



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, December 12, 2023

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:07p.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.
Attending Members:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill, Paul
Remote Participants:	Coombs, Thornewill, Camp
Absent Members:	Pohl
Late Arrivals:	Camp arrived at 7:00 pm.
Early Departures:	-

ADOPTION OF AMENDED AGENDA	
Motion:	Motion to approve agenda. (Made by: Oliver)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

I. SIGNS

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. David Fredericks	31 Old South rd.	Wall sign	68/3	Lauriane Araujo Lima
3. Marine Home Center	5 Bayberry Ct	Wall sign	55/705.1	Walt Spokowski
4. Marine Home Center	5 Bayberry Ct	Wall sign	55/705.1	Walt Spokowski
Voting:	Welch, Coombs Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as recommended by the Sign Advisory Council. (Made by: Coombs) (00:01:42)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs Oliver, Thornewill, Paul (Aye)			
2. VTT LLC	48 Center St.	Projecting sign	42.3.1/1	Hannah Poindexter
Concerns:	Application not opened.			
Motion:	Held for representation.			

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1. Kimarick Farm	128 Hummock Pond	Fen Barn revs	66/129	Gryphon Architects	jp
2. Cherner, Stephen & Vickery	190 Hummock Pond	New dwelling	65/33	Kris Megna	jp
3. Lori Geddes	13 Evergreen Wy	New dwelling	68/718	Reid Yenor	jp
4. 22N LLP	22 Nonantum Ave	Rev 8795 fen MH	87/19	Botticelli + Pohl	vo
5. 22N LLP	22 Nonantum Ave	Rev 8796 fen GH	87/19	Botticelli + Pohl	vo
6. 8 Walbang Nom Trust	8 Walbang Ave	New shed	82/146	Botticelli + Pohl	vo
7. Lord Robin B	9 Old Westmoor Farm	Pergola	41/829	Ahern LLC	vo
8. Savel Nom Trust	47 Pocomo Rd	Shed	15/19	Robert Paladino/Mellow	ct
9. Savel Nom Trust	53 Pocomo Rd	Shed	15/17	Robert Paladino/Mellow	ct
10. Wood Hollow Properties	13 Wood Hollow Rd	Roof & Replace windows	72/23	Main St Architects	ac
11. Wood Hollow Properties	13 Wood Hollow Rd	Garage roof	72/23	Main St Architects	ac
12. NT Landbank	14 Cathcart Rd	Fenestration/ trim	43/101	Gryphon Architects	dc
13. Joyce Granik	244 Madaket Rd	Add Dormer	59.4/118	NAG	dc
14. Edward King	69 Milestone Rd	Addition	68/28.3	Brook Meerbergen	cp
15. Quebe/Danylaite	10 Bailey Rd	Windows/skylight	55/106.3	Brook Meerbergen	cp
16. Bob & Michelle Atchinson	28 Pequot St	Pergola	80/186	Robert Paladino	cp
17. Peter K O'Brien	8 Netowa Way	Rebuild porch, brick walkway	55/581.1	Robert Pike	sw
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul				
Alternates:	Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	-				
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Coombs) (00:02:16)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)				

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1. 2020 Flax Family Trust	12 Moors End Rd	Pool & Hardscape	43/215	Atlantic Landscaping	ct
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. Howard	13A Willard St	new dwelling Rev 9279	42.4.1/15.1	Thornewill Design	jp
need a revised elevation certificate addressing the new height increase in ae 9 flood zone. & indicate the height change on the application and elevations.					
3. 8 Walbang Nom Trust	8 Walbang Ave	Pool	82/146	Ahern LLC	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.					
4. N Liberty St LLC	74 N Liberty St	Porch roof over deck	41/236	Val Oliver	ac
date should be indicated on the coa.					
5. Sankaty Head Golf Club Inc	100 Sankaty Rd	Roof Replacement	49/2	Jesse Smith	cp
to match existing buildings/structure on property.					
6. 27 Cato Ln LLC	27 Cato Ln	Pool, driveway, gate hardscape	55/118	Jardins Intl	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:	Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	Oliver, Thornewill				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	-				
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made by: Paul) (00:02:34)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:0 // Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)				

IV. OLD BUSINESS 11/21/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 43 W Miacomet LLC 10-9347	43 W Miacomet	Pool & hardscape	86/13.2	Jardins Intl.
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing:	Elisabeth O'Rourke- Jardins International			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - Shared that she went out to look for the poll stakes, couldn't see them and expressed no concerns with the application. Coombs - Stated that as long as the pool is not visible, she has no complaints. - Mentioned that the brush in front of the house will make it impossible to see. Paul - Conducted a site visit and mentioned that there are no concerns. - Noted that one of the abutters suggested the grade rises as you go past it but found it well hidden from both the front and the side. Welch - Expressed concern about the visibility of the proposed use but questioned whether it falls within the HDC's purview.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (00:06:55)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:1 // Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) // Welch (Nay)			Certificate #HDC2023 -10-9347
2. Nancy Holmes 11-9486	3 Eagles Wing Way	Rooftop solar array	80/229	Empower Energy
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Fritz- Empower Energy			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - Requested that solar panels not be placed on the front of the house, especially if visible. - Advised to aim for a more consistent and linear pattern, suggesting potential adjustments to the placement of panels. - Mentioned the possibility of re-evaluating the design and considering a ground array. - Offered assistance in understanding policies and expressed willingness to discuss any inquiries or concerns regarding the policies. Coombs - Expressed concern about the visibility of the solar panels on the front of the house, particularly from Surfside Road, and questioned the compliance with HDC rules.			
Motion:	Motioned for the application to return with the removal of all lines on the roof plan except for roof lines and solar panels, emphasized heavier weight lines for roof lines, and specified that panels should only be shown on the rear and side (west and south). Proposed a site view for further evaluation. (Made by: Welch) (Seconded by: Oliver) (00:17:25)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			Certificate # HDC2023 – 11-9486

V. NEW BUSINESS 11/28/2023

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 43 W Miacomet LLC 11-9482	43 W Miacomet	New shed	86/13.2	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (Seconded by: Coombs) (00:20:40)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)		Certificate # HDC2023 – 11-9482	

2. 40 OSR LLC 11-9527	2 Forrest Ave	New mixed-use rev 08-8905	69/10	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed concerns about a small bump-up and the underground parking at the front of the building. - Noted that the presence of a building between this one and Old South Road made the elements on the south side less concerning. Paul - Recommended converting the cupola-looking element to a flat roof, suggesting a chimney or shingled alternative. - Mentioned having no other concerns. Coombs and Patten concurred. Welch - Expressed agreement with the previous comments. - Added a caveat about the brick, proposing that if it's used, it should resemble a chimney and have a higher profile than the roof, possibly with a slight pitch or minimal hip.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to minimize the roof and shingle the element. (Made by: Oliver) (00:28:41)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:0 // Welch, Oliver, Paul, Patten (Aye) Due to technical difficulties, Coombs was unavailable to vote.		Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9527	

3. Yauheni Shubin 11-9513	8 Gray Ave	Fenestration & roof	67/772	JB Studio
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Paul, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	None			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Juraj Bencat			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Made by: Patten) (00:33:30)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Oliver, Paul, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)		Certificate # HDC2023 – 11-9513	

4. Margaret Connolly Trust **11-9502** 151 Surfside rd. Roof walk covered porch 80/36.1 JB Studio

Voting:	Welch, Paul, Patten, Thornewill	
Alternates:	None	
Recused:	Oliver	
Representative:	Juraj Bencat	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	-	
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through Staff) pulling the deck in a foot and a half on each side, adding kick panels to the doors and reducing the first-floor windows to two as existing. (Made by: Thornewill) (00:36:07)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:0 // Welch, Paul, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9513

5. Christopher Tofalli Tr **11-9504** 122 Main St Fens, 2nd floor deck 42.3.3/100 JB Studio

Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Paul, Patten, Thornewill	
Alternates:	None	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Juraj Bencat	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus – Comments read by Esmeralda Martinez - Expressed concerns about the second-floor deck's visibility and suggested changing the French doors to a typical 12-light with a kick panel. - Recommended removing the three-gang windows on the south rear elevation and replacing them with a single double-hung window. - Proposed eliminating or significantly reducing the deck.	
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Expressed concern about the visibility of the second-floor balconies from Bloom Street and noted that such balconies are not appropriate. - Suggested minimizing the balconies, especially the narrow sliver facing west, to reduce visibility from Main Street. - Recommended separating the triple-ganged windows facing south for appropriateness.	
Concerns:	Oliver - Agreed on the concerns related to the visibility from Bloom Street, particularly regarding the second-floor deck and suggested window reduction on the first floor. Paul - Acknowledged, emphasizing agreement with Holly's suggestion for a kick panel on the second-floor door and Mickey's point about the cheek wall on the west elevation. - Stated that there's no issue with the increase in the number of ganged windows to three, considering it's the only ganged fenestration in the building and appears to be a replacement. Thornewill - Believed the second-floor deck is inappropriate. - Would stick with two windows instead of the three. - Fine with the two windows on the first floor underneath the deck but it should be a roof, not a deck. Patten - Concurred with Carrie's comments. Welch - Concurred with Joe's comments.	
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through Staff) pulling the deck in a foot and a half on each side, adding kick panels to the doors and reducing the first-floor windows to two as existing. (Made by: Oliver) (00:43:05)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:2 // Welch, Oliver, Paul (Aye) // Thornewill, Patten (Nay)	Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9504

6. Pamela Krueger **11-9550** 4 Weeweeder Ave Move dwelling on lot 80/102 LINK

Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill
Alternates:	Paul
Recused:	None
Representative:	Victoria Ewing
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Commissioners had no concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to include a site plan and additional photos, site plan to include the dimensions to the current location from two different locations from property lines. (Made by: Oliver) (00:50:08)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten (Aye) Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9550

7. Pamela Krueger **11-9549** 4 Weeweeder Ave Move shed on lot 80/102 LINK

Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill
Alternates:	Paul
Recused:	None
Representative:	Victoria Ewing
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to include an updated site plan that includes the relocation and the two dimensions from different locations. (Made by: Coombs) (00:53:25)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye) Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9549

8. Pamela Krueger **11-9551** 4 Weeweeder Ave Plunge pool 80/102 LINK

Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill
Alternates:	Paul
Recused:	None
Representative:	Victoria Ewing
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Commissioners had no concerns.
Motion:	Motion to Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) to include dimensions to triangulate the location of the pool and the new site plan. Condition of approval: Not visible at the time of inspection or thereafter, no change from existing grade at the time of application. (Made by: Thornewill) (00:57:28)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye) Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9551

9. 9 Thirty Acres LLC **11-9547** 9 Thirty Acres Ln New fence 67/115.7 LINK

Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates:	Patten
Recused:	None
Representative:	Victoria Ewing
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Oliver - Stated not comfortable with it going the whole lot line to lot line. - Expressed concern about a tremendous amount of fence stopping at the corner of the house. - Suggested vegetation every other section. - Emphasized that vegetation cannot be right on the lot line. Coombs - Concurred with the previous comments made by Oliver. Paul - Agreed with the five in one stopping at the house. - Would be in favor of it transitioning to a 4ft board fence towards the front of the property.

	- Expressed uncertainty about the other Commissioners' thoughts on the fence, specifically the five and one stopping at the corner. Thornewill - Concurred. Welch - Stated a preference for reducing the fence to 42 inches with a natural-to-weather cap, as opposed to 4 feet. - Advocated for using vegetation to soften the fence visibility, with a preference for vegetation on the property side. - Advised against using Baltic Ivy due to potential damage to the fence, suggesting climbing hydrangea as an alternative. - Suggested that supplemental vegetation may not be required for every other section, especially if there is established plant material that the neighbors want to retain. - Acknowledged that this approach deviates from guidelines but is based on the specific conditions observed on the site. Oliver - Proposed adding a caveat: If the existing vegetation goes away, there should be a requirement for mitigation.
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) modifying the site plan to indicate a 42-inch type two cap fence from the corner board to the street; the remainder to be a five-and-one fence, with vegetation every third panel if or when existing vegetation is removed. (Made by: Oliver) (01:06:43)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye) Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9547

10. 61 Fairgrounds LLC **11-9505** 61 Fairgrounds lot D Roof and fenestration 67/173.2 JB Studio

Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill
Alternates:	Paul
Recused:	None
Representative:	Juraj Bencat
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Concerns:	Welch - Stated that the explanation given raises doubts, particularly regarding the quarter-inch scale and roof intersections. - Expressed skepticism about the provided reasons, especially in comparison to other structures. - Pointed out that the primary consideration should be whether the changes in the revision are acceptable, transitioning from the previously approved plan. Oliver - Suggested that the new structure appears large in comparison to the neighboring houses. - Proposed a site visit to better assess the size and scale of the proposed building in relation to the existing ones. Coombs - Expressed a preference for the smaller one-and-three-quarter-story structure and mentioned the challenge of reducing the height to 27 feet as initially proposed. - Stated a personal preference for the design with a dormer. Patten - Stated she would be open to a review. Thornewill - Agreed with Val and suggests a review of the design, expressing a preference for keeping the building on the smaller side and questioning the need for it to be larger than one and a half stories. Welch - Suggested that the building can be constructed at a lower height and in line with the previously approved design. - Requested the addition of scaled dimensions to the drawings. - Asked for perspectives of the proposed home and the neighboring home from Fairgrounds and Parker, if visible. - Requested Fairgrounds and Parker Lane Street elevations for both the previously approved homes and the proposed structure. - Summarized with three specific elements to be included and a request for a view.
Motion:	Motion to continue to the next meeting; requested adding the scaled height of the prior approved dwelling to the drawings; Requested perspectives and street elevations of all existing structures on the lot and the proposed structures as viewed from Fairgrounds and Parker; Clarified the need for actual dimensions, not the

	erroneous 28 feet, and a view of the property. (Made by: Coombs) (01:35:11)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9505
Concerns:	Welch - Suggested to Mr. Bencat to create a master plan that includes each approved dwelling and requested pool for 61 Fairgrounds Lot B, C and D. - Apologized for any delay and suggested placing the item on the agenda for the next meeting. - Proposed including the master plan, along with individual site plans, in future applications.	
Motion:	Motion to continue until the next meeting Items 11-13 61 Fairgrounds, Lot B, C, and D for additional information, which is a Master Site Plan showing prior approved dwellings and structures and the proposed pool. (Made by: Oliver) (01:36:58)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten (Aye)	

11. 61 Fairgrounds LLC 11-9506	61 Fairgrounds lot B	New pool	67/173	JB Studio
12. 61 Fairgrounds LLC 11-9507	61 Fairgrounds lot C	New pool	67/173.1	JB Studio
13. 61 Fairgrounds LLC 11-9508	61 Fairgrounds lot D	New pool	67/173.2	JB Studio

14. Steven Jemison 11-9514	4 Lavendar Ln	New pool	33/24	JB Studio
-----------------------------------	---------------	----------	-------	-----------

Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Oliver			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	Juraj Bencat			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Thornewill - Expressed concern about the vegetation between the proposed structure and the neighbor. - Inquired about plans for planting vegetation for the neighbor's benefit. Paul - Stated that the pool is relatively large but well integrated into the house. - Appreciated that the pool is not rotated 90° along the ocean side facing front. - Indicated satisfaction with the distance from the public way. - Suggested constructing the structure with concrete and cladding it with wooden boards to save costs on stonework that might not even be visible. Coombs - Expressed uncertainty about the 9-foot-6-inch edge of the infinity pool. - Questioned the relatively small size of the infinity edge given the substantial space along the back. - Suggested consideration for turning it into a deck. - Requested additional drawings or visualizations to better understand the proposed design. Welch - Recommended integrating the infinity pool into the deck for better harmony with the character and setting. - Mentioned reduced concern due to limited visibility.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) the pool size and location as submitted, with the exposed structure of the pool clad in natural-to-weather wood to match the details of the deck. (Made by: Paul) (01:48:48)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)		Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9514	

15. 10 Silver St 11-9512		10 Silver St	New Main House Dwelling	55.4.1/187	JB Studio
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill				
Alternates:	Oliver				
Recused:	None				
Representative:	Juraj Bencat				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus – comments read by Esmeralda Martinez - Stated that while this is a four-bay infill, it's appropriate for Nantucket. - Pointed out that the specific area has more three-bay, 1.5-story structures nearby. - Suggested dropping the scale considerably and adopting a simpler three-bay design. - Mentioned the examples of Richard North house at 44 Pine Street and the Samuel Smith house at Silver Street. - Proposed a three-bay structure with added fill and 9-ft ceiling heights for better compatibility in the area.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Expressed concerns about the proposed location and architecture of the house. - Highlighted that parking in front of the house is not typical in the Old Historic District (OHD), where parking is usually to the side or rear. - Suggested a site visit due to the challenging slope of the lot, emphasizing the potential impact on the elevation of the parking in front of the house. - Recommended scaling down and simplifying the front door surround to align with the informal character of neighboring houses. - Pointed out the need for uniform window sizes in the main mass and suggested eliminating the shingle course above second-floor windows. - Raised concerns about the second-floor balcony projecting too far and being visible from the road. - Critiqued the bracketed side porch as not in keeping with the house's style. - Emphasized the importance of situating the house closer to the street edge based on typical practices in the area. Kathy Ward - Expressed concerns about the proposed parking backing out into an intersection with a stop sign on Silver Street. - Highlighted the steep decline of the lots in the neighborhood and suggested the house appears too large for the area. - Stated that if there will be no pool, what is the purpose of having a cabana. - Mentioned concerns about the legality of the second-floor deck. Kevin Stutz - Mentioned being across the street from the lot at 49 Pine and expressed concerns about drainage issues for their house. Welch - Emphasized the importance of focusing on architectural elements, massing, size, and location on the site, steering away from addressing items outside the purview. Stutz - Expressed concerns about the mass and size of the proposed structure, considering it out of proportion with neighboring houses. - Mentioned the busy nature of the corner and potential issues with a driveway backing out into the intersection. - Highlighted concerns about the impact on the neighborhood, especially given the tight corner and potential confusion. Patrick Dober - Raised concerns about the procedure, stating that they didn't receive the abutter letter and had difficulties obtaining information. - Concurred with neighbors' comments about the proposed structure being out of character with the Fish Lots neighborhood. - Expressed agreement with the idea of the HDC staff and commission visiting the site to better understand its unique features. - Shared concerns about the busy intersection, the scale of the proposed house, and the design of a pool in the historically important area.				
Concerns:	Coombs - Believed the proposed house is too big for Silver Street, which is described as a very informal area. - Emphasized that the neighboring houses are simple and small, contrasting with the proposed large and formal house. - Expressed concerns about the length of the sides of the house, going sideline to sideline, which is				

	considered inappropriate for the neighborhood. - Opposed the inclusion of a roof walk, stating it would not be suitable for the area. - Agreed with the comment about the formality of the front door and reiterated that the overall size of the house is too large for the context. Thornewill - Believed this design is more appropriate for Pleasant Street, closer to town than the neighborhood of small eclectic buildings. - Expressed that, despite the large site, a massive 4 bay house at 29 1/2 ft tall is not appropriate, suggesting a simpler three bay design. - Agreed with the suggestion to bring the house closer to the street and stack the parking to the side, avoiding a parking-centric focus. - Pointed out that the pool is not allowed in the Historic District, rendering the cabana and the cottage likely to change. - Expressed the view that the second-floor deck is inappropriate and suggested reducing the overall height and simplifying detailing. Paul - Suggested that the house feels appropriate but emphasized the importance of considering the context. - Recommended stepping the house incrementally down the hill to align with the topography, utilizing logical places on the first and second floors. - Suggested that stepping down would resolve parking and height issues and provide the clients with a larger yard. - Encouraged working with the topography and having the massing step down the hill for a more beneficial design. Patten - Expressed agreement with the opinion that the house is too large. - Opposed the inclusion of a roof walk and the second-floor balcony. - Suggested that the design requires significant rework and revisions. Welch - Agreed with Connie and emphasized the need for a scaled-down version, suggesting a reduction of at least 40% of the overall volume. - Expressed a strong agreement with the concept of a stepped floor plan.
Motion:	Motion to hold for substantial revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (02:08:58)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye) Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9512
16. 10 Silver St 11-9511	10 Silver St New Gh/ cottage 55.4.1/187 JB Studio
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates:	Oliver
Recused:	None
Representative:	Juraj Bencat
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus – comments read by Esmeralda Martinez - Expressed concern about the odd positioning of the cottage, suggesting it might be more suitable as a main house or at least a revision of its scale. - Critiqued the doors, recommending a six-panel front door and a rear double French 12-light with a kick panel.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Critiqued the awkward projection of the gable on the building, suggesting its complete elimination. - Disapproved of the four-panel slider and raised concerns about the cramped positioning of the structure, recommending a rethinking of the sighting or a reduction in size. Patrick Dober - Expressed agreement with Mickey Rowland's comments on various details, pointing out the applicants perceived lack of understanding of the context, scale, and historic nature of the Fish Lots. - Described the design as appearing more suited to a different site and expressed concerns about its placement near their property.
Concerns:	Thornewill - Agreed with the commentary on the awkward sighting, expressing that the west elevation looks like it should be the front elevation. - Criticized the one-story gable with French doors for overpowering the simple two-dormer elevation. - Stated that the fenestration is awkward, the front door is awkward, and suggested that with a reworking of the main house, the cottage could be simplified and better situated on the property. Patten - Concurred with Thornewill.

	Paul - Expressed agreement that the cottage feels jammed in and suggested that the angle is peculiar, likely due to the pool and cabana. - Liked the story-and-a-half massing. - Proposed looking at a shed roof instead of the gable with four French doors and suggested removing the pergola for a simpler structure. Coombs - Expressed difficulty with the layout under the house, especially with a bedroom, hall, and mechanic. - Mentioned concerns about parking and suggested squaring the building once the pool is removed. - Recommended simplifying the design, possibly with doghouse dormers instead of four French doors. - Emphasized the need for consistency with the main house's simplification. Welch - Expressed concerns about the orientation of the cottage on the lot, finding it inappropriate in terms of angular positioning. - Mentioned the perception of the structure as oversized and suggested considering a mud sill instead of three or more steps above grade. - Noted discrepancies in the elevations, specifically with the stair entryways and floor heights, emphasizing the larger issues of scale and orientation.	
Motion:	Motion to hold for revision. (Made by: Coombs) (02:21:08)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9511
17. 10 Silver St 11-9510		
	10 Silver St	Cabana /Shed alterations
		55.4.1/187 JB Studio
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill	
Alternates:	Oliver	
Recused:	None	
Representative:	Juraj Bencat	
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.	
Staff Comments:	-	
Public Comments:	-	
Concerns:	-	
Motion:	Motion to track with the two previous applications. (Made by:) (02:22:28)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)	Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9510

18. Matthew Roberts		21A Daffodil Lane	Roof top Solar array	68/749	Empower Energy
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul				
Alternates:	Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	-				
Motion:	Motion to reconsider. (Made by: Oliver) (02:23:43)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)			Certificate #HDC2023 – (as noted)	
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul				
Alternates:	Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	Oliver - Stated that the application was incomplete. Welch - Advised Oliver to contact staff via email to communicate the specific incompleteness, with the expectation that the application would be heard at the next meeting after addressing the issues.				
Motion:	Motion to continue to the December 19, 2023, HDC meeting. (Made by: Oliver) (02:24:55)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)			Certificate #HDC2023 – (as noted)	

VI. OLD BUSINESS 12/05/2023

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
---------------------	----------------	---------------	------------	-------

1. John Brazilian Tr	34 Easton St	Parking & outdoor shower	42.1.4/18	David Bartsch
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Camp			
Recused:	None			
Representative:	David Bartsch			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus – comments read by Esmeralda Martinez - Appreciated the colored site plan but expressed concern about excessive use of Bluestone walkways, stating that it is not in keeping with the historical character of the area. - Suggested that shell driveways would be more appropriate and recommended reducing the amount of Bluestone walkways.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Expressed that the solid walkways of square-cut Bluestone pavers around the building are not in keeping with the Brant Point area, suggesting that irregular natural-colored steppingstones would be more appropriate. Noted a reference to a glass fence by the harbor side on the site plