



HDC Minutes March 03, 2026; adopted March 24, 2026

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 ~~

DATE: March 3rd, 2026

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via ZOOM

Called to order at 4.15 Pm, and announcements by Ray Pohl

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

Present: Pohl, Oliver, Camp, MacLeod, Patten

Remote: Thornewill

Absent: Welch, Paul

Motion to approve agenda made Patten.

Sitting Board: Pohl (Acting Chair), Oliver, Camp, MacLeod, Patten

Vote: carried 5-0

PUBLIC HEARING- UPDATE TO HDC FEE SCHEDULE

Legal Framework

- HDC application fees must reflect actual administrative costs (staff time and overhead).
- Fees cannot be used as punitive penalties; enforcement penalties must instead come through town code, Massachusetts General Laws, or district court citations.

Work Without a Permit

- Current practice imposes a 10× multiplier on the base application fee for work done without a permit (Building Department uses 4×).
- This 10× penalty was not previously listed on the public fee schedule, so the board directed staff to add it for transparency.

Concerns About Deterrence

- Board members noted the 10× penalty may still be too small to deter violations.
 - Example: a \$50 fence → \$500 penalty.
- Some members described the penalty as insufficient for meaningful deterrence, particularly for minor-fee projects.

Demolition Example

- Current: \$100 demolition fee → \$1,000 penalty (10×).
- New schedule: \$500 demolition fee → \$5,000 penalty (10×).
- Staff confirmed no additional public hearing is required to increase fees under the current notice.

Fees vs. Fines

- Application fees: limited to administrative cost recovery.
- Punitive enforcement (daily fines, citations): should occur through municipal enforcement mechanisms, not through application fees.
- Board directed staff to explore separating enforcement penalties from the fee schedule while keeping the 10× multiplier as an administrative consequence.

As-Built Applications

- “As-built” cases (work completed before approval) may require a different fee or enforcement structure.
- Board suggested treating as-built situations separately from standard applications.

Broader Enforcement Costs

- Violations often involve Town Counsel, Select Board time, and additional municipal resources, not just staff review.
- Board members emphasized penalties should scale with the severity of violations (e.g., minor paint changes vs. illegal demolition).

Staff Assignments / Next Steps

- **Update fee schedule to:**
 - Adopt new staff-time-based HDC application fees.
 - Add a clearly listed 10× “work without permit” multiplier.
- **Legal/policy review** (Megan/PLUS with Leslie and Town Counsel) to:
 - Confirm legal limits on fee-based penalties.
 - Develop punitive enforcement options via town code or citations, especially for serious violations.
 - Revisit the as-built fee structure and its relationship to enforcement.

Board Action

- Motion: Adopt the new HDC fee schedule effective date: June 1 made by MacLeod
- Note: Penalty and as-built mechanisms will be refined separately.
- Board: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten; Alternates: Thornewill
- Vote: Approved unanimously.

II. COMMISSIONER Q & A WITH PRESERVATION PLANNER

None

III. OLD BUSINESS 01/27/2026

NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	AGENT
1.7 Orange St, LLC 13958	7 Orange St	New dwelling	42.3.1/149.1	Emeritus
Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul; Alternates: Patten; Recused: Thornewill Last heard 2/10/26 HOLD				
2. Vestal Nantucket, LLC 12439	85 Vestal St	New dwelling	56/252	JB Studio
Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, MacLeod, Patten; Alternates: none; Recused: Thornewill Last heard 01/13/2026 HOLD				
3. Vestal Nantucket, LLC 12442	85 Vestal St	Guest house	56/252	JB Studio
Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: Thornewill Last heard 12/02/2025 HOLD				
4. Vestal Nantucket, LLC 12440	85 Vestal St	Pool- hardscape	56/252	JB Studio
TRACK				

