most properties, which makes the issue of visibility more complicated. While the panels might be visible from some angles, their placement on the rear of the structure and partially on a dormer makes them less intrusive.

MOTION: Motion to approve as submitted with keeping the vegetation.

Motion made by Abby – Carried Pohl, Camp, Welch, Paul (aye) Macleod (no) (4-1)

II. OLD BUSINESS 01/28/2025

1. NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
LB Nantucket LLC	65-67 Old South Rd	Rev Commercial Bldg	68/158&158.1	Oliver

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Paul, Camp, MacLeod

Alternates:

Recused:

Documents:

Representative

Presentation:

Public Comment:

Holly Backus:

BOARD DISCUSSION:

There are concerns about the design of the two gables facing Old South Road, as they feel a bit flat compared to the rest of the building. It's understood that this flatness may have been intentional to keep the building low and create variation in the eave heights, but there is a suggestion that a more dynamic adjustment could improve the overall look. One potential solution is to adjust the roof pitch, increasing it to an 8/12 pitch. This would lower the plate height and raise the ridge, adding more dimension and visual interest to the gables, while still maintaining the low-profile design intent. Another suggestion is a more refined adjustment: rather than changing the ridge height, the eave height could be lowered, allowing for a steeper pitch of 8/12. This would provide more steepness and visual interest, while ensuring a balanced and proportionate look for the gables without altering the overall ridge height. There's also a preference for aligning the two windows on the gables more directly under the eave, which would improve the symmetry and balance of the facade. The roof pitches and their interaction with the rest of the structure should be carefully considered to maintain harmony in the overall design. One designer suggests increasing the pitch of the gables slightly while ensuring they still relate to the hip roof structures on the right side of the building, particularly with the hip roofs along Old South Road. This would prevent the gables from feeling isolated and disconnected from the rest of the design. Additionally, the proposal includes sacrificing the third-floor window on the gable forward to introduce clipped gables, which would tie the design elements of the hip roofs and gables together, helping to unify the overall design and avoid abrupt transitions.

Approved HDC Minutes January 28, 2025; adopted March 18, 2025

Regarding the connector piece, the pitch doesn't need to be altered, as it won't be highly visible. Another design suggestion is to add a faux chimney, which would contribute a roof element and provide additional architectural character that feels more appropriate for the structure's context, enhancing the overall aesthetic and integrating it more seamlessly with its surroundings.

MOTION: Motion approve as submitted, made by Joe – Carried.
Welch, Macleod, Paul, Pohl (aye) Camp (no)

2.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
1	Cliff Lane LLC	1 Cliff Lane	Cabana Roof Change	30/633	JB Studio

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod

Alternates:

Recused:

Documents:

Representative

Presentation:

Public Comment:

Holly Backus:

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The suggestion to remove the pergola and replace it with a porch roof indicates a desire to simplify the design and potentially create a more cohesive and grounded appearance. The current roof design, where the ridge height has remained the same but the pitch has been decreased, seems to move in the opposite direction of the intended design goals. The concern here is that the ridge height needs to come down to reduce the overall verticality of the structure, which would help with the massing and proportion of the building, making it feel less top-heavy and more balanced in the surrounding context. The focus would be on reducing the ridge height to lessen the vertical impact, resizing the dormers to make them more proportionate to the roofline, and rethinking the small pent roof over the stairs to achieve a better visual balance. Additionally, there's a desire to ensure coherence between the main building and the garage structure in terms of height and massing. The goal is to avoid a disjointed appearance by making sure both parts of the property have a similar scale and relationship, ensuring the design feels unified and visually balanced as a whole.

MOTION: Motion to hold for Revision's and the garage/shed to track made by Stephen – Carried Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Macleod (aye)

3.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
	Remain LLC	54 Main Street	Solar Roof	42.3.1/193	Ack Smart

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod

Alternates: Paul

Public Comment:

Diane Coombs addresses concerns about the visibility of solar panels, specifically keeping them as far to the right as possible to minimize their impact.

Holly Backus: concerned about the visibility of solar panels on a structure that's individually significant. She is recommending that the panels be pushed back or potentially removed on the south side, especially if a mockup isn't going to be proposed. The idea is to preserve the building's appearance, particularly for those walking on the street, while also respecting the board's prior request for more detailed review. She also clarifying that the roof should be black, or at least that this is preferred, as the visibility of the panels on a black roof may be less jarring visually. Overall, she's seeking a solution that minimizes the visual impact on the historic character of the structure while balancing the need for modern amenities like solar panels.

