



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

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

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Abigail Camp (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, Diane Coombs, OliverVallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Stephen Welch, Jessie Dutra, Carrie Thornewill

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, January 11, 2022

This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube.

Called to order at 5:00 pm. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Holly Backus, Preservation Planner; Esmeralda Martinez, PLUS Administrative Assistant; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker
Attending Members: Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
Absent Members: Thornewill
Late Arrivals: McLaughlin, 6:18 pm
Early Departures: Dutra & Welch, 8:38 pm

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion **Motion to Approve as drafted. (Coombs)**

Roll-call vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Dutra, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. DISCUSSION OF PRE-STAINED WHITE CEDAR SHINGLES

Voting Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
Documentation Photos of pre-treated shingles
Concerns **Pohl** – There has been a run on white cedar shingles and local lumber yards can’t get them. Recently, people have been requesting to use pre-stained, pre-weather shingles. He’s familiar with the product. He hopes this is a temporary issue with the supply chain.
Oliver – There are several types of stained shingles. She wishes the lumber yards had contacted HDC about this before selling them. The lumber yard she talked to said there’s no telling when things will change. There are people waiting for siding with their houses wrapped.
Welch – This is our new reality; suggested contacting the local vendors and have them provide sample boards so HDC can approve select colors and manufacturers, like we did with roof shingles. We can reserve typical cedar shingles to the core historic districts. As an interim step, suggested reaching out to the vendors about how long this supply-chain issue might go on.
Dutra – He’s waiting for shingles to sidewall his house.
Coombs – She wants to know what they will look like a year down the road. We don’t know how long they will last.
Welch – For those who are waiting, they can come into the office to review what they want to use and start getting them approved as long as they aren’t in the old historic district (OHD).
Linda Williams – The issue is that these come from Canada, and we can’t get them because of COVID. Noted that the bleached shingles remain bleached for a very long time. Asked how the Board feels about natural-to-weather clapboard instead.
Pohl – Natural-to-weather clapboard is not typical to Nantucket. People with issues will bring what they are proposing to PLUS and 3 commissioners will decide if it’s okay. Steps to pre-approved shingles will be: contact the lumber yards, see what’s they’re selling, review what they’re selling, and approve the colors; he’d like to have a board of regular weathered shingles for a benchmark.
Motion No action at this time.
Roll-call Vote N/A

III. CONSENTS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Delmark LP 12-5287	10 Rugged Road	Move off	67/303	Stephen Maury
2.	81 Low Beach, LLC 12-5453	81 Low Beach Road	Roof Replacement	75/30	Ronan Bradley
3.	Greenleaf 12-5456	139 Surfside Road	Addition & window changes	80/143.1	LINK
1.	Duane Jones 12-5360	21 Meader Street	Fence	42.2.3/44	Val Oliver
2.	Pat Augustine 12-5419	13 Woodbury Lane	Hardscape revision	41/549	Ahern, LLC
3.	Georgi Dimov 12-5383	15B Greglen Avenue	New shed	68/187.1	Georgi Dimov
4.	Georgi Dimov 12-5434	3 Miles Court	Addition	68/187.2	Georgi Dimov
5.	Galley West, LLC 12-5396	1 Mothball Avenue	Move on studio	83/424	SMRD
6.	Terrence Carden 12-5378	7 Mayhew Drive	Alterations	92.4/209	Permit Plus
7.	Hightide Partners 12-5446	8 Ackermuck Way lot 29	Hardscape	41/618	Atlantic Landscaping
8.	Tallat, LLC 12-5424	14 Union Street	New shed	42.3.2/17	Meerbergen Designs
9.	4170 & Down, LLC 12-5416	107 Tom Nevers Road	Hardscape	91/26	Ahern, LLC
10.	Peter Lisi 12-5407	2 Flintlock Road	Rev. 05-1012: domr & wndw	75/50	Shelter 7

Voting Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Welch, Dutra

Alternates None

Recused Oliver

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Coombs, Dutra, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye

Certificate #

HDC2021-(as noted)**IV. 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.	Koyote Realty Trust 12-5472	4 Hickory Meadow Ln	Roof walk	41/900	Linda Williams

- Decrease width to 14'

Voting Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Dutra

Alternates Welch

Recused None

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns No additional concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Coombs)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Dutra, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

Certificate #

HDC2021-12-5472**V. NEW BUSINESS 12/07/2021**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Rose R.T. 11-5107 (OB)	28 India Street	Spa	42.3.4/8	Jardins Int.

