



Historic District Commission

Sign Advisory Council

Commissioners: Chris Young (Chair), Kevin Kuester, Paul Wolf, Mark Cutone, Ben Normand

Planning and Land Use Services

2 Fairgrounds Road

Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

APPROVED MINUTES (*Approved on 02/04/25*)

Tuesday January 07, 2025

I. Procedural Business

Call to order at 9:00 am.

Attending members: Chris Young, Mark Cutone, Ben Normand, Kevin Kuester & Paul Wolf

Staff in attendance: Nicky Sheriff- Land Use Specialist/HDC Enforcement Officer

Absent members:

Late arrivals: None

Early Departures: None

Audio Recorded Announcement

Motion to Adopt Agenda as amended made by Paul Wolf; Seconded by Ben Normand.

Vote: carried unanimously

Motion to approve the minutes from 10/29/24 made by Mark Cutone; Seconded by Paul Wolf.

Vote: carried unanimously

II. Public Comment N/A

III. Commissioners Comments

Paul Wolf expressed interest in discussing the proliferation of freestanding signs around town by various organizations and suggested having this conversation at the end of the meeting under enforcement.

IV. New Business

NIR RETAIL LLC	Zero Main St	Wall Sign (Northeast Advisors)	42.3.1/181	SIGN HERE

Recommendations

Ben- Expressed strong opposition to the proposed location of the sign, stating that it is confusing and does not effectively direct people to the door. He recommended rethinking the location, noting that it may also necessitate changes to the sign's design.

Nicky Sheriff mentioned that after searching the database and reviewing the file, she couldn't find anything related to a master sign plan for the particular location in question. However, she noted that there are master sign plans for other properties and suggested that NIR could consider looking into creating one for this location.

Chris- explained that the concept of a master sign plan emerged when buildings were divided into multi-tenant spaces. It helps address the issue Ben raised about finding appropriate locations for signage, ensuring that future tenants know where signs are allowed based on prior consideration. He emphasized that this situation would be an ideal candidate for a master sign plan, which should be part of the approval process. He suggested discussing the placement of the sign as though it were part of a master sign plan, focusing on the most appropriate location for the sign.

Kevin- Agreed with Ben's point that the guidelines are clear about signs being located at or near the entrance. He mentioned that a previous sign had been approved in a location closer to the door, although he couldn't recall the business name. He expressed concerns that the current sign location is problematic and that the design of the sign does not respect the character of Main Street.

Mark- Agreed with the concerns about the sign's location, noting that businesses on the second floor traditionally have their signs placed near the entry. He referenced a past example of a real estate office, Cooper & Shepherd, whose sign was located near the door in a clearer, more appropriate spot. Mark also expressed that the sign design feels somewhat generic and could be better suited to the Nantucket and Main Street aesthetic. He mentioned that he would like to see revised signage that might better reflect the local character.

Paul- Suggested that while he is unsure about what is currently in the box to the left of the door, it seems like an appropriate location for signage on the second floor. He pointed out that the Chamber of Commerce has a projecting sign near the door and proposed that this applicant could have a similar sign on the other post to the left of the door. He made it clear that he would not be in support of placing a sign over the middle of the building, as it does not align with the business's actual location.

Kevin- Shared his concern that, aside from the word "Northeast," the sign lacks any reference to historical typography or elements that reflect a traditional, historic approach. He agreed with Mark's comment that the design feels generic and could be anywhere, not specific to Nantucket. Kuester also noted that the logo seems too contemporary and out of place. While he wasn't certain if the real estate and rental elements were historically appropriate, he emphasized that traditional signage on Main Street would typically be a simple name, often in gold on black. He concluded that this design feels like a missed opportunity to better reflect the area's character.

Mark- Shared similar concerns, emphasizing that the sign's design felt generic and lacked historical elements that would connect it to Nantucket's character. He agreed with Kevin Kuester's point that the logo and overall design seemed too contemporary for the area, and he felt the approach missed an opportunity to incorporate a more traditional aesthetic that aligns with Main Street's historical signage.

Chris- Referred to the sign guidelines, noting that serif fonts are encouraged and suggesting that adding serifs to the current font could help improve the design without compromising the message. He also mentioned that logos are allowed as part of the sign, but they should occupy no more than 15% of the total sign space. He advised that if the logo is to be incorporated in a redesign, this limit should be kept in mind.

Kevin Kuester recommended that the application be **HELD** for revisions and a master sign plan, and it was duly seconded by Ben Normand.

Vote: carried unanimously

V. Enforcement

Paul Wolf expressed frustration with the proliferation of popup signs around town, particularly during the summer. He noted that these signs often appear without approval, time frames, or proper regulations, and some stay up long after the event they were meant to advertise. He mentioned a specific instance where he removed a sign left by a local organization. Paul emphasized the need for clear regulations on temporary signs, suggesting a simple application process—possibly with no fee—that staff could approve, outlining requirements like time frames, sizes, and colors. He specifically referred to the small lawn signs with metal posts that are frequently appearing for various events and causes.

Chris Young acknowledged the distinction between political signs and other types of signs, such as

those promoting events like a wind farm message or a county fair. He noted that while it could be argued that some of these signs have a political nature, he understood the point being made, particularly when it comes to commercial events or community gatherings.

Ben Normand expressed that he sees a clear distinction between political signs and advertisements, viewing the regulation of advertisements as part of the role of the board. He considers political signs to be a form of free speech and, in a way, a reflection of the current moment in time. While he acknowledged that political signs contribute to clutter on roadways, he doesn't find them insulting and doesn't feel obligated to remove them.

Nicky Sheriff mentioned that she is still investigating a couple of issues that were sent to her and plans to take further enforcement actions for the other two cases, as the deadline she set is approaching and she hasn't heard back from them. She also noted that the signs for two buildings were removed after she drove by. Regarding the state forest issue, she is still looking into it, trying to get in touch with someone at the office via phone, as she feels that approach might be more effective than sending a letter.

VI. Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn made by Mark Cutone seconded by Paul Wolf.

Vote: carried Unanimously.

Link to Meeting Recording [Sign Advisory Council-01/07/2025](#)

Submitted by: Nicky Sheriff