



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

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

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Stephen Welch (Vice-chair), Abby Camp, Diane Coombs, Vallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Connie Patten, Joe Paul, Carrie Thornewill

~ ~ MINUTES ~ ~
Tuesday, November 14, 2023

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:00pm and announcements by Chair Pohl	
Staff in Attendance:	Holly Backus , Historic Planner; Esmeralda Martinez , Land Use Specialist, Adrian Rodriguez , Administrative Specialist & Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist
Attending Members:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul
Remote Participants:	Coombs
Absent Members:	Thornewill
Late Arrivals:	None
Early Departures:	

ADOPTION OF AGENDA	
Motion:	Motion to approve agenda. (Coombs)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

I. OTHER BUSINESS- DISCUSSION & VOTE

Pohl

- Received comments expressing concern about the extended duration of the process from Historic District Commission (HDC) approval to obtaining a building permit.
- There's an emphasis on the contrast between new business applications, which seemingly require less time, and old business applications.
- Pohl discusses the current procedure, highlighting that minutes for old business applications must be submitted along with the application itself.

Esmeralda Martinez, Land Use Specialist

- Stated instead of including the traditional detailed minutes, she informs clients, agents, or applicants that they can submit a cover sheet containing essential information such as the meeting date, board members present, and a brief narrative summarizing the discussion.
- This alternative is proposed to help facilitate the process for clients and expedite the review of old business applications.

Welch

- Clarifies that the current discussion on submitting a cover sheet instead of detailed minutes is considered a temporary or "stopgap" measure. This is acknowledged because there is a designated minutes taker, Terry, who is in the process of becoming operational.
- Once the proper minute-taking system is in place, he suggests returning to the traditional system of submitting detailed minutes.
- Welch emphasizes the importance of having a record to refer back to, especially in cases where there is a significant time lapse between submissions. The distinction is made between meetings with extensive discussions and contentious points compared to simpler matters, like changing the color of a front door.

Martinez

- Elaborates on the approach, emphasizing that for matters that are contentious or involve extensive discussion, a narrative is essential. However, for straightforward items such as a motion to approve made at the table or staff approvals where the motion is clearly documented, she suggests that these can be processed more quickly in lieu of detailed minutes.

- This distinction is made to expedite the review process for certain types of applications.

Holly Backus, Historic Planner

- Adds to the discussion, noting the change in the processing timeline. Previously, the approval process was dependent on quickly receiving minutes, especially with Terry providing them the next day.
- However, Backus points out that the reliance on minutes for processing consents has changed. Consents can now be quickly stamped in the next couple of days, removing any waiting time.
- The use of the meeting agenda serves as proof, and certain consent conditions, like boilerplate requirements for items such as pools, can be efficiently handled without delays.

Welch

- Introduces a perspective on the situation, highlighting several considerations. Welch suggests that it would be appropriate and protective of staff to establish a process that can eventually be part of a legal framework in case of an appeal. This approach is aimed at ensuring a systematic and legally defensible procedure, recognizing the potential complexities that may arise in the future.
- The suggestion is made regarding the handling of consent and consent with conditions.
- Welch proposes that the chair, or whoever is chairing, can use a spare agenda to mark up and sign off on consents as they are approved during the meeting. This signed agenda then becomes an official record and goes into the file.
- Welch emphasizes that in such cases, there may not be a need for a copy of the detailed minutes. The signed agenda serves as a tangible and official record of the approval process, providing a standard procedure for memorialization with the application. This approach aims to streamline the process and create a readily accessible record for any future reference or potential appeals.
- Welch acknowledges the efforts made so far and suggests further improvements to ensure that every approval has an Exhibit A, regardless of how minor the matter may be. The idea is that having a visual representation, such as a picture or photocopy, makes it more accessible for applicants or agents to submit with their drawings. This, in turn, simplifies the process for staff, especially for those who may not be as familiar with architectural elements and terminology.
- Welch underscores the practicality of a visual reference (Exhibit A) to accompany approvals, making it easier for staff to interpret and process applications efficiently.
- Welch proposes that minutes be attached to any application based on two specific criteria. First, by request – for example, in cases where a property has been under consideration for an extended period, it could be standard practice to request minutes for better context. The example of a historical structure or contentious application is provided. Second, Welch suggests making a motion during the meeting to request minutes when needed. This approach ensures that minutes are specifically requested based on the circumstances of each application, providing a more tailored and potentially more comprehensive record of the discussions.
- Welch proposes another element to the approach by suggesting a general policy: if an application is submitted 30 days after it was heard, minutes should be included. The rationale behind this suggestion is that after 30 days, there may be a higher likelihood that applicants, agents, or even board members may have difficulty recalling specific details of the discussions.
- By implementing this policy, Welch aims to ensure that the minutes are available for applications submitted after a certain timeframe, contributing to a more accurate and comprehensive record of the deliberations.

Pohl

- Clarifies that the suggested 30-day timeframe for including minutes is not related to any delay caused by the minutes themselves. Instead, it is based on the situation where the applicant has not submitted the required documents within the 30-day period after the hearing.
- This distinction emphasizes the need for timely submission by the applicant, and after this period, the inclusion of minutes becomes particularly important to ensure an accurate record of the discussions.

Welch

- Suggested that the 30-day timeframe is a convenient measure for the sake of simplicity. The key point is that if an application is submitted after this period, regardless of the number of meetings that may have occurred in between, it triggers the requirement for including minutes.
- This streamlined approach allows staff to easily identify cases where the submission has been delayed for an extended period and ensures that minutes are attached for a more comprehensive record.

- Welch suggests that the minutes should focus on pertinent details related to architectural elements and motions. Specifically, if there's a motion for revision, including a list of architectural elements with concerns is essential.
- This guidance emphasizes the importance of capturing substantive discussions and decisions in the minutes, while minimizing unnecessary or extraneous information, such as the history of the HDC or other non-essential details.
- Welch highlights a best practice related to substantive revisions: if an applicant doesn't make substantive revisions in three meetings, the HDC can recognize this and inquire about adherence to prior comments. This responsibility aligns with the first part of the potential solution, which involves requesting minutes.
- Welch suggests that the HDC can address incomplete narratives separately, cautioning applicants against providing insufficient information. This underscores that the allowance for narratives is a courtesy, and applicants are expected to provide thorough and accurate details, reminding them that the HDC is permitting this approach in lieu of waiting for detailed minutes.

Pohl

- Expressed support for the idea that if an application, especially one going for revisions and resubmitted for old business, involves contentious and complicated matters with different viewpoints, the HDC can request, along with the motion, for the minutes to be attached to the new application.
- This approach is seen as fair, aiming to separate essential details from less critical information and contribute to a clearer understanding of the discussions and decisions made during the review process.

Oliver

- Concerned about catching up on minutes and whether the person responsible for taking minutes is able to start now, potentially covering tonight's meeting and addressing the backlog. The feasibility of this approach is uncertain, and the concern is expressed that catching up on the backlog may be challenging.

Welch

- The suggestion is made for the minute's taker, to focus on transcribing tonight's meeting promptly. Similar to Terry's practice, a draft could be prepared during the same week and posted. This approach aims to contain the issue moving forward, ensuring that the narrative or detailed minutes are available soon after each meeting. The idea is to utilize the narrative for those looking back on past meetings, effectively addressing the backlog without delaying the process.

Backus

- Caution is raised regarding the dual responsibilities of the minute taker, who is also involved in other aspects of Town Administration beyond HDC. Instead of directly instructing the minutes taker, it is suggested that a request be made through Town Administration, outlining the reasons and considerations for the proposed approach.
- This recommendation emphasizes the need for effective communication with Town Administration and an understanding of the broader responsibilities and commitments of the minute's taker.

Martinez

- Mentioned having received minutes for October 3rd but notes the need to go back and review the meeting as there are some small discrepancies, likely resulting from cross-talking and other factors. Additionally, minutes for October 10th were received, but the speaker has yet to finish reviewing them.

Pohl

- Suggests the idea of formally requesting to prioritize certain items, specifically emphasizing the need to implement this approach starting tonight. The priority items mentioned include motions for revisions and the associated minutes.
- This proposal underscores the urgency of addressing and reviewing these specific elements among the various items under consideration, placing them at the highest priority for timely completion.

Welch

- Presents a candid perspective, acknowledging that in the context of an appeal, the HDC is often perceived as the "bad guy." Welch advocates for a respectful but clear request for enhanced support in terms of minutes, emphasizing that the HDC, given its nature and operations, relies heavily on accurate and timely minutes, especially in contentious or complicated matters. The need for consistent and up-to-date minutes is linked to addressing potential criticisms of the HDC's functionality.
- Welch highlights the importance of making a request to Town Administration for the necessary support to ensure that the HDC's work is not negatively impacted, particularly during appeals where the quality and timeliness of minutes can become a point of discussion.