Voting Camp (acting chair, Coombs, Welch)

Alternates None

Recused Pohl

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.

Representing Elisabeth O'Rourke, Jardins International

Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl

Public None

Concerns (5:23) Discussion about whether or not to move forward with a 3-person board.

O'Rourke – Asked this be held for next week and a full board.

Not opened at this time.

Motion **Motion to Hold for a fuller Board. (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Welch, Coombs, and Camp-aye

Certificate #

HDC2021-11-5107

2.	Anthony Noto 11-5270	10 Lincoln Avenue	Addition & renovation	30/184	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Dutra				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	Nina Pickering-Cook, Anderson Kreiger, for 11 & 13 Lincoln Avenue Linda Williams				
Concerns (5:29)	<p>MacEachern – Presented project; circa 1902; currently elevated about 3’ out of the ground and that will be maintained; moving 15’ closer to Lincoln Avenue.</p> <p>Backus – Confirmed circa 1902. Requests a window survey and the age of the chimney proposed for removal. Read HSAB comments: It would be helpful to see other options for the new front dormers, such as shallower gable roof pitches, or hipped roof dormers with taller windows. The new front balcony railing might fit in better with shingled sides and a short return with a blustered front opening; this would complement the shingled columns next to the blustered rail below. The 15-light French doors on the front balcony should be changed to 12 lights with lower panel. The 5-unit French door facing east should be changed to a combination of windows and doors with 12 lights. The 6-unit French doors on the south should also be changed to a combination of windows and doors. The original house had a chimney on the front; it would be nice if that returned. HSAB would like to review further revisions</p> <p>Coombs – This house needs a chimney. Agrees about too many French doors and being 12-lights with kick panels. Agrees revisions should go back to HSAB. Gable dormers over the front door should be changed; they don’t go with the rest of the house.</p> <p>Camp – She agrees about the gable dormers on the front; they don’t add to this building. Likes the eye-brow windows on the side. West elevation, she likes the middle 3rd-floor window; that might work instead of the dormers. South elevation, the French doors feel very tall; reduce their height and add a kick panel. North elevation, she likes the thick shingled columns on the porch.</p> <p>Oliver – Agrees with HSAB. The front gable dormers have a very steep pitch. Agrees the front balcony railing should be shingled. The bank of doors on the south are nano-doors; the doors on east elevation should not be those.</p> <p>Dutra – North elevation, agrees about shingled railings; okay with the dormers but it looks nice as is; maybe the shed dormers could be taller with larger windows. It would be nice to have the south elevation chimney back. West elevation, adding the window to the 2nd-floor window would help.</p> <p>Pickering-Cook – The entire building is being moved closer to Lincoln Avenue; there’s been no discussion of that. It is currently 37’ tall so that height will become more impactful for the abutters if moved forward; also, it’s moving off its historic location.</p> <p>Williams – She grew up in this building and knows every inch of this house. The prior owner was a good steward of the building. This has a magnificent setting; the proposed driveway will impact that setting by having parked cars in front. Moving it is inappropriate. The gable dormers on the front of a gambrel are inappropriate. Every side is 100% visible. The decking has never been a shingled rail. Suggested a viewing. Concerned that adding the deck over the front door will throw off the historic façade.</p> <p>Pohl – Feels shingling the deck over the front door is awkward because the posts are very formal. Doesn’t like any of the nano-walls. When the house at 12 Lincoln moved forward, the argument was it would be no more forward than this house; now they want to move this forward. He’s opposed to moving this forward at all. The 2nd curb cut on the front would mar the beautiful front lawn.</p>				
Motion	Motion to View and Hold and to go back to HSAB for review. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Dutra, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

