



HDC Minutes April 29, 2025; adopted May 27, 2025

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Minutes April 29, 2025

2 Fairgrounds Road

Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

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

Associate Commissioners: Carrie Thornewill, Constance Patten, Joe Paul

Staff: Cathy Flynn Holly Backus, Fiona Johnson

Meeting called to order at 4:00 PM

MacLeod: made the motion to approve the agenda. Approved Stephen Welch, Val Oliver, Ray Pohl, Angus

MacLeod and Abby Camp.

In person, Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod Camp, Paul, Patten and Thornewill

Chairman Stephen Welch's comments on National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC) and the HDC public comment process focused on improving efficiency and clarity. He emphasized the importance of using short, declarative statements to streamline the meeting minutes and allow commissioners to focus on more important agenda items. He encouraged a clear and direct communication style to ensure that both the public and commissioners understood the process.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- **HDC Public Comment email**

Welch outlined the public comment procedure, noting that comments should be submitted via a specified email by 8 a.m. on the Monday before the meeting. This approach ensures that comments are reviewed before the meeting, included in the official record, and contribute to transparency and public engagement. Additionally, Welch emphasized the need for clear communication about the limited jurisdiction of the HDC to prevent confusion among community members.

II. COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION AND/OR VOTE

- **New Historic Determination Application Form**

The Commission reviewed a draft of a new historic determination application form intended to replace the outdated three-ply version. The proposed form is designed to collect more specific information on the purpose of each request and improve the cataloging and indexing of submissions. The new form includes checkboxes for various reasons an applicant may seek historic determination, such as eligibility for tax credits, building code compliance, and adherence to the stretch energy code. Applicants will be allowed to check multiple boxes and may resubmit the form for different purposes as needed.

Backus emphasized the need for applicants to provide detailed and thorough information to better inform the determination process.

The form will help the Commission tailor historic determination letters more specifically to the applicant's stated purpose.

The overarching goal is to clarify which architectural changes may alter a structure's historic character.

Commissioners expressed general support for the revised form.

MacLeod suggested holding the draft temporarily to allow for potential revisions based on additional feedback.

- **Article 71- General Bylaw Amendment: Streets and Sidewalks: Installation of traffic control devices using LED**

Board: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp

Presentation by Chris Young, Chair of the Sign Advisory Committee, on a Proposed Amendment to Article 71 Regarding LED Signage Installation

Young presented concerns and proposed revisions related to a proposed amendment to Article 71, which would modify current restrictions on LED signage. Prohibits the installation of LED or internally illuminated signs. Designed to preserve the historic character of road systems on Nantucket.

Chris's Proposed Modifications:

Remove references to portable changeable message signs entirely.

Limit speed feedback signs to a maximum size of 24x30 inches, consistent with minimum size for speed limit signage.

Impose a cap of one LED sign per 5,000 residents.

Ensure that LED signs on both state and local roads count toward the total allowable limit.

Boards Discussion: The Historic District Commission held a discussion regarding the proposed amendment to Article 71, which would modify current restrictions on LED signage. Several concerns were raised during the meeting, including the lack of a clear definition of who is responsible for installing and managing the signage, the absence of specific guidance on how signage should align with the character and setting of its location, and the potential for excessive and uncontrolled sign proliferation. Uncertainty was also noted regarding which entities hold jurisdiction over signage on various types of roadways.

Welch recommended using geographic metrics—such as square mileage—instead of population figures to determine allowable signage, adding a sunset clause to create a pilot program, and clarifying which parties are responsible for signage installation and oversight. Specific concerns were also expressed by individual commissioners: Val referenced previous complications with signage on state roads, Pohl questioned jurisdiction over publicly traveled ways, and MacLeod voiced apprehension about the risk of sign over-proliferation across the island. There was consensus among commissioners that clear limitations and guardrails are necessary to prevent unregulated expansion of LED signage.