BOARD DISCUSSION: It seems like there's a clear focus on minimizing the visibility of the solar panels from Orange Street while also preserving the building's historical integrity and maintaining the functionality of the solar array by moving the panels only about a foot might not make a huge difference, but it could help with reducing visibility from Orange Street, which is a priority. Even a small adjustment might provide a good compromise between visibility and functionality. One suggestion is to move the panels as far as possible, ideally by 4 feet. This would likely offer more significant relief in terms of visibility while still maintaining the solar array's effectiveness. By removing the three panels closer to Orange Street, the visibility from the street could be reduced while still allowing the array to function properly. This approach balances visibility with energy efficiency. Another option is to shift the panels as far to the right as possible (even

Approved HDC Minutes January 28, 2025; adopted March 18, 2025

by just a foot). This could reduce their visibility from Orange Street and help align the panels better with the surrounding environment, making them less noticeable from the street.

MOTION: Motion to approve with the panels moving as far to right as possible made by Val – Carried
Oliver, Camp, Pohl, Macleod, Welch (aye)

4.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
----	------	---------	---------------	------------	----------------

<u>Maisto</u>	<u>78 Pleasant Street</u>	<u>Kitchen Addition</u>	<u>55/654</u>	<u>Gryphon</u>
---------------	---------------------------	-------------------------	---------------	----------------

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod

Alternates: Paul

Public Comment:

Holly Backus: this is non-contributing Circa 2005 infill but within the OHD, that's a great point about the horizontal boarding underneath the porch, it might create a busier look compared to shingles, which could be more in line with the existing aesthetic of the area, especially given the surrounding context of the historic district. Shingles would likely be less visually distracting and could maintain a more classic, cohesive look with the rest of the property and the neighborhood.

BOARD DISCUSSION: The consensus is that using traditional panels, with simple and elegant detailing, will better integrate the porch into the historical context of the building. While the white color may make it stand out, it's seen as a helpful way to break up the mass and maintain a cohesive design that complements the surroundings

MOTION: Motion to approve with Exhibit A made by Ray – Carried.

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

5.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
----	------	---------	---------------	------------	----------------

<u>21 Pleasant St LLC</u>	<u>21 Pleasant St</u>	<u>Main House</u>	<u>55.4.1/1</u>	<u>Link/Glidden</u>
---------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	-----------------	---------------------

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Camp

Alternates:

Recused:

Documents:

Representative: Victoria Ewing & Richard Glidden

Presentation:

Public Comment: Diane Coombs agrees on the scoring of the foundation is appropriate for the house.

Holly Backus: this is an individual significant Four Square from the 1920s, the scoring should match what was historically there, and for the brick sizes to align more closely with the intended CMU block sizes. The size difference could significantly impact the overall appearance, so it's important to maintain the original proportions. A mockup, as previously requested, would help clarify how these details will work in the real context of the building.

BOARD DISCUSSION: Ensuring that the scoring technique used is historically accurate is critical. The process involves creating a pared surface instead of grinding it down, which helps maintain the authentic look of the building. This attention to detail is important for preserving the integrity of the structure's appearance. There's a clear concern about ensuring the final product looks authentic and true to the historic style. The process you're referring to seems to involve the CMU (Concrete Masonry Unit) block style, which requires applying a layer of cement over the block and then scoring it in a way that mimics traditional masonry. This technique is essential for maintaining the building's character and aligning with historical accuracy. There's a request for a sample or mockup of the work to be done. This would allow everyone to assess how the finished product will look and ensure that it aligns with the desired historical appearance before proceeding with the final installation.