3.	450 Green Park LLC 11-5272	2 Stone Alley	Adtn/Alter/foundation	42.3.1/102	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	Linda Williams, for Virginia Andrews Virginia Andrews, 1 Stone Alley				
Concerns (6:00)	<p>MacEachern – Presented project. He reached out to Ms. Andrew’s counsel to understand her concerns with the previous submission and he addressed those. South elevation isn’t highly visible.</p> <p>Backus – There are multiple references to this structure which are incorrect. Constructed as a barn circa 1853; circa 1871 it was converted to a home by Elisa Codd, a female architect.</p> <p>Read HSAB comments: The proposed additions are still much too massive for the scale of this house. The rear ridge is at the same height as the existing main ridge and needs to drop; the stepped addition beyond that should be changed to a one-story element or eliminated entirely. There is too much building attached to the back of this relatively modest home. The existing glassed-in porch is visible from Stone Alley and Union Street; it is an important character defining element and should be retained. The existing exterior chimney should also be retained. The proposed drawings should show the proposed grade changes. The HDC and HSAB have been very clear from the start that any additions to this house need to be sensitively designed to complement the scale of the existing house. HSAB would like to review further revisions.</p> <p>Williams – She provided a very detailed history on this structure. There have been consistent concerns about this extending down the hill and being tall. It is completely visible from Union Street and Stone Alley and Orange Street. This is a better design, but it still looms over Union Street and obliterates the view of the historic structure and those elements critical to its unique design.</p> <p>Andrews – Agrees with HSAB. We haven’t thought about the representation that there is a lack of lawn; that isn’t true. There is a parking area off Stone Alley; eliminating that is not a good idea.</p> <p>Oliver – She’s looked closely at this and the past iterations. To her this is fairly similar to those and reads as a single plane along Stone Alley. Agrees the new section should have some element to separate it from the original, but not sure the exposed rafter tails are appropriate with this style. The building should step down the hill; additions should be smaller in height and scale. Site and setting should help set standards of simplicity and unintrusiveness. This is very visible, and the north elevation would dwarf Stone Alley. Suggested a hyphen massing then add on, that would make the existing more prominent; an alternative is a separate structure.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees the addition should be subordinate and the roof ridge dropped then telescope back. Liked the prior idea of ending in a sunroom. This doesn’t go with the nature of the hill. The chimney should remain.</p> <p>Coombs – The addition is 2/3rd larger than the original house. It needs to drop with the grade going south; we’ve asked for that on every iteration. This proposal is too large for Stone Alley. The history of this structure should be maintained. North elevation, the 30’5” at the lower ridge is excessive; all the sections need to drop down. The addition windows should be 6-over-6 to match the existing; also, the ridge is very long before it drops. The addition should run parallel with Union Street, not perpendicular. There needs to be a split of at least 3’ between the ridge height of the original and the first addition with the second addition dropping further.</p> <p>Welch – He supports subservient massing with distinctiveness between the old and new. This is an unconventional design; inspiration should come from that and the immediate surrounding area to be sensitive to this hillside. This should flow down the hill away from Stone Alley.</p> <p>Pohl – East elevation, there is plenty of room to move the addition farther south away from Stone Alley without impacting the view if the owner’s other house. The south elevation has a richness to its design that humanizes it. The north elevation is 3 flat planes very close to Stone Alley. Take some of the good stuff from the south side to give the north side a human face. Agrees with HSAB and that the right answer is to extend laterally working with the grade.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and to go back to HSAB. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