The Commission expressed general support for Chris Young's proposed amendment but agreed that further modifications are essential to protect the island's historic character. The board leaned toward endorsing a modified version of the amendment that incorporates specific controls, clarifies implementation responsibilities, and imposes reasonable limitations on quantity and placement. The overall sentiment favored allowing limited, safety-focused signage while preventing an open-ended approach that could compromise Nantucket's unique historic environment. The Commission intends to provide informed input at the upcoming Town Meeting in support of a refined version of the amendment.

McLeod: made a motion to support Chris Young's amendment to Article 71, with potential modifications to align with the Commission's discussion. The motion specifically supported the concept of adding guardrails to regulate LED signage, allowed Chris Young to make appropriate modifications based on the Commission's feedback, and aimed to provide input that would help control the open-ended nature of the proposed bylaw amendment, ensuring it aligns with the preservation of Nantucket's historic character.

Motion Carries unanimously

III. COMMISSIONER Q & A WITH PRESERVATION PLANNER

IV. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Trapasso, Anthony- 12321	40 Goldfinch	Clapboard/door clr chg	68/616	Self AM
2. Ted Silva- 12397	14 Harbor View	Rev. 8887; MH windows	42.4.1/26	LFW JP
3. Price, Margaret- 12322	10 Long Pond	Add dormers	59/24	WCBC SW

Pohl made the motion to approve 10 Long Pond, 14 Harbor View and 40 Goldfinch

Board: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp Approved unanimously

4. Abigail Reardon- 12416	31 Shimmo Pond Rd	Deer fence	43/170	Jacob Svirsky VO
---------------------------	-------------------	------------	--------	------------------

MacLeod pulled this application for a discussion. It was noted this application will be heard at the beginning of next week's agenda 5/6/2025

Motion carries unanimously

V. HELD OVER PER COMMISSION REQUEST FOM 4/15/25 MEETING

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Thomas Sansone- 12139	35 Pleasant St	Rev. 1486; extend addition	55.4.1/156	Gryphon Architects

- Commissioners:** Welch, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul; **Alternates:** Thornewill, Patten **Last heard 4/15/2025**

Backus: The property in question is the former Pease family home, built circa 1923-1935, and is located within the Old Historic District (OHD) Design feedback praised the reduced height of the rear addition and emphasized the importance of ensuring the addition remains subordinate to the facade. Holly raised specific concerns about the 32-fixed light window on the facade, deeming it inappropriate, and recommended relocating it to the rear. She also noted that the new columns and water table created a "false sense of history." Holly supported Option 2, where the roofline drops down to better mimic existing conditions and advised against adding pilaster details and a water table to the side walls. While acknowledging the previously approved bay window as a new, period-appropriate feature from the 1920s, Holly's comments focused on maintaining the historic integrity of the structure while guiding the design to be more sympathetic to its original architecture.

The Boards discussion centered around design options for a property that is a former Pease family home built circa 1923-1935, located in the Old Historic District. The board debated the placement and design of a 32-light window, with some members proposing moving it to the rear or side of the building. There was also discussion on whether to replace it with six-over-six double-hung windows. Overall, the board supported Option 2, which included a dropped roofline, as it better aligned with existing conditions.

Paul made the motion to approve Option 2. Welch, Oliver and Paul approve MacLeod and Camp Nay motion carries

VI. OLD BUSINESS 04/08/2025

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Bridges Family LLC-11892	6 Ishmael Rd	New dwelling	82/91	Val Oliver

- Commissioners:** Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill and Patten; **Alternates:** none; **Recused:** Oliver; **Mullin:** Welch **Last heard 3/4/2025**

The Board's discussion on 6 Ishmael focused on several key architectural elements, particularly the building's integration into the surrounding neighborhood. Examples of neighboring homes were presented, showing common characteristics such as eight-shaped plans, non-symmetrical combinations of chimneys and porches, varying house heights, and different roof styles. Design changes for the property included a reduced roof

pitch, a dropped main mass moving E-forward, the elimination of a dormer on the south side, the removal of shutters (while keeping some on the first floor), and an increased porch roof to better integrate with the right-hand mass. Concerns were raised about the two-story gable facing the road, with a preference for designs that resemble one-story cottages with dormers rather than a two-story gable. Suggestions included reducing the ganged windows on the second-floor dormers, splitting the two dormers into three individual dormers and lowering the second-floor plate height. Support for the design was expressed with recommendations to space out the dormer windows for better visual balance. In defense of the design, it was noted that a neighboring house features a similar two-story mass, arguing that the design fits within the neighborhood context. Overall, the board was generally supportive of the design but recommended minor modifications to address the concerns raised.

