



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Diane Coombs (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, Abigail Camp, Vallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Stephen Welch, Terence Watterson, Jessie Dutra

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, January 21, 2020

Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room – 4:30 p.m.

Called to order at 4:31 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Cathy Flynn, Land Use Specialist; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker
 Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
 Absent Members: Watterson
 Late Arrivals: Camp, 5:15 p.m.
 Early Departures: Pohl, 8:09 p.m.; Camp, 8:55 p.m.

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Butler, David 01-0496	8 Salros Road	Bsmnt egress/walk down	67-106	Jason Libby
2. 22 BLVD, LLC 01-0494	22 Boulevarde	Rev 11-0174; resite cabana	80-327	Normand Residential
3. Delgado, Jonathan 01-0502	1 Parson Lane	Chg door to win/win chags	75-143	Richard Green
4. NIR Retail, LLC 01-0501	Straight Wharf	3 tab to arch roof change	42.2.4-1	James Lydon
5. Hunter, Juliet 01-0500	3 Sleetwing Circle	Move garage back 8 feet	74-27	NAG
6. Bocage, Ronald 01-0498	39A Milk Street	Like kind roof and skylight	56-198	Welch & Associates
7. Rye Realty Trust 01-0497	69 Eel Point Road	A/C enclosures	32-45	Welch & Associates
8. Callahan 01-0499	30 Huntington Street	Rev 72773; roof over frnt dr	76.4.2-97	Val Oliver
9. Fuchsberg, Alan 01-0503	66 Squam Road	Window/door changes	13-35	Jeff Morash
10. Morgan, Jacqueline 01-0504	11 Henderson Drove	Window changes	66-199	Jeff Morash
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver, Welch			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 3-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	HDC2020-01-(as noted)	

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 22 BLVD, LLC 01-0495	22 Boulevarde	Rev 11-0175; reconf pool	880-327	Normand Residential
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity 			
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No additional concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0495	

IV. OLD BUSINESS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Showstack, M. 01-0505	29 Sheeps Pond Road	Emergency demo	63-35	Scott Valero
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Dutra				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:34)	Oliver – Scott Valero asked this be reviewed without him; structure is circa 1979. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve the request for an emergency demolition due to its non-historic. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0505	
2.	450 Green Park, LLC	2 Stone Alley	Addition	42.3.1-102	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Victoria Ewing, LINK Chris Skehel, Cottage Group				
Public	Linda Williams, for Virginia Andrews Virginia Andrews, 1&3 Stone Alley Sarah Alger, Sarah J. Alger p.c., for Virginia Andrews Jay Maroney, for Crosby’s Union Street abutters				
Concerns (4:39)	Pohl – Read HSAB comments: no quorum, Lucy Dillon & Brook Meerbergen. Read Micky Rowland’s comments of concern. Read Angus MacLeod’s comments of concern. Read Jascin Finger’s comments of concern. Ewing – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns and reviewed grade changes. Reviewed packet of historic photos supporting the existence of retaining walls and justifying the proposed retaining walls. The closest abutting structure is closer to the road and taller than anything being proposed. Williams – Repeated requests have been to extend south and not down the hill. Feels not enough has been changed. Reviewed photo packet indicating what impact will be and more historic photos and that there is sufficient space to add on southward. Doesn’t agree with the proposed grading plan. Asked for a denial due to lack of response to repeated requests and the applicant should come back with something more appropriate. Andrews – Stated previously the applicant has claimed there is nothing historic about Stone Alley, to which she disagrees; 2 Stone Alley as a contributing structure. It was an agricultural building converted to a cottage; Eliza Codd was the design architect and resided in the house. Read a letter from Matthew Kuhnert about Ms. Codd and his concerns against the proposal. Alger – Agrees with what’s been said and comments read into the file. This is an important contributing structure. The proposed addition overpowers the historic nature of the structure and forever would change the streetscape of Stone Alley. The massing of Ms. Andrew’s house is irrelevant to the massing of this addition; each structure should be considered on its own merits. Her clients are concerned the applicant’s tactics will wear the commission down until it is approving the application to get it off the table. Asked this be denied without prejudice and they come back with a more appropriate design. Maroney – The massing is huge, and the retaining and wall will create a massive vertical wall looming over the abutters. Also encourage a denial and redesign. Skehel – Definition: “An alley is a narrow street with walls or buildings on both sides.” They are saying they want to keep this open. The owner feels he has made drastic changes. If we move this south, that could change the appearance of the Unitarian Meetinghouse Clock from Union Street. In the last five years, the properties along Union Street below this property have changed and no property looks as it did in any of the presented historic photos. Coombs – Confirmed the length east to west is 63’7” and east elevation height is 35’4”. Agrees with the concerns of the abutters; we have repeatedly asked that it extend south rather than east. The HDC guidelines limit the height at 30 feet regardless of zoning or the Planning Board. Three stories on Stone Alley is not appropriate. This should follow the existing streetscape and there should be no berms. We need to keep buildings designed by historic architects of note like Ms. Codd. Welch – First and foremost, regards the discussion we’ve been having about the shift to the south; to be acceptable this has to happen. The connector and secondary mass are too close to Stone Alley historic setting. The applicant’s agent has mentioned the applicant’s perception of modifications and being sensitive however there is a difference between the applicant’s perception of their design conformance to-date, and their actually being receptive to HDC concerns—we’ve not gotten much traction with HDC concerns addressed. Confirmed through applicant’s agent that addition segments along Stone Alley have not been moved any further away. East elevation, there is a discrepancy that does not represent the jog between the existing structure, the proposed additions and the dormer and as drawn on the proposed plans; the covered porch corners and trim details need to replicate the existing exactly; the proportion of window height to the wall is different, too much at approximately 3’ vs. 1’ existing and this needs to be addressed; porch window bays should be				

