



# HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road  
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554  
[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://www.nantucket-ma.gov)

**Commissioners:** Kristine Glazer (Chair), Diane Coombs (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, Raymond Pohl, Abigail Camp  
**Associate Commissioners:** Vallorie Oliver, Matt Kuhnert  
**Staff:** Mark Voigt, John Hedden

~~ MINUTES ~~

**Thursday, May 5, 2016**

Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room – 1:00 p.m.

Called to order at 1:00 p.m.

Staff in attendance: J. Hedden, Administrative Specialist  
Attending Members: Glazer, Coombs, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Kuhnert  
Absent Members: McLaughlin  
Late Arrivals: None  
Early Departures: None

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

## II. HOSPITAL

1. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	57 Prospect Street	New Hospital Construction	55-3	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
2. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	57 Prospect Street	Demo existing hospital	55-3	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
3. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	57 Prospect Street	Move off Anderson building	55-3	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
4. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	59 Prospect Street	Move on Anderson building	55-805	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
5. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	57 Prospect Street	Move off Founder's building	55-3	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
6. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	10 Vesper Lane	Move on Founder's building	55-249	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
7. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	10 Vesper Lane	Move/demo residential bldg	55-249	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
8. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	57 Prospect Street	Move/demo dormitory	55-3	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
9. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	10 Vesper Lane	Hardscaping	55-249	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
10. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	57 Prospect Street	Hardscaping	55-3	RJ O'Connell & Assoc
11. Nantucket Cottage Hospital	59 Prospect Street	Hardscaping	55-805	RJ O'Connell & Assoc

Voting Glazer, Coombs, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Kuhnert

Alternate Kuhnert

Documentation Associated site and elevation plans, photos, correspondence, and required historical documentation.

Representing John Twohig, Health-care Law Goulston and Storrs

Sebastian Martello, Cannon Design

Bill Flemming, William Flemming Associates

Frank Kovack, NCH

Dr. Margret Hartman, NCH

John Jennings, Cannon Design

Rich O'Connell, RJ O'Connell & Associates, Inc.

Steve Glowacki, RJ O'Connell & Associates, Inc.

Tim Sullivan, Goulston and Storrs

Public Mark Field, 3 Vesper Lane

Concerns **Twohig** – Reviewed regulations in regards to the new hospital and the need for a new hospital: \$1 million lost in repairs, insufficient operating facilities, patient privacy, deficiency in meeting Department of Public Health regulations, layout. Goal is to complete the permitting process to start construction in the fall. The move/demo are to be donated. Reviewed the associated projects preliminary to the new construction.

**Pohl** – Asked if the Anderson building will remain at 59 Prospect or eventually go away.

**Twohig** – The expectation is it will be there during construction then the doctors will move into the new hospital and the Anderson building be used for specialists. Noted that the new hospital footprint will be smaller than the existing. Currently the cost for a new hospital is about \$89 million. To rehab the existing hospital will cost as much as to build a new one. Reviewed the philosophy behind the plan for the new hospital.

**Coombs** – Noted that the Anderson Building faces east; if it moves and the air-conditioning units (A/C) is on the south, it will show.

**Twohig** – The orientation will change and A/C will be on the interior.

**Kuhnert** – Asked if filing with the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) is part of their permitting process.

**Twohig** – Said they have filed a letter with the MHC noted they are building in a fully disturbed area; stated they did not find any particular historical issues with the site; it was a field in 1958.

**Kuhnert** – The existing hospital was designed by Cram and Ferguson; suggested the hospital donate any of those blueprints for the existing hospital to the Nantucket Historical Association for preservation.

**Twohig** – He wasn't aware of that connection, he will track down any materials and information as requested.

**Martellotto** – The idea is to build a facility that will provide state of the art health care and reflect the spirit of the island. Presented a detailed review of the massing, materials, details, and color pallet.

**Oliver** – Asked if the main entrance is an emergency exit as well and would it allow for a fire truck to get under it.

**Twohig** – Everyone enters the hospital through the main entrance; emergency vehicles and emergency patients have different access points. The helipad will be closer to emergency services.