MacLeod: Motion to approve as submitted with reducing the two shed dormers have the shingle space removed so just the corner boards and window casings with existing double-hung; shutters to be gray.

Motion carries unanimously

VII. OLD BUSINESS 04/29/25

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Town of Nantucket 11901	1 Shadbush Rd	DPW Facility Main Bldg	78-5	Weston & Sampson
<i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill and Patten; Alternates: none; Recused: Oliver, Welch</i> <i>Last heard 3/4/2025</i> Board: prefers a horizontal eave line on the South elevation where the bay comes out for vehicles. Concerns with the height of second floor. Prefers a drop in height and long ridge line. Solar needs to be strike on plans and submitted as a separate application. MacLeod made the motion to approve as submitted. Motion carries unanimously				
2. Town of Nantucket 11903	1 Shadbush Rd	Salt Shed	78-5	Weston & Sampson
<i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill and Patten; Alternates: none; Recused: Oliver, Welch</i> The Board's discussion on the 1 Shadbush salt shed centered around both design and functionality. The height of the shed was reduced to 30 feet to match the adjacent storage garage. Two options were considered: board and batten or metal panel, with a decorative cupola deemed unnecessary. The functionality of the shed was emphasized, with its height allowing trucks to lift dump bodies inside for efficient salt distribution. The design also aimed to maximize salt storage capacity, with a concrete push wall to prevent runoff and material waste. Board members preferred board and batten siding to match the adjacent building, while another suggested removing or enlarging the cupola. There were also questions about the building's siting and salt usage, which were addressed by an explanation of the salt storage strategy during potential supply disruptions. Key modifications included reducing the ridge height to 30 feet, removing the cupola, and opting for board and batten siding. The shed was sited at the property entry to allow for efficient truck loading, improve safety by reducing vehicle crossings, and facilitate easier snow and ice event management. The board was generally supportive of the design, appreciating its functionality and aesthetic integration with the surrounding buildings. MacLeod made the motion to approve option 1 the ridge height will be reduced to 30 feet, and the cupola will be removed. Motion carries unanimously				
3. Town of Nantucket 11902	1 Shadbush Rd	hardscaping	78-5	Weston & Sampson
<i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill and Patten; Alternates: none; Recused: Oliver, Welch</i> The Board: Suggested adding trees in the middle to break up all the pavement/concrete. MacLeod made the motion to approve as submitted with a post-approval request to assess the parking area for potential tree placement if space allows. Motion carries unanimously				
4. Jeff Booms 11744	14 Woodland Dr	Addition to dwelling	79-206	JB Studio
<i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Patten and Paul; Alternates: none; Recused: Oliver</i> <i>Last heard 2/4/2025</i> Board: no concerns. Patten: Motion to approve as submitted motion carries unanimously				
5. 85 Orange LLC 10613	85 Orange St	Addition	554.1/27	C Anderson
<i>Commissioners: Welch, MacLeod, Paul and Patten</i> <i>Last heard 4/8/2025</i> Backus: The property in question is a 1834 three-and-a-half bay, half house with an L added in the late 1800s. The board appreciated the trim and fenestration details, noting they matched the 1890 historic photo. However, it was observed that the chimney size appears smaller than the original. Holly recommended not altering the historic rear L's roof and suggested that the new addition should feature a hip roof, to maintain architectural harmony. The addition should also be one story to provide appropriate additive massing that aligns with the historic structure. requested the existing floor plans of the historic house and noted that the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application was not included in the submission. The board further recommended confirming the colors to ensure they complement the				

existing structure.