reduced by at least 2, which pulls the porch addition away from Stone Alley by making it narrower, which necessitates changing 2nd-floor windows adjusted to align accordingly. Not redesigning, simply illustrating types of concepts that are appropriate to him. Provided examples of other concepts: South elevation, the height of the secondary gable needs to read as purely secondary to the main structure which can be accomplished by decreasing the width, which also lowers the height; doors on the 1st floor are 7'6", which can be decreased North elevation, comments on width and height and porch trim details stand; rim board header at the dormer windows and doors would allow a decrease in height. If the addition has to be a shift south and east, that could make a dramatic difference.

Oliver – We have consistently said it should move to the south and taken off the street; she did a sketch on how to do that. Massing of the addition has no additive interplay. Asked about the possibility of a completely separate structure leaving the existing as is. It would go a long way if the connector were only one story.

Discussion about the possibility of a second structure versus an addition.

Pohl – He is certain the maximum ridge height on one side, which is measured 4 feet away from the wall, exceeds the allowed zoning height on the north and south side; he checks that every time this comes in and no change has been made. Supports moving this more south. The foundation plan shows the wall 1-foot thick that doesn't allow for a veneer over the concrete. This addition is too tall because it is being built on a precipitous slope.

Discussion about measuring the maximum allowable zoning ridge height.

Welch – Requested any rebuttals to comments at this hearing be submitted in writing prior to the next hearing.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)**
 Vote Carried 4-0 Certificate #

3. ACK Crazy, LLC 01-0484 9 West Chester Street Add front exterior stairs 42.4.3-112 JB Studios

Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Dutra
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
 Representing Juraj Bencat, JB Studios
 Public None
 Concerns (5:50) **Bencat** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.

Oliver – There is way too much parking with two driveways and way too much brick. We asked that the brick parking be broken up and that existing parking be given up.

Dutra – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. We requested changes that weren't made.

Pohl – Cross parking off this application. We are only reviewing the friendship stairs.

McLaughlin – No comments.