MOTON: Motion to approve with the following the proportions of the parge joints will match the proportions of historic cmus from the 1930s both with respect to their location their depth and there will be a mockup of work to be reviewed by the chair of the application upon his sign off proceed with the work made by Stephen – Carried Camp, Welch, Pohl.(aye)

6.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
----	------	---------	---------------	------------	----------------

<u>21 Pleasant St LLC</u>	<u>21 Pleasant St</u>	<u>Hardscape</u>	<u>55.4.1/1</u>	<u>Link/Glidden</u>
---------------------------	-----------------------	------------------	-----------------	---------------------

Sitting: Welch, Paul, Oliver, Camp

Alternates: Paul

Representative: Victoria Ewing & Richard Glidden

Approved HDC Minutes January 28, 2025; adopted March 18, 2025

Public Comment: Diane Coombs more traditional brick pattern, like a running bond, instead of the herringbone. The cobblestone strip should be set back a few feet from the street edge to reduce visual clutter and avoid using shells. A regular brick color, ensuring a classic, timeless look.

Holly Backus: suggests that the driveway materials be simplified, which is a reasonable point, especially considering the historic nature of the area. The combination of cobblestone, brick in a herringbone pattern, and shells could indeed be too visually busy and clash with the surrounding environment. She likes the suggestion of reducing the width of the driveway to align with what was approved previously (10x20 feet). This would help create a more cohesive, historically appropriate look. As for the brick, avoiding the herringbone pattern could make it less overwhelming. A simpler layout, maybe a more traditional running bond, could fit the character better while still allowing the driveway to be functional.

BOARD DISCUSSION: The aim is to simplify the design while keeping it cohesive with the historic district. This involves choosing appropriate materials for the driveway and parking area, being mindful of the existing vegetation (hedge), and considering the fence placement carefully to ensure it complements the property's natural and historical context.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Stephen – Carried Welch, Oliver and Paul (aye)

7.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
----	------	---------	---------------	------------	----------------

<u>PACT LLC</u>	<u>41 Orange St</u>	<u>Rev Dormer</u>	<u>42.3.2/224</u>	<u>LFW</u>
-----------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------	------------

Sitting: Welch, Pohll, Oliver, Camp, Macleod

Alternates: Paul

Representative: Linda Williams

Public Comment: Diane Coombs no concerns

Holly Backus: suggests that the panels underneath the windows could be better suited to shingles, in line with the more traditional style for the 1920s property. This would be a minor but important modification, and if the board agrees.

BOARD DISCUSSION: The current panels are too visible and clash with the rest of the design. Replacing them with shingles would tie the appearance together and make the design feel more unified. Shingles are a classic material that can add texture and blend well with the roof and other exterior elements. Moving to a hipped roof on the west elevation could elevate the design, giving it a more traditional and refined aesthetic, like that of a sleeping porch. However, the complexity of the roof's slope and angles might create challenges during implementation. If it's difficult to execute or adds unnecessary complexity, it's worth reassessing whether the visual improvement justifies the additional cost or labor. If the visual benefits are not drastic or are hard to implement, sticking with the shed roof could be more practical. Adjusting the spacing between the windows to align with the proportions of the north elevation will create a balanced and harmonious look. Reducing the size of the windows could also help them blend more seamlessly into the overall design, making them feel more subtle and refined without drawing too much attention.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Stephen – Carried Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Macleod

III. NEW BUSINESS 12/10/2024

1.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
----	------	---------	---------------	------------	----------------

<u>7 Stone Post Way LLC</u>	<u>7 Stone Post Way</u>	<u>Hardscape</u>	<u>74/79</u>	<u>Atlantic</u>
-----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------	--------------	-----------------

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod

Alternates: Paul

Public Comment:

Representative: Lindsay Congleton:

Holly Backus: the driveway should have clear dimensions to ensure it complies with zoning requirements (Chapter 139-20.1). You also don't mind if Belgium Block is used, as long as it's consistent with what's already in the neighborhood.

BOARD DISCUSSION: No Concerns

Motion: Motion to approve as submitted made by Val – Carried Oliver, Macleod, Pohl, Camp. Welch (aye)

IV. NEW BUSINESS 1/07/2025

1.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
	6A Marble Way LLC	Marble Way (lot 5)	New Dwelling	66/103	K. Megna

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod

Alternates: Paul, Thornewill, Patten

Public Comment: **Lindsay Congleton:** is making sure the design is in tune with the neighborhood's aesthetic, keeping the buildings subtle and not imposing. The driveway layout, vegetation, and the overall positioning to make sure the property feels more integrated with its surroundings, rather than standing out too much.

