



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 04/15/2025*)

Tuesday April 01, 2025

I. Procedural Business

Call to order at 9:03 am.

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

Staff in attendance: Nicky Sheriff, Land Use Specialist

Absent members:

Late arrivals: None

Early Departures: None

Audio Recorded Announcement

Motion to Adopt Agenda made by Paul Wolf Seconded by Mark Cutone

Vote: carried unanimously

Motion to approve the minutes from **03/18/25** made by Kevin Kuester and duly seconded by Paul Wolf.

Vote: carried unanimously

II. Public Comment N/A

III. Commissioners Comments

Mark Cutone sought clarification on whether the remote Zoom meeting is still authorized under Governor Baker's order or if it's now under Governor Healey's authority. Nicky Sheriff mentioned that she will look into it and forward the relevant information to the Council members.

Chris Young also mentioned that a member of the public approached him regarding a proposed Town Meeting article on electronic street signage, such as speed limit signs. He suggested it would be preferable to seek the Historic District Commission's (HDC) approval before taking a stance. The intent of the article is to limit the number and size of such signs to preserve the character of the streetscape. He noted that other towns have adopted similar restrictions and that the Select Board expressed interest in ensuring limited and appropriate use of the signage. The article currently includes language referencing the preservation of streetscape character, but Chris proposed considering whether to make that language more specific. He will circulate the article's text via email and mentioned the possibility of submitting a floor amendment at Town Meeting if further restrictions are desired.

IV. Old /New Business

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
VTT MANAGEMENT	53 MAIN ST	PROJECTING SIGN REV (HOT HAUS)	42.3.1/223	SIGN HERE

Sign Name: HOT HAUS

Comments

Paul Wolf- No concerns

Ben Normand- **RECUSED** (did not sit on the initial application)

Mark Cutone- Stated that he had no graphic concerns with the proposed sign and noted that the black color may be more appropriate for Main Street. He visited the location and measured the proposed sign dimensions, confirming it to be approximately 18 inches by 40 inches, with a 48-inch bracket arm. For context, he also measured nearby bracket arms and found them to range from 30 inches up to approximately 53–54 inches. Initially concerned that the bracket arm might be too long, he concluded that the proposed scale appears appropriate and expressed support for the sign as proposed.

Kevin Kuester- Stated that he felt the revisions to the sign were appropriate but noted that the overall width still seemed a bit long.

Chris Young- Stated that while the sign is indeed long, it is located next to the Congdon and

Coleman sign, which he believes is even longer, making the proposed length more acceptable in this context.

Recommendations

Mark Cutone recommended approval with the black and creme color scheme and it was duly seconded by Paul Wolf.

Vote: carried unanimously

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
MARINE LUMBER OPERATOR INC	5 BAYBERRY CT	WALL SIGN (YALE APPLIANCE)	55/705	SIGN HERE

Sign Name: YALE APPLIANCE

Comments

Paul Wolf- **RECUSED**

Ben Normand- stated that his initial impression of the sign was that it appeared out of proportion for its intended location. He felt it was too vertically oriented and not horizontal enough, suggesting it would be better if it resembled a traditional quarter board rather than a stand or logo. Additionally, he commented that the font appeared too squared and modern, lacking serifs, which contributed to it feeling out of proportion and not in keeping with the character of the area. He felt the sign, as proposed, would be a bit underwhelming for a storefront. He mentioned that if he were coming to buy appliances, the sign might not make a strong impression. Ben suggested a more decorative or stylized approach to better fit the building's upscale character, with its clapboard siding and columns. He emphasized that this recommendation was for the benefit of the store, not just the sign. While acknowledging that the warehouse-style sign could work if that's what the client desires, he believed there was an opportunity to create something more interesting and fitting for the building's aesthetic.

Mark Cutone- stated that he generally agreed with Ben's comments. He recalled that, historically, signage for that unit may have been placed on the frieze board above the columns rather than on the cap above, as the current proposal suggests, though he acknowledged he could be mistaken. He noted that the frieze is a smaller surface area, but if the applicant intended to place the sign there, he would support Ben's view. Mark also felt the proposed sign looked too much like a logo due to its font style and suggested a more horizontal, lower-profile sign located closer to the first-floor unit might be more appropriate.