Motion **Motion to Approve the stairs as drawn and through staff with the understanding parking is not included. (Dutra)**
 Vote Carried 4-0 Certificate #

4. Borislav, Iliev 12-0380 9 Maclean Lane Rev.12-0340: roof/windows 55-485 JB Studios

Voting Coombs (acting Chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Dutra
 Alternates Welch
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Juraj Bencat, JB Studios
 Public Iliev Borislav, owner
 Public None

Concerns (5:56) **Bencat** – Reviewed the proposal.
Camp – At 30 feet, this seems tall; asked if the neighborhood has similar heights. Basement access on the front is not approvable.

Dutra – Okay with the design and height. The basement access being on the front is a concern.

Oliver – If the rear deck were reduced, there would be room for the basement stairs. Not as concerned about the height. Suggested eliminating the friendship stairs; put in a porch across the front with the basement access incorporated into the porch. Feels the roof is being raised to much for one small window; would like to see the ridge brought down.

McLaughlin – South elevation right, the basement access on the front. Casement window should be fixed.

Coombs – This is too tall at 30 feet; most buildings are 1.5 stories. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about the basement access.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate #

5. National Elect Comp 01-0444 2 Commercial Street						Raised flood platform	42.3.1-94	Joshua Smith	
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Dutra								
Alternates	None								
Recused	None								
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.								
Representing	Steve Holdgate, Operating Supervisor National Grid								
Public	Brook Meerbergen, HSAB								
Concerns (6:08)	<p>Holdgate – Mr. Meerbergen has helped with the revisions; reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Meerbergen – At the last hearing, it was decided an opaque fence with vegetation would better screen the units.</p> <p>Oliver – She’s okay with the proposed as long as the vegetation grows and is maintained. Asked for more vegetation to mitigate the view from Candle Street.</p> <p>Dutra – Likes the proposed; if it weren’t for security, he’d prefer there be no gaps between the boards.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Asked for clarity of the application to ensure mitigation of visibility.</p>								
Motion	Motion to Approve with the platform to be screened at time of inspection and in perpetuity. (Oliver)								
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0444					
6. Oman, David 12-0400						219 Madaket Road	Addition	59-43	Bernheimer Arch
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver								
Alternates	Welch, Dutra								
Recused	None								
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.								
Representing	Emma Costello, Bernheimer Architects								
Public	Linda Williams, MAB								
Concerns (6:33)	<p>Williams – MAB’s biggest concerns are sliders facing the street. Single, full-scale sidelights is inappropriate and especially with glass in the doors; they can have one or the other. Air-conditioning units (A/C) should be screened by a fence. Horizontal skirt boards on the deck should be vertical. North elevation, the 1/12 roof on the screen porch is atypical.</p> <p>Costello – Presented project. All windows are existing.</p> <p>Coombs – The flat roof is not appropriate. Asked what is being demolished.</p> <p>Oliver – The screen porch is too much of an anomaly; it would set a bad precedent. The pitches need to be identified on the drawings. A/C needs to be screened with a fence. The skirting should be vertical.</p> <p>Camp – She’s okay with the horizontal skirt boards because it’s on the back and will probably be screened by vegetation. Agrees the screened porch should mimic an old fashion porch.</p> <p>McLaughlin – South elevation, the left window should be a double hung window. East elevation, the flat porch roof is not appropriate; should be at least 4/12.</p> <p>Pohl – Agrees with MAB. He’s okay with the horizontal skirt board.</p>								
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)								
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #						
7. Whitney Trust						27 Broadway	Window and trim	73.1.3-91	NAG
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp								
Alternates	None								
Recused	None								
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.								
Representing	Bill McGuire, Nantucket Architectural Group								
Public	None								
Concerns (6:49)	<p>McGuire – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns and requested additional information.</p> <p>Pohl – Suggested adding a gutter to the flat-roof eave for depth.</p> <p>Camp – Okay with the changes and adding the gutter.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The windows show the casement windows open; they are supposed to be fixed.</p>								
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the addition of a gutter to the east elevation. (Camp)								
Vote	Carried 3-0		Certificate #	73368					
8. BeKind Development 01-0459						154 Cliff Road	Demo/move off	41-73	Tomaiolo Development
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver								
Alternates	Welch, Dutra								
Recused	None								
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.								
Representing	Matt Tomaiolo, Tomaiolo Development								
Public	None								
Concerns (6:56)	<p>Tomaiolo – Presented project; circa 1974.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>								
Motion	Motion to Approve as a move off/demolition. (Camp)								
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0459					

Break 6:59 to 7:06 p.m.

9. Voyages, Roland 14 Osprey Way Rooftop Solar Cottage 82-33 Cotuit Solar

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.
 Representing Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar
 Public None
 Concerns (7:07) **Alence** – The owner is putting black asphalt shingle on all roofs.
Oliver – No concerns since the roof is going to black shingles.
Welch – It will be visible from Hummock Pond Road and the disjointedness will be visible.
Coombs – Suggested putting in some trees on the Hummock Pond Road side; it would also screen the skylight and vent.
McLaughlin – No comments.
Pohl – No concerns; appreciates the change to black shingles.

Motion **Motion to Approve. (Coombs)**
 Vote Carried 4-0//Welch abstain Certificate # **73369**

10. Mueller Nantucket Assoc 34 Prospect Street Addition 55.4.4-77 CWA

Voting Camp (acting Chair), Welch, Dutra
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.
 Representing Amy Ledoux, Chip Webster Associates
 Public None
 Concerns (7:15) **Ledoux** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; not changing the northeast elevation of the main house.
Dutra – He is pleased to see the diamond windows back. Appreciates keeping as much of the existing as possible.
Welch – Agrees with Mr. Dutra. If the corners of the addition dormers match the existing, he has no concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Dutra)**
 Vote Carried 3-0 Certificate # **73370**

11. Mueller Nantucket Assoc 34 Prospect Street Garage 55.4.4-77 CWA

Voting Camp (acting Chair), Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Amy Ledoux, Chip Webster Associates
 Public None
 Concerns (7:24) Discussion about whether to go with a full board since this hasn't been opened or go with the same board that sat on the house. Added Ms. Coombs and Ms. Oliver.
Camp – Read HSAB comments: no window casings; French doors too tall and wrong style; highly visible from North Mill; north and south cardinal points inverted; doesn't related to main house; too close to Prospect Street.
Oliver – This is much too tall and sits very proud of the main house. The 8-foot French doors match the house but feel larger than the garage doors below. The view from North Mill Street with subterranean entry will be too much. North elevation is overdone. The cupola draws attention to itself.
Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. No cupola. This is way too big for the site and will obstruct the view of the historic structure. Would like to have a cross section of the structure and a topo on the site plan.
Coombs – Agrees with what's been said. Too big and too complicated and they already have a garage; no sliders over garage doors on the north elevation. This is an historic area. At 27' tall, this is too tall for a garage. Eliminate the cupola.
Dutra – Agrees with much that's been said. Agrees about removing the cupola. It still should be smaller. North elevation the doors and height should be reduced and there should be landscaping to hide the garage doors.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions and more information. (Welch)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate #

12. Ash, Diane 11-0240 23 Pine Street Relocate (new) shed 42.3.2-113 Emeritus

Voting Camp (acting chair), McLaughlin, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused Pohl
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
 Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
 Public None
 Concerns (7:34) **MacEachern** – Proposing a new small carriage-house style. Submitted perspectives at the table.
Welch – Clarified the house has 9-light doors and 4-light double-hung windows; confirmed new windows would match the house. Thinks it's appropriate as a garage structure.
McLaughlin – 60 years ago, there was a 2-car hipped-roof garage in this location; it shouldn't go right on the road.

