



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 21, 2023

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:20p.m. and announcements by Chair Pohl	
Staff in Attendance:	Esmeralda Martinez , Land Use Specialist, Adrian Rodriguez , Administrative Specialist & Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist, Holly Backus , Preservation Planner, Billy Saad , Zoning Administrator & Land Use Specialist
Attending Members:	Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul
Remote Participants:	Coombs
Absent Members:	Pohl, Patten, Thornewill
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	Coombs left the meeting at 7:41pm.

MODIFICATION OF AGENDA	
Motion:	Motion to modify Consent with Conditions, Item #3 -to add retain existing light post and light housing. (Welch)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs Paul (Aye)
Recused:	Oliver

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

I. RATIFY

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Nantucket Development	8 Sconset Ave	New Garage	49.3.2/28	LINK

- Approved Through Staff On 11/14/2023.

Motion:	Motion to approve agenda. (Camp) (2:15)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs Paul (Aye)
Recused:	Oliver

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
2. Forby the Sea LLC	4 Harborview Way	Omit spa	42.4.1/30	Topham Designs
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. 3 Willard ST Trust	3 Willard St	Roof replacement	42.4.1/18	T & T Roofing
6. Four Quaker LLC	4 Quaker Rd	Roof replacement	41.5.2/4	James Lydon

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Paul) (2:55)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye) / / Oliver (Recused)

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	Amelia Wilson	5 New St	Remove & rebuild chimney	73.4.2/15	Normand Residential
	• the chimney's red brick and mortar to match the existing color and dimensions and corbelling to match existing.				
2.	C. DiPerro	76 Sankaty Rd	New pool	49/112	Topham Design
	• 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.	Amanda Jacobs	1 Judith Chase Lane	Hardscape, fence & steps	42.3.2/4.1	Julie Jordin
	• If the existing driveway is being altered to match traffic direction, Driveway should be reduced in size, retain existing light post and light housing.				
Voting:		Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul			
Alternates:		-			
Recused:		Oliver			
Documentation:		Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:		-			
Public Comments:		-			
Concerns:		-			
Motion:		Motion to approve. (Paul) (2:55)			
Roll-Call Vote:		Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye) / / Oliver (Recused)			

IV. NEW BUSINESS 10/31/2023

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	Hans Dalgaard	51 Weweeder Rd	Main House	88/12	Thornewill Designs
	Concerns: Application not opened.				
	Motion: No action.				
3.	NIR Retail LLC- hold 11/28	4 Harbor Sq.	Structure rev 03-8063	42.2.4/1	WAPD
4.	Richmond Meadows II hold 11/28	20 Nancy Ann Ln	Commercial dwelling revs	68/339.1	KOH

V. OLD BUSINESS 11/07/2023

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	Jonathan Nyland	93 Sankaty Rd	Rooftop solar	49/182	Ack Smart
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: Thornewill, Paul; Recused: None.</i>				
	Concerns: Application not opened.				
	Motion: No action.				
2.	Robert Stock 08-9002 hold 11/28	50 Squam Rd	As-built fence	13/31	Robert Stock
	• <i>Commissioners: Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None Recused: None.</i>				
	Concerns: Application not opened.				
	Motion: No action.				
3.	Adam Glick hold 11/28	31 Eel Point Rd	New dwelling	39/52	WAPD
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: Paul, Pohl; Recused: None.</i>				
	Concerns: Application not opened.				
	Motion: No action.				
4.	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>				
	Concerns: Application not opened.				
	Motion: No action.				

5. Geoffrey Tressell **08-8965** 26 Rabbit Run Rd Addition 28/9 Ben Herter

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	None
Recused:	None
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Ben Herter
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Coombs - Expressed reservations about the North elevation, particularly the portion facing the harbor. - Critiqued the variety of window shapes, sizes, and pane configurations, deeming it inconsistent. - Advocated for more uniformity in the design, emphasizing the need for windows to follow a consistent pattern. - Specifically mentioned concerns about the width and configuration of windows on the left side compared to the right side. - Raised the desire for a more cohesive look by avoiding wide variations in window design. - Proposed the addition of another chimney on the large building for increased symmetry. Paul - Expressed similar concerns about the existing Gable, the flanking Windows, and the windows adjacent to the French door. - Suggested that the two over twos flanking the French door should match the two over twos in the Dormer for increased consistency. - Acknowledged the acceptance of oversized two over twos in the single-story mass but emphasized the need for uniformity among other two over two windows. - Proposed maintaining consistency in window sizes, even considering the possibility of reverting to a picture window below the Dormer for improved rhythm. - Specifically addressed a slightly oversized first-floor double-hung window on the left Gable, recommending that it match the one above it. - Highlighted concerns about the second-floor flanking windows next to the French door, describing them as feeling out of scale. - Noted diminished visibility on the first floor but expressed a difference in concerns compared to those on the second floor. Oliver - No concerns. Camp - Expressed agreement with Diane's idea of introducing a chimney to break up the perceived rigidity. - Acknowledged that the board generally doesn't share the concern about rigidity. - Acknowledged a shared perspective with others regarding the second floor's prominence and the need for consistency, particularly with the two windows on either side of the French door. - Concurred with the idea that the large square windows on either side of the French doors stand out and suggested matching them to the size on the second floor. - Agreed with Joe's suggestion of simplifying the design by opting for either a picture window or something simpler, instead of multiple gang windows.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A – Alt 2 (through staff). (Oliver) (22:11)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-1 // Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye) / / Coombs

7. Ack Midisland LLC **08-8888** 18-26 Sparks Ave New mixed used building 55/231.1 LFW

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

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

8. SeaHero LLC **05-8447** 12 Pilgrim Rd New dwelling 41/476 LFW

- *Commissioners: Pobl, Welch, Camp, Thornewill: Alternates: None; Recused: None.*

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

9. SeaHero LLC **05-8450** 12 Pilgrim Rd New shed 41/476 LFW

- *Commissioners: Pobl, Welch, Camp, Thornewill: Alternates: None; Recused: None.*

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

VI. 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. HWGC Property LLC	7a Sherburne Rd	Studio revision	30/112.1	Studio PPark
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	James Krapp			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Paul) (27:04)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			

2. f 15 CHR LLC 8 Chuck Hollow Rd Addition & Porch 72/31 Val Oliver
- Concerns:** Application not opened.
- Motion:** No action.

3. 44 Monomoy LLC 44 Monomoy Rd Patio, pergola, walkways 54/72 David Champoux
- Applicant will resubmit the application, ensuring the digital version gets included.**

4. 44 Monomoy LLC	44 Monomoy Rd	Move shed	54/72	David Champoux
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Ben Champoux			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	None			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Coombs) (34:36)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			

5. 4 Ray Court Nt	4 Rays Court	Rev COA 04-6226	42.3.2/3	Normand Residential
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Ben Normand			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Introduced the property as the "Circa 1797 George Ray Cooper's house," providing historical context. - Pointed out the existence of an 1848 addition and noted the availability of a house history and historic assessment by Brian Feifer. - Raised concerns about the roof walk, questioning its historical accuracy in terms of size on this particular structure. - Referenced the commission's usual adherence to standards regarding the size and dimensions of roof walks, unless supported by historical evidence. - Highlighted the importance of historical photographic evidence or documentation for atypical features like the roof walk. - Mentioned the absence of an updated Form B but acknowledged that it is in progress. - Addressed the egress windows to the south, indicating belief in them being a new addition and expressing no concerns. - Expressed appreciation for the removal of the exterior fireplace, recognizing it as not historically or originally part of the main dwelling. - Stated the main concern as being the size of the roof walk and the clabber.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Echoed similar concerns to Holly's, particularly regarding the roof walk.			

	- Asserted that the roof walk is inappropriate unless there is evidence of a pre-existing one many years ago and suggested seeking photographic evidence. - Stated the roof walk was oversized both in length and width. - Raised concerns about the proposed clabber, emphasizing the commission's usual requirement for proof of its historical presence on the building. - Stated that the commission typically doesn't approve clabber unless historical evidence supports its existence on the structure. - Mentioned the specific concern about the request for white clabber, noting that it might be too formal for the character of the side street.
Concerns:	Coombs - Stated that if the roof walk is new, it is considered excessively large. - Described the roof walk as not fitting into the building and not aligning with historical context. - Expressed uncertainty about the exact width of the roof walk but emphasized that it is deemed too wide. - Advocated for the roof walk to be resized and made more compliant with the standards and historical context observed by the commission. Camp - Concurred with the observation that the roof walk is excessively large. - Suggested reducing the size of the roof walk by pulling in a couple of bays, proposing at least one on either side. - Mentioned being on the fence about the clabber, suggesting a level of indecision or neutrality on that particular aspect. Oliver - Stated that the combination of white clabber and white windows was too excessive. - Described the transition from a plain shingled facade to a blaring white as too much. - Proposed the use of a grey color for the clabber as a potential alternative. - Reiterated agreement with previous comments regarding concerns about the roof walk, emphasizing alignment with those viewpoints. Paul - Concurred with all other comments made by staff, the public and fellow Commissioner's. Welch - Recommended reducing the width of the roof walk to one-third of the width of the ridge. - Requested information on a color choice for the clabber that is not white.
Motion:	Motion to view and for the applicant to include additional information, such as photos. (Camp) (48:44)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

6. Shenandoah Trust	40 Easton St	Color change	42.1.4/20	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Lisa Botticelli			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Provided information about the building, noting it as a Circa 1893 structure. - Mentioned the availability of an HDC survey from the E9 effort. - Expressed the opinion that black shutters are deemed appropriate for the structure. - Raised uncertainty about the precedent for a black door, suggesting consideration of a contrasting color for the door.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Stated no concerns.			
Concerns:	None			
Motion:	Motion to approve black shutters & doors. (Coombs) (51:24)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			

7. C. DiPerro		76 Sankaty Rd	Alterations & addition	49/112	Topham Design
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Joseph Topham				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Described the structure as a non-contributing one, dating back to 1983. - Clarified that the building is located right outside the Old Historic District (OHD) of Sconset and is not within the OHD. - Noted that the property is technically a corner lot, making it visible from both sides. - Commented on the complementarity of the proposed additions. - Expressed concern about the proposed Juliet Balcony facing the public way, particularly off the bike path. - Acknowledged the presence of an existing second-floor deck. - Mentioned that most of the proposed additions seem to be situated at the back, which is considered more appropriate.				
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley , Former Chair of the Sconset Advisory Group - Concurred with Holly's comments and expressed alignment with her observations. - Specifically mentioned concerns about the proposed third-floor balcony. - Described the balcony as conspicuous from both Sankaty Road and the bike path. - Asserted that the balcony does not seem to harmonize well with the Building of Nantucket in Mind.				
Concerns:	Camp - Suggested that the third floor is drawing too much attention with the dormer and Juliet balcony. - Proposed toning down the design, possibly by converting the Juliet balcony into a window. - Raised the idea of simplifying the proposed dormer to just one window to reduce visual prominence. - Mentioned the importance of considering the building's orientation and its visibility from the bike path. Paul - Expressed a concern specifically about the proposed dormer. - Suggested that if the dormer matched the existing one, it wouldn't be problematic. - Mentioned that the dormer appears a bit tall. - Acknowledged the uniqueness of the Juliet balcony, noting a perceived visual centering effect on the rear elevation. Coombs - Concurred with Joe's perspective on the overall design. - Suggested simplifying the third floor to reduce complexity. - Pointed out the abundance of porches on the east elevation facing Sankaty Road. - Questioned whether the third-floor porch should be reduced to avoid visual busyness. Oliver - No concerns. Welch No concerns.				
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff), to include revisions to the dormers and reducing the Juliet balcony by six inches on either side. (Coombs) (1:01:09)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) / / Camp (Nay)				

8. C. DiPerro	76 Sankaty Rd	New zoning shed	49/112	Topham Design
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Joseph Topham			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Acknowledged that the zoning shed is well-designed and matches the main house's architecture. - Mentioned that the shed appears tall for its purpose. - Suggested that reducing the shed's height could enhance its success. - Noted the importance of ensuring that the dormer is appropriately situated relative to the ridge.			
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley , Former Chair of the Sconset Advisory Group - Shared the opinion that the shed is too tall for its intended purpose.			
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed that the shed is still considered too tall but could be supported if its height is reduced by a couple of feet. Oliver - Mentioned that the shed meets the criteria for an exempt shed, with an allowable height of up to 16 feet, and expressed approval for the shed as it is. Paul - Agreed with Val's assessment that the shed meets the exempted height criteria and expressed approval, especially considering the height of the adjacent house. Coombs - Expressed dislike for the dormer on the shed, suggesting that it looks like too much for the small building and recommending consideration for making the dormer smaller or modifying it. Welch - Proposed the idea of using a mud seal to reduce the height of the shed by six inches, and the applicant expressed willingness to consider this modification.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to include the condition of reducing the overall height by six inches using a mud block. (Oliver) (1:06:30)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) / / Camp (Nay)			

12. Amy Rowland	3 Pawguet Ln	Main house rev coa	30/128	Normand Residential
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Mickey Rowland			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Acknowledged the Circa 1920 structure with an old HDC survey on file. - Appreciated the proposed changes in elevation, including the skirt and brick detail. - Inquired about the color of the brick and whether it would be natural or painted. - Appreciated the removal of the roof walk, previously approved prior to the last approval. - Recognized the appropriateness of the new front steps and railings for the architectural style. - Noted that due to the previous move, the increased height in elevation was not considered. - Observed that the property is bisected by a FEMA flood zone, raising concerns about flood-proofing mechanisms. - Questioned the status of flood-proofing measures and sought clarification on the site plan. - Expressed curiosity about the elevation certificate and its availability, considering it might not have been obtained in the previous move. - Highlighted the importance of adhering to resilient design guidelines, particularly with a FEMA flood zone involved. - Suggested obtaining more information on flood-proofing and the elevation certificate to address uncertainties. - Raised questions about the specifics of the property's flood resilience measures and how they align with guidelines. - Recognized the fact that this is a contributing structure. - Stated that typically a historic determination is necessary when associated with anything that's being elevated. - Requested that an application is submitted for that so after reviewing it, it could be put on consent on a future agenda.			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Welch - Concurred with Backus' comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to include the conditions to submit the FEMA packet and the historic determination. (Camp) (1:06:30)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			
3. 2SP LLC	2 South Pasture Rd.	Windows revisions	80/297.2	Brook Meerbergen
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Brook Meerbergen			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Coombs - Noted the perception that the added windows might appear heavy. - Speculated that the weight may not be noticeable since the windows on top might not be visible. Welch - Concurred with Coombs. Camp - No concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted due to lack of visibility. (Paul)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			

13. Kathryn Graham	11 Priscilla Lane	Fenestration changes	41/351	DTA
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Anton Dimov			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Camp) (1:29:36)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)			

14. Elizabeth Singer	63 Baxter Rd	Pool	49/22	Jeffrey Lee
Concerns:	Application not opened.			
Motion:	No action.			

15. 89 Easton St	89 Easton St	Fenestration change & sm addition	41/351	BPC
Concerns:	Application not opened.			
Motion:	No action.			

16. Melissa Layman	3 Cottage Ct	Add new dormers	55.4.1/141	DTA
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Anton Dimov			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Provided historical background, stating that the building is a Circa 1838 Gable-ended Greek Revival built by John B Nicholson. - Shared anecdotal information about the property being researched by a Pin student in 2004 and owned by the Corkish family for about 70 years. - Mentioned a personal connection by noting the existence of a photo of great-great-grandparents who lived in the house. - Expressed the view that the proposed dormers are not appropriate, emphasizing non-compliance with Nantucket building requirements. - Suggested that the dormers should be removed from the ridge and that window placement needs adjustment. - Expressed gratitude to Anton for providing a 3D scan, which will aid in the survey effort on Orange Street. - Acknowledged the need for dormers on the second floor but proposed a smaller dormer due to an existing knee wall. - Requested a view of the proposed dormers from York Street, considering potential visibility concerns. - Reiterated the need for dormer design to align with the requirements of Building with Nantucket in Mind.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Aligned with Holly's earlier comment, expressing a similar concern about the shed dormers on the back of the building. - Stated that both shed dormers are perceived as too massive and overpowering the roof plane. - Noted that the south-facing dormer may not be visible, but the north one could be seen from York Street. - Suggested setting back the north dormer from the eave to avoid it being a flush dormer, proposing the division into two smaller dormers. - Emphasized that the reduction in floor space due to this adjustment should not significantly impact the program.			
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed agreement with the previous comments regarding the dormer design. - Reiterated the suggestion to bring the dormer off the ridge. - Advocated for a smaller dormer with proportionately smaller windows. Oliver - Suggested downsizing the dormer by five to five and adjusting the window configuration. - Highlighted the importance of having at least two windows on one side to maintain proportions. - Indicated a willingness for the side that is not visible to potentially remain as is, contingent on bringing the dormer down off the ridge and lowering the wall height.			

	Coombs - Described Cottage Court as having small and not massive houses, referencing Jack Van Lou's former residence. - Expressed a desire to see the dormers made smaller, suggesting no more than two windows. - Echoed the sentiments of Holly and Micky, agreeing that the dormers appear too heavy for the house. Paul - Expressed agreement with most of the comments made so far. - Suggested achieving the necessary height adjustment by bringing down the fascia to serve as the head casing for the windows. - Indicated alignment with Val's comments, supporting the idea that a single dormer could be suitable. - Recommended that if the dormers are brought in, they should come in from left to right, emphasizing the potential for minimal visibility and improved aesthetics. Welch - Expressed agreement with the points raised, particularly endorsing the suggestion to bury the top plate in the header to lower the heights. - Highlighted a specific emphasis on lowering the height of the more visible dormer.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) with the following conditions: drop the eve down, aligning it with the top of the window casing; bring in each dormer by one foot on both the north and south sides and keep the dormers as a single entity. (Oliver) (1:38:18)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

17. Katherine Littlefield 11-9464 3 Franklin St Chimney revisions 41/267 Normand Residential					
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Fred Lilly				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Highlighted that the structure is a contributing Circa 1938 building with an HDC survey on file. - Noted the planned relocation of the chimney from off-center to the right to the rear end on the left. - Acknowledged that the existing location of the chimney is a character-defining feature of the Cape. - Referenced the HDC survey, revealing a photo without the front shed dormer and the chimney in a different off-center location in 1989. - Suggested that the existing chimney may have been relocated between 1989 and now. - Pointed out that the current chimney appears larger in girth than the one in the 1989 survey. - Recommended that if the chimney is relocated, it should be off-center and not at the end as proposed.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Informed that the Historic Structure Advisory Group (HSAG) reviewed the project and approved most aspects. - Noted that the HSAG's comment suggested moving the chimney closer to enhance visibility from the street. - Indicated overall satisfaction with the proposed changes, with the exception of the chimney's recommended adjustment for better street visibility. - Conveyed that the group was supportive of the project, subject to the specified modification.				
Concerns:	Camp - Expressed a specific concern regarding the placement of the chimney. - Emphasized the desire for the chimney to align with historic authenticity as much as possible. - Stated uncertainty about the ideal historic location for the chimney. - Indicated a preference for an off-center placement to maintain historical accuracy. Paul - Noted a concern about the size of the chimney, perceiving it as feeling out of proportion. - Suggested that the chimney should be slightly wider as it exits the house. Coombs - Concurred with previous comments. Lilly - Clarified that the large chimney is being removed. - Confirmed that the smaller chimney on the left side of the south elevation is the new one. - Referenced the photographs of the 1989 survey. - Pointed out that the proposed chimney's size is similar to the one that used to be there. - Highlighted the similarity in location, noting that it is not at the end as proposed.				

	- Provided a visual comparison to emphasize the alignment with the historical size and location of the chimney.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver) (1:46:18)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) / / Camp (Nay)

18. Katherine Littlefield 11-9463		3 Franklin St	Studio fenestration revisions	41/267	Normand Residential
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Fred Lily				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Stated the record that information is based on 1989 surveys and the Town's 1998 aerial imagery. - Observed that the existing sheds from 1938 and 1975 appear to have been relocated, and the present one is contemporary and non-historic. - Emphasized the importance of this information in the context of the project. - Stated that the use of a triple 16-light French door on the shed, deeming it inappropriate for the Building with Nantucket in Mind. - Suggested assessing the glazing percentage and recommended a 12-light door with a kick panel for better alignment with historical appropriateness. - Highlighted the preference for a normal-sized French door instead of a triple configuration.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - No concerns.				
Concerns:	Oliver - No concerns due to lack of visibility. Camp - Expressed a concern about the triple slider on the shed. - Suggested reducing the number of sliders to at least one or possibly two. Paul - No concerns due to lack of visibility. Coombs - Expressed a concern about the number of windows on the east elevation.				
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A (through staff) the conditions, to revise the design by reducing the number of doors from three to two and that the two doors should be 15 lights each to match the style of the house. (Paul) (1:51:33)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)				

19. 41 Monomoy LLC		41 Monomoy Rd	Omit chimney rev 03-5883	54/79.1	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Matthew McEachern				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Provided context that the dwelling is part of the Monomoy Heights subdivision created in 1852. - Stated that the proposal to remove the chimney would be considered highly inappropriate. - Asserted that removing the chimney for such a long ridge is incongruent with the principles of Building with Nantucket in Mind. - Recommended retaining the chimney.				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	- By consensus, all of the Commissioners expressed agreement, acknowledging a shared perspective that the chimney should be retained. McEachern - Expressed the desire to retain the option to come back and make changes, specifically addressing the size of the proposed element if needed in the future.				
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp) (1:55:30)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)				

20. IAMDUMMY LLC

77 Eel Point RD

Beach stairs rev 05-6300

32/44

JB Studio

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	None
Recused:	None
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Juraj Bencat
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Oliver - Questioned if there are other stairs in the area. Camp - Expressed agreement with the need for a view or more information about the structures in that area. Welch - Expressed the desire for Juraj to provide images of neighboring installations from the beach for all members.
Motion:	Motion for review including the additional images. (Camp) (1:59:54)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

21. 41 Hulbert LLC 11-9472

41 Hulbert Ave

MH revisions

29/18

Botticelli + Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	None
Recused:	Pohl
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Lisa Botticelli
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Stated that the structure is a non-contributing one built circa 2005. - Expressed a view that adding another porthole window on the west is unusual, especially considering the presence of an existing one. - Noted that adding additional portholes is not typical. - Conveyed having no concerns with the proposed pergola addition over the deck, emphasizing its appropriateness in that location, particularly being a feature more oriented towards the water.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Expressed agreement with Holly's perspective. - Shared the view that the additional round window on the west is excessive. - Suggested that windows like these should serve as unique accent features rather than being randomly placed on the side of the building.
Concerns:	Camp - Agreed with Holly and Mickey's comments. Oliver - No concerns. Paul - No concerns. Coombs - Indicated a willingness to accept the additional round windows if they are not noticeable. Welch - Stated that due to limited visibility and the oblique angle, he has no concern. Paul - Suggested considering lowering the round window on the first floor to the center line of the mutton bars. - Offered the idea that lowering the window might enhance its special feel, especially if it doesn't align with adjacent window headers.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to drop at least the first-floor round window to center its horizontal mutton with the horizontal mutton of the upper sash adjacent. (Paul) (2:07:29)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) / / Camp (Nay)

23. 23 Sankaty Trust	21 Sankaty Head Rd	Sm addition & remove dormers	48/4.1	BPC
Concerns:	Application not opened.			
Motion:	No action.			

14

VII. OLD BUSINESS 11/21/2023

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	Carolyn Manera 10-7351	15 Morey Lane	Garage		EMDA

- *Commissioners: Pobl, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill; Alternates: None; Recused: None. -last heard 12/20/23.*

Concerns: Application not opened. No quorum.

Motion: No action.

2.	Brandon Scimone 04-8324	6 Sandpiper Way	Addition	76/89	R. Newman/ Sandcastle
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Rob Newman				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	Camp - No concerns. Oliver - No concerns. Coombs - No concerns. Paul - Raised a minor concern about the new shed dormer, particularly on the south elevation, which is the most visible side. - Observed that the face of the shed dormer appears to be forward of the main gable of the house, estimating a difference of about a foot. - Suggested pulling back the shed dormer to bring it into the same plane as the main gable or ideally setting it back a little bit.				
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted, with Exhibit A (through staff) a revision to the shed dormer to be pushed back so that it is co-planer with the main gable. (Paul) (2:42:37)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)				

3.	Sandras Nantucket LLC	20 Pleasant St	Raise roof & fenestration	42.3.2/51	R. Newman/ Sandcastle
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	Oliver				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Charles Lenhart				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Provided information about the main block being a Circa 1838 house. - Noted the draft Form B and an updated HDC survey in progress. - Expressed appreciation for the shorter addition of the second floor with three-over-three double-hung windows. - Suggested reusing the existing three-over-three windows on the Southeast side if possible for the story and a half. - Acknowledged the retention and relocation of the existing gable end window from the main block to the contemporary addition. - Expressed curiosity about the glazing percentage on the end where a seventh window is added to retain a historic window, highlighting the consideration of glazing percentage in accordance with Building with Nantucket in Mind guidelines.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Expressed general approval for the change in roof lines but provided specific suggestions regarding the windows. - Suggested lowering the gable end window in the main mass, which is becoming a six-light, to give more space around it and avoid a tight appearance to the rakes. - Expressed concern about reusing the existing 6-over-6 window, noting that it's larger than the other windows on that side and stands out as an anomaly. - Offered feedback that it might look better if all three windows on that side were the same size, as the existing larger window seems unusual, especially being on the second floor.				

Concerns:	Camp - Expressed approval for the proposed changes as a good compromise between the existing and a more historic look. - Specifically mentioned the addition of six-over-six windows, noting that it contributes to the appearance of a historic house with subsequent additions. Coombs - Concurred with Oliver. Paul - Expressed approval for the overall design, finding it good and appropriate. - Highlighted a consideration raised by Mickey regarding the existing six-light window proposed in place of the 6-over-6. - Shared Mickey's suggestion of lowering the window slightly towards the ridge to avoid a tight appearance to the rake boards. - Suggested a minor adjustment, such as dropping it down by six inches, to ensure the head casing doesn't appear tangent to the facial boards. Welch - Clarified a comment about a note in the drawing related to the middle side. - Acknowledged understanding and clarified that the note in question is a holdover from a previous notation on a lower section of the drawing. - Suggested that the original note should be crossed out or removed, indicating a need for clarification or correction in the drawing notes.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted, with Exhibit A (through staff) to correct the annotations and lower the third-floor gable window approximately six-inches. (Camp) (2:53:25)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye)

4. 43. W Miacomet LLC 43 W. Miacomet rd. New dwelling 42.4./3 Emeritus LTD

Concerns: **Application not opened.**

Motion: **No action.**

5. 43 W Miacomet LLC 43 W Miacomet rd. Pool & hardscape 86/13.2 Jardins Intl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	None
Recused:	None
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Elisabeth O'Rourke
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	Tom Barada – Abutter - Expressed concern regarding the staked-out walls and their planned height of 16 inches. - Noted that despite the planned height, the raised grade may make the walls noticeable. - Asserted that stone structures and seating are not typical in the area, suggesting that the proposed walls may not align with the neighborhood's character. - Raised the issue of the house being moved forward, impacting the views and changing the landscape, potentially affecting both neighbors and the community. - Expressed uncertainty about which authority—HDC or Planning Board—is responsible for addressing the concerns related to the change in landscape and sighting. - Emphasized that the concerns are shared by other neighbors in the area. - Emphasized the contrasting perspective from the other end of the property, near the beach, where the land is at the same grade as the road. - Clarified that the property has a “pork chop” shape, contributing to the varying elevation perspectives. - Noted that the information provided offers a comprehensive view, indicating that while the driveway end is 8 feet lower, the opposite end is at the same grade as the road.
Concerns:	Oliver - Stated that she did not go and view the project. Camp - Stated that she did not go and view the project, as well. Welch - Outlined a condition that ties the approval of the pool to the approval of the associated house, indicating a dependency between the two approvals. Paul - Noted that the area is tightly controlled, possibly by MESA, with restrictions on building during certain months.

	- Expressed awareness that a lot of the vegetation in the area may need to stay undisturbed. - Emphasized that the vegetation, being 3 or 4 feet tall, can effectively hide structures less than 24 inches, and any visibility is likely only from a great distance away. Welch - Stated that he did not go and view the project. Camp - Suggested pulling the pool back and towards the house by a couple of feet. - Believed that this adjustment would completely hide the pool from the road and may mitigate any visibility concerns. Welch - Referenced the practice in Cisco, which is similar, and mentioned a consistent request for vegetative screening. - Pointed out that, given the height difference of approximately eight feet between the pool and the road, screening is crucial. - Stressed that without adequate screening, there would be visibility into people's activities around the pool, raising concerns about preserving the character and setting of the area.
Motion:	Motion for a view. (Paul) (3:18:19)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

6.	NT Island Resorts	19 N. Water Lot 7	New Dwelling	42.4.2/3	Emeritus LTD
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten; Alternates: Paul; Recused: None. -last heard 10/10/23.</i>				
	Concerns:	Application not opened.			
	Motion:	No action.			

IV. NEW BUSINESS 10/31/2023

2.	Whitney A Gifford, Trust	32 Pocomo Rd	Gate & fence	14/77	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Matthew McEachern				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed not seeing anything similar in the area to the stone pillars presented. - Suggested moving the stone pillars to a location where they wouldn't be visible, such as near the bend in the driveway. - Recommended exploring alternative options for posts. Coombs - Concurred with Val's comments. - Suggested a simpler solution by proposing a farm-style fence. - Recommended avoiding the complexity of placing the gate around the corner and other intricate details. Camp - Agreed with Val's perspective on the stone pillars, finding them out of place. - Suggested a simpler alternative with wooden columns and a barn-style gate. - Mentioned the preference for a rural, toned-down, and simplified design. Paul - Concurred with previous comments. Welch - Favored a simplified, toned-down, and more rural application for the gate. - Suggested pushing the gate back by another five feet for a better transition. - Highlighted the importance of landscaping to soften the transition between the gate and the surroundings. - Clarified that the gate being on the rear side, not flush, would provide a subtle depth characteristic. - Emphasized the importance of proportionality in decorative elements, considering the limited visibility.				
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Coombs) (2:42:37)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)				

VI. NEW BUSINESS 11/14/2023

10. Harold Brothers Realty LLC 2 & 4 Highland Ave Add roofwalk/outdoor shower rev 30/187/289 Emeritus LTD					
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Matthew McEachern				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Expressed concern about the appropriateness of the roof walk, particularly on the gable end. - Expressed uncertainty regarding the widening of the chimney. - Stated no concerns with the outdoor shower if it's natural to weather. - Indicated no concerns with the proposed changes in fenestration.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Expressed concern about the width of the roof walk, describing it as too wide and making the house feel massive. - Suggested that if allowed, the roof walk should be narrowed down to a more traditional width of 8 feet. - Mentioned that the chimney also feels a bit too wide and modern for the house.				
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed agreement regarding the concern about the roof walk, specifically mentioning that the posts seem rather minuscule. - Stated that the configuration of the roof walk with the steep roof pitch and longer legs looks awkward. - Indicated a lack of favor for the roof walk in its current configuration. - Mentioned having some concern about the chimney initially but later stating that it's probably okay. - Approved of the outdoor shower. Camp - Expressed agreement with the concern about the roof walk. - Complimented the overall design of the house, stating that the roof walk is taking away from it. - Suggested that the roof walk might look better if oriented differently (running the other way). Paul - Expressed no issue with the fenestration changes and the outdoor shower. - Suggested that the chimney needs some work at the top with the cap. - Provided feedback on the roof walk, proposing changes in dimension and considering a natural finish to match the wood roof. Also, requested 3D views to better evaluate the impact. Welch - Expressed a concern about the roof walk, indicating that additional imagery would be helpful. Specifically mentioned a desire to see a skirt-less version.				
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp) (3:39:29)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)				

11. Harold Brothers Realty LLC 6 Highland Ave Revisions to COA 01-7684 30/288 Emeritus LTD					
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Matthew McEachern				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Expressed concern about the proposed balconies facing inward, suggesting that the previously approved design might be more appropriate. - Highlighted concerns about potential visibility, especially in relation to the site plan and the neighboring structures.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Expressed agreement with the concern raised by Holly about the second balcony, emphasizing its clever design without visible means of support and deeming it inappropriate. - Suggested that the new French doors should match the others, specifically mentioning the absence of kick panels.				
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed agreement with the observation that there are too many doors on the west side, noting that the bulk of that facade is comprised of doors rather than windows.				

	- Shared the concern raised by Holly about the potential visibility situation, aligning with other remarks made during the discussion. Paul - Expressed agreement with integrating the second-floor balcony into a roof structure, similar to the adjacent deck, to minimize concerns. Camp - Suggested reducing the number of French doors on the second floor, proposing a ganged window or another type of window for the Juliet balcony. - Recommended having two French doors with a kick plate for the far-left mass. Welch - Concurred with Paul's comments.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Paul) (3:46:14)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

VII. OLD BUSINESS 11/21/2023

7. NT Island Resorts 19 N. Water Lot 11 New Dwelling 42.4.2/3 Emeritus LTD

- *Commissioners: Camp, Oliver, Thornevill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: Welch; Recused: None. -last heard 10/10/23.*

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

8. O'Spray LLC 25 Willard St New Garage 29/33 Emeritus LTD

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates:	None
Recused:	None
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Representing:	Matthew McEachern
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Suggested a possible reduction in height, considering the elevation for FEMA flood. - Also appreciated the efforts in aligning overhangs and exposed rafter tails with the main house. - Suggested further adjustments for a stronger connection to the colonial revival style.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - No concerns.
Concerns:	Paul - No concerns Oliver - No concerns. Camp - Proposed the idea of adding a six-inch on-center lattice on the west side for further detail.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to include lattice on the west approximately 6 inch by 6 inch on center. (Paul) (3:53:29)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

9. John Hendricks 1 Jefferson St Fenestration Rev 554.1/158.1 Emeritus LTD

- *Commissioners: Pobl, Welch, Camp, Coombs; Alternates: None; Recused: None. -last heard 10/31/23.*

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

10. 63 Hulbert LLC 63 Hulbert Ave Main House Revisions 29/9 Emeritus LTD

- *Commissioners: Camp, Oliver, Thornevill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused None. – last heard on 10/10/23.*

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

11. 63 Hulbert LLC 63A Hulbert Ave Revisions to COA 29/9 Emeritus LTD

- *Commissioners: Camp, Oliver, Thornevill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused None. – last heard 10/10/23.*

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

12. Jonathan Raith 2 Goldstar Dr MH partial demo & addition 55/196 Permit +

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

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

13. Stark Point LLC 02-7988		16 Easton St	Rev 02-7988	42.4.1/11	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	Pohl				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Lisa Botticelli				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - Appreciated the revision, finding it better than the previous proposal. - Emphasized the importance of carrying over the FEMA package submitted with the original design to ensure consistency and requested verification that nothing has changed in the FEMA documentation for the structure.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - Noted that the current building is considerably bigger than the previous submission. - Mentioned that the new design is wider and more complex, expressing a preference for the simplicity of the previous proposal, which was deemed more appropriate for the area.				
Concerns:	Oliver - Concurred with Rowland's comments. - Noted that the characters in the new version are more complex, particularly mentioning the shutter and the bay. - Stated a preference for simplicity, emphasizing that simple is better. Camp - Concurred with Oliver's comments. Welch - Concurred, as well. - Requested the applicant to review and consider the feedback received on the current proposal.				
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Oliver) (4:01:35)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver (Aye)				

V. OLD BUSINESS 11/07/2023

5. Dennis Weller		8 Walsh St	Hardscape	42.4.1/83	Wellner Arch
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	Coombs				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing:	Julie Wellner				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus - The dwelling is circa 1913. - An updated Form B is in the process. - The existing hedge does not provide appropriate screening, and additional vegetation may be needed. - Stones similar to the existing front walkway tones, which are organic Field Stones, were suggested for supplementation.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland - No concerns.				
Concerns:	Oliver - Suggested better screening, as the current hedges appear spindly. Camp - Proposed considering the use of brick for a more historically appropriate appearance in the historic area. - Suggested doubling up and increasing the height of the hedging for improved screening, preventing a direct view into the patio. Paul - Favored the use of brick, suggesting that it could allow for softening the edges with a soldier course, creating a more diminutive and appropriate appearance for the house. - Mentioned that if the patio material is blue stone, it might require double privet for adequate screening, but felt that brick would eliminate this issue. - Pointed out the cottagey style of the house and the existing brick chimney, suggesting that brick would seamlessly fit with the overall aesthetic. Welch - Suggested osmocote treatment for the privet to encourage growth. - Advised softening the edges of the blue stone patio with plant material. Camp - Suggested that blue stone gives a modern feel and recommended softer edges with grass in between.				

	- Suggested using natural granite stones instead of squared-off blue stone, noting that blue stone may appear harsh. Welch - Emphasized that the objective is to make the feature not visible, highlighting the subjective nature of determining its appearance if it's not visible. Paul - Raised concerns about the existing hedge potentially visually obscuring the entire front yard. - Suggested having privet tighter to the porch stairs with a gate leading to the patio for better visibility. - Noted that the primary choice of 2x3 wasn't represented in the patio plan's patterning. - Questioned the direction and pattern of the 2x3. Welch - Stated that if the patio is not visible, the question arises whether the preference is to keep it entirely out of sight. - Proposed the option of having privet halfway back from the front of the house to create a partition and prevent visibility. - Suggested the idea of having privet across from the porch to the existing privet parallel to the street without a gate. - Clarified that the condition would be that the patio is not visible at the time of inspection or thereafter. - Mentioned the consequence of fines and fees if the condition is not met.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to partition the front yard from the patio with privet and the patio is not to be visible at time of inspection or thereafter. (Oliver) (4:18:58)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

MINUTES

Motion:	Motion to approve October 3, 2023, minutes. (Oliver)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 3-1 // Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye) / / Welch (Abstain)

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 28th at 4pm *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 7:20pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fWVGZPNlcPM>

Nantucket Old Historic District Sconset Old Historic District