IV. OLD BUSINESS 02/10/2026

NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	AGENT
1. Shelley Dolan 13913	1 Pawgvet Ln	New dwelling	30/129.1	Normand Residential
Commissioners: Camp (Acting Chair), Oliver, MacLeod, Patten, Thornewill; Alternates: none				
Discussion: The board reviewed the proposal for a new dwelling, replacing an existing house that must be elevated to meet FEMA floodplain requirements. The applicant revised the design by relocating the front door to the Jefferson Avenue elevation, simplifying roof forms, and replacing a large sliding door with more traditional French doors and double-hung windows. While members appreciated efforts to retain the character of the original house and acknowledged that the roughly four-foot height increase is required for flood compliance, several concerns remained, including excessive glazing on the east elevation, reduced articulation between gable masses, and a front entry that felt overly formal for the coastal neighborhood context. Staff also requested a streetscape drawing to better evaluate the building's relationship to surrounding structures.				
The board ultimately held the application for further revisions addressing these design issues. Motion: Motion to hold for revisions made by Angus				
Carries unanimously				
2. Stacey Davis 13855	13 Williams St	New dwelling	55/134	Val Oliver Design
Commissioners: Camp (Acting Chair), MacLeod, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: none; Agent: Oliver				
Motion: Motion to approve with an Exhibit A made by Angus.				
Carries unanimously				

V. OLD BUSINESS 03/03/2026

NAME	ADDRESS	SCOPE OF WORK	MAP/PARCEL	AGENT
------	---------	---------------	------------	-------

1. Flagship Club 11963 1 Cherry St		New building	55/377.1	EMDA
------------------------------------	--	--------------	----------	------

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, MacLeod, Patten; Alternates: none; Recused: Oliver

L

PRESERVATION PLANNER: Holly Backus raised several concerns about the proposal, noting inconsistencies between the original commercial application and revised plans that appear residential, while the COA sheet and parking layout still indicate commercial use, and she requested clarification of the intended use. Because the property is in the OH), she also flagged several design issues: black window trim and 6-over-1 windows were considered too contemporary and inconsistent with the streetscape, recommending 6-over-6 Nantucket-profile windows instead. She further commented that the Cherry Street elevation should read as a traditional primary façade, with a more appropriate front door treatment, and expressed concern about a second-story balcony over the front, which she felt does not align with typical OHD architectural patterns. She also noted concerns about the overall height and scale of the building in relation to the district.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Two abutters raised strong concerns about the proposal. Kristine Mortensen, a Cherry Street resident, argued the new building would be approximately 7.5 times larger than the existing 400 sq ft structure, raising issues about neighborhood scale and safety. She warned that the Cherry and William Street intersection already has poor visibility and tight turning conditions, and that added parking and building mass could worsen traffic circulation and create blind corners, particularly if a commercial use like a doctor's office brings frequent visitors. She also questioned the accuracy of the submitted site plan, noting the north curb line appears to extend into William Street and that stairs were not clearly shown, and raised concerns about parking requirements if the building includes mixed uses. Steve Geldart, another neighbor, supported these points, emphasizing that the building feels too large and imposing for the residential character of Cherry Street, especially given its minimal setback from the street, and echoed concerns about traffic safety and sight lines at the corner.

BOARD DISCUSSION: Angus requested more context, asking for streetscape drawings from Orange, Cherry, and William Streets to better understand how the proposed building relates to surrounding structures, noting that without adjacent buildings shown it is difficult to judge scale. He also raised design concerns about the porch and balcony on the Cherry Street elevation, which he felt conflict with Old Historic District (OHD) guidelines. Abby clarified the proposed footprint on the plans and stated she preferred the earlier design, which had more additive, stepped massing, while the current revision appears larger, boxier, and more monolithic, taking up too much of the lot visually. She also objected to 6-over-1 windows and black trim, recommending 6-over-6 windows and a more traditional front door facing Cherry Street. Connie agreed that the building overwhelms the lot and echoed safety concerns raised by neighbors. Ray similarly favored the earlier design, saying the new version, though technically shorter, appears bulkier due to its uninterrupted mass and reduced articulation, and suggested returning to a toned-down version of the earlier scheme. Given the concerns about scale, OHD appropriateness, missing streetscape context, and abutter safety issues, the board voted to hold the application for revisions, requesting clarified use and COA information, streetscape drawings from Cherry, William, and Orange Streets, revised massing closer to the earlier additive design and OHD-appropriate windows, trim, and front door treatment.

Motion: Motion to hold for revisions made by Abby.
Carries unanimously

2. Greg Raiff 13786	100 Low Beach Rd	Alterations	75/27	Val Oliver
---------------------	------------------	-------------	-------	------------

Commissioners: Camp (Acting Chair), MacLeod, Patten, Thornewill; Alternates: none; Agent: Oliver

Motion: Motion to approve with an Exhibit A made by Angus.

Carries unanimously.

3. Seamac ACK 14055	4 Westerwick Wy	Garage	73/32	LFW
---------------------	-----------------	--------	-------	-----

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill; Alternates: Patten

Carrie made a motion to approve the application with staff approval, contingent on a design modification requiring the removal of the dormer on the street-facing elevation, while allowing the rear dormer to remain as proposed.