Victoria Ewing: feeling positive about the design in terms of aligning it with the neighborhood's aesthetic, particularly with how the houses are positioned to look more like single-family dwellings. However, her concern about the setbacks and how close the buildings are to the property line, especially in the context of the surrounding area, is valid. The fact that the property is in an established development of single-story homes and you're looking at something two stories might create a noticeable change in the streetscape, even if there's plenty of vegetation. As for the parking and access, it sounds like the way the houses are staggered is helping mitigate the potential for a cramped look. Still, the proximity to the road is something the board might need to take a closer look at to ensure the balance between privacy, spacing, and neighborhood character is maintained.

BOARD DISCUSSION: The conversation is adjusting design elements to improve visual balance, while also considering how the layout and green space affect the overall feel of the site.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions and the site plan information made by Val – Carried Oliver, Camp, Macleod, Pohl, Welch(aye)

2.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
	Clifford A Williams	11 Somerset Rd	Portico	59/96	Structures

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Paul

Alternates: Patten

Representative: Clifford Williams

Presentation:

Public Comment:

Holly Backus: highlights some areas that could be adjusted to better fit the aesthetic, the stoop seems too wide, and the entablature might be too heavy for the structure. She also suggesting that the proportions could be toned down, especially in the entry area, to better align with the scale of the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION: There is agreement that the general concept is fine, but the building feels top-heavy, especially when viewed from the side. Suggestions include lightening the upper portion and adjusting the proportions to create a more balanced visual. While the design feels formal, it's generally acceptable. However, some feel the design could be simplified, particularly due to the rural setting. A more traditional farmhouse appearance is suggested as a reference. The proposed color scheme is white, which may create concerns about the upper portion appearing too heavy. A suggestion to use an off-white or silver-platinum shade is offered as a potential solution. There's a suggestion to look at similar historical structures nearby, particularly those with well-proportioned porticos, to draw inspiration for the design.

Motion: Motion to hold for revisions made by Abby – Carried Paul Camp, Macleod, Pohl, Welch(aye)

3.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
	Truymen Isaiah	117 Orange St	Move off Building	55/377	EMDA

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod

Alternates: Paul

Representative: Ethan McMorro

Presentation: Diane Coombs would like to have the building remain on the site if it was possible.

Public Comment:

Holly Backus: this is a circa 1850s 3-bay house that has had various additions over the years, including one from the 1920s or 1930s. The house is a contributing resource within a historic district. Holly expresses concern about altering this historic property, as any changes could impact its character and the setting of the district.

BOARD DISCUSSION: While there is general support for moving the addition, concerns remain about its replacement and the overall impact on the historic site.

MOTION: Motion is made to hold off on a decision until the applicant can provide further details about the site's future use and the visual impact of removing the addition made by Angus – Carried Macleod, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, Welch (aye)

4.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
----	------	---------	---------------	------------	----------------

<u>Truyma</u>	<u>Isaiah</u>	<u>10 Polliwog Pond Lane</u>	<u>Move on Building</u>	<u>55/423.4</u>	<u>EMDA</u>
---------------	---------------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------	-------------

Sitting:

Alternates:

Recused:

Documents:

Representative

Presentation:

Public Comment:

Holly Backus:

BOARD DISCUSSION:

MOTION: Motion to Track 117 Orange St

Pohl left the meeting

5.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
----	------	---------	---------------	------------	----------------

<u>Truyma</u>	<u>Isaiah</u>	<u>10 Polliwog Pond Lane</u>	<u>Move on site garage</u>	<u>55/423.4</u>	<u>EMDA</u>
---------------	---------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	-------------

Sitting: Welch, Paul, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod

Alternates:

Representative: Ethan McMorro

BOARD DISCUSSION: No Concerns

Motion: Motion to approve as submitted made by Val – Carried Oliver, Camp, Paul, Macleod, Welch

6.	NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
----	------	---------	---------------	------------	----------------

<u>Coburn,</u>	<u>Holly</u>	<u>5 N Beach St</u>	<u>Rev COA</u>	<u>42.4.1/92</u>	<u>Normand Residential</u>
----------------	--------------	---------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------------------

Sitting: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod

Alternates: Paul

Representative: Ben Normand

Public Comment: Diane Coombs – Chimney should remain

Holly Backus: comments on the chimney, even if it's not functional, is considered an important character-defining feature for the area and the National Historic District, emphasizing that the chimney should be preserved for its historical significance. She is concerned about the three-panel door, noting that it's atypical for Nantucket-style homes, either using a previously approved design for the door or opting for a more cottage-style door to better match the local aesthetic.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Chimney: Some members agree that the chimney isn't necessary for this house, especially given its proportions and roofline. They feel the house would look fine without it. Others believe the chimney is an important character-defining feature and should be preserved, though they note the current placement is inappropriate. They suggest moving it to the ridge, making it smaller, and ensuring it looks authentic with proper flashing.