**Oliver** – If the front is not for emergency, doesn't understand why the canopy has to be so high.

**Martellotto** – Explained how mechanicals will be screened and treatment of pick-up/drop-off areas.

**Flemming** – Reviewed the hardscape plan to include: paving materials, fencing, and gardens. Explained the faux granite paving blocks.

**Field** – Expressed concern about the lighting not being as bright as at the Stop & Shop and more like the Boys and Girls Club. Expressed concern about traffic and parking congestion along Vesper Lane.

**Glazer** – Asked about the off-street parking proposed.

**Twohig** – Haven't had the site-plan meeting with the Planning Board yet. There had been thought of parallel parking along Vesper but there isn't enough right-of-way room. Another slight modification, the entrance opposite Holdgate's Laundry might be shifted to relate to 10 Vesper Lane, which is NCH property.

**Pohl** – On a project of this scale, we will require perspective views done by computer; noted discrepancies between the elevation drawings than the perspective drawings. His concern is about the blank space of the front portico. Looking at the elevations, it is hard to reconcile that the new hospital is only 15,000 square feet (SF) larger than the existing; the elevations make it look three times larger. The existing hospital is 15,000 SF less than the proposed and the same height as the proposed, 45 feet.

**Martellotto** – Noted that the proposed hospital has lower elements, which the existing doesn't have; the proposed main mass is 45 feet. Noted that the 15,000 SF includes the Founders and Anderson Buildings as well.

**Pohl** – He would like to see elevations to the same scale as the existing hospital drawings, would compare the window sizes and space between floor levels. Would also like to see a section through the building show all windows.

**Oliver** – Her concern was the main entrance, which Mr. Pohl addressed; it looks better in the elevation drawing. Noted she would prefer the front entrance to be more reminiscent of what is there now.

**Coombs** – Agrees with Mr. Pohl and about the main entrance portico. Noted that the elevations of the existing should be included in the application.

**Camp** – Not sure about having doors without windows for a hospital. Appreciates the colors and materials proposed. Pergola is usually natural to weather but could accept the platinum grey. For paving we use a lot of Belgium block, but the paver looks close to that. Asked if there will be a basement.

**Martellotto** – No, it is slab on grade.

**Camp** – Some elevations show a chimney and some don't.

**Martellotto** – Code requires the height for separation between in-take and outflow; it is located closer to the back and won't seem so tall from Prospect Street and will be painted grey.

**Camp** – Noted from the sledding hill toward the top of the hospital roof, the utilities will be visible and will need to be mitigated.

**Glazer** – A 17-foot tall wall long Vesper Lane is a huge concern as it will be almost right on the property line. Asked how that would be mitigated.

**Martellotto** – The wall is to help block view of vehicles in the emergency area from public view; it will be enhanced with planting and is not a continual wall.

**Pohl** – The wall only needs to be 6 feet tall to block the view; a 5&1 fence would be adequate to block public view. Consensus agrees a 5&1 would be adequate and acceptable screening.

**Glazer** – Noted that the pergola left of the front entrance is called waiting area, but you have to go outside to get to it; also, we don't normal permit pergolas on the front of a building.

**Martellotto** – If the weather is nice, that will create a relief; the main portico is for weather protection; it is more of a landscape feature.

**Kuhnert** – No additional comments on the design. Agrees with what's been said. Asked how long this proposed hospital will meet its programmatic needs.

**Twohig** – Reiterated that it isn't the square footage, it is the interior layout. They are looking at this lasting 50 to 60 years.

**Coombs** – Having satellite buildings with easy access will help as well.

**Camp** – Asked why they aren't adding at least a partial basement that would be helpful for future expansion.

**Twohig** – The cost of programming, and allowable use of the basement becomes an issue; we can't afford a basement.

**Martellotto** – Noted that if there is a natural disaster, the hospital would need to keep running, ergo putting the mechanicals on the roof which makes the building more resilient.

**Glazer** – The new helipad in the proposed location is closer to the building than it is now; asked if there is a problem with having the equipment on the roof when a helicopter comes in.