Paul

- Presents a separate idea related to clarity and streamlining the review process. Paul suggests that applicants could use clouds to indicate changes, a practice that some applicants already follow with helpful descriptions.
- However, Paul notes the potential confusion when reviewing old business applications, as not all changes are board-requested; sometimes, designs evolve, or clients introduce changes independently.
- Paul proposes exploring a distinction between board-requested changes and other types of changes, possibly using a different type of cloud or a distinct rendering method. The goal is to facilitate a clear comparison between the before-and-after states when viewing applications.
- Paul emphasizes the importance of uniformity in presentations to enhance the efficiency of the review process, even while allowing for individual expression in how architects present their designs. This approach, while not directly addressing the minutes issue, aims to make the review process smoother by improving the clarity of change documentation in submitted applications.

Pohl

- Expresses agreement, emphasizing that some applications provide a clear and straightforward progression with existing house details through multiple submissions. In contrast, Pohl notes that other applicants may need to explain everything, and some changes may not even be adequately highlighted, which, according to Pohl, should warrant rejection but often doesn't.
- This observation underscores the need for more consistency in the presentation of changes and a potential refinement of standards for accepting or rejecting applications based on their clarity and completeness.

Welch

- Suggested, proposing that Joe sign up for the Organizational Focus Committee. This committee would review the schematic layout of projects, potentially presenting a couple of different options for consideration. The committee would then weigh in, make a recommendation, and present it to the full commission for a vote.
- This process would be part of the checklist for a complete application, including diagrams A and B for two material options. Welch emphasizes the potential efficiency gained by discussing complex projects at the Organizational Focus Committee, acknowledging that while more straightforward projects may not require such detailed review, it could greatly benefit larger or more intricate submissions.
- The overarching goal is to facilitate the HDC's work, streamline staff processes, and provide clarity for applicants, even if architects desire a more stylized presentation.

II. CONSENTS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	Denise Kronan	5 Old Quidnet rd.	Roof replacement	20/54.1	T & T Roofing	VO
2.	Kyle Snell	5 Pine Crest Dr.	Add skylight	68/424	Thornewill Design	VO
3.	32 Chuck Hollow RD LLC	32 Chuck Hollow Rd	New shed	75/68	Structure Unltd.	CP
4.	Cory Piper	37 Chuck Hollow Rd	New shed	75/108	Sanne Payne	CP
5.	37 Cato Ln LLC	37 Cato Lane	Replace all windows renew coa	56/40	Cosgriff Construction	CP
6.	Michelle Kolb	27 North Liberty St	Historic determination	41/453	Michelle Kolb	CP
7.	41 Monomoy LLC	41 Monomoy RD	Shed rev 07-6720	54/79.1	Emeritus LTD	JP
8.	57 Eel Point LLC	57 Eel Point Rd	Move off/ Demo shed	32/46	WAPD	AC
9.	John O'Toole	3 Appleton Rd	New cottage	66/389	Thornewill Design	AC
10.	John O'Toole	3 Appleton Rd	Color change, windows & doors	66/389	Thornewill Design	AC
11.	Dali & Lily Kovacevic	3 Aster Court	New dwelling	68/373	K. Megna	AC
12.	James Crosby	63 Bartlett Rd	New shed	66/439	NAG	RP
13.	Doreen Breahler	71 Pochick Ave	New shed	79/14	Atlantic Landscaping	RP
14.	79 Polpis Rd LLC	79 Polpis Rd	Cabana solar roof array	44/23.3	Ack Smart	RP
15.	79 Polpis Rd LLC	79 Polpis Rd	Gazebo solar roof array	44/23.3	Ack Smart	RP
16.	Dorothy Bailey	83 Sankaty Road	Hardscape & patio	49/91.1	Ahern LLC	RP
17.	Amanda Jacobs	1 Judith Chase Lane	Door, stoop & shutters	42.3.2/4.1	Normand Residential	SW
18.	Nol Ack LLC	2 Nobadeer Way	Addition	68/113	Reid Yenor	SW
19.	1 Twin LLC	1 Twin St	Roof replacement	42.3.2/43	James Lydon	SW
20.	Ed & Kathy Chibaro	2 Middle Tawpawshaw	New garage	53/49	Thornewill Design	SW
21.	Juan Speck	286 Polpis Rd	New covered porch	25/33	Botticelli + Pohl	SW
22.	Gita Nalami	39 Hooper Farm Rd	Roof replacement	67/127	Gita Nalami	EM
23.	James Kelly	18 Nonantum Ave	Window replacement	87/18	Reid Yenor	EM
24.	Hristo Rashkov	8 Lewis ct	New cabana	67/37	Hristo Rashkov	EM
25.	Robert Middleton	12a Surfside Drive	Railing replacement	67/331	Robert Middleton	EM

26. 14 Hussey LLC	14 Hussey St	Roof Replacement	42.3.4/132	EMDA	EM
27. Leon Francis	3 Bailey Rd	New zoning shed	56/246	Leon Francis	EM
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill				
Recused:	Pohl				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	N/A				
Staff Comments:	None				
Public Comments:	None				
Concerns:	None				
Motion: (25:49)	Motion to approve. (Oliver)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)		Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	

III. CONSENTS WITH CONDITIONS

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent	
1.	Laurel Langworthy	55 Sankaty Rd	Pool revisions	49/69	David Troast	JP
	• pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
2.	Henry Askew	5B Green Meadow Rd	Pool & patio	67/378.2	Atlantic Landscaping	VO
	• pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
3.	63 Todd Circle LLC	6 Todd Circle	Add spa to pool	66/294	Atlantic Landscaping	VO
	• Pool & spa not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool & spa to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
4.	SPF Lady Beach LLC	19 Austine Locke	Pool & hardscape	82/57	Atlantic Landscaping	em
	• pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
5.	James Crosby	63 Bartlett Rd	Pool & patio	66/439	NAG	em
	• pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
6.	Edward Mills	2 Hiawasse Lane	Pool & hardscape	56/469	Atlantic Landscaping	SW
	• Pool, spa & fire pit not visible at time of inspection or thereafter, including from Land Bank property/paths—move pool, spa, patio and fire pit layout 5' towards house and supplement that 5' depth created along rear of property with planted buffer (adjacent to Land Bank property) and in addition to what's shown in original submission, no grade change from existing.					
7.	Nina Liddle	98 Madaket Rd	Pool deck revisions	40/79.6	Julie Jordin	SW
	• pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.					
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver					
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill					
Recused:	-					
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.					
Representing:	N/A					
Staff Comments:	None					
Public Comments:	None					
Concerns:	None					
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Oliver)					
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver (Aye) / / Camp (abstain)		Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)		

IV. OLD BUSINESS 10/31/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Laura Hedrick 9384	10 Everett Ave	Demo garage	73.3.2/3	Laura Hedrick

Laura Hedrick experienced technical difficulties. The Commission returned to this item. (3:36:44)

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs		
Alternates:	Patten, Paul		
Recused:	-		
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.		
Representing:	Laura Hedrick		
Staff Comments:	Backus - Approved the move of 5 Beach Street, a 1930s Cottage, to Laura Hedrick's property at 10 Everett Ave. - The move is intended to replace the existing 1930s or 1940s garage at the same location in Sconset. - During a Halloween meeting, a split decision among four members prompted a request to hold the decision until all had a copy of the approval, eventually granted. - Laura was acknowledged for proactively preserving a contributing structure by having someone lined up to take it. - Despite initial plans for a move-off, the garage demolition is now necessary as efforts to find a taker have been unsuccessful. - Laura currently has approval for a move-off only of the garage, awaiting the relocation of the saved house from town to the same location on her property. - Pohl mentioned from the last meeting about retaining and moving an older contributing structure (3:44:51). - Acknowledged that while the existing garage is also contributing, it is younger and not in great shape. - Highlighted the importance of transforming a garage into a dwelling. - Stressed the significant aspect of moving contributing structures, noting that even when relocated out of town, they continue to contribute since there are no "donut holes" in the jurisdiction. - Confirmed support for the proposal. -		
Public Comments:	None		
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Camp - Explained that the proposal was on the verge of being voted down. A request was made to view detailed information about what exactly from 5 Beach Street was being moved to the location, as the pictures did not provide clear information. - The decision was held until more specific information about the building from 5 Beach Street could be presented. Coombs - Acknowledged some sentiment in seeing it move from its current location but anticipates it will be a valuable addition to Everett Street. Camp - Shared mixed feelings about the proposed move but ultimately expressed acceptance. - Speculated that the garage is likely from the 40s, acknowledging its crumbling and old condition. - Considered the move an improvement to the property, emphasizing the importance of ensuring it matches the trim of the main house and fits in on the lot. - Conveyed overall approval with the condition that it integrates well with the existing structures. Welch - Stated that the proposed move is a net benefit. - Indicated that while one of the structures is older, the other has more character.		
Motion:	Motion to approve, subject to replacing it with 5 North Beach Street and if it isn't moved, then the garage should be replicated. (Camp) (3:47:35)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