Door: Some members are fine with the proposed door, while others prefer the original door with its Victorian lace detailing, which they feel better matches the house's intended style. A few members mention that the proposed door is acceptable, but they'd prefer a more traditional style or a four-panel door for a more balanced appearance.

Motion: Motion to hold for revisions made by Angus – Carried Camp, Oliver, Macleod, Paul, Welch

7. NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	REPRESENTATIVE
John Wise	36 Tennessee Ave	New Dwelling	59.4/79	Emeritus LTD

Sitting: Welch, Paul, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod

Alternates: Paul, Thornehill, Patten

Representative: Matt MacEchern

Presentation:

Public Comment: Sarah Alger has concerns about the bulkiness of a structure, particularly its impact on the surrounding area and the canal. She feels the design is atypical and suggest that the building should be moved back closer to the road, allowing for a more traditional appearance. Bruce from Madaket Application Review Group is advocating for the preservation of the existing structure at 36 Tennessee, emphasizing its importance to Nantucket's historic preservation efforts. They point out that the structure is recognized as historically significant by the Massachusetts Historical Commission and is part of both the National Register and local historic districts. They express concerns that the proposed changes will negatively impact the neighborhood's historic character, and they argue that alternatives should be considered to avoid disrupting the community's rural and historical nature. They believe that the applicant should go through the Conservation Commission review process first, due to the request for several variances from Wetland Protection regulations. This process could lead to revised plans that might affect the current design. Therefore, they request that the review be rescheduled to allow time for further consideration and the receipt of updated plans that account for historic preservation and the variances.

Holly Backus: Preservation Planner Holly Backus comments on the relocation and adaptation of a historic 1938 Clon Revival structure, with the goal of preserving part of it rather than demolishing it. The new dwelling is planned to maintain a similar design, in a U-shape, consistent with the original structure. Concerns were raised about how the new design relates to the relocated Gambrell structure across the street, as well as potential environmental issues related to wetlands on the site, which weren't clearly reflected in the site plan. There's also mention of a unique canal feature in the design, which is considered atypical but part of the cottage's evolved character. She highlights the need for coordination between design, historic preservation, and environmental regulations.

BOARD DISCUSSION: Several comments mention that the design feels too boxy and lacks the organic, additive nature that's characteristic of Nantucket architecture. Instead of the large, unified mass, they suggest breaking the building into smaller, distinct parts, like how older houses in the area developed over time with additions and extensions. There's a desire to see a more playful and varied design that feels like it evolved naturally, rather than one that was "done all at once." The windows and doors across the design are seen as too uniform, with too much symmetry and vertical alignment. This is considered too contemporary and rigid, not responding well to the more relaxed and inconsistent nature of Nantucket's traditional architecture. There's a push for less formality and a more diverse approach to the placement and size of windows, especially on the north elevation, which faces the water. The use of a cable railing on the deck is called out as atypical for the area, and there's a preference for simpler, more traditional details, like a shingle railing. Similarly, the brackets are seen as oversized, and there's a suggestion for something smaller and more understated. While the design might have concerns about its aesthetic qualities, there's also mention of the site's location. It's noted that the building will likely be heavily screened by trees and wetlands, making it less visible from Tennessee Road. The site plan doesn't reflect how the property reads in the field, and the wetland areas might prevent significant visibility of the building, particularly if Tennessee remains an infrequently traveled road.

MOTION: Motion to hold for revisions made by Abby– Carried Camp, Oliver, Macleod, Paul, Welch

Adjournment: TIME 8.30pm

Motion: Motion to adjourn made by Welch

Vote: Motion was passed by a unanimous vote (4/0) Welch, Paul, Camp, Oliver

Submitted by: Fiona Johnson