**Twohig** – The helipad is 120 feet from the structure, is segregated with actuated gates and closer to the emergency room; trying to adjust the flight paths to keep the helicopters from flying over the hospital. The pad will be elevated a little and increased in size to 44X44 feet.

Review of what further information the board: elevations of existing, topographical maps, cross sections, match the 3D model to the elevation, HVAC colors, limitations in relation to the hill, landscaping along Vesper, inclusion of lighting on the hardscape plan; dimensions on hardscape elements.

**Pohl** – Suggested that larger windows would help mitigate the space between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.

Discussion about whether or not to have all the applications track with the main hospital or discuss those that can be removed from the table.

Discussion about next meeting date and keeping this review separate from the normal Tuesday meetings. Next hearing will focus on the main building.

DISCUSSION ABOUT DEMOLITIONS AND MOVES

**Coombs** – Wants to ensure that the history of the Founders Building is documented.

**Twohig** – Did a photo array and included information about the building in the packet. Had heard that it came from the school but that wasn't in the files.

Item 8: Move/demo dormitory, 57 Prospect Street

**Staff** – Circa 1968.

No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve as a demolition or move. (Coombs)**

Vote Carried unanimously **Certificate # 65831**

Item 7: Move/demo residential, 10 Vesper Lane

**Staff** – Circa 1950.

**Twohig** – Andrew Vorce, Planning Director, stated there might be a home for this with affordable housing.

**Oliver** – Noted that if affordable housing doesn't take it, others might be interested and it should be advertised.

Motion **Motion to Hold for further information on a possible move on location. (Oliver)**

Vote Carried unanimously **Certificate #**

Item 5: Move off Founder's Building, 57 Prospect Street

Item 6: Move on Founder's Building, 10 Vesper Lane

Motion **Motion to Hold to track with Item 7. (Camp)**

Vote Carried unanimously **Certificate #**

Item 3: Move off Anderson Building, 57 Prospect Street

Item 4: Move on Anderson Building, 59 Prospect Street

**Pohl** – He would like an opportunity to scrutinize the existing north elevation that would face prospect Street in the new location.

**Martellotto** – The trash and A/C units would be moved to the south elevation.

**Pohl** – North elevation, the double window in the left mass is the only fenestration on that elevation; would need windows and doors added.

**Glazer** – Suggested a better picture of the elevation facing prospect for a better determination.

Motion **Motion to Hold for more information pertaining to the north elevation. (Camp)**

Vote Carried unanimously **Certificate #**

Motion **Motion to Hold Items 1 & 2 for further information. (Camp)**

Vote Carried unanimously **Certificate #**

Motion **Motion to Hold Items 9, 10, & 11 to track. (Camp)**

Vote Carried unanimously **Certificate #**

**Glazer** – Asked if there are any comments pertaining to the dormers.

**Oliver** – Asked if the dormers aren't usable space that they make the parapet that hides the utilities.

**Martellotto** – Looking at that being usable space with natural lighting; areas that can't be used would be maintained to keep the rhythm through the façade. Asked for guidance on size of the windows in the dormer; currently the windows are the same size as those below.

**Pohl** – the dormer windows should be kept the size they are.

**Glazer** – The board also needs to consider the two 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor porches on the front of the building.

**Camp** – She likes the concept but something is lacking that would provide the porches integrity.

**Pohl** – They read like motel porches; that might be due to the expanse of space between the 1<sup>st</sup>- and 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor windows. He would like to defer any discussion until he has the true-to-life perspective.

**Glazer** – The next hearing will be May 12 at 1 p.m.

<b>IV. HDC BUSINESS</b>	
Approve Minutes	April 12&19 2016 – Held
Review Minutes	April 26, 2016 – Held
Other Business	Clarification of staff approval for 20 West Sankaty Road: <b>Oliver</b> – The approval stated that the fence should be high enough to cover the A/C unit which is 44”. Asked for clarification that the fence be higher than 36”. <b>Glazer</b> – That was clearly stated in the minutes, the fence was to be higher than the A/C.
Commission Comments	None

Motion to Adjourn: 3:00 p.m.

Submitted by:  
Terry L. Norton