Public: Mickey Rowland, et al agreed with Holly's recommendation that the additions should be one-story with shed roofs instead of two-story gables, believing that one-story additions would provide better additive massing and enhance the structure's overall appearance. They also recommended keeping the rear gable as a gable, rather than altering it to a hip roof. In addition, the front stoop railing was specifically critiqued, with the shingle-style railings described as "awkward" and "untraditional." The board suggested changing the railings to traditional balusters or, at a minimum, vertical boards, noting that the current design appeared unusual and narrow.

The Board discussion at 85 Orange Street involved several key considerations regarding the proposed design. It was suggested that it would potentially reduce the second-floor addition's footprint and shift the interior program to create a single-story mass on the most visible side. He supported keeping the gables, believing the proposed gable design would help break up the horizontal wall. Angus expressed concern about the addition being almost flush with the North Gable and supported Joe's suggestion of a one-story eve to mitigate the wall-like appearance. The board was generally fine with the current design but suggested possible modifications to the connector piece's height. They emphasized the need for clear and specific modification requests for the applicant. Overall, the board was mostly supportive of the design but recommended refinements to the addition's massing, particularly on the North elevation. Joe's one-story mass concept received significant interest. It was discussed several key modifications to improve the design of the addition at 85 Orange Street. One proposed change was pushing back the two-story addition further from the North Gable to create more separation. Additionally, creating a one-story eve along the middle portion of the building was recommended to reduce the wall-like appearance of the addition and maintain the expression of the existing gable. There was also an emphasis that the dropped roof adjacent to the gable was handled thoughtfully. The primary concern was that the current design, which is almost flush with the North Gable, does not align with the guidelines for additive massing. In response, the board supported Joe's suggestion of introducing a single-story element to break up the continuous wall and provide a more appropriate architectural transition.

Paul made the motion to hold for minor revisions focusing on the elevation motion carries unanimously

6.	85 Orange LLC 10610	85 Orange St	Front Hardscape	554.1/27	C Anderson
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, MacLeod, Paul and Patten</i>				<i>Last heard 4/8/2025</i>

MacLeod made the motion to approve through Exhibit A which Paul will write up
Motion carries unanimously

7.	85 Orange LLC 10609	85 Orange St	Rear Hardscape	554.1/27	C Anderson
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, MacLeod, Paul and Patten</i>				<i>Last heard 4/8/2025</i>

Paul made the motion to approve through Exhibit A
Motion carries unanimously

8.	Town of Nantucket 12067	24 Surfside Rd	Office Building	55/243	Chip Clunie
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod and Patten; Alternates: Paul, Welch</i>				<i>Last heard 4/1/2025</i>

Board: Option C. Asked about continuous eave option or 6 pitch hip- no bump out with the low pitch.

MacLeod made a motion to approve Option C with a modification to lower the main hipped roof pitch from 7/12 to 6/12.

The board unanimously approved the motion.

9.	Town of Nantucket 12068	24 Surfside Rd	Hardscape	55/243	Chip Clunie
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod and Patten; Alternates: Paul, Welch</i>				<i>Last heard 4/1/2025</i>

MacLeod made the motion to approve as submitted motion carries unanimously

10.	Giles, Gregory	48 York St	Addition	55.4 55	LINK
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, MacLeod Paul and Patten; Alternates:</i>				<i>Last heard 4/8/2025</i>

Welch made the motion for Exhibit A by leaving the chimney in current location and dropping the eaves of the dormer to embrace the head casings. Motion carries unanimously

11.	3 Pops Lane Trust- 11083	3 Pops Ln	New Dwelling	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl (chair), Welch, MacLeod, Oliver and Paul; Alternates: Patten</i>				<i>Last heard 4/8/2025</i>

Ray Pohl Chaired 3 Pops Lane

Backus' comments emphasized concerns about the proposed design's compatibility with the surrounding historic context. She acknowledged that the structure is an infill dwelling replacing the circa 1940 Taylor house and appreciated the revision that changed the side wall to primarily shingles. However, she raised concerns about the visibility of the building from Hither Creek, Madaket Road, and Ames Street, highlighting that the proposed massing and detailing could significantly impact the character of the area.