Kevin Kuester- stated that he agreed with what was previously said and felt that the approach being used for the applicant's other property would be just as effective at this location. He

suggested that placing the sign on the frieze board would look more appropriate and be a better fit.

Chris Young- Mentioned that he agreed the scale of the sign seemed somewhat awkward. He suggested that reconfiguring the layout to resemble more of a quarter board sign—where the word "Appliance" follows "Yale"—could be a better approach. He added that the length of the sign was not a concern and that a longer format might actually be more appropriate, aligning with what was being proposed. He agreed with Ben's thoughts on the sign. While he understood the importance of the font for identification purposes, he felt that the sign for a storefront should have more character. He found the current design to be too utilitarian for the architectural style of the building, which has some ornateness. Chris suggested that the sign could take on a quarter board shape and was open to exploring how to integrate the Yale font and logo with more decorative ends. He proposed that the sign could be closer to the 20-foot size allowed to better match the scale of the storefront but noted it should be more elongated and shorter in height. He was not strongly attached to placing the sign on the frieze board, as he felt it could end up being too small. Instead, he was open to the idea of the sign being placed on the quarter board, just in a more horizontal, less tall design.

Recommendations

Mark Cutone recommended the application be ***held for revisions*** and it was duly seconded by Ben Normand.

Vote: carried unanimously

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
NCHWU LLC	8B SALROS RD #2	WALL SIGN (YALE APPLIANCE)	67/106.2	SIGN HERE

Sign Name: YALE APPLIANCE

Comments

Paul Wolf- RECUSED

No Concerns

Recommendations

Kevin Kuester recommended approval as submitted and it was duly seconded by Ben Normand.

Vote: carried unanimously

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
ARNO JOSEPH V TRST	31 EASY ST	PROJECTING SIGN 1 (EASY STREET RESTAURANT)	42.4.2/16	MILAN BASNET/SGN HERE

Sign Name: EASY STREET RESTAURANT

Comments

Kevin Kuester- asked about the thickness of the sign, noting that since it is double-sided, it would need to be at least an inch thick—possibly an inch and three-quarters. He mentioned that sometimes signs appear too thin, which can be a concern. However, he concluded by saying that he felt the design was appropriate, it looked good, and he had no concerns.

Paul Wolf- Only question was regarding the sign on the corner post, which appeared to be placed very high. He noted that, based on the photo, it looked unusually elevated.

Mark Cutone- Mark stated that he has observed the bracket for nearly 20 years and noted that nothing significant has changed about the building during that time aside from different tenants. He believes the bracket was mounted high originally because there used to be an awning at that elevation, along with outdoor seating in the area. He confirmed that the bracket has been in place for as long as he can remember, and although its height may seem atypical, it has historical precedent. Mark also added that the location does have considerable foot traffic, so any sign installed would still need to maintain a certain height for clearance. He also mentioned that the Easy Street Sign was located there prior, for what that's worth. He also asked the applicant whether, in addition to the two signs currently being proposed, there would also be a menu box, or any similar element mounted at either the main entrance or the Easy Street entrance. He acknowledged that it was stated these were the only two signs being applied for but wanted clarification on whether additional signage, such as a menu box, might be expected. He also asked is there any proposal to illuminate this or for map matter the other sign as well the applications just for the record. He also went on to note that he wasn't sure if umbrellas or similar items would be introduced as part of any outdoor dining setup but emphasized that any umbrellas used should not display vendor or product names. He concluded by wishing the applicant good luck.

Ben Normand- No concerns.

Chris Young- stated that he believed the signs had been used previously and felt that they appeared to be appropriate.

Recommendations

Mark Cutone recommended approval as submitted in conjunction with only one (1) additional sign on this building and it was duly seconded by Paul Wolf.

Vote: carried unanimously

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
ARNO JOSEPH V TRST	31 EASY ST	PROJECTING SIGN 1 (EASY STREET RESTAURANT)	42.4.2/16	MILAN BASNET/SGN HERE

Sign Name: EASY STREET RESTAURANT

Comments

No concerns.

Recommendations

Mark Cutone recommended approval as submitted in conjunction with only one (1) additional sign on this building and it was duly seconded by Paul Wolf.

Vote: carried unanimously

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
HOOPER FARM LLC	1 HOOPER FARM RD	PROJECTING SIGN (NANTUCKET AESTHETICS)	55/228	ROBIN MANNING

Sign Name: NANTUCKET AESTHETICS

Comments

Paul Wolf- No concerns.