Motion: Motion to approve removing the dormer on the street side through Staff made by Carrie.

Carries unanimously

4. Robert Sarkisian 11899 8 N. Mill St House move on site 5' 55.4.4/78.2 LFW

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, MacLeod, Patten; **Alternates:** none; **Recused:** Oliver

PRESERVATION PLANNER: Holly Backus confirmed the project is as-built and located in the Old Historic District in the Quaker neighborhood and reminded the board that a September vote approved the hardscape revision (a three-rail paddock fence with planting) by a 3–1 vote, with the condition that the fence not extend directly across the front of the house along North Mill Street, only at the corner. She raised concerns that the corner slope along Angola Street, previously shown in photos as a steep fill, now appears flatter and more heavily landscaped in the new rendering, which may not accurately represent existing conditions. Holly also suggested that additional planting should be added along the paddock fence to better screen the exposed foundation and recommended that any new or additional vegetation beyond what was approved in September be clearly included as conditions in the approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Several abutters spoke in opposition to the project. Henry Mueller (11 North Mill, also representing 3 North Mill) expressed that the move and build-out “should not have happened,” criticizing the lack of meaningful opportunity for discussion before construction and stating that abutter rights were not properly considered. Anne Dewez noted that a full-scale mock-up using live plants, requested a year ago, was never completed and questioned what penalties exist for such disregard of prior approvals, warning that without consequences it signals applicants can ignore HDC conditions and pay fees later. Anne Dewez focused on the Angola corner, arguing that current snow-covered renderings obscure the steep, unnatural slope and exposed foundation, making the house appear to “float,” and raised concerns about planting near a sewer main, emphasizing that these issues harm the historic character and reflect a weakening of HDC authority.

BOARD DISCUSSION: Board members expressed strong concerns about the as-built house at the Angola corner. Angus noted that the previously requested full-scale mock-up was never completed, with only a photoshopped winter image provided, and emphasized that moving the house 5' closer to the street significantly alters the corner's visual impact; he requested an on-site mock-up showing the height and depth of plantings and the foundation mitigation, possibly using stakes or a plywood profile. Abby highlighted frustration that the project returned as-built without a final vote, focusing on how to mitigate the steep slope with options like stone walls versus landscaping and questioning the placement of window wells affecting grading. Connie called it an “unfortunate incident,” noting that paying the as-built fee does not resolve the visual or precedent concerns. Ray stressed that while floor height didn't change, the forward shift makes the house feel taller and emphasized mitigation over punishment, calling for a substantial, integrated planting scheme beyond low shrubs and a single tree, supported by either a landscape rendering or on-site staking, showing both previously approved and additional plantings to visually anchor the building and soften the slope.

Motion: Motion to hold for revisions made by Angus.

Carries unanimously

5. Ralph Lauren 14070 16 Main St Rev.47890; roof walk 42.3.1/179 LFW

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten; **Alternates:** Thornewill

Motion: Motion to approve as submitted, made by Val.

Carried: 4-1 (Abby Opposed)

6. David Gregory 13832 53 Nobadeer Ave New dwelling 88/54.1 WAPD

Commissioners: Camp (Acting Chair), Oliver, MacLeod, Patten, Thornewill; **Alternates:** none

Motion: Motion to approve with an Exhibit A made by Angus.

Carries unanimously.

7. Sower Property LLC 13564 6 Coffin St New dwelling 42.3.2/21.1 MCA+

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten; **Alternates:** none

PRESERVATION PLANNER: Holly Backus noted that the project is a non-contributing infill behind an existing commercial building in flood zone AE9 and appreciated the elevation certificate provided. She expressed concerns that the hip roof form is uncommon for the neighborhood and recommended a simpler gable roof with shorter overall height, as the proposed ~29'-2" grade-to-ridge height makes it appear dominant compared to nearby one-story cottages. She suggested pushing second-floor head casings into the eave and reducing floor heights where it would be possible to lower the building's profile. Regarding the streetscape, she disagreed with depicting neighbors as raised to FEMA standards, noting that only the actual proposed streetscape is relevant, since contributing structures may be exempt from full FEMA elevation. She also emphasized that windows should be SDL/Nantucket profile and requested a foundation plan for the addition, including clarification on vents in the 4-foot concrete foundation for floodwater passage.