VI. OLD BUSINESS 12/14/2021

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Rich Gillis	38 Prospect Street Lot 29	Hardscape		Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs,				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments				
Representing	Linda Williams Rich Gillis, owner				
Public	Anne Dewez, 5 Mill Street for Mill Street neighborhood area group. Zach Stuppy, 38 Prospect Street Lots 27 & 27 B Ann Davis, 15 Mill Street Pat Beilman, 17 Mill Street Joan Taylor, 16 Mill Street				
Concerns (6:35)	<p>Williams – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Received 2 emails in favor of this project. This is not longer a rural area; no rural character exists since the land was subdivided and cleared.</p> <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments 12/20: This section of Prospect Street currently has a relatively rural character, especially compared to the section of Prospect closer to Milk Street. This property, along with the old Mueller property, frame the entrance from Prospect Street onto North Mill Street, and both currently have a somewhat naturalized appearance with a variety of different plant species. These plants are fairly tall and help screen the new development from Prospect Street. The proposed landscape plans would drastically change that rural character to a much more formal setting. The landscaping for this new development should look to the existing character of that area for direction. Privet hedges and formal walkways are more suited to the smaller lots and density closer to Town. Encircling this entire property (and all the other new lots) with privet hedge would create a suburban look not appropriate for this neighborhood. The hedges should be eliminated. The bluestone walkways and patio should be changed to an irregular shaped stone of natural color. The stone walls should be eliminated and replaced with a natural berm. The evergreen hedge and the 5&1 fence connecting the two buildings are too formal and should have a more rural appearance. Hopefully the pressure treated retaining wall in back won't be visible, but if it is, it should be faced with natural wood or stone. The area on the Prospect Street side of the guest house should not be lawn and become dense naturalized vegetation to help buffer the close proximity of the structure to the street. Any new screening should be done with less formal planting clusters rather than rigid linear plantings. The Belgian block apron should be changed to cobblestone. HSAB would like to review further revisions. Read email dated 1/6 from Ann Dewez. This is an infill lot within the OHD.</p> <p>Dewez – Some HSAB comments are still valid. Takes exception to the concept that we can't try to maintain some of the rural nature of this area.</p> <p>Gillis – He spoke with Ms. Dewez last week about what we are trying to accomplish and lack of visibility. We're trying to keep the house open in the front with a private patio in the back. The driveway material is deed restricted by the Planning Board.</p> <p>Stuppy – He feels there has been a lot of push back rather than constructive feedback from the neighbors. We've heard 3 different descriptions of this area; feels this is in keeping with the surrounding area. Encouraged the commission to approve this.</p> <p>Davis – This is the first design for the development and sets the tone for everything to follow; it needs to fit into the neighborhood. Agrees with HSAB comments and feels there is still a lot of hedging that isn't consistent with what's around.</p> <p>Beilman – We are passionate about this land, which is the last open space of its kind; that should be preserved. There are references to it not being visible; much of what will go in there will be visible from Prospect Street and North Mill footpath. Agrees with HSAB.</p> <p>Taylor – This is an opportunity to produce something that will meet the owners needs and fit into the neighborhood. There was an indication that all these lots are much larger than most on Mill Street; that's not true.</p> <p>Pohl – This shares issues with the subdivision abutting Prospect Hill Cemetery - severe grade changes. We have to accept the fact the topography is changing, but we don't want it to become artificially manipulated.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Asked questions clarifying the photos. No comments about the landscaping.</p> <p>Coombs – She would like to see less formality: round the hedge corners, boxwood not planted in a square swath, and a looser look. Suggested removing 50% of the Green Giants and using a more relaxed planting plan.</p> <p>Camp – It should be more rural because of its proximity to the Mueller property; as you go toward Angola, you might be able to get more formal. The driveway in the middle with flanking structures is much too formal; it would be less formal off to the side and curving. A shell driveway on a gravel road is inappropriate. Agrees with Ms. Coombs. The boarder should not appear as a soldier course of trees. The patio looks like it's opening up an area for a pool.</p> <p>Pohl – This has an axial symmetry to it like a French renaissance garden. Doesn't think a 5&1 fence with a formal hedge in front is necessary to block the terrace. Green Giants are Arbor Vitae, which deer love to eat. Pull back on the formality of the straight-line geometry; formality is the over-arching issue.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