Ben Normand- stated that he appreciated the inclusion of a beveled edge in the sign design, considering it a positive detail. He suggested that adding a color to the bevel might help complete the overall look, though he did not see it as essential. He left the decision up to the applicant and concluded that he was otherwise okay with the proposal.

Mark Cutone- stated that he agreed with Ben's comments, noting that the sign graphics are traditional enough that, combined with the beveled edge, the design works well. He added that although the signs would be voted on separately, he believed both signs were totally fine as applied for.

Kevin Kuester- No concerns.

Chris Young- Felt strongly about the need to paint the bevel on the sign teal blue. He emphasized that, especially on a white background, the bevel tends to disappear and loses its effectiveness as a border. He believed it was important to avoid the white space bleeding off the edges and maintained that painting the bevel would enhance the overall appearance.

Recommendations

Ben Normand recommended approval as submitted with 2 by 2-foot sign with the bevel painted teal blue and it was duly seconded by Paul Wolf.

Vote: carried unanimously

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
HOOPER FARM LLC	1 HOOPER FARM RD	WALL SIGN (NANTUCKET AESTHETICS)	55/228	ROBIN MANNING

Sign Name: NANTUCKET AESTHETICS

Comments

Ben Normand- Stated that, similar to the other sign, he felt the bevel should be painted in the same teal blue color. He acknowledged that if there hadn't been a previous sign in that location, he would likely have pushed back on the proposal, as it feels somewhat like a billboard on the rotary. However, since the applicant is replacing an existing sign, he was willing to support it. He emphasized that the approval should clearly state that it is being granted specifically because there was a pre-existing sign at that location.

Mark Cutone- Stated that he had no concerns with the sign. He noted that the corner conditions were similar to those when they originally approved the Gable End sign. As Ben mentioned, the sign is somewhat "grandfathered" in since an existing sign was previously approved for that location. Therefore, he had no objections.

Kevin Kuester- No concerns.

Paul Wolf- No concerns.

Chris Young- Stated that he agreed with everything that had been said and thanked the applicant for modifying the design to include the bevel being painted teal.

Recommendations

Mark Cutone recommended approval as submitted with the bevel painted teal blue and it was duly seconded by Paul Wolf.

Vote: carried unanimously

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
NIR RETAIL LLC	2 WASHINGTON ST	WALL SIGN (MILLY & GRACE)	42.3.1/182	EMILY HOLLISTER

Sign Name: MILLY & GRACE

Comments

Ben Normand- Stated that he wasn't sure if businesses like this were allowed three signs, which was his first question. He mentioned that while he found the small back entrance sign adorable, he questioned whether it should even be considered a sign due to its small size (under one foot by one foot). Ben expressed no issue with the corner board sign above the big picture window from a permitting or context standpoint, as he was familiar with the area. However, he raised concerns about the visibility of the alley where the entrance is located. He described it as a "gem" in town that people often miss, and he thought the corner board sign might not be enough to draw people into the alley and toward the entrance. While he had no problem with the corner board itself, he felt that something more could be done to better attract attention to the entrance and encourage people to notice and enter the alley. Ben also believed the ivy on the building should stay, as it added beautiful aesthetic value. He suggested that moving the blade sign above the door, allowing it to "poke through" the ivy, would be a fantastic idea. He mentioned that the service entrance sign was so small and utilitarian that he was uncomfortable making an exception for it in this case. However, he felt the corner board sign, as submitted, was perfectly approvable. Overall, Ben expressed that he would be very comfortable with the proposal if the blade sign was repositioned above the door in some way.