BOARD DISCUSSION: Board members expressed concerns about the proposed in-fill addition behind the commercial building. Abby noted that while the existing front commercial building provides a more substantial context than the

nearby cottages, the hip roof felt inappropriate for the street, and **the** west elevation's recessed door, multiple door types, and step-backs created a visually disjointed façade; she preferred the earlier additive massing over the current boxier version. Connie felt the building was too massive for the lot, running nearly from lot line to lot line and overwhelming the surrounding one-story context. agreed with Holly Backus that the hip roof is out of step, recommending a gable main block with any hip elements confined to subordinate massing, and highlighted the need for a streetscape showing the proposed building with actual neighbors at current grade, rather than speculative FEMA-lifted neighbors. Given concerns about height, massing, roof form, visual bulk, and streetscape accuracy, the board found the proposal not acceptable as submitted.

Motion: Motion to hold for revisions made by Abby.
Carries unanimously

8. St. Paul's Episcopal 14071 18 Fair St Fence 42.3.2/6 Emeritus, LTD

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten; **Alternates:** Thornewill

Motion: Motion to approve with an Exhibit A made by Val.

Carries 4-1 (Abby opposed)

9. NIR 14195 19 N Water St- Lot 8 Add chimney 42.3.2/3 Emeritus, LTD

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten; **Alternates:** none

Motion: Motion to approve as submitted with the condition that plantings or climbing vegetation be installed to help mitigate its visual impact made by Val.

Carries unanimously.

10. N. Water Holdings 14079 17 N. Water St Addition 42.4.2/49 Emeritus, LTD

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill; **Alternates:** Patten

PRESERVATION PLANNER: Holly Backus confirmed that the building is a contributing structure in the Resilient Nantucket/FEMA flood zone and thus is not required to meet full FEMA height standards. She noted that the new poured concrete foundation should include vents for floodwater and be finished to match the existing CMU-block appearance. Holly praised the rear porch revisions, which now copy existing bracket/post details and use a shed roof consistent with guidelines, but questioned why the porch stairs turn inward rather than outward, as is typical in the OHD. She also expressed concern about a large, permanent ADA ramp on the visible side of a 200-year-old building, suggesting alternative locations or solutions. Finally, she asked for clarification on the windows, which were listed as TDL in the application but shown as Marvin SDL wood in the drawings, to ensure they meet board approval.

BOARD DISCUSSION: The board generally liked the revisions, noting the rear mass is lower, respecting the building's hierarchy, and the porch updates with historic bracket details and a shed roof. Angus raised concerns about the south-facing triple window dormer, which appears flush with the eave and visually dominant; he requested that the dormer face be set back so window head casings tuck into the roof, making it feel more recessive from North Water Street. The board was uncomfortable with the large, permanent side ADA ramp and supported removing it from this application, to be reconsidered separately with possible alternatives such as rear placement or gently sloped walkways. Otherwise, there were no major objections to the overall rear addition massing, porch details, or window and door treatments, aside from the dormer adjustment.

Motion: Motion to approve with an Exhibit A made by Angus.
Carries unanimously

11. FP 4 N. Water 14194 4 N. Water St Rev. 13315; fenest/chimney 42.4.2/90 Emeritus, LTD

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, Patten, MacLeod; **Alternates:** Paul
HOLD

Last heard 02/17/2026

12. 69 Monamour, LLC 14104 69 Monomoy Rd

Gate

43/102

Miroslava L + D

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill; **Alternates:** Patten

BOARD DISCUSSION: The board reviewed the gate and approved it with specific conditions. Abby supported moving the gate back from the road and using plantings to visually ground it. Carrie recommended a natural-to-weather finish instead of dark paint and **lower granite posts** to avoid a harsh, stark appearance. Angus requested that when the gate swings open, the bottom rail not float more than 6 inches above the sloped driveway. Mirka agreed to all adjustments.

Motion: Motion to approve the gate with the following conditions: the gate and woodwork to be natural-to-weather, granite posts reduced to 8” and the open-gate bottom no more than 6 inches above grade to maintain proper visual proportion made by Abby.

Carries unanimously.

Minutes of February 10, 2026, and February 17, 2026

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten; **Alternates:** Thornewill

Motion to approve made by Val.

Carries unanimously

Adjournment.

Commissioners: Pohl (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten; **Alternates:** Thornewill

Motion to adjourn at 7:25PM made by Val.

Carries unanimously.