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)**
 Vote Carried 3-0 Certificate # **HDC2019-11-0240**

13. 12 Lincoln Ave N.T.	12 Lincoln Avenue	New second dwelling	30-183	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	Arthur Reade, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, & Gifford LLP for Marcos at 10 Lincoln Avenue			
Concerns (7:40)	<p>MacEachern – Recapped the project and reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Reade – His client is now completely comfortable with all aspects of the project, including moving the cabana.</p> <p>Camp – Loves the architecture and connecting the cabana, but the lot-line-to-lot-line massing is overwhelming along Capuam Road.</p> <p>Oliver – It does seem rather large side to side while east to west it's very narrow. Not in favor of connecting the cabana; that is too much structure on the site. If parking is in front of the 1st-floor bedroom, the basement well will be visible from Capuam Road.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with what's been said. Asked about parking, which he believes is relative to setting and context and that this be included in any future site plan. Agrees with Ms. Oliver. He needs to do a viewing to get some context of what's along Capuam Road.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Nothing to add.</p>			
Motion	Motion to View and Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
14. Leichtman-Levine 12-0402	26 Milk Street	Demo/move off	42.3.3-37	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Camp (acting chair, McLaughlin, Oliver)			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for January 28 meeting at applicant's request. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 3-0	Certificate #		
15. Hale, Everts 12-0300	46 Monomoy Road	Main House renovations	54-71	Ethan McMorrow
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Ethan McMorrow			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:53)	<p>McMorrow – Reviewed the project.</p> <p>Oliver – The plans don't show (bubble) the changes or have the existing structure.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for addition of the as-built to the drawings and clarification of the proposed. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
16. Hale, Everts 12-0301	46 Monomoy Road	Cabana	54-71	Ethan McMorrow
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Ethan McMorrow			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:58)	<p>McMorrow – Don't look at the garage.</p> <p>Oliver – The plan shows this connected to a portion of the garage with a deck and pergola.</p> <p>Welch – Should have a cut-line of how it connects.</p> <p>Dutra – Wants to hold this to see how it connects.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with removal of the garage from the plans. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2019-12-0301	

17. Reinemo Family 01-0458	Tuckernuck	New dwelling	95-19	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver, McLaughlin			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:00)	Not opened due to No Quorum.			
Motion	No action due to lack of quorum.			
Vote	N/A	Certificate #		
18. Kaschuluk, Jeff 01-0461	27 North Liberty Street	Addition/move on lot	41-453	LINK
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Dutra			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design Carrie Thornewill, Thornewill Design Jeff Kaschuluk, owner Arthur Reade, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, & Gifford LLP Victoria Ewing, Link			
Public	Sarah Alger, Sarah F. Alger P.C., for abutters: Barry & Peggy Berman, 28 North Liberty Street; Margot & Tom Montgomery, 33 North Liberty Street; Joan Hoyt, 30 North Liberty Street Barry Berman, 28 North Liberty Street Peggy McCarthy Berman, 28 North Liberty Street Mary Bergman, Executive Director Nantucket Preservation Trust Margot Montgomery, 33 North Liberty Street Tom Montgomery, 33 North Liberty Street			
Concerns (8:09)	<p>Coombs – Read letter of concern into the record from Brook Meerbergen, HSAB.</p> <p>Ewing – Ensured all commissioners received the requested information and had time to review it.</p> <p>Welch – The only item he didn't get was on the initial move of the adjacent structure, that was moved onto 15 North Liberty Street; confirmed date of that move was well prior to the HDC.</p> <p>L. Thornewill – Presented the broader streetscape as requested. Addressed the on-site move of the structure. Feels there was more disruption in moving the Blair House than moving this structure six feet back from the road and 8 feet away from the property line.</p> <p>Kaschuluk – The Blair House was moved to 19 North Liberty Street in 1912 and in 2006 was approved for a move to 15 North Liberty Street and to be added onto. He hasn't seen any language regarding trouble from abutters on that move.</p> <p>Reade – The fact is the Blair House was moved to 19 North Liberty Street in 1912 and sat there for nearly 100 years before it was approved to move to 15 North Liberty Street. In those 100 years, it took on the fabric of the neighborhood. Feels it would be arbitrary and capricious not to allow this to move.</p> <p>L. Thornewill – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Alger – The argument that you can move a historic structure just because other historic structure was moved means any historic house – such as the Three Bricks – can be moved. Every application should be taken on its own integrity. Once a historic structure is moved, it loses its historic integrity and never regains that. This commission stands to protect this individually significant structure; this is over 220 years old and has remained in the same place. If HDC doesn't protect this, questions what historic structure will HDC protect. Reviewed the four reasons for moving a historic house; none pertain to this case. It is moving to create space for a lot with another house. Hopes the commission will deny this.</p> <p>B. Berman – Thanked the commission for its commitment to the history of Nantucket. Ms. Alger said it best. The four reasons were set by the Federal Department of the Interior. Any move negates what this historic property has meant for Nantucket.</p> <p>P. Berman – The difference between this and the Blair House is this still looks the same as it did in historic photos. If it's allowed to be moved, the owner can come back later to ask to move it again. This house is the subject of a number of historical tours. Read a letter from Joan Hoyt, 30 North Liberty Street, against damaging the historic streetscape of Nantucket by approving the move and not allowing the opportunity to subdivide the lot.</p> <p>M. Bergman – Spoke against allowing this structure to be moved. The board has a responsibility to protect the Island.</p> <p>M. Montgomery – The application would cause irreversible change to one of the most historic streets on Nantucket.</p> <p>T. Montgomery – Read a letter of objection into the record. Built 222 years ago as a cooper shop for whale oil; later it became the home of a whaling captain. This building is as historic as Nantucket gets; if it moves off its foundation, it loses all its protections and that must not happen. It is up to the HDC to protect this structure. Asked for a denial of the application to move. Submitted a handout.</p> <p>Oliver – This is taking excessive time. Wants to review this information over the week.</p> <p>Welch – We repeatedly asked at the last hearing that information be submitted in advance to provide ample time for all parties to review it for the benefit of all parties—both opponents and proponents. Specifically, we requested Mr.</p>			