Mark Cutone- Concerned about setting a precedent for approving three signs and wondered if there might be another way to achieve the desired outcome. He referenced Ben's comment about the current sign being proposed and seemed to be seeking a solution that wouldn't involve the need for multiple signs. He also added that he agreed with Ben's comment about the lack of signage from the alley. He was torn about the proposal, as he wasn't sure whether it was inappropriate from a historical perspective, but he had concerns about approving three signs. He is worried about setting a precedent that other store owners with similar conditions might follow. Mark expressed a desire to find a solution that helps direct people to the front door without the need for multiple signs, but he wasn't sure if the current proposal was the right way to achieve that. He went on to say that he could accept the three signs if the blade/projecting sign wasn't serving much of a purpose where it currently is. He suggested that, instead, the blade/projecting sign could be relocated above the window and potentially moved closer to the front door. Mark proposed a solution similar to how the town sometimes carves around vegetation for signs, like with the Steamship or other street signs. He wondered if the ivy could be trimmed back to accommodate the blade sign, particularly if it were placed on the right side of the door. This positioning, he believed, would make the sign visible when people turn the corner into the alley and help draw attention to the entrance. Mark also mentioned that it could be charming if the sign and other elements were framed by the vegetation, allowing the vegetation to be carved around them.

Kevin Kuester- Stated that he believed there should be a sign by the front entrance. He also suggested that cleaning off the growth around the front of the building would help make the entrance more visible and solve a significant part of the issue. While he didn't mind the proposed

quarter board sign above the window, he expressed concern about the need to add a sign simply because the landscaping hadn't been maintained, which he felt was unreasonable. He also clarified that the guidelines refer to the number of entrances, meaning that if there were a different tenant at the other entrance, a sign would likely be allowed for them. He expressed that, in this case, it seemed unnecessary for the business to make a smaller sign just to work around the guidelines. While he was less concerned about the three signs in this particular case for those reasons, he still believed there might be a way to make the entrance more defined and visible.

Paul Wolf- Stated that he was going to make the same point as Kevin about the need to trim the bushes to improve visibility. He acknowledged that approving three signs might be an exception but mentioned that he wasn't opposed to it, as this business is likely one of the few that would require three signs. Overall, he felt the signs were appropriate.

Chris Young- Stated that his primary concern was the approval of three signs, as the guidelines are quite specific about limiting businesses to two signs. He emphasized that the issue wasn't necessarily about where the signs were located, but rather the quantity of signs being requested.

Recommendations

Mark Cutone recommended approval of the wall sign above the window submitted with the blade/projecting sign relocated to the main entrance and it was duly seconded by Paul Wolf.

Vote: carried unanimously

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
DXD SS FUND II NANTUCKET PROPCO LLC	10-12 DAVKIN LN	WALL SIGN (SMARTSTOP SELF STORAGE)	68/61	EMERITUS

Sign Name: SMARTSTOP SELF STORAGE

Comments

Mark Cutone- stated that he preferred signs to be placed lower on buildings, ideally near the entrances. He expressed discomfort with the asymmetrical approach to signage on the north elevation, given that the building has a nearly symmetrical design. He suggested that the sign could sit within the Portico above the entrance, making it more in scale with the human eye and more visible for people approaching the building, especially if it's their first time there. Regarding the south or west elevation, he made a similar comment, suggesting that the sign could be placed lower within the Portico. Graphically, he thought the design was fine, but he would prefer a square shape. He noted that the applicant might need to modify the signs to accommodate this Portico placement if they decided to go in that direction.

Kevin Kuester- agreed with Mark regarding the positioning of the sign. Additionally, he felt that the upper and lowercase font being used was not appropriate for the design.

Paul Wolf- agreed with Mark's proposal to move the sign over the entrance.

Ben Normand- Stated that he was comfortable with the proposed location of the sign on the

north elevation, noting that it's the first view people see when arriving by vehicle. Given the semi-industrial setting and the fact that many visitors may be unfamiliar with the site, he felt it was helpful for identification purposes. He believed placing the sign directly over the door wouldn't be as effective for quick recognition. Regarding the west elevation, Ben preferred that the sign be placed in the triangular space above the door, as it would better draw people into the entrance. He also commented that the current font was not approvable, stating that it should include a serif for added detail. He clarified that full capitalization wasn't necessary, but some refinement in the typography would improve the design.

Chris Young- agreed with Ben's comments, emphasizing that he wouldn't want the sign to be too small, especially given the large building façade. He felt it was important for the sign to clearly identify the building's purpose. While he acknowledged a preference for placing the sign closer to the main door, he agreed that its current proposed location seemed appropriate. He also noted that the size of the sign was within the allowed 20 square foot limit. He also added that he would also like to see the use of a serif font in the sign design.

Recommendations

Ben Normand recommended the application be **held for revisions** and it was duly seconded by Kevin Kuester.

