



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, February 18, 2020

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

Called to order at 4:34 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Cathy Flynn, Land Use Specialist; Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist; Holly Backus, Preservation Planner.
Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Camp, Welch, Dutra
Absent Members: McLaughlin, Watterson
Late Arrivals: None
Early Departures: Coombs, 9:07 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.	O'Connell, Chris 02-0613	10 Sheep Commons Ln	556 sf addition	57-274	Ethan McMorrow
2.	40 Nobadeer, LLC 02-0658	40 Nobadeer Avenue	Window change	88-4	Normand Residential
3.	40 Nobadeer, LLC 02-0657	40 Nobadeer Avenue	424 sf garage	88-4	Normand Residential
4.	40 Nobadeer, LLC 02-0656	40 Nobadeer Avenue	Fenest & shower	88-4	Normand Residential
5.	Palenski, Paul 02-0654	12 Golfview Drive	Roof change	66-190	Self
6.	Greenberg, Frank 02-0678	3 Packet Drive	Rev. 72621: add pergola	74-20	CWA
7.	Bowman, Jennifer 02-0680	14 Starbuck Road	Deck/patio	60-114	Ethan McMorrow
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns	No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	HDC2020-02-(as noted)	

III. SIGNS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	NIR Retail, LLC 02-0675	16 Straight Wharf	Wall sign	42.3.1-139	Jean Petty
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	None				
Concerns (4:35)	Flynn – This was reviewed but left off last-week's agenda; SAC approved. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0675	

IV. FURTHER DISCUSSION REGARDING ARTICLE 62: PRESERVATION OF HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT BUILDINGS

Documentation Article 62; State Act; Ms. Backus written statement; *Building with Nantucket in Mind*
 PLUS Staff Holly Backus, Preservation Planner
 Public Mary Bergman, article proponent
 Linda Williams

Discussion (4:36) **Bergman** – She spoke with Sarah Alger about amending the article to having the Historical Commission making decisions on historic structures; Ms. Alger said that cannot be changed at Town Meeting. Asked how we might look at the process around demolition applications for older houses and how the Historical Commission could support HDC.
Backus – Recommends a statement from HDC for the Finance Committee (FinCom).
Pohl – He feels poorly educated in the many aspects of this.
Welch – Suggested HDC puts this under the Organizations Focus Committee for review as done with other important topics requiring focus; any HDC member is welcomed to attend. That would allow us to meet with Ms. Bergman and the Historic Committee and the public.
Pohl – It sounds like you’re creeping outside the scope of the State Act; Mr. Welch’s suggestion might be a way to get it back to where we’d like to see it go.
Welch – It could be ready as soon as a Fall Town Meeting. That would give us time to compare and get PLUS involved and make a recommendation.
Coombs – She’d like to see the workgroup to look at this and for Ms. Bergman to suggest changes.
Dutra – Sounds like we’re asking to make a statement requesting Article 62 be held for a fall Special Town Meeting.
Welch – We don’t have to act on this tonight as our statement wouldn’t be included in the warrant.
Backus – She prepared a statement for FinCom, which she shared with Planning Director Andrew Vorce and Ms. Bergman ahead of this meeting. Read the statement in its entirety; Massachusetts Historic Commission (MHC) advises the Town not to adopt this because of the way the Special Act is written. HDC has a lot of power on this.
Coombs – Every small building in the Old Historic District is covered by Appendix C of the guidelines. However, we have allowed demolition of these buildings “just because.”
Oliver – She is struggling with the designation of contributing versus non-contributing; what makes a structure contributing? No one explains that.
Pohl – It’s a complicated answer: sometimes it’s who owned, used, or built a structure; age and location also have something to do with it. Everyone acknowledges the survey forms are terrible flawed; we’ve seen glaring errors and they need revamping. Rather than relying on one sheet; there would be a more in-depth vetting of the structure.
Oliver – Then we need someone to do that for us.
Welch – The Historical Commission gets funding for that type of thing and should be used for that. The idea is the workgroup would figure out the realities and processes to resolve and distill into a useable pamphlet that anyone can use.
Bergman – The survey forms do have to be updated.
Backus – PLUS has but money into the budget to update the historic surveys; there will be a request for proposal issued for that after Town Meeting. Noted that the survey work done by the Preservation Institute of Nantucket students is vetted before it goes to MHC. The National Historic Landmark listing from 2012 is pretty good but is also flawed. The 1989 surveys need to be updated. Explained processes PLUS staff are instituting to help with this project.
Welch – Read a statement he wrote for FinCom. It shows HDC is interested and supportive of pursuing this article.
Motion to Adopt the language of Mr. Welch’s statement to be sent to FinCom. (Oliver)
 Motion Carried unanimously
 Vote

V. OLD BUSINESS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Oman, David 12-0400	219 Madaket Road	Addition	59-43	Bernheimer Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> .				
Representing	Emma Costello, Bernheimer Architecture				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:57)	Costello – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; contends the 2 nd -floor deck is not visible; doesn’t know the original date of the house; no windows are changing. Coombs – The locus map is too small; can’t tell which lot this is. Asked the age of the house if the windows on the 1 st floor are changing. Doesn’t trim around the front door fits the style of the house; should be simpler trim with no sidelights. The 2 nd -floor deck will be hard to see if there are not pathways through the conservation land. Oliver – If there’s vegetation between this and the conservation land, she has no concerns. Pohl – If the front door is going to have sidelights, it needs a frontispiece.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with a frontispiece around front door. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	HDC2019-12-0400	

2.	Kaschuluk, Jeffery 01-0461	27 North Liberty Street	Addition-move on lot	41-453	LINK
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	Dutra, read back in.				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and Clay Lancaster's <i>Architecture of Historic Nantucket</i> .				
Representing	Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design Carrie Thornewill, Thornewill Design Jeff Kaschuluk, Owner Victoria Ewing, LINK Arthur Reade, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, & Gifford LLP				
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				
Concerns (5:11)	<p>L Thornewill – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Reintroduced the master plan.</p> <p>Alger – Her clients' main objection is to the move of the 1795 structure; few structures as old as this are still in their original location. The only reason for the move is to allow room for an additional building lot and that isn't typically approved. Referenced her letter and photo submitted at the last hearing. What you see on the street today is the same as in an 1880 photo.</p> <p>C Thornewill – Quoted from Clay Lancaster's <i>Architecture of Historic Nantucket</i> regarding moving structures. This 6-foot move on the property is insignificant in relation to how this structure will be perceived.</p> <p>Camp – Appreciates the architecture and it is one of the few houses on this street that haven't been changed. The other small cape style has been manipulated and changed until this is the only one left. The streetscape has also been over manipulated; wants to keep this architecture simple. Thinks the 6-foot move would reveal the southwest portion of the house. What's marked as northwest elevation is over fenestrated on the 2nd-floor with the 2 ganged windows; should reflect the same configuration as the southeast elevation. Some of the windows are new and the fascia above is large and doesn't look original over the front door so this has been manipulated to some degree. From the Lily Pond, a lot of houses have decks on the back so has no concerns with that elevation. Southwest elevation proposed right shed extension should have a window. From the Land Bank property, you can see the whole west side.</p> <p>Welch – Thanked applicants for the supplement historical information. On the site map, wants to know which homes have been modified or replaced since the mid-1950s.</p> <p>Kaschuluk – Reviewed the houses changed per Mr. Welch's parameters.</p> <p>Welch – There are three issues: structural changes not related to raising, structural changes that don't relate to moving, and raising the height and moving. Southeast elevation, for this style, the previous dormer with double-hung windows was more appropriate; they should be slightly wider, so casings touch the cornerboards or are the same. Applies to the northeast elevation dormer as well; also wants to know the age of the northeast elevation R5 window, if it's 1950s he has no concerns. He'd like to see a cross section regarding the height; he'd like to see it with a mudsill. What we associate with a structure is how it associates with our eye level; with a mudsill, it would require only a platform. In his mind a lateral move is less noticeable than lifting; if you move one of the 3 Bricks you'd now but raising one would be more noticeable. If we approve the move, he'd like to see some protocols based upon HDC criteria; there's been discussion about criteria for a move, but those are National Historic Registry (NHR) criteria. If it moves, it should be contingent upon HDC review of a move plan based upon that volume of information. Also, any move should be as limited as possible; 5 feet is just outside the fire separation. The proposed move would place it 7'8" from the property line.</p> <p>Dutra – Everyone's made a good point. He's not concerned with the move as much as he is about the architecture; however, the move does impact the streetscape and keeping that the same is his concern. Wants to keep it looking as much as it does now; the mudsill idea is good and would help keep rails off the front door. Southwest elevation silhouette should be maintained as is, which doesn't have rails. Okay with the shed dormer on the southwest. Southeast elevation, anyway to drop the dormer would be appreciated; the new proposed chimney should have a clay owl. Northeast elevation, is overall well done. Northwest elevation, try to get double-hung windows in the dormers. NW elevation the foundation, shows a shingle-drop.</p> <p>Oliver – She appreciates the changes, but she can't embrace the long transom windows. The amount of changes seems to be okay with everyone but not the move. She looked up a lot of information on standards of the Secretary of the Interior and NHR and has questions; she doesn't understand those concerns because 15 feet of the original structure is in the original location. Her research found a process that has to be followed to move a historic house and that it won't necessarily ruin the historic value of the house. Moving this to allow the lot to be subdivided isn't HDC's purview; our concern is if the move will change the character. In her mind yes, however, she doesn't know if that will ruin its integrity. They have presented a plan of what they want to do, but there is no guarantee that will happen; we have to take these applications individually. Our job is to manage changes to a historic building. What's interesting about the historic pictures is the different spacing, and it shows 29 North Liberty Street barn with a house identical to this beside it.</p> <p>Coombs – She feels strongly about the fact this has sat here since 1785; that impacts the changes that would be made. Mr. Lancaster said buildings are moved all the time, but he didn't say it was okay. She can agree to raising the house 8 inches with a mudsill. The 1888 photo of the southwest elevation shows a very simple house; some of the proposed would make it no longer simple. Southeast elevation 1st-floor, windows are only 3 inches apart when they could be spread out. We have responsibility to keep this as simple as possible. In raising 21", it gets basement windows shown as 3-over-3;</p>				