She specifically criticized the "saw tooth" effect created by the repeating gables and eaves, stating it was inconsistent with traditional Nantucket architecture. She also found the continuous eave lines problematic and recommended incorporating varying heights to reflect more authentic additive massing. The contemporary pergola with rigid posts was seen as out of place, and a more traditional design was advised. Holly expressed

that the dwelling, as designed, may alter the simple architectural character of Madaket and noted that abutters had submitted additional comments. Overall, she felt the design did not fit well within its setting.

Linda Williams' comments were strongly critical of the project's scale, design, and fit within the Madaket context. She stated that the structure remained too long at 124 feet and that problematic elements—such as the glass connectors and flat roofs—had not been adequately revised. She found the exterior chimney awkwardly placed and noted that the color specification was too vague, merely listing "gray" without specifying a shade. Procedurally, she recommended a site visit from the water—specifically Hither Creek, Madaket Road, and Millie's Bridge—and suggested installing ridge poles to visually demonstrate the full length of the proposed building from these vantage points. She emphasized that the HDC has jurisdiction over water views. Regarding development scale, she argued that the project was overbuilt at over 3,200 square feet, significantly larger than other structures in the area, and asserted that no comparable project exists along the creeks. She represented abutting property owners Paul and G. Moran and John and Sarah Hendrickson. Overall, her comments focused on concerns about the massing, appropriateness, and impact on the surrounding historic and natural environment.

Oliver: I've reviewed all submissions since October 2024, comparing the first iteration to the current one to see how things have evolved. Overall, there have been only minor incremental changes in details, with no significant alterations in size, aside from a few inches in height. The footprint remains the same. That said, I do want to acknowledge the positive changes. The height has been well-received, and the shift away from the ranch style is appreciated. The fenestration has been reduced, and the use of muted colors is a positive step. However, my concerns remain largely unchanged. The primary issue is still the massing, which has not been adequately addressed. While there were suggestions, such as changing one gable to an "E" forward, the overall design continues to feel too contemporary. The glass connectors seem out of place and could be reduced or eliminated to make the building appear smaller and more compact. There's no clear architectural hierarchy—just masses connected with connectors, which makes the building feel like one large structure rather than a composition of additive elements. The visibility from the water is a concern, but I don't think the view from a boat would offer any new insights. Ultimately, while I appreciate the reduced height and the ranch-style approach, I don't feel this design is approvable in its current form.

Welch expressed concerns about the accuracy of the meeting minutes, stating that they did not properly reflect the commission's previous discussions. The commissioner noted that the minutes seemed to suggest the commission was supportive of the design, when many members had significant reservations. Regarding the design, the commissioner appreciated that it was a single-story structure, which they felt was more appropriate compared to many of the buildings built in Madaket over the past 25 years. They favored architectural elements that are low-slung, one-story, and quirky/unique but felt this design did not embody those characteristics. Specific design recommendations included: Moving towards more traditional fenestration Steering away from the contemporary feel of the design. The structure needs more traditional fenestration to shift away from the contemporary feel. This change would naturally help reduce the size of the building, both in terms of height and footprint, and I don't think that's a bad thing. Additionally, the connectors need to be reconsidered. If they are to remain, they should follow a more traditional approach and be used sparingly.