Vote: carried unanimously

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
CENTRE AMA REALTY VENTURES LLC	2 BROAD ST	WALL SIGN (NANTUCKET CRISPS THE STORE)	42.4.2/66	HAYDEN ARNEST

Sign Name: NANTUCKET CRISPS THE STORE

Comments

Kevin Kuester- From a graphic standpoint, he believed the signs were approvable. However, he expressed reservations about the wall sign, noting that despite having been one there previously, its scale felt too large for the building. He described the building as a "cute little building" and felt the signs lacked character, coming across as a bit of a "toss-off." To him, the signage gave off more of an outlet store feel and didn't reflect the unique character of Nantucket—aside from the name itself.

Paul Wolf- didn't recall the original conversation about the signs, but his immediate reaction was that the colors were too stark—specifically, too white and too red—for the downtown area. He suggested that a cream background and a more subdued red would be more appropriate, especially given that this location is one of the first things people see when arriving by boat and one of the last things they see when leaving.

Ben Normand – expressed his excitement about a business moving into the small building, noting his concern that it might remain unused after the toy store left. He thanked the applicant for revitalizing the space. Regarding the signage, he felt the blade/projecting sign by the door was straightforward and easy to approve. However, he found the wall sign more challenging,

commenting that it felt a bit like a billboard. He also pointed out that the rendering may not be accurately scaled, which made the wall sign appear larger than it is. He explained that when approaching the building from Surfside and Stubby's, the sign is clearly visible, but when walking from the Dreamland side, it's harder to notice until you've already passed it. While he acknowledged the visibility concern, he also noted that the storefront windows will likely be filled with product, making it obvious what the store is. Ultimately, he felt that using the building in this way was appropriate, and since the wall sign has historically been located there and is not as large as it appears in the rendering, he was okay with the proposal.

Mark Cutone- commented that the former projecting sign by the door appeared smaller than the dimensions currently proposed for the new sign, and he expressed concern about how the scale of the new sign would look on that corner board. He assumed the existing bracket would be re-used and felt the new sign should be more in scale with the previous one, which seemed to work well in that location. He also noted, for historical context, that the building was once a black-smith shop. Acknowledging Ben's earlier point, Mark agreed that foot traffic from Easy Street often misses the store until people are right on top of it. He recalled that the previous tenant, would change out a flag for holidays, which added charm, but he acknowledged that a flag sign might hang too low and pose an issue for the sidewalk. Mark concluded that he would be okay with the proposal, provided the projecting sign is scaled down to better match the former sign's dimensions.

Recommendations

Mark Cutone recommended approval as submitted and it was duly seconded by Ben Normand.

Vote: 3-2 Cutone-Aye, Wolf-Aye, Normand-Aye, Young-Opposed, Kuester-Opposed

Property Owner	Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
CENTRE AMA REALTY VENTURES LLC	2 BROAD ST	PROJECTING SIGN (NANTUCKET CRISPS THE STORE)	42.4.2/66	HAYDEN ARNEST

Sign Name: NANTUCKET CRISPS THE STORE

Comments

Recommendations

Mark Cutone recommended approval as submitted provided that the sign is scaled appropriately to the existing bracket arm which is 28" to the tip and it was duly seconded by Ben Normand.

Vote: 4-1 Cutone-Aye, Wolf-Aye, Normand-Aye, Young-Aye, Kuester-Opposed

V. Enforcement

During the discussion, council members and Nicky Sheriff reviewed concerns about the material used for recently installed signs at various Cape Cod 5 locations, particularly whether they were constructed from wood as previously approved. The original applications proposed carved HDU (High-Density Urethane), but the council had only approved the signs on the condition that they be made of wood, in line with historic district guidelines. Members noted that the signs—especially the one by the door—appeared identical to others installed around town and looked overly modern and plasticky rather than natural wood. Paul Wolf and Ben Normand volunteered to inspect the signs in person to determine whether the material matched what was approved. Nicky Sheriff confirmed that the requirement for wood was clearly stated in the motions for both the Main Street and Pleasant Street properties. If the signs are not made of wood, they would be in violation of the approvals.

Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn made by Kevin Kuester seconded by Ben Normand.

Vote: Carried Unanimously.

Link to Meeting Recording: [HDC Sign Advisory Council - 4/1/2025](#)

Submitted by: Nicky Sheriff