2.	23 Broad St, LLC	23 Broad Street	Fenestration & addition	42.4.2/77	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, advisory comments, Building with Nantucket in Mind (BWNIM), and audio from prior hearing.				
Representing Public	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development Ann Lingeman Davis at 10 Ash Street John Pressman, 2 Ash Lane Roberta Saint-Armour, 2 Ash Lane				
Concerns (7:19)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; there is historic evidence of and precedent for the side deck. He looked into the mechanical equipment on the drawings but he isn't proposing and changes to them.</p> <p>Backus – This is an individually significant, post-1846 structure. Use is under Planning Board jurisdiction. Agrees about having a stoop rather than deck; fenestration should be simple in nature</p> <p>Read HSAB comments 12/27: The existing exhaust vents and fans should be accurately represented on the elevations; screening these from Ash Street would be a great improvement and benefit to the neighbors. Previous HDC comments asked that the elevated seating deck be eliminated, yet it is still there; it is very visible and inappropriate in this location in the OHD. A small stoop could be used for egress. Creating planting beds in front of the stairs and stoops for some vegetation would help buffer the highly developed courtyard area. The change from French doors to windows is good, but there is still too much glass; reduce the size of the windows a little. HSAB would like to review further revisions</p> <p>Davis – North elevation plans should indicate the central stack has a tall extender, which is far more prominent than articulated in the plan, and a fan set into the wall which is visible from Ash Lane. The deck still extends beyond the friendship stairs and would be visible from many angles; the historic photo indicates a deck that doesn't extend past the friendship stairs. Asked commissioners to hold the line on the deck.</p> <p>Pressman – HSAB focused on the deck; he agrees there is no place for the deck in the OHD and it should be no more than a stoop. The played back comments of Ms. Thornewill and that were brought up to the HSAB regarding using the west elevation door to the rear for egress; the argument against that was it was through the kitchen; when HSAB asked that same question, they got a different answer. Ms. Oliver had referenced the negative impact of building to the owner's own aspirations and not to guidelines set in BWNIM. This board should adhere to HSAB recommendations that the egress be a stoop and fenestration reduced and uphold the principals of BWNIM.</p> <p>Saint-Amour – We've asked for the same changes 3 or 4 times which haven't resulted in any substantial changes. The huge deck jutting out is not in keeping with Nantucket. This is an important historic building.</p> <p>Oliver – Appreciates going back to simplification. In terms of the deck as egress, she wonders if it is necessary when there are several other doors on the rear portion of the building; the simple solution is to eliminate the deck and make it a bank of windows and/or have a minimal stoop with stairs toward the tent area.</p> <p>Coombs – We've heard enough about the doors and deck. The interior program isn't our concern. It should be a door and stoop.</p> <p>Welch – He doesn't disagree with much that's been said. Looking at the 1890 image against current photos, both the former deck and current stairs are co-planer and it looks as if the prior outdoor porch became the shed addition not proud of the friendship stairs. The Sanborn map shows a deck but not the friendship stairs; that deck is now the addition with the shed roof. Agrees there shouldn't be this large of a deck; suggested a single door toward the rear of the shed bumpout with stairs leading to the awning area.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Most of the west elevation is visible; the 12-light doors are inappropriate in the OHD. On the north elevation, asked if the metal vents and hoods could be reduced (no change to the north).</p> <p>Pohl – North elevation, hopefully the vents and hoods will be screened. The deck and fenestration need to be pared down more.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and to go back to HSAB. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

VII. NEW BUSINESS 12/21/2021

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	3 Beaver St LLC 12-5316	3A Beaver Street	Dormers, raise foundation	55.1.4/97	Polly Walldorf
	Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver			
	Alternates	Welch, Dutra			
	Recused	None			
	Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
	Representing	Linda Williams			
	Public	None			
	Concerns (7:59)	Williams – Continuing to have a scan done Not opened at this time.			
	Motion	Motion to Hold for further information. (Oliver)			
	Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
2.	John Manera	4 Larrabee Lane	New dwelling	55/102.7	Linda Williams
	Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver			
	Alternates	Welch, Dutra			
	Recused	None			
	Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
	Representing	Linda Williams			
	Public	None			
	Concerns (8:00)	Williams – This is being head for an updated site plan that reduces the size of the house. Not opened at this time.			
	Motion	Motion to Hold for a revised site plan. (Camp)			
	Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
3.	8 North Star NT 12-5473	8 North Star	Roof walk	30/212	Linda Williams
	Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver			
	Alternates	Welch, Dutra			
	Recused	None			
	Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
	Representing	Linda Williams			
	Public	None			
	Concerns (8:01)	Williams – presented project. Backus – This was not reviewed by HSAB. Agrees that what’s being presented fits the area. Oliver – She got an outside staircase approved in this area due to lack of visibility and attests to the lack of visibility here. Camp – She is willing to accept this won’t be very visible. Coombs – She wouldn’t normally approve this but knows this won’t be visible. McLaughlin – Believes the stairs will be visible because they’re above the 1 st floor. Pohl – The back is not visible.			
	Motion	Motion to Approve. (Oliver)			
	Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Oliver, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye; McLaughlin-abstain		Certificate #	HDC2021-12-5473
4.	Sam Shamoun	9 Field Avenue	New dwelling	80/162.1	Linda Williams
	Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver			
	Alternates	Welch, Dutra			
	Recused	None			
	Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
	Representing	Linda Williams			
	Public	None			
	Concerns (5:40)	Williams – Continued for a new site plan. Asked if 38 Prospect Lot 29 could be heard ASAP. Discussion about when 38 Prospect could be heard with a full board. Not opened at this time.			
	Motion	Motion to Hold at applicant’s request for more information. (Camp)			
	Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	