she'd have do look at other old houses to see how many basement windows they have. She'd prefer the 4-light window be somewhere else. Asked that it be simpler. The maple tree is very old and would like it preserved.

Kaschuluk – Asked if the board wants to see the proposed landscape plan, which will show what will and will not be visible.

Welch – He'd like to see a perspective view of the two lots from the street. The two dormers will be visible from the northeast; to the extent they can be lowered would help.

Alger – Asked if the board is aware this is a NHR listed structure; if not, she wants to present information regarding that.

Welch – The NHR integrity versus Nantucket's definition are different. A substantial addition jeopardizes the standing on the NHR, so they would have to reapply for that. He wouldn't be comfortable approving this without the applicant endeavoring to have this relisted on the NHR.

Coombs – It is important to meet both HDC and NHR criteria.

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

3. Zarcone, Michael 02-0612 16 Cherry Street Pool and patio 55-379 Jesse Dutra

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch

Alternates None

Recused Oliver, Dutra

Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.

Representing Jesse Dutra

Public None

Concerns (6:16) **Dutra** – Presented project; contends it will not be visible.

Pohl – Read HSAB comments: question if pool can be approved here; question visibility from Pleasant Street; and asked if shower is existing. Read Holly Backus comments: circa 1984; should not be visible from a public way.

Welch – The overlay puts this outside the OHD where it's allowed. This shouldn't be visible and doesn't think it will be; if approved we must have the stipulation about no visibility in perpetuity.

Coombs – If we can't see it and it can be squeezed in, she has no concerns.

Camp – Has trouble with hardscaping a lot of backyards with pools; also, feels this is inappropriate so close to the OHD.

Pohl – Agrees with Mr. Welch about it being screened. Behind this property is undeveloped wetland.

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted subject to not being visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. (Welch)**
 Vote Carried 3-1//Camp opposed Certificate # **HDC2020-02-0612**

4. 22 Starbuck, LLC 11-0195 22 Starbuck Road New dwelling 60-118 Thornewill Design

Voting Pohl, Camp, Oliver

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design

Public None

Concerns (6:24) **Thornewill** – Reviewed the redesigned project.