Montgomery submit his prepared comments and he refused. We have not had time to review this and are running out of time for today's meeting.

Coombs – We only have 12 minutes before three members have to leave; there is no way to discuss this. Asked that this be put on next Tuesday's meeting; commissioners will have reviewed all information by then.

Staff – Next week is new business; asked if this should be at the beginning of the meeting.

Welch – Suggested that if we are going to close out the public contribution portion of the process, that we let Mr. Montgomery read his statements then close out the public comment portion and thereafter begin our own deliberation.

Kashuluk – He would like the opportunity to respond to misstatements made tonight.

Welch – Pointed out this is not a trial with a series of rebuttals; we accept, welcome and encourage comments but ongoing rebuttals cannot be not part of our process. We need to exercise our charge and control over the process. Suggest that after Mr. Montgomery's comments, any rebuttals should be in writing and submitted in advance for commissioner review and that this be the last round.

Coombs – We are done tonight.

Discussion about whether or not Mr. Montgomery should speak tonight or next Tuesday and frustration at disparaging comments about commissioners who have to leave for valid reasons.

T. Montgomery – He wants HDC to be aware of what they are defending; referred to his Exhibit A.

C. Thornewill – The building is not being demolished

Motion

Motion to Hold for commissioner review with any rebuttals to be written and submitted in advance for commissioners' review, and to be heard on Tuesday, January 28. (Welch)

Vote

Carried 4-0

Certificate #

V. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approve Minutes -	January 2 & 7, 2020: held
Amend Previously Approved	December 10, 2019: Motion to amend the previously approved December 10, 2019 Minutes. (Welch) Carried unanimously
Review Minutes	January 14, 2020
Other Business -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission Statement for Town Website vote • Certain Teed 3-tab Nickel Gray • Discussion of time management • Discussion of SDL guidance in the OHD/SOHD • Application pictures • Roof plans: threshold • Plans: Scale of Elevations, Floor & Roof Plans • Application checklist: Differentiation between complex/simple; minimum standards • Application as Master Sheet • Discussion of Net Zero Stretch Code and impacts to HDC • Discussion and update on Nantucket Sidewalk Work Group
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. None

Adjourned at 9:01 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board
Sconset Advisory Board
Madaket Advisory Board
Tuckernuck