VIII. OLD BUSINESS 12/28/2021

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	13 Commercial Wf., LLC 09-4749	13 Commercial Wharf	Revise changes on addition	42.2.4/10	NAG
Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Bill McGuire, Nantucket Architectural Group Ann DeRuso, owner				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:14)	<p>McGuire – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns and HSAB’s comments.</p> <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments 1/10: The proposed revisions are an improvement. However, there should be some additive massing on the west facing gable; the tall two-story gable could be a one-story shed roof with a dormer, similar to what is existing. The proposed north portico feels out of scale and could be enlarged and changed to a shed roof to lower the front roof edge. After the neighboring building to the east on the Land Bank property is removed, the east elevation will be very visible; that wall should have more consistent fenestration floor to floor, and the small windows should change to full size to help fill the space. East elevation massing overwhelms that side. HSAB would like to see further revisions.</p> <p>The main façade faces Commercial; this is moving in a better direction but agrees additive massing should be added to the west elevation.</p> <p>DeRuso – This is in line with but smaller to the neighbor heading toward Washington Street. Asserts all structures along the Wharf is 2 stories. We will be landscaping the east side.</p> <p>Camp – She has no concerns.</p> <p>Coombs – She’d like to see some more 1-story additive massing. This tends to be big for Commercial Wharf.</p> <p>Oliver – Appreciates the changes. She concurs the east elevation will be very visible when the abutting structure is removed; it’s currently a big box. The front is more successful. She has no concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The north elevation, asked about the lattice (existing). West elevation, the double decks might exceed the guidelines.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye; McLaughlin-nay			Certificate #	HDC2021-09-4749
2.	Matt O’Connor	16 Tashama Lane	Add spa & retaining wall	55/481	KM Designs
Voting	Camp, Coombs				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Katy Mitchell, KM Designs Linda Williams				
Public	Gregg Tivnan, 13 MacLean Lane				
Concerns (8:33)	No quorum.				
Motion	No action taken due to lack of quorum				
Roll-call Vote	N/A			Certificate #	

3.	Robert Meyer 10-4866	307 Polpis Road	New Dwelling	25/39	CWA
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:35)	Webster – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. This was on the view list and there was a pole up. Trim is natural to weather. McLaughlin – East and west elevations, the deck is over 8’ deep and needs to be brought back. West elevation, there’s a lot of glass on the 1 st floor. North elevation, this side would be visible from Polpis Road and the Cranberry bogs; the fenestration needs to be reduced. He’d like to view this. There are 18 French doors; the structure has too much glass. Oliver – Appreciates going to shingles. The east elevation faces the driveway and has no proper front door, and it needs one. Don’t need French doors on every façade. East and west elevations have an anomaly at the top of the ridge (drawing error). Given the location, much of this is okay. There is an overabundance of glass on the north elevation but doesn’t think it will be visible. Coombs – Appreciates changes made. Agrees with what’s been said. She too would like to see a proper front door. Pohl – The “front” door is in a single-story mass so isn’t actually a proper front door. Most of us are comfortable due to limited to no visibility.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the front door in the east elevation gable mass in place of the left French doors and reduce the 2nd-floor deck on the north elevation to 8’ deep. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2021-10-4866	
4.	Nice to Be Back, LLC 11-5037	43 Kendrick Street	New pool	76.4.3/31	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	David Bartsch				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:32)	Discussion about holding for Thursday and a 5-person board. Bartsch – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. The pool is 60’ long. Camp – She’s uncomfortable approving this without seeing what will take place regarding the berm; she wants to see a cross-section of the proposed berm. The driveway looks large and odd. Coombs – Thinks the pool should be reduced. The berm should flow naturally into the land. McLaughlin – No comments on the landscape plan. He thinks it’s approvable. Pohl – Our view of this has been tainted because of the straight, 6’ berm set right against the road. Mr. Bartsch is proposing a bio-morphic berm following natural contours set farther from the road and only about 3’ tall.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (McLaughlin) not carried Camp and Coombs-aye				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2021-11-5037	

Rest held for Thursday, January 13th.

5.	Kim Wentworth 11-5168	14 Lincoln Avenue	Move & increase pool	30/182	Mark Cutone
6.	NIR Retail LLC 11-5041	4 Harbor Square	Renovate building	42.2.4/1	Workshop APD
7.	22 Easton, LLC 06-4026	22 Easton Street	Pool & hardscape	42.1.1/12	Ahern Design
8.	Okay Okay House 10-4821	10 Union Street	Parking & patio	42.3.1/43	BPC Architecture
9.	Family Ties Ack, LLC 11-5125	11 Alliance Lane	Pool, court, hardscape	39/24.1	Atlantic Landscaping
10.	Family Ties Ack, LLC 11-5159	11 Alliance Lane	New dwelling	39/24.1	Studio Ppark

IX. NEW BUSINESS 01/04/2022

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Michael Robinson	13 Fayette Street	Roof walk	42.3.2/28	Sanne Payne
2.	Mayberry N.T.	9 Fair Street	Roof change garage	42.3.2/4	Linda Williams
3.	Mayberry N.T.	9 Fair Street	Roof walk skirt	42.3.2/4	Linda Williams
4.	Chandra Miller	9 Magnolia Avenue	Change windows	73.3.1/85	Chandra Miller
5.	Faith Breen 11-5147	19 Broadway Sias	Roof change	73.1.3/111	Steven Stockigt
6.	Brett Fodiman 12-5374	3 Tetawkimo Drive	New dwelling	53/41	CWA
7.	John Wolff 12-5385	32 Woodbine Road	New 2 nd dwelling	80/18	MCA
8.	Grace Hull 12-5397	27 Beach Grass Road	New dwelling	68/380	Topham Design
9.	Christian Brunet 12-5377	4 Quidnet Road	M.H. alterations	20/709	Permit Plus
10.	Christian Brunet 12-5376	4 Quidnet Road	Cottage alterations	20/709	Permit Plus
11.	Paul Darrah 12-5393	28 North Water Street	Dormer fenst chng	42.4.3/22	EMDA
12.	Barbara VonDerGorben 12-5388	132 Main Street	Hardscape	42.3.3/45	Grady Murtagh
13.	John Barry 12-5398	22 Eel Point Road	Demo or move off garage	40/45	Emeritus

HDC Minutes for January 11, 2022, adopted Jan. 25

14. Don Russell 12-5422	14 Brewster Road	New 3 rd dwelling	54/236	Don Russell
15. LBC Sconset LLC 12-5413	9 Hawks Circle	Hardscape revision	74/37.1	Ahern, LLC
16. Eric Savetsky 12-5418	12B Oak Hollow	Pool & hardscape	56/128.2	Ahern, LLC
17. Johnson Charles Trust 12-5415	24 Bassett Road	Driveway & hardscape	26/61	Ahern, LLC
18. 1 Caroline Way LLC 12-5414	1 Caroline Way	Pool & hardscape	82/59	Ahern, LLC
19. Tallat LLC 12-5423	14 Union Street	Addition & fenestration	42.3.2/17	Meerbergen Designs
20. 66 Easton, LLC 12-5417	66 Easton Street	Fence	42.4.1/62	Toni Yacobin
21. Elizabeth Powell 12-5445	71 Cliff Road	Hardscape & retaining wall	30/160	Atlantic Landscaping
22. Elizabeth Powell 12-5440	71 Cliff Road	New cabana	30/160	Thornewill Design
23. Melissa Spruce 12-5433	21 Bank Street	Rev 72714: addition	73.1.3/57	Gryphon Architects
24. NIR Retail LLCV 12-5442	27 Old South Wharf	Widen dormer	42.2.4/2	Emeritus
25. Eleven Lincoln Trust 12-5444	32 Jefferson Avenue	Demo or move off studio	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
26. Eleven Lincoln Trust 12-5447	32 Jefferson Avenue	Demo or move off GH	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
27. Eleven Lincoln Trust 12-5443	32 Jefferson Avenue	New guest house	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
28. 1 Caroline Way, LLC 12-5439	1 Caroline Way	Main house revisions	82/59	Vicente Burin
29. Ali & Zach Smith	232 Madaket Road	New Dwelling	59.4/120.1	JN Design
30. Ali & Zach Smith	232 Madaket Road	New Garage	59.4/120.1	JN Design
31. Courtney Arnot	8 New Street	Fence	55.4.1/35	Courtney Arnot
32. Larry Maury	23 Washington Street	Like-kind window replace	42.3.1/39	Larry Maury

X. OLD BUSINESS 01/11/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Darlene DeMichelle 11-5252	Lot 26- Birdsong	New dwelling	55.4.4/80.2	Meerbergen Designs
2. Darlene DeMichelle 11-5254	Lot 26- Birdsong	New 2 nd dwelling	55.4.4/80.2	Meerbergen Designs
3. Darlene DeMichelle 11-5255	Lot 26- Birdsong	New garage	55.4.4/80.2	Meerbergen Designs
4. Prickly Pear 11-5155	17 Broadway- Sconset	Storage containers	73.1.3/112	Val Oliver
5. Anne M Rose 10-4998	62 Boulevarde	New dwelling	79/211	Botticelli + Pohl
6. 32 Hulbert Ave Trust 11-5220	32 Hulbert Avenue	New Dwelling	29/72	Botticelli + Pohl
7. Harborside Partners 11-5242	5 York Street	Rev. fenest & pergola	55.1.4/162	Gryphon Architects
8. 33 North Mill St, LLC	7 North Mill Street	New Shed	55.4.4/77	Sophie Metz
9. 33 North Mill St, LLC	7 North Mill Street	New Garage/Studio	55.4.4/77	Sophie Metz
10. 33 North Mill St., LLC 11-5126	7 North Mill Street	Hardscape	55.4.4/77	Atlantic Landscaping
11. Geradi Prolopov 11-5187	80 Surfside Road	New dwelling	67/194	DTA
12. Geradi Prolopov 12-5328	80 Surfside Road	Hardscape & pool	67/194	DTA
13. Patrick DePalma 10-5025	3 Westerwick Road	New dwelling	73/37	Concept Designs
14. Patrick DePalma 10-5023	3 Westerwick Road	Garage/ studio	73/37	Concept Designs
15. Jonathan Jacoby 12-5435	3 Tautemo Way	New garage revision	83/22	EMDA
16. Hoehn- Saric 10-4865	34 Easton Street	New dwelling	41.1.4/18	CWA
17. Tack3, LLC	26 Washington Street	Rev COA: Roofwalk, entry,	42.3.2/23	CWA

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

Approved Minutes	December 21, 2021
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)
Roll-call vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye
Review Minutes	December 23, 28, & 30, 2021 and January 4 & 6, 2022
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next HDC Meeting: Thursday, January 13, 2022 at 1:00 pm. ZOOM • Discussion of Advisory Board Review • Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, intro • Discussion of additions and new dwellings added to the consent agenda • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings • Hardscaping • Discussion of salvaging demolitions • Discussion of options for house moves
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 9:05 pm. (McLaughlin)**
 Roll-call vote Carried 4-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:
 Terry L. Norton