

PROPOSED MINUTES

Organizational Focus Committee

Tuesday, May 9 , 2018

Community Room @ 4 Fairgrounds Rd, Nantucket, Ma

Board Members Present: Stephen Welch (Chairman), John McLaughlin

Staff Present: John Hedden, Land Use Specialist

I. Procedural Business

- a. Stephen Welch called the meeting to order at 1:01PM
- b. Audio/Video Announcements: Stephen Welch
- c. Adoption of Agenda: Motion to Approve voted unanimously

II. Minutes

Review: N/A

Approve: March 28, 2018 (McLaughlin)

III. Public Comment :

None

IV. Unfinished Business

1. Update of Meeting with the Madaket Advisory Board meeting from 5/8/18. They discussed the perimeter of the Madaket Historic District Area and went into detail of Appendix G.

MAB decided to review Appendix G for both proposed maps. To come up with do's and dont's over the next two weeks. The OFC will then review and make the necessary changes before bringing a final recommendation before the HDC.

2. Discussion of **Building with Nantucket in Mind** and related topics. Addressing the Certificate of Appropriateness application items. Staff would like to address items on the application like fences, roofs, sheds.

The OFC and Staff would like to “nail down” guidelines and policies, as the applications are more frequent, especially in subdivisions.

Building with Nantucket in Mind (BWNIM) references fences multiple times and throughout the guide. It also mentions as a preferred way to create private space in town and smaller lots by using fences and hedges.

The guidebook mentions that in town, fences under 4 feet are appropriate in front of the house, along the side walk to the property line. Fencing in the back of the house should start from the house and along the property line.

Lots outside the OHD needs to be addressed. We will have a set of recommendations for the town and outside of town. The objective will be to create uniformity not homogenous or monotonous. For areas in the R5 and R10 districts, split rail fencing is appropriate and any fencing in the rear, would be to hide utilities. And the rules and regulations for R5 and R10 might be height restriction.

It was suggested to group items from Appendix G together for discussion; ie, roofs, leaders, downspouts and gutters.

It was also suggested to possibly meet with HDC members on a Thursday to expedite this process.

In researching fences, there has been historical documentation regarding taller fences as seen in an application for 86 Main Street. There was no understanding how the 6 feet fence became standard.

For the next meeting, John Hedden was asked to bring images of fences for the group to review.

The OFC decided it might be suggested to remove either the “case by case’ or the footnote at the bottom “reserving the right to vary, for a good cause, any of the above”.

A more user- friendly approach in fences would be to break down fences by historic district, dense neighborhoods and open spaces. From there it could be broken down by fence type and height. Illustrations with references to type and height would be helpful.

Fence applications with subdivisions like Sachems Path needs to be addressed. Putting expensive mature plant material is not a concern, but should that be addressed as part of a concern.

3. Discuss “HDC-OFC Initial Questionnaire”

The questionnaire discussion is temporarily postponed until we hear from the other HDC members.

- V.** New Business: N/A
- VI.** Date of Next Meeting: May 16, 2018 at time TBD
- VII.** Motion to Adjourn: 2:05 pm (McLaughlin) carried unanimously

PROPOSED