V. NEW BUSINESS 10/31/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. CMR 11 Osprey Way LLC	11 Osprey Way	move off /Demo primary dwg.	82/3	Chris Hall Architects
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	Welch			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Christopher Hall, Architect, Inc.			
Staff Comments:	Backus - NHL data confirmed the 1970 contributing structure within the period of significance. - The structure had the shell of a contributing element. - From a sustainability perspective, it was preferable to relocate the structure rather than demolish it.			
Public Comments:	None			
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Oliver - Asked if the buildings couldn't be used anymore due to water damage. Hall - Explained that, focusing on the mentioned structure, there was an issue with water affecting the new foundation of the moved Cottage. - An investigation into the crawl space foundation revealed high water marks near the underside of the floor joists. - The concern raised was about maintaining a mold-free and safe house in the long term. - Questioned the rationale behind investing money in renovating the structure if there was a possibility of ongoing issues. - There was consideration given to lifting the structure and placing a new foundation underneath. - However, after evaluation, it was deemed that this approach didn't align with the longer-term goals for the property. Backus - Acknowledged the proximity of the structure to Hummock Pond. - While not within a FEMA flood zone, the speaker mentioned the absence of awareness regarding FEMA flood zone guidelines. - There was a suggestion for the applicant to explore resilient net design guidelines for flooding and adaptation. Camp - Expressed appreciation for the existing Cottage. - Stated that any alterations to the Cottage could significantly impact on its character. - The observation was made that the Cottage seemed to be in a close and potentially soft (squishy) environment. - Liked the scale of the house, noting the preference for a smaller structure, especially in close proximity to a pond. Paul - Stated his preference for relocation over demolition. - Supported Camp's remarks concerning the scale of the structure. Conveyed a message to the applicant, emphasizing that if the relocation is approved, the new structure might be scrutinized with the existing building in mind. - The quirky, individually unique nature of the existing structure, with its history of additions over time, was appreciated by Paul. - Acknowledged the importance of the structure, especially in its visibility from the water. Coombs - Spoke against considering the structure for demolition, with the belief that it could be saved with less impact on the property. - Recommended to evaluate the existing foundation, considering that its appearance did not warrant immediate replacement. Pohl - Expressing a preference towards relocating the building as it didn't seem to be in derelict condition. - The idea of a new foundation was considered beneficial for the structure.			

	- Open to the possibility of exploring a replacement for the existing structure. - Agreed with other Commissioner's comments on scale and appropriateness to the site, Pohl emphasized the importance of these factors in evaluating the structure's location.
Hall	- Addressed concerns raised by their client regarding a long-term plan for the property, which includes two dwellings and a pool. - Outlined a commitment to having one-story buildings on the property, smaller than the existing house. - The intention was to hide the pool from view from any public way and maintain a design that aligns with the scale and character of the area. - Emphasized the effort put into designing a replacement that is sensitive to the surroundings and respects the scale of the existing houses along the pond.
Motion:	Motion to hold for more information. (Paul) (44:54)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)
2. CMR 11 Osprey Way LLC	11 Osprey Way move off/ Demo 2 nd dwelling 82/3 Chris Hall Architects
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	Patten
Recused:	Welch
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Christopher Hall, Architect, Inc.
Staff Comments:	Backus - Stated that the structure was moved to a lot with the address 237 Hummock Pond Road. - NHL data indicated that the structure was built in 1982. - The plans from Neil Parent suggested revisions between 1988 and 2000. - Despite a few revisions over the years, the structure was deemed a non-contributing one. - From the HDC's perspective, it did not meet the classification of a contributing structure. - There was a suggestion that, from a sustainability perspective, it would be better if the structure could be removed rather than demolished.
Public Comments:	None
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Oliver - Suggested that moving or demolishing the structure would be acceptable. - Acknowledged a valid point made about the accessibility of the road, noting that it poses challenges for removing items. - Expressed the desire for people to salvage materials from the structure before it is taken to the dumpster. Camp - No concerns. Coombs - No concerns. Paul - No concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted move off or demo. (Paul) (49:19)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)
3. Nantucket Development	8 Sconset Ave New Garage 49.3.2/28 LINK
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul
Recused:	-
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Victoria Ewing, LINK Permitting and Design
Staff Comments:	Backus - Stated that the structure is from the 1980s with an addition. - Dormers of the same nature were added to the structure. - Observations were made about the Dormers appearing to comply with building standards but being somewhat tall.
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley , Former Chairperson of the Sconset Advisory Group - Agreed with the comments made by Backus.

Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Camp - Questioned whether the roof pitch on the proposed garage matched that of the main mass. Ewing - Mentioned going through several renditions of the roof pitch on the main house. - Initially, it was mentioned that they might have started with a 12 x 12 pitch. - The final decision or conclusion was a 10 x 12 pitch for the main house. - Adjustments were made to the pitch to accommodate the Dormers, ultimately settling on 10 over 12. Coombs - Suggested changing the pitch of the roof to avoid it resembling a rocket ship. - Expressing a preference for a window on the rear elevation of the garage, contingent on whether it would be visible based on the site plan's small size. - Agreement with the consensus on dropping the roof pitch and anticipating a final height around 20.5 feet. Pohl - Suggested, upon reviewing the section, that it would be safe to drop the roof pitch to 11 and 12. - Mentioned that this adjustment would still allow the Dormers to function as they currently do. - Noted that this change would result in a reduction of approximately eight inches from the ridge height.	
Motion:	Motion to with Exhibit A (through staff) revise the paint schedule for the main house, originally approved as black sash, to white. The garage would also follow suit with white trim and white sash. Additionally, change in the roof pitch from 12 x 12 to 11 x 12, affecting the ridge but leaving the eaves unchanged. (Camp) (59:13)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)

4. Ann Teasdale 24 India St New dwelling 42.3.4/66 EMDA

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver	
Alternates:	Patten, Paul	
Recused:	-	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Representing:	Ethan McMorrow- EMDA	
Staff Comments:	Backus - Explained that this is a secondary dwelling designed to complement the main house, dated circa 1899, known as the Walter and Lydia Chase house. - Walter Chase, a captain, received a high Medal of Honor for lifesaving in 1892. - The secondary dwelling is described as a simple structure within the Old Historic District (OHD), with proposed massing and height considered appropriate. - A notable feature is a barn door on the facade, giving it the appearance of a converted barn. The concern raised is about the proposed 35-light window behind the barn door, visible from a public way, deemed highly inappropriate within the OHD. - Recommends the commission explore ways to alter the window behind the barn doors, as it is considered atypical for the district's guidelines.	
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Affirmed agreement with Backus concerning the issue of the window	
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Oliver - Expressed a positive opinion, describing the structure as a "sweet little outbuilding." - Noted that it gives the impression of being an outbuilding that has been repurposed into a house. Camp - Raised a concern about a perceived trend of installing French doors facing the street, noting it as a new phenomenon. - Acknowledged the visual appeal when the French doors are closed but expressed uncertainty about how to address this trend. - Specifically mentioned a liking for the tongue and groove doors but pointed out that they appear somewhat tall. - Conveyed a sense of uncertainty about finding a solution to the issue raised. Welch - Concurred with Camp regarding the height of the doors, suggesting they be made smaller, preferably six foot eight or shorter. - Indicated that a shorter door would result in a corresponding reduction in what's visible behind it. - Emphasized that if these doors are intended to be a reviewed and approved exterior architectural element, they should be included in the floor plan for comprehensive evaluation.	

	Coombs - Shared the view that the window is contributing, resembling the front entrance door. - Suggested that a 36-pane window might not be appropriate behind the barn doors. Pohl - Highlighted a potential lack of awareness regarding how often the doors would be open and observed. - Shared a personal viewpoint that the board might be safest by not approving the window behind the barn doors. - Raised the concern that if the doors are open regularly, and the window is visible, it might pose an issue for approval. - Emphasized the importance of considering the potential visibility of the window and the impact on approval. McMorrow - Suggested an alternative approach for the small door on the bottom left. - Proposed the idea of placing a French door behind it, incorporating a panel below, similar to what is typically seen in town.		
Motion:	Motion to have a set of French doors with a kick panel behind the barn doors not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity and ensure the kick panel's dimensions will match those of the other panels for uniformity. (Camp) (1:08:50)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-2 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver (Aye) // Welch, Coombs	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

5.	Hans Dalgaard	51 Weweeder Rd	Main House	88/12	Thornewill Designs
	Concerns:	Application not opened.			
	Motion:	No action.			
6.	43 W Miacomet LLC	43 W Miacomet Ave	Pool & hardscape	86/13.2	Jardins Intl
	Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
	Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
	Recused:	-			
	Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
	Representing:	Elisabeth O'Rourke, Jardins Intl.			
	Staff Comments:	Backus - No comments.			
	Public Comments:	Thomas Barada- 39 West Miacomet (1:61:59) - Stated that there are several issues with the hardscape plan. Firstly, the pool is situated within the setback, contrary to the indicated 25-foot setback on the plans; the actual setback is 50 feet. - The proposed Hardscape patio on the left side, facing the ocean, is on the highest part of the property. This may be visible from West Miacomet Road, especially considering the request for a stack stone sitting wall, which is deemed inappropriate for the area as there is no existing stonework of that nature. - The stone landscape patio might be visible from West Miacomet Road, posing concerns about its appropriateness for the location. The photos provided from the road are taken in a lower valley, which may not accurately represent the visibility of the patio from various vantage points. - The proposed stone sitting wall is considered unsuitable for the area, with potential visibility all the way from the Land Bank parking lot at the beach. - Additionally, there are concerns about the placement of pools at the back of the house, visible from West Miacomet Road and neighboring areas, contradicting the notion of being in the rear due to its visibility from the road. - Stated the house has been shifted forward about 20 to 25 feet, prompting concerns from the speaker and neighbors. - Emphasized the need for proper communication and notification, especially when issues may affect the neighborhood without adequate screening.			
	Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Oliver - Clarified that there is no requirement to notify neighbors for pool-related projects. - Notification is mandated only for structures or construction exceeding a certain square footage, highlighting a specific threshold for notification requirements. Welch - Clarified that HDC approval does not grant permission to violate zoning, building codes, or any other regulations.			

	- Regardless of the sequence or other considerations, it was emphasized that HDC approval doesn't necessarily mean having full information about zoning requirements. - Pointed out that zoning matters are not within the HDC's purview, and lack of discussion on zoning doesn't imply approval. - Emphasized that, even if the HDC approves something, it must still conform to the Town's bylaws and codes. - Noted that the relevance of setbacks (25 or 50 feet) is limited to zoning considerations, and any non-compliance would be addressed during the zoning enforcement officer's review, specifically mentioning Marcus Silverstein as the officer in charge of zoning reviews.		
Motion:	Motion to view and install stakes to delineate the pool and above-grade hardscape elements. (Welch) (1:22:47)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

7. NIR Retail LLC	4 Harbor Sq.	Structure rev 03-8063	42.2.4/1	WAPD
-------------------	--------------	-----------------------	----------	------

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

8. Lisa Morse	199 Madaket Rd.	Deck stairs	59/58.1	NAG
---------------	-----------------	-------------	---------	-----

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten		
Alternates:	Paul		
Recused:	-		
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.		
Representing:	Stephen Theroux, Nantucket Architecture Group		
Staff Comments:	Backus - Noted that the structure is a non-contributing one from circa 1985. - Mentioned that the existing location for the external stair was preferable as it wasn't visible, but the new location will make the stairs visible. - Described the contemporary building as having a characteristic Gable forward onto an e-forward main block. - Pointed out that the design standards for this building are very customized compared to typical standards. - Recommended, if the stair can't remain in its current location, that it be screened in some way.		
Public Comments:	None		
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Welch - No concerns. Oliver - No concerns. Patten - No concerns. Coombs - No concerns.		
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted with screening. (Oliver) (1:41:02)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

9. Whitney A Gifford, Trust	32 Pocomo Rd	Gate & fence	14/77	Emeritus LTD
-----------------------------	--------------	--------------	-------	--------------

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action. (1:41:37)

10. Jana Oddleifson	2 Dukes Rd	Move off /demo dwelling	41/187	LFW
---------------------	------------	-------------------------	--------	-----

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Linda Williams/ Spencer Cordsten McCombe
Staff Comments:	Backus - Shared the discovery of a 1935 aerial photo, indicating the main dwelling's presence at that time.

	- Clarified that the photo in discussion was from 1957, while the 1935 aerial photo was available and could be circulated among the commission. - Based on the information from NHL, suggested that the structure is at least a 1935 Colonial Revival. - Advocated for the structure to be considered for a move only, emphasizing its age and potential for reuse on-site or relocation, rather than demolition.			
Public Comments:	None			
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Coombs - Agreed with Backus' comments and recommendation. Welch - Concurred.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as a move-off. (Coombs) (1:46:02)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	
11. Jana Oddleifson	2 Dukes Rd	Move off/demo cottage	41/187	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Linda Williams/ Spencer Cordsten McCombe			
Staff Comments:	Backus - Noted that the characteristics of the contemporary structure were designed in harmony with the main structure, indicating a clear connection between the two. - Expressed satisfaction in hearing that both structures might be moved together to a similar location. - Confirmed that the contemporary structure is non-contributing and was built in 1996.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Paul - No concerns. Patten - No concerns. Welch - No concerns. Coombs - No concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Coombs) (1:47:42)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	
12. NHA	99 Main St	Fence	42.3.3/110	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Linda Williams/ Spencer Cordsten McCombe			
Staff Comments:	Backus - Highlighted the historical significance of 99 Main Street, built circa 1799 by Valentine Swain and later enlarged and remodeled by Thomas Macy in 1832. - Clarified that the proposed work is for repair, replacement, and like-kind reconstruction, with the exception of support provided by Sona tubes and concrete. - Mentioned that assistance from Ben Moore would be acquired to mill and build the fence, and Russell Harms would set down the posts with J bolts, following the proposed plan. - Emphasized the importance of reconstructing the fence in its exact location, using the same existing brick and granite mix. - Stressed that no work outside the property line, within the public way or sidewalk, should be conducted. - Expressing appreciation for the restoration efforts, noting the historical photographs of the fence that exist and the positive impact of seeing it being restored.			
Public Comments:	Edwin Rudd, Nantucket Historical Association - Stated the plan is to rebuild the fence exactly as it was. - The proposed modification is to add a granite block underneath the main posts to prevent rotting. - Additionally, Sona tubes will be placed underneath the granite, and a J Bolt will run through the granite into the fence for added stability.			

	- Clarification was provided regarding the visibility of the granite. On the left side, facing the house, no granite would be visible. On the right side, there would be a gradual appearance of granite, limited to four to five inches. Mickey Rowland - Noted the presence of a short brick and granite wall below the bottom rail of the fence in various locations. - Stated that they are fine with the replacement of this wall as long as it replicates the current appearance. - Mentioned a previous suggestion of moving it inward towards the plantings, but clarified that maintaining its current location would also be acceptable. - Expressed the opinion that the railings should continue to return to the house, similar to their current configuration. Williams - Clarified that the mentioned railings are, in fact, gates. - Explained that the plan is for the railing to return for a short distance (about two or three feet) before transitioning into gates. - Acknowledged concerns raised by Camp about the gates and expressed a willingness to reinstall them. - Mentioned the need for creative hardware solutions to facilitate easy removal when necessary for gardening within that area.		
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Welch - Suggested that the treatment of the brick should continue, advocating for consistency on both sides. - Noted that, due to the removal of some brick along the sidewalk for the project, there would be access to the brick underneath the fence on the left side. - Stressed the importance of maintaining the same treatment for continuity, even if it means seeing only a small portion of brick in certain locations. Camp - Expressed satisfaction with the new foundation underneath. - Expressed a previous concern about the 24-inch gate and was relieved to hear that it would be reconstructed and put back, addressing the initial omission. Oliver - No concerns. Coombs - No concerns. Backus - Recommended that Rudd reach out to Erica Mooney at Town Administration regarding any proposed work on the sidewalk. - Emphasized the importance of ensuring proper authorization and permissions before proceeding with the proposed work.		
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Welch) (2:01:15)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

13. KMS126 NT	126R Main St	Reno Relocate Garage	42.3.3/98.1	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Linda Williams/ Spencer Cordsten McCombe			
Staff Comments:	Backus - Referred to an HDC survey on file for a garage dating back to Circa 1915, marked as a contributing structure. - Appreciated the proposal's focus on renovating the garage rather than demolishing and reconstructing it.			

	- Noted that previous proposals to demolish were denied, and a subsequent application for demolition and reconstruction was withdrawn in anticipation of a new application, which is currently under consideration. - Highlighted that even though the proposal includes moving the garage on-site, it will still be visible from the public way, aligning with historical appropriateness. - Expressed concerns about the proposed fenestration, emphasizing that the garage doors should resemble the existing triple French doors, and stating the large fold-up window as inappropriate. - Advocated for all fenestration to be True Divided Light (TDL) on a historic structure within the Old Historic District (OHD). - Stated that the garage's design should reflect the time when it was predominantly used for vehicles on the island, maintaining a simple aesthetic.
Public Comments:	Backus - Read a statement received via email just prior to the meeting from Mary Bergman. In the email, Ms. Bergman: - Raised questions about efforts made to restore or stabilize the building in the 10 months that followed the denial. - Expressed concerns about the potential message conveyed to future applicants if plans to move and rebuild, effectively demolishing the structure, are approved. Suggested that this might be perceived as an indication that the HDC could reverse its decision if an applicant waits long enough. Kevin Toth (2:08:59) - Expressed gratitude to the HDC for its efforts in preserving the historic legacy of Nantucket. - Urged the HDC to rely on the same reasoning used to deny the demolition of the structure earlier in the year and to deny the current proposal, seen as a thinly veiled attempt to reconsider the decision. - Emphasized the historic significance of the Saltbox garage, over 100 years old and dating back to the introduction of automobiles on the island. - Stressed that allowing the garage to be moved would erode the historical character of the island. - Argued that the current application is a "demolition in disguise," as the structure is claimed to be in poor condition, and the setback issue cited is a result of the developer's actions during subdivision. - Contended that the desire to move the historic building is merely to facilitate the construction of another new house behind it. - Criticized the applicant for neglecting the maintenance of the historic building under their ownership, leading to visible deterioration. - Called on the HDC to exercise its authority to order the maintenance and repair of historic buildings and to view with disapproval owners who allow neglect as a justification for demolition or relocation. - Requested that the historic outbuilding receives the maintenance it deserves and is preserved in its original historic location.
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Camp - Expressed appreciation for preserving the old saltbox shape, describing it as a pure form with perfect dimensions. - Stated a preference for the structure to remain in its current location, as it makes sense when viewed up the driveway, evoking a historical context. - Mentioned concerns about the flush Dormer, deeming it inappropriate, and suggested that if Dormers were necessary, they should be pushed up and made more historically aligned. - Proposed an alternative design with windows and a simple set of French doors as a more fitting option. Oliver - Acknowledged the possible function of the Dormer to provide height for the doors in the back, suggesting that it could be adjusted to snug around the door if necessary. - Expressed agreement with concerns about the proportions of the fold-up window, emphasizing that it lacks panes and is out of balance with the overall design. - Stated that having five French doors and a carriage door in a small structure seems excessive, recommending the elimination of some elements, particularly on the West Side. - Preferred keeping carriage doors, considering them appropriate, while expressing an understanding for the desire to retain the existing overhead door for practical reasons related to cars. Coombs - Raised a question about the design, specifically questioning the purpose of the Dormer on the South Elevation, given the absence of windows or other features that would utilize the head height provided by the Dormer. - Suggested that the garage doors should resemble the wooden ones shown in the proposed North Elevation. - Expressed confusion about the design choice on the South Elevation, noting the presence of French doors with a kick panel and the Dormer but without additional windows or features.

	- Described the East Elevation as simple but raised concerns about the design, particularly questioning the loss of historic charm due to the incorporation of French doors and an unclear window feature. - Emphasized the importance of maintaining the building as close as possible to its original form. Welch - Expressed concerns about the character of the proposed doors, suggesting they are not in keeping with the historic nature of the building. - Inquired about the purpose of moving the structure five feet. Williams - Clarified that the purpose of moving the structure five feet is to get it out of the setback. - Mentioned that the East Side cannot be touched due to property boundaries and its deteriorated condition. Welch - Highlighted concerns about the inappropriateness of the proposed Dormer on the West and East elevations. - Suggested that the top plate height of the Dormer on the South elevation doesn't align well with the doors below. - Emphasized the importance of considering a smaller move for the garage (around three feet) to preserve the historic character without jeopardizing it. - Raised the need for documentation of the structural elements to be retained before making a decision on the proposal. Pohl - Supported the idea of having vertical board doors with strap hinges for the garage doors facing north (Main Street). - Suggested removing lights from the doors to maintain a simple barn-like appearance. - Advocated for pulling back the triple doors and the large window on the south elevation, emphasizing the need for better alignment. - Discussed the placement of the building, expressing agreement with the relocation due to historical variations in Sanborn maps. - Acknowledged the visibility of the structure from Main Street even in its new location and reiterated the preference for specific door characteristics.		
Motion:	Motion to hold the application for further review, incorporating provisions for an inventory of the structure elements to be retained. Additionally, to seek clarification on the necessity of moving the structure three feet instead of five. (Welch) (2:24:51)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

14. Matthew Stone	47 Milk Street	Rev Pool Location	56/201	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Linda Williams/ Spencer Cordsten McCombe			
Staff Comments:	Backus - No comments			
Public Comments:	None			
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Oliver - Stated that the current proposal shows a deviation from the previous approval.			

	- Notable changes include the absence of certain hardscaping elements: retaining walls, stairs, and a separate spa. - Questions and concerns have been raised regarding these modifications. - Observed that the current proposal does not depict any of the mentioned hardscaping elements. Welch - Concerns raised about the grade in the current proposal. - Previous approval indicated a grade of 42 feet, while the new plan shows 43 feet. - The inclusion of three steps at 8 inches each contributes to the increase in grade. - Mention of retaining walls in the previous design, and the absence of these features in the current proposal may be related to the grade issues. - Emphasis on the need for clear and self-evident drawings to avoid confusion and ensure transparency in the project. - Inconsistencies noted in the grade markings. - Unclear interpretation of "42 times 0" in comparison to other grade markings. - The use of different vocabulary for grade notations, specifically mentioning "patio 42" and "times 0," causing confusion. - Request for clarification and more straightforward communication of grade information in the drawings. Oliver - Inquired about the purpose and location of thicker shaded areas on the drawings. - Specifically, seeking clarification on whether these shaded areas represent proposed retaining walls and their respective locations. Coombs - Noting the observation of numerous houses on a single property. - Inquiring about the remaining square footage on the property that has not been developed. Williams - Providing information on the percentage of ground coverage (21%). - Mentioning that they have a 30% allowance, indicating they are under the limit. - Describing the lot size as 19,000 square feet in a 5,000-foot zone.		
Motion:	Motion to hold to gather more information about the height of retaining walls and clarification on changes, such as the spa and its relocation outside the pool area. (Welch) (2:33:47) (2:35:25)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

15. 5 Surfside Road LLC 5 Surfside Rd Pool & Hardscape 55/253 LFW

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul
Recused:	-
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Linda Williams/ Spencer Cordsten McCombe
Staff Comments:	Backus - Stated that the property in question was the Grimes house, dating back to the 1900s. - Noted that the owners were undergoing a historic tax credit process. - Explained that the pool and Hardscape had not been submitted for historic tax credit review at that time. - Mentioned that the pool and patio, while large, might not have been visible from Surf Side Road. - Suggested that the patio design could have been softer with less harsh edges.
Public Comments:	-

Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Welch - Expressed concern about doors installed backward on the garage, finding them atypical and inappropriate. - Noted that the doors' reversal of the typical support structure was not visible on a typical door. - Mentioned concerns about improperly sized shutters. Coombs - Mentioned the presence of a significant tulip tree (1 of 3 in the area) in the backyard. - Clarified that the tree is not near the proposed pool area. - Shared personal involvement in securing the tree as a “town-owned tree.” - Suggested adding photographs to make the plan clearer. - Expressed agreement regarding concerns about the garage doors and shutters. Welch - No concerns with the pool.		
	Motion:		
	Motion to approve as submitted. (Welch) (2:42:39)		
	Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-2 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver (Aye) // Camp, Coombs	Certificate #

16. Valerie Osley	305 Polpis Rd	Fence	25/9.7	Sandcastle Const
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Robert Newman			
Staff Comments:	Backus - Highlighted the visibility of the site due to the undergrowth, expressing familiarity as a local resident. - Mentioned the atypical nature of the proposed fence for the area and suggested considering a split rail fence, which is more typical in the neighborhood.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Welch - Mentioned a longstanding guideline about installing fences. - Noted that fences could be on the property line with Vining material, citing the example of a climbing hydrangea. - Described the need to cut a portion of the bottom panel for plant material to grow on both sides. - Suggested having the fence just far enough from the property line to allow for planting five feet of Vining material or vegetation. Pohl - Concurred. Coombs - No concerns. Paul - Suggested the possibility of a landscape solution, emphasizing the potential visibility from the driveway and expressing a preference for a split rail fence. Welch - Noted the potential conflict with rural roads guidelines, suggesting that an extensive amount of fence might be frowned upon or indicated as inappropriate. - Stressed the inappropriateness of the proposed fence, particularly if visible. - Recommended exploring alternatives, such as selective areas for fencing or addressing specific concerns with birming and planting.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Coombs) (2:53:24)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Welch, Pohl (Aye)		Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

17. Lauren Gudonis Trust	69 Hulbert Ave	Replace all windows	29/6	Jeff Morash
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Jeff Morash			
Staff Comments:	Backus - Confirmed that 69 Hulbert Avenue is a contributing structure, a Colonial Revival built around 1926. - Mentioned the existence of a draft Form B and an ongoing survey to document the structure.			

	- Noted the character-defining feature of 12-over-12 windows on the facade facing Hulbert Avenue and expressed appreciation for the intention to retain them. - Encouraged a window survey to identify replacements, given the historic nature of the structure. - Appreciated the shift to Boston sash and mentioned the absence of concerns if mutttons match the historic profile. - Acknowledged the challenge of identifying replaced windows but welcomed the positive changes in the proposal.		
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Concurred with Holly's comments, emphasizing agreement with the preference for retaining 12-over-12 wood windows. - Indicated acceptance of window replacements if they have already occurred and proposed replacements align with the historic style.		
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	No concerns stated by the Commissioners. Welch - Because the previously provided proposal to convert the 12-over-12 windows to 6-over-6, requested an update to reflect the desired 12-over-12 configuration, as shown on the current digital submission.		
Motion:	Motion to approve the application as submitted, specifying the use of 12-over-12 windows with Boston sash. (Welch) (2:58:04)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

18. John Fones	126 Somerset Rd	New Dwelling	66/151	Val Oliver
----------------	-----------------	--------------	--------	------------

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul		
Alternates:	-		
Recused:	Oliver		
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.		
Representing:	Val Oliver		
Staff Comments:	-		
Public Comments:	-		
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Welch - Suggested to bury the window headers on the second floor into the top plates. Paul - Stated that the building was considered appropriate due to its location set far back from the street. - Suggested to reconsider the four-panel front door, similar to the one on the side. Patten - Concurred with the door suggestion. Coombs - Suggested considering adding a rail on the left side of the four-panel door, extending it to frame the door and terminating at waist height. Pohl - Concurred with Paul.		
Motion:	Motion to approve, subject to Exhibit A (through staff) front door to be modified using the side door type, lowering the top plates on the second floor, and modifying the baluster and railing. (Welch) (3:04:26)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

19. John Fones	126 Somerset Rd	Garage	66/151	Val Oliver
----------------	-----------------	--------	--------	------------

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Val Oliver
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns/Questions/ Comments:	Welch - Inquired about colors for the previously discussed item. - Oliver confirmed: natural weather sand tone, Sash, and Essex Green Door. - Regarding this application, the use of natural weather corner boards was immensely helpful as it eliminated the perceived "rocket ship" effect that white corner boards would create. Paul - No concerns.

	Patten - No concerns. Coombs - Suggested adding two windows on the first floor, south facing the road, to achieve balance. Pohl - Noted that the structure feels very tall in relation to its footprint. - Described it as appearing boxy. - Identified the South elevation facing the road as the least impressive or dynamic. - Expressed uncertainty about how to address the issue, mentioned it might be related to the narrow volume in proportion to its height, being full two stories. Welch - Considered suggesting fenestration on the first floor of the South elevation. - Echoed Diane's proposal of placing one window on the second floor centered on the Gable and another on the first floor. - Emphasized the need for first-floor fenestration to improve the overall design. Discussion ensued during which Commissioner's suggested that the South elevation needs more fenestration at a minimum. Proposed the idea of adding lattice, expressing openness to a lattice pattern.
--	---

Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff), which includes lattice on the south face, covering at least 75% of the open shingled area, with a specific lattice pattern with six inches on center vertically and horizontally. (Welch) (3:10:11)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

20. 45 Shawkemo Rd LLC 45 Shawkemo Rd Hardscape Rev 2021-10-4894 27/18 Ahern LLC

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul		
Alternates:	-		
Recused:	-		
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.		
Representing:	Miroslava Ahern		
Staff Comments:	-		
Public Comments:	-		
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Oliver - Expressed acceptance, stating that it's okay, acknowledging its very atypical. Paul - Expressed the belief that the proposed feature won't be visible as it will be screened with other parts of the landscape. - Pointed out the potential for an organic shape due to the material, providing a more natural feel than a stone wall. - Stated the opinion that the steel will blend in well and is appropriate given its expected lack of visibility. Welch - Concurred with Paul. Coombs - Stated that if they are buried and tucked in such a way that they are not visible, suggested giving them a try.		
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted, due to a lack of visibility. (Paul) (3:17:48)		
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)

21. Robert Atlee 4 Sunset Hill Rd. Window & door change 41/502 S. Metz

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten,		
Alternates:	Paul		
Recused:	-		
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.		
Representing:	Sophie Metz		
Staff Comments:	Backus - HDC survey on file from the 1989 effort, indicating a Circa 1930 structure that aligns with the 1926 date. - Noted the need for window surveys, emphasizing the importance of photographs for age and condition assessment. - Stressed that veneer is inappropriate in the Old Historic District (OHD), especially for a contributing structure, and appreciated the retention of character-defining six-over-one windows.		

	- Acknowledged the appropriateness of the colonial revival front door for a Circa 1930s or possibly 1920 structure, recommending keeping it rather than changing it to a different style. - Suggested that changing the garage door in the 1970's garage edition is appropriate, expressing appreciation for the sensitivity to the contributing structure but recommending one with fewer lights.
Public Comments:	Rowland - Concurred with Backus. - Expressed concern about the brick foundation, assuming it's a veneer, and the potential conflict with the shingle plane if applied directly to the concrete block. - Emphasized the need for the foundation to be recessed behind the shingles to avoid surface conflicts. - Raised questions about the front window in the basement, noting that a typical foundation window would be recessed into the foundation wall without the possibility of shutters, suggesting a more minimal brick mold casing
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Pohl - Clarified the understanding of veneer, highlighting the specific approach used. - Described the bricks as literal bricks that are cut and can be mortared onto surfaces, essentially creating a brick appearance without the full thickness. Camp - Admired the design and believed it added a certain period style, possibly reminiscent of an 1840s house or a story and a half structure, noting its authentic appearance - Explored options for the foundation, suggesting parge and paint as an alternative to brick for an aged look. - Proposed the possibility of veneer with gray paint to tone down the overall effect. - Expressed satisfaction with changes made, including drawing the front porch back and adding boards, while appreciating the sunroom. - Suggested reconsidering the shutter on the basement, considering it might be a bit cutesy, and recommended waiting to see if it's necessary. - Mentioned that the garage doors could benefit from being toned down a bit. Oliver - Commended Ms. Metz for consistently doing an amazing job and expressed gratitude for her work. - Shared a similar appreciation for the proposed front door. Patten - Concurred with the previous comments. Coombs - Suggested removing the shutters on the window in the basement. - Proposed the idea of a 6-over-1 window, similar to the ones at the back of the basement, as a replacement for the existing 3-over-3 window. - Noted the availability of space to fill in the whole foundation, creating a consistent look for basement windows. - Expressed appreciation for the overall work. Pohl - Expressed liking the new fretwork piece on the door, finding it reminiscent of the Light Ship Museum and charming. - Mentioned it also bringing to mind the houses on Darling Street with twin structures and an X foundation. - Appreciated the clarification about the veneer brick, acknowledging that padding it out for insulation could resolve the issue of conflicting planes with shingles. - Favored changing to a brick foundation, particularly the "Nantucket veneer brick", and noted that the shutters would need to be removed the basement window.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with the exclusion of shutters on the basement window and adding a brick molding trim to the window in the basement. (Camp) (3:34:12)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Patten (Aye) // Coombs was not audible during the vote.
Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

22. Richmond Meadows II

20 Nancy Ann In

Commercial dwelling revs

68/339.1

KOH

Concerns: Application not opened. (3:35:12)**Motion:** No action.

Laura Hedrick experienced technical difficulties but is now available to discuss her item, 10 Everett Ave Demo garage. The Commission returned to Item 1 – Listed under Old Business – 10/31/23. (3:36:44)

VI. OLD BUSINESS 11/07/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Luckity Trust LLC	Tuckernuck	Alteration to existing	96/8	Val Oliver
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Val Oliver			
Staff Comments:	Backus - Introduced the historical context of the Circa 1893 Chapel and the available Form B HDC survey from 2001, emphasizing its extensive history. - Provided insights into the builder's background, a crew member of the Muskeget Life-Saving Station, contributing to the historical significance of Tuckernut. - Informed the commission about efforts to gather expert opinions from former members of the Advisory Group in Tuckernut, detailing comments received from Mr. Michael Taylor and Susan Robinson. - Summarized Mr. Michael Taylor's positive comments on the restoration plans, and specific queries about window replacement, chimney movement, and the preservation of certain elements. - Positive feedback received from Mr. Michael Taylor, mentioning that the new porch design is sensible and in keeping with the adjacent twin sister house with a similar design. - Noted that the twin sister house is believed to be part of the Dunham family. - Mr. Michael Taylor expressed the hope that the three-seater outhouse, reminiscent of a previous period, would be retained, even though it is non-usable. Backus noted that it is referenced in their Form B - Highlighted Susan Robinson's remarks about the original front door location on the south elevation and the east door was the kitchen door, acknowledgment of window and door repair and retention, and the mention of the character-defining chimney. - Backus expressed sadness about the removal of the chimney, considering it a character-defining feature that has been on the structure for a long time. - Indicated that despite the sentiment, if the proposed location and height comply with building codes, it would be in accordance with regulations.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Camp - Expressed concern about moving the chimney, noting that the proposed location doesn't align with where one would typically find it on a 19th-century house. - Acknowledged difficulty in understanding the existing location of the chimney. - Despite reservations about the chimney, expressed satisfaction with the porch design, highlighting its similarity to the sister building with cupola, add-ons, and similar additive massing. Coombs - Noted observations about the moved chimney, particularly the brick chimney on the west elevation. - Recognized the efforts to keep some chimneys, expressing appreciation as it aligns well with the house and its sister structure, considering it a commendable job. Patten - Expressed appreciation for all the changes and conveyed overall positive sentiments. Paul - Shared a preference for the lightness of the fascia on the porch of the sister house, suggesting eliminating the stack beam and pushing it up into the rafters to replicate the levity of the precedent porch roof. - Pointed out that on the precedent house, the Gable end emphasizes the center line, while as a side porch, a shed roof might be more appropriate. - Noted that the cheek wall of the shed porch feels top-heavy with thinner columns. - Suggested that transitioning to a hip roof could lighten up the porch, and eliminating the beam might result in just a shingle line. - Conveyed approval for all the submitted changes, expressing satisfaction with everything presented. Welch - Agreed with the concern related to the fascia on the shed porch, specifically mentioning the removal of the fascia to have just a shingle wall, irrespective of lightening up the overall length of it.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff), including the removal of the double fascia off the roof on the north elevation and including the shingles on the cheek walls. (Camp) (3:59:16)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)	Certificate #	HDC2023 – (as noted)	
2. Graux Dahlin	12 Darling St	Fenestration revision	42.3.2/115	Gryphon Architects

Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	Pohl
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Ethan Griffin
Staff Comments:	Backus - Provided information about the property, identifying it as a Circa 1842 Greek Revival half Cape with a draft HDC approval. - Highlighted the individually significant nature of the structure, built by John Kelly Sears, and mentioned that the proposed fenestration change on the rear pertains to a contemporary addition. - Acknowledged the visibility of the proposed change from Pine Street. - Expressed support for the proposed revisions, particularly endorsing the wraparound configuration on the west elevation for the porch infill.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Agreed with Holly's comments and expressed support for the glassed-in porch concept. - Suggested fully glassing in the porch instead of having shingled corners for a more cohesive glassed-in appearance.
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Coombs - Concurred with Mickey Rowland's suggestions. - Suggested extending the glassed-in porch concept all the way by incorporating glass windows on both sides, eliminating the shingles or brick for a seamless and fully enclosed appearance. Paul - Supported Mickey's suggestion of making the porch all glass to clearly convey its porch function. - Proposed incorporating two windows on the sides and suggested that the drawn configuration with a little shingle area might work. - Overall, in agreement with the idea of making the porch feel more like a porch. Oliver - Concurred with the previous comments. Welch - Expressed support for making the infill look more like a porch, suggesting more windows, particularly wider ones, spaced to mimic columns at 8 or 10-foot intervals. - Recommended experimenting with the design to create the illusion of some elements looking like posts while others appear as non-structural spacers. - Raised concerns about achieving this effect with the proposed six-over-six windows. Camp - Suggested adding two more windows to the existing five on the upper portion to create a more cohesive look and referred to it as a sun porch. Welch - Emphasized that historically, porch windows are typically wider and often a two-light sliding configuration, suggesting a departure from the appearance of other windows.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff), adding more windows to the South elevation, making it seven windows with well-balanced elements in between, and changing the single window on the sides to a double window. (Paul) (4:09:17)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-1 // Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) // Welch (Nay) Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)

3. Robert Stock **08-9002** – 50 Squam Rd As-built fence 13/31 Robert Stock
NO ACTION

- *Commissioners: Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None Recused: None.*

4. Rob Sarkisian **03-8052** 8 North Mill St Main house revisions 55.4.44/78.2 Topham Designs

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten
Alternates:	-
Recused:	Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Joe Topham
Staff Comments:	Backus - Expressed appreciation for the revisions made, particularly the decision to make the garage a separate structure. However, there was a suggestion to update the site plan to remove the connector.

	- Concerns were raised about the fenestration on the North elevation, emphasizing the need for a more traditional appearance, including single or double-hung windows instead of ganged windows. - Stressed the importance of adhering to traditional additive massing principles and recommended referencing building with Nantucket in mind for guidance. - Specific adjustments were proposed, such as switching the Gable with the connector to align with traditional additive massing principles. - It was noted that a two-story Gable is atypical for the South elevation, and the recommendation was made to switch the Gable with the connector for a more historically accurate design. - Additionally, there was a suggestion to coordinate visual axes on the facade, aligning the front door within the third Bay for a traditional look in the four-bay structure.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Quoting relevant sections from "Building with Nantucket in Mind," emphasizing the importance of new constructions being compatible with adjacent buildings to contribute to the overall harmony of the street. - Concern was raised that the proposed two-story building would dominate and detract from the existing context, rather than strengthening it, suggesting that the scale should closely relate to neighboring one-and-a-half-story houses and the rural feel. - Suggested to make the south elevation more symmetrical with dormers on both sides of the Saltbox roof. - On the north elevation facing Angola Street, Rowland advocated for traditional additive massing, with segments of the house stepping down, rather than a low connector to a taller mass. - It was noted that the windows in the connector are out of scale with the rest of the house. - The main concern revolved around the height of the main mass, with a recommendation to lower it and slightly raise the middle section to address the issue without compromising the program. Ann Davis, 15 Mill Street - Expressed the hope that all attendees had the opportunity to review a letter from the Neighborhood Preservation Group. - Indicated that she would read sections of the letter relevant to each application and provide physical copies of the letter to the HDC Commissioners. - Emphasized that the walls and retainage, as well as the overall size, massing, and orientation of the structure, were significant concerns raised in previous meetings (April 4th and May 30th). - Mentioned not repeating points about the importance of aligning with the spirit and style of the one and a half-story houses on the Garden of the Sea. - Should the Commissioners decide to accept the orientation of the house towards North Mill, the Neighborhood Preservation Group suggests potential ways to mitigate the modern appearance of the 62-foot-long mass facing the Garden of the Sea. They recommend measures such as telescoping, lowering the middle section, and removing the shed dormer to enhance consistency with the surrounding houses that overlook the open space. - Highlighted the majority recommendation for the house to face Angola Street and suggested potential ways to mitigate the modern appearance facing the Garden of the Sea. - The letter was signed by various individuals in the community, including Sam and Janet Bailey, Pam Clark, Jim and Pamela Chapman, Chuck and Ann Davis, Patrick and Dez Warren, Gregory and Annabelle Folks, Bob and Margorie Carman, Allan and Darina McKelvie, Bob and Antina Miklos, Anne Mueller, Redmond David, Pat Balman, Christine Sanford, Philip and Merl Strange, Bill Wilmont and Joan Taylor, Elizabeth Mueller Wales, Andon Ville, Little, Gerylyn Brewer, and Henry Mueller. Robert Sarkisian, Owner - Mentioned working extensively with the neighborhood for the past seven months and highlights a positive response from Bob Miklos regarding the substantial changes made to the house design in response to Mill Street Neighbors and the HDC. - Expressed a desire for the board to acknowledge these efforts and allow him to proceed.
Concerns/Questions/Comments:	Camp - Emphasized the prominence of the corner of North Mill Street and Angola and advocated for the orientation of the house to face Angola, with additive massing going up the hill. - Explained her rationale is that the corner is highly visible, especially when approaching from New Dollar Lane or Candlestick. - Suggested having the house face Angola, like the neighboring house they're working on, would look more historically relative. - Expressed a preference for seeing the front of the house rather than the side. - Stated that while she doesn't have issues with the architecture, her main concern is the orientation. Coombs - Emphasized the importance of the project and echoes the suggestion to have the house ascend the hill rather than extending along Angola.

	- Expressed a desire to see efforts made to address the massing, especially given the perceived massive view from certain angles. - Suggested reducing the length along Angola and making the architecture simpler, referencing the need for compatibility with the streetscape. - Stressed the importance of fitting the house into the context of the surrounding homes along Angola Street. - Advocated for maintaining the height but changing the orientation to better integrate with the neighborhood. Patten - Appreciated the separation of the garage from the main house but expressed concerns about the orientation facing Angola and North Mill. - Emphasized the need to lower the main mass of the house to better align with the surrounding context. Welch - Stated he will not be addressing the orientation. - Commended the architectural alterations, particularly highlighting the effective separation between the garage and the main house. - Voiced reservations about the orientation facing Angola and North Mill, advocating for a repositioning of the main mass. - Specific recommendations included pushing back the garage, suggesting a wood flush deck if it remains above grade, and addressing non-traditional windows on the North elevation. - Recommended modifying the connector's roof, proposing potential adjustments to the triple windows for consistency, and supporting the changes made on the East and South elevations. Pohl - Expressed a preference to face North Mill Street rather than Angola. - Appreciated that the larger mass of the house is directed away from the Garden by the Sea, with smaller additive masses closer to the garden, creating a better scale. - Suggested “tidying up” the Angola Street elevation, emphasizing the need for a more cohesive arrangement of windows. - Proposed the possibility of a single-story shed or element between existing windows for better additive massing and transitioning to the two-story structure. - Commended the separation of the garage as a positive change. Camp - Emphasized the need for the Angola Street side of the house to be well-organized, resembling the front of a house to create a visually appealing composition when viewed from that angle.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions (Camp) (4:53:59)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye) Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)

Rest held for next meeting-

5.	Rob Sarkisian	8 North Mill St	Studio/ garage	55.4.4/78.2	Topham Designs
	• <i>New business to track with main house</i>				
6.	Rob Sarkisian	8 North Mill St	Hardscape	55.4.4/78.2	Mitchell Designs
	• <i>New business to track with main house.</i>				
7.	Adam Glick	31 Eel Point Rd	New dwelling	39/52	WAPD
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: Paul, Pohl; Recused: None.</i>				
8.	WSH Holding LLC 10-9288	1 Sconset Ave	Pool & patio	73.4.1/8	Atlantic Landscaping
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: Welch, Thornewill Recused: None.</i>				
9.	Dennis Weller	8 Walsh St	Hardscape	42.4.1/83	Weller Arch
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused: Coombs.</i>				
10.	Geoffrey Tressell 08-8965	26 Rabbit Run Rd	Addition	28/9	Ben Herter
	• <i>Commissioners: Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Coombs; Alternates: None; Recused: None.</i>				
11.	Ack Midisland LLC 08-8888	18-26 Sparks Ave	New mixed used building	55/231.1	LFW
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul, Alternates: None, Recused: Oliver, Coombs.</i>				
12.	SeaHero LLC 05-8447	12 Pilgrim Rd	New dwelling	41/476	LFW
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Thornewill; Alternates: None; Recused: None.</i>				
13.	SeaHero LLC 05-8450	12 Pilgrim Rd	New shed	41/476	LFW
	• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Thornewill; Alternates: None; Recused: None.</i>				

VII. NEW BUSINESS 11/14/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Forby the Sea LLC	4 Harborview Way	Omit spa	42.4.1/30	Forby the Sea LLC
2. HWGC Property LLC	7a Sherburne Rp	Studio revision	30/112.1	Studio PPark
3. HWGC Property LLC	7a Sherburne Rp	Main dwelling revision	30/112.1	Studio PPark

4.	Frank Viano	7a Crooked Lane	New Garage	41/80.1	Val Oliver
5.	f 15 CHR LLC	8 Chuck Hollow Rd	Addition & Porch	72/31	Val Oliver
6.	2SP LLC	2 South Pasture rd.	Windows revisions	80/297.2	Brook Meerbergen
7.	3 Willard ST Trust	3 Willard St	Roof replacement	42.4.1/18	T & T Roofing
8.	44 Monomoy LLC	44 Monomoy Rd	Patio, pergola, walkways	54/72	David Champoux
9.	44 Monomoy LLC	44 Monomoy Rd	Move shed	54/72	David Champoux
10.	Shenandoah Trust	40 Easton St	Color change	42.1.4/20	Botticelli + Pohl
11.	Amanda Jacobs	1 Judith Chase Lane	Hardscape, fence & steps	42.3.2/4.1	Julie Jordin
12.	4 Ray Court Nt	4 Rays Court	Rev COA 04-6226	42.3.2/3	Normand Residential
13.	Amelia Wilson	5 New St	Remove & rebuild chimney	73.4.2/15	Normand Residential
14.	Four Quaker LLC	4 Quaker Rd	Roof replacement	41.5.2/4	James Lydon
15.	C. DiPerro	76 Sankaty Rd	Alterations & addition	49/112	Topham Design
16.	C. DiPerro	76 Sankaty Rd	New zoning shed	49/112	Topham Design
17.	C. DiPerro	76 Sankaty Rd	New pool	49/112	Topham Design
18.	Harold Brothers Realty LLC	2 & 4 Highland Ave	Add roofwalk/outdoor shower rev	30/187/289	Emeritus LTD
19.	Harold Brothers Realty LLC	6 Highland Ave	Revisions to coa 01-7684	30/288	Emeritus LTD
20.	Amy Rowland	3 Pawguet Ln	Main house rev coa	30/128	Normand Residential
21.	Kathryn Graham	11 Priscilla Lane	Fenestration chngs	41/351	DTA
22.	89 Easton St	89 Easton St	Fenestration change & sm addition	41/351	BPC
23.	Melissa Layman	3 Cottage Ct	Add new dormers	55.4.1/141	DTA
24.	Katherine Littlefield	3 Franklin St	Chimney revisions	41/267	Normand Residential
25.	Katherine Littlefield	3 Franklin St	Studio fenestration revisions	41/267	Normand Residential
26.	41 Monomoy LLC	41 Monomoy RD	Omit chimney rev 03-5883	54/79.1	Emeritus LTD
27.	IAMDUMMY LLC	77 Eel Point RD	Beach stairs rev 05-6300	32/44	JB Studio
28.	41 Hulbert LLC	41 Hulbert Ave	MH revisions	29/18	Botticelli + Pohl
29.	Sea Daze LLC	27 Baxter Rd	Raise portion & fenestration rev	49.2.3/10	Botticelli + Pohl
30.	23 Sankaty Trust	23 Sankaty Head Rd	Sm addition & remove dormers	48/4.1	BPC
31.	23 Sankaty Trust	23 Sankaty Head Rd	2 nd floor addition & fenestration	48/4.1	BPC

POTENTIAL ITEMS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

- Discussion of Previously Approved Best Practices.
- Classification of street trees & vegetating mapping
- Discussion of Wind Turbines -
- Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, Intro (update as needed)
- Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings
- Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new Historic dwellings
- Hardscaping
- Discussion of salvaging demos
- Discussion of options for house moves

OTHER BUSINESS

Next HDC Meeting- November 21st at 4pm ***HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:55pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZHIRK4lkqkk&t=160s>

Nantucket Old Historic District ‘Sconset Old Historic District