No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)**
 Vote Carried 3-0 Certificate # **HDC2019-11-0195**

5.	Spencer, Steven	01-0471	6 Magnolia Avenue	(Partial) Demo dwelling	73.3.1-57	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Oliver, Welch, Dutra					
Alternates	Welch and Camp, read back in, but Camp stepped out					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, Town Warrant Article 62, correspondence, and historic documentation.					
Representing	Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design Carrie Thornewill, Thornewill Design Steven Spencer, owner					
Public	None					
Concerns (6:30)	<p>C Thornewill – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Between 1923 and 1949 there was a tiny building on the lot; 1949 shows a building with a porch; dormers and some windows are circa 1960s.</p> <p>Welch – Based upon the demolition plan, reviewed what is being retained and what is being removed.</p> <p>Spencer – Stated the streetscape will be maintained as this is a rebuild from scratch using the existing windows and doors on the historic part.</p> <p>Oliver – If we start to allow people to just rebuild because it’s easier, we may as well be all replicas like Disney Land; the owner knew he was buying an older structure. She would like to see at least the barn structure remain.</p> <p>Dutra – He would prefer to retain as much as possible as shown in the drawings.</p> <p>Welch – This is circa 1920-1930 structure, which doesn’t mean we are going to disallow a demolition; it comes down to who lived there and who built it, etc.</p> <p>Pohl – This is small enough that the original structure could be saved and some of the fabric retained; some windows being saved are 1960s and could be eliminated.</p> <p>Thornewill – The cost and complexity of lifting and supporting off the foundation could be prohibitive; there is a precedent for taking this apart in panels and setting those panels aside for reassembly.</p> <p>Welch – If we allow dissembling, rather than cutting up in panels, he’d prefer the boards be numbered left to right, top to bottom, take the sheathing off and put it back together the way it was built. Cutting up the panels and putting together pieces would impact its structural integrity. He’s looking forward to the surveys being updated; that would make this so much easier. This is the type of thing to be hammered out regarding Article 62. If we approve this demolition, we need to layout the particulars; using a skill saw to cut up walls isn’t maintaining the historic fabric.</p> <p>Dutra – In 1909, a building was on this property; in 1923, this building appeared on the front of the property. He prefers the demolition plan as outlined; to be on the safe side, we can request the three walls be retained.</p> <p>Oliver – Center Street opened a can of worms HDC won’t live down; this furthers that. We are here to save our history; that is why Article 62 was submitted. This is a bad road to go. We have no one to authenticate the information submitted at the last hearing by Linda Williams; cited an example from 27 North Liberty Street where the photo circulated turned out not to be the structure being applied for.</p> <p>Pohl – Another option is to keep the sides intact and set them aside. The original roof is already mostly gone and can’t be saved. Engineers over-engineer to prevent something from falling down; they will always say to remove old fabric. We can write a letter exempting them from some of the building code such as using 2X4 and less insulation.</p> <p>Further discussion the method of how to dismantle this structure in a way that best preserves historic fabric.</p>					
Motion	Motion to Approve the demolition plan through staff with the front three historical sides to remain on site as a structure. (Dutra)					
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	HDC2019-01-0471		
6.	Spencer, Steven	01-0470	6 Magnolia Avenue	New dwelling (addition)	73.3.1-57	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra					
Alternates	Welch and Camp, read back in.					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation.					
Representing	Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design Carrie Thornewill, Thornewill Design Steven Spencer, owner					
Public	None					
Concerns (7:07)	<p>C Thornewill – Presented revised project as an addition.</p> <p>Dutra – No concerns.</p> <p>Welch – Nice design and an improvement with a 1920s look but plans to vote no due to proximity to the street.</p> <p>Camp – Asked how close to the street it will be. (4 feet) The new massing dominates the old mass.</p> <p>Oliver – She’s okay with it.</p> <p>Pohl – Compared to the existing addition, this is will be less prominent; it won’t be evident.</p>					
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)					
Vote	Carried 3-2//Camp & Welch opposed		Certificate #	HDC2019-01-0470		

7. Mueller Nantucket Assoc., LLC 34 Prospect Street Garage/apartment 55.4.4-77 CWA					
Voting	Camp (acting chair), Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:18)	<p>Webster – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; in the next submission, he will provide a reconfigured layout of the area.</p> <p>Oliver – Looking at the north elevation, the building was 27’9” tall and is going to 28’6”. West elevation, the front door trim should be bigger. Suggested a cottage with an attached garage lower.</p> <p>Coombs – Mr. Webster was going to show any landscaping to screen; asked for that. This will be visible, and this is an important location near the Pony Park; would like it resited a little down the hill away from Prospect Street. Asked the square footage of the garage. (864 SF on the ground at 3 stories)</p> <p>Welch – Asked everyone to consider that this is a garage in the front yard of the house, which is one of the most iconic in the area; we wouldn’t allow this on Mizzenmast Road, which is circa 1980s. This is also much larger than the primary structure; he thinks this is a huge mistake. If it were a house half this size and oriented toward the street, that would be different. It would change the character of this section of the road; this is not the place for this structure: too big and not properly sited. This will be a subdivision and is very concerned about the location and context for the density of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Dutra – His concern is the historic impact of the location of this. Agrees it should be smaller.</p> <p>Camp – She doesn’t want to see this as part of the existing but rather as its own building.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and View with height poles on corner indicating the height of the fascia and a pole the ridge along prospect street and a property-line stake off the corner closest to the structure. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
Break 7:38 to 7:42 p.m.					
8. Fish, Kevin 02-0627 36 York Street Porch 55.4.1-103 EMDA					
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Ethan McMorrow, EMDA				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:43)	<p>Welch – verified the columns are square.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 3-0		Certificate # HDC2020-02-0627		
9. MacKenzie, Jon 01-0541 4 Howard Court Rev. 11-0163: wndw/chmny 42.3.2-113 Emeritus					
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:44)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; asked that the sunroom be allowed Marvin simulated divided light windows (SDLs). The owners asked if they could eliminate the chimney.</p> <p>No one supports eliminating the chimney.</p> <p>Pohl – HSAB and Ms. Backus comments were read at the last hearing.</p> <p>Welch – Asked about the arbor. It looks odd that shallow; it would be better with a solid roof. Regarding the windows on the back wing, the Marvins would be fine he thinks; however, the sliding casements are a concern.</p> <p>Oliver – She agrees with Mr. Welch about the arbor being too shallow; would be better as a simple stoop. No concerns about SDL on the rear but not the crank open.</p> <p>Camp – Okay with the rear windows. Doesn’t like the arbor.</p> <p>Dutra – He has no concerns with the windows in the rear.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with removal of arbor, the stoop to stay in place, and windows on the rear may be Marvin SDL. (Dutra)				
Vote	Carried 3-2//Oliver & Welch opposed		Certificate # HDC2019-01-0541		

10. Lieber, J 02-0616	6 Stone Post Way	Garage changes	74-38.1	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:52)	<p>MacEachern – Presented project; included elevations of the main house but not photos.</p> <p>Pohl – Read SAB comments (no quorum): revisions improve; concerned garage is size of main house and possibly dwelling co-equal to first. Read Holly Backus comments: circa 1955, not contributing; pergola gives feeling larger than main dwelling.</p> <p>Welch – It’s big but it’s good and it’s behind the main house.</p> <p>Oliver – No concerns.</p> <p>Coombs – No concerns.</p> <p>Camp – Not okay, too many French doors.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 4-1//Camp opposed	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0616	
11. Ash, Diane 01-0546	23 Pine Street	Rev. 11-0244: fenestration	42.3.2-133	Emeritus
Voting	Camp (acting chair), Oliver, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and correspondence.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	Pohl – Not sitting, just reading letter of concerns submitted by Jascin Finger: rear is visible from Pleasant Street			
Concerns (8:00)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; will be filing a hardscape application and can include the pergola at that time.</p> <p>Oliver – The window changes harken back to what it was before; okay with the fill-in porch but not the pergola. Can’t recall any pergolas facing the street on Pine Street. Also, the front yard is all patio.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; it’s too much of an adornment for such a simple structure. Suggested boxing both sides of the pergola with no wings.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff without the pergola at this time. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	HDC2019-01-0546	
12. Century House RE 02-0617	10B Cliff Road	Color change	42.4.4-61	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:07)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed change from black to Quaker grey trim and sash.</p> <p>Welch – He’d like to see color chips of the Moccasin (beige) and Torque (black). He wants to see it done with the Sherman-Williams color app.</p> <p>Camp – Thinks the beige won’t look good with grey.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for color rendering. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

13. South Water Assoc. 02-0629	5 South Water Street	Second/third floor addition	42.3.1-270-75	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:11)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; working on a 3D model.</p> <p>Coombs – This is the old Hardees building. Doesn't see the necessity for this large a building next to small buildings at nearly 34'tall; it needs to be kept simple and single story. It would be lovely somewhere else.</p> <p>Welch – This is an improvement over what exists, but it overwhelms the site. There is room to simplify the massing so that it reads as two structures, which is more what it was when it was Hardees and the Firestone shop. The Easy Street side mutated into a country-store front. There's a lot of square-footage of decks for downtown. On the South Water Street side, no skirt on the roof walk. He'd like to see the 3D model of structure at the next hearing.</p> <p>Camp – South Water Street side is too busy and overly fenestrated. What she likes about the existing is the mass of shingles with no fenestration; it's so simple. Some of it is successful; it should be toned down.</p> <p>Dutra – Going in the right direction; agrees about simplifying it. Take out some height especially on the west elevation where the big mass is overpowering. Would be okay with the little middle balcony but not along the Pacific Building side. He'd like to see this design compared to the buildings around it.</p> <p>Pohl – Agrees with what's been said. West elevation could have flat cornerboards instead of pilasters. The south elevation reflects a lot of elements of the Killen Real Estate Building, which is too much; he'd like to see this side greatly simplified. It's really attractive with the low wrap-around porch.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

14. Wilner, Sheila Tr. 01-0548	10 Beach Street	Move off- demo dwelling	73.2.4-10	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:23)	<p>Pohl – This is a case where we should look at this and the new dwelling at the same time.</p> <p>MacEachern – He talked to neighbors and they don't have a high opinion of this. He'll talk to the Land Bank.</p> <p>Oliver – She'd love to see this reused in the area; this is listed as contributing.</p> <p>Camp – She's not a fan of demolishing this; but what takes this place should be in the same vein.</p> <p>Dutra – No concerns with a demolition; it looks like a camper.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold to track with the new dwelling. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

15. Wilner, Sheila Tr. 01-0547	10 Beach Street	New dwelling	73.2.4-10	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:23)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – Appreciates many changes but she's concerned with the height; the newer building in front is odd for Codfish Park and shouldn't be complimented. This is almost 2 full stories; the 2nd-floor knee walls should come down and the decks shingled to simplify it. She hates to see Codfish Park being gentrified one building at a time. This goes almost from setback to setback. The house is adorable but wonders how it would feel on that site.</p> <p>Camp – East elevation has too many front doors. This is too "frou-frou" for Codfish Park. No windows on west elevation line up.</p> <p>Dutra – Likes the north and south elevations though two windows on the north would be good; bigger windows would make this look smaller. Suggested a single set of French doors on the balcony.</p> <p>Welch – This is inappropriate design: too large; 1 3/4 story; house on the corner is an appropriate model. Part of the charm of the area is the different designs and styles: most are simple some are quirky; it would be better to go that way versus a mini trophy house. Suggested ways to bring the scale down. This is not Codfish Park to him. There's a little well on this.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

16. Champoux/Durand **02-0605** 8 Upper Tawpawshaw Roof top solar- MH 53-56 Cotuit Solar
 17. Champoux/Durand **02-0608** 8 Upper Tawpawshaw Roof top solar - shed 53-56 Cotuit Solar

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.

Representing Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar

Ben Champoux

Public None

Concerns (8:39) **Alence** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Asked Nr. 8 be considered together.

Champoux – Lot 6 is on the street; Lot 8 is behind it and isn't visible. We're abutted by conservation land on the north and west side.

Welch – He viewed this; he doesn't think Nr. 8 will be visible. The panels on the dormers won't be very visible. All he could see were the four skylights on the east roof plain.

Coombs – She viewed this. You have to be very careful that Nr. 8 is covered by foliage year-round; there are a lot of panels on a wood roof. You can see different angles, and they stand out especially in the winter.

Camp – She didn't view this and would like to hold this for another view. Asked about the area.

Pohl – He's convinced it won't be visible or minimal at the least.

Flynn – Asked for large plans for the file.

Motion **Motion to Approve both solar applications at 8 Upper Tawpawshaw as submitted. (Welch)**

Vote Carried 3-0//Coombs abstain Certificate # **HDC2020-02-0605/0608**

18. Champoux/Durand **02-0607** 6 Upper Tawpawshaw Roof top solar- MH 53-55 Cotuit Solar

19. Champoux/Durand **02-0606** 6 Upper Tawpawshaw Roof top solar- shed 53-55 Cotuit Solar

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.

Representing Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar

Ben Champoux

Public None

Concerns (8:54) **Alence** – Asked these be considered together as well. Reviewed the project; lower roof is somewhat visible from the road.

Champoux – It is visible, but that roof is the most southern exposure.

Welch – If there were trees planted to continue the row between the road and house that extended to between the driveway and house. The issue is the distinct issue of the solar and wood with breaks in the field; suggested ways to close the gaps in the field. The two in the front aren't approvable.

Coombs – We have rules to benefit different areas; we asked for black roofs, so panels won't stand out. She'd like to see a revision with more clearly marked roofs impacted and the sun splatter.

Camp – Would like this held for revisions.

Pohl – We appreciate it isn't a heavily traveled way but it is a publicly travelled way. Asked how this could be screened; the panels will be visible. The revisions would be to any screening.

Motion **Motion to Hold both for revisions. (Coombs)**

Vote Carried 4-0 Certificate #

20. 40 Polpis Road LLC **02-0609** 44 Polpis Road Solar rooftop array 54-26 Cotuit Solar

Voting Pohl, Camp, Welch

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.

Representing Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar

Jeff Carlson

Public None

Concerns (9:07) **Carlson** – The roof shingles are being replaced to black.

Welch – He had asked for the view. He has no concerns.

No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)**

Vote Carried 3-0 Certificate # **HDC2020-02-0609**

VI. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approve Minutes	None
Review Minutes	None
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of Article 58: Zoning Bylaw Amendment: Commercial Mid-Island Height Restriction Oliver – Asked if anyone read her statement and would they support this article; she needs something for the Finance Commission. As we know, as things get developed, they are taken to the Nth degree; that would be every building at 40 feet with parking. Camp – Yes. Welch – He’s a bit torn; he doesn’t feel 40 feet is appropriate. However, if we develop guidelines, we can make people use less groundcover and diversify the structures. Pohl – The reason the zoning was changed was to encourage car-free structures. His issue is the struggle we’ve had where different zones meet and working up from one to another. The Stop & Shop is 30 feet. The Intermediate school, Boys and Girls Club, and hospital are all in excess of 30 feet. Motion to Draft a memo for the Finance Commission endorsing this article. (Camp) Carried 4-0//Welch abstain • Discussion of Article 48: Zoning Bylaw Amendment: Swimming Pool- Residential Welch – This is a Planning Board article that would prohibit pools on lots 75,000 square feet or smaller. Asked to vote to support this article. Backus – Some of these lots could be rezoned into the ROH. Motion to Draft a memo for the Finance Commission endorsing this article. (Camp) Carried 4-0//Dutra abstain Backus – Stated that the vision HDC has for mid-Island is an example of why <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> needs to be updated. • Mission Statement for Town Website vote • Historic Preservation Guideline/Nantucket Resiliency updates • Time management • Organizational Focus Committee • 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	

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Town Warrant Article 48: Zoning Bylaw Amendment: Swimming Pool- Residential
2. Town Warrant Article 58: Zoning Bylaw Amendment: Commercial Mid-Island Height Restriction
3. *Building with Nantucket in Mind*

Adjourned at 9:19 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board
Sconset Advisory Board
Madaket Advisory Board
Sign Advisory Committee