Paul: Madaket is special for its eclectic mix of architectural styles, and while this building lacks whimsy, it embraces simple gable forms and a single-story height, which is rare given the 25-foot height limit and small lot sizes. This property benefits from a large creek frontage, allowing the building to spread out. I appreciate the rendering's brown color, though it will weather to gray. The flat roof, which separates the masses, adds authenticity and is a modern take on Madaket whimsy. The building's gables and their proximity to one another are typical for the creek, and I don't expect them to be perceived as a mass from the water. I think the design's simplicity fits the Madaket skyline with its undulating roof forms. While contemporary pergolas are included, they'll likely blend in over time. The applicant has also addressed roofline concerns, making the guest house design more consistent with the main structure. I don't think height is an issue—lower heights often lead to horizontal designs. This project doesn't max out ground cover, and the basement is a good solution for the program. Overall, despite some contemporary details, this is one of the simpler and more appropriate designs for the waterfront.

MacLeod: appreciated the simplicity of the one-story design, noting its consistency and lack of busy elements like second-floor decks. He observed that the even eave heights made it read as one cohesive building, but raised concerns about the sawtooth effect with gables, particularly on the north side. Angus felt the gables were too similar in height, hindering additive massing. While he liked the revision that emphasized the chimney, he agreed with Val that the changes were incremental and not substantial enough to reflect Madaket's architectural character. He suggested toning down some modern aspects for a better fit.

Pohl My thoughts are most aligned with Joe's. While there are criticisms, I think some of the positive aspects are being overlooked, such as the basement buildout, which reduces the need for a second floor. That's a benefit, not a drawback. Given that there's not enough support for approval at this point, I'd like to see a motion for revisions to keep the process moving.

Welch: I take exception to some of the comments suggesting the structure has gotten shorter. Comparing the October 24 south elevation to the current proposal, the ridge is about 2.5 feet taller, and the top plate appears to have increased by at least three shingle courses roughly 18 inches. These changes run counter to what the commission has requested.

The HDC has a best practices guideline that substantive modifications should occur within three submissions in response to commissioner feedback. From what I see, the changes made so far go against those requests. I want to make it clear to the applicant's agent that if the next iteration does not materially address the prevailing concerns, particularly height, fenestration, ridge height, connectors, and gable orientation, I will be prepared to make a motion to deny.

Welch made the motion to hold for revisions, with the secondary dwelling, garage and pool to Track
Motion carries unanimously

12. 3 Pops Lane Trust-11084	3 Pops Ln	Secondary dwelling	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+
• TRACK				
13. 3 Pops Lane Trust- 11087	3 Pops Ln	Garage	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+
• TRACK				
14. 3 Pops Lane Trust- 11085	3 Pops Ln	Pool	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+
• TRACK				
15. Gale & Richard Valero- 12185	4 Spruce Ln	VIEW Addition	55/411	Val Oliver
• <i>Commissioners: Welch, MacLeod, Camp, Paul and Patten</i>				<i>Alternate: Thornewill</i>
Held per applicant				<i>Last heard 4/15/2025</i>
16. CNV Surf LLC-12266	68 Shawkemo	VIEW New Dwelling	44/5	Emeritus LTD
• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul</i>				<i>Alternate: Thornewill, Patten</i>
				<i>Last heard 4/15/2025</i>

The Board was generally supportive of the revised design, appreciating the lowered height, improved dormer alignment, and the effort to tuck the house into the corner of the lot while preserving roadside vegetation. Suggestions included potentially extending the porch to the east side and adjusting the side gables for better additive massing. There were some concerns about the second-floor deck's size, grading impacts, and the finished floor height, prompting requests for additional information such as cross-sections and contour revisions. While the design changes were viewed positively overall, the board recommended further refinements to address topography and architectural integration.

Camp made motion to hold the application for additional information, specifically requesting cross sections running west–east and north–south, along with detailed contour data. The board sought clarity on how the proposed building’s finished floor height of 62 feet would interact with the existing topography, expressing concerns about potential grade manipulation and the overall site integration. Motion carries unanimously

17. Farhood Azima- 10063	20 Liberty Street	MH addition	42.3.1/143	SMRD
• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul, Thornewill; Recused: Oliver</i>				<i>Last heard 4/2/2024</i>

Backus focused on preserving the historic integrity of the 1885 Sara G. Wilber house, a Greek Revival in the Old Historic District. She expressed concern that the proposed addition is more than double the size of the historic structure, recommending it be reduced in scale and that the garage be detached and repositioned to align with historic patterns. Citing both “Building with Nantucket in Mind” and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, she emphasized that additions should be subordinate in mass and design. While she appreciated the design simplifications and visual materials, she ultimately recommended further reducing the size of the addition and rethink the garage placement.

Public: Mickey Rowland- current design for 20 Liberty were critical, emphasizing that it still fails to address the board’s earlier concerns.

He noted the structure continues to overwhelm the historic property and remains highly visible from Winter Street and the Coffin School lawn. Specific issues included the two-story rear wall looming over the school fence and the two-story connector, which now reads as a full addition rather than a subordinate outbuilding. He recommended significantly reducing the addition’s width and height to better align with the scale and proportions of the original house and its historic context.

Thornewill I appreciate the effort to make the structure subordinate, but I feel it lacks simplicity. There are too many dormers, shed roofs, and elements that don’t relate to the simple Victorian style, making the building feel larger than it should. A simpler barn-like structure would be more appropriate one that stays true to the simplicity of the existing building. While the scale is close, the design still doesn’t quite work with the original structure.

Paul I appreciate the clarity of your presentation. From Liberty Street, the addition appears smaller than its actual footprint, and the scale and the height of the existing house change the perception. The design is moving in the right direction, especially with the central steep-pitched gable dormer over the garage. While attached garages are rare in town, this is the most successful iteration. Shifting the masses slightly could help break up the wall, but it likely won’t make a significant difference from Winter Street. The east elevation could align better with the existing house, and the rendering might better integrate the new and old structures. The west elevation feels subordinate to the main house, but the site plan makes it seem larger than it will appear once built. Reducing the scale near the setback and adding undulation in the rear mass would help. Overall, it's moving in the right direction, especially from Liberty Street.

Patten offered a concise but critical assessment of the 20 Liberty design. She felt the original house is very simple and that the proposed addition is too "fussy," with excessive gables and complex rooflines that clash with the historic structure. Connie considered the attached garage inappropriate and believed the overall design does not harmonize with the existing building. Her primary recommendation was to significantly simplify the addition to better aligning with the straightforward character of the original house.

Camp: The feedback expressed concerns about the design's insensitivity to the historic house and the proximity to the Coffin School, suggesting that the addition creates a "wall" that would block views from the school. The attached garage was highlighted as an issue, as garages are rarely integrated into historic district designs. The design was described as feeling like two disconnected buildings, especially from the east elevation (Winter Street) and the driveway side. Overall, Abby felt that the site had been overdeveloped, leaving little breathing room, and that the changes from the previous iteration was not substantial enough to address these concerns.

Welch general support for the changes made to the design, particularly as viewed from Liberty Street. The addition was seen as appropriate from that perspective, though it was recommended that the dormer facing Liberty be more limited and set further back. Suggestions included simplifying the roof plane visible from Liberty and possibly adding a turret element to the East elevation to better relate to the existing structure.

While the west dormer wasn't a major concern due to limited visibility, the north elevation was flagged for potential simplification—lowering the top plate and reducing its perceived mass. Welch noted that close lot lines are typical in the area, which helps contextualize the design's proximity issues. Overall, feedback was constructive, encouraging refinement while recognizing the limitations of the site.

Camp made the motion to hold for revisions. Motion carries unanimously

Welch reiterated the importance of the minutes. Everyone reviewing the minutes for Pops Lane should confirm that their comments are reflected; if not, please follow up so they can be incorporated. It's important to have an accurate record for future reference, and this applies to both the March 11th meeting and tonight's minutes as well."

MacLeod made the motion to approve March 4, 2025, and April 1, 2025, minutes MacLeod, Pohl and Camp are in favor Welch is a No and Oliver Abstained.

Welch asked members to review January 21, 2025, minutes

Oliver made the motion to adjourn at 8:31 PM

Motion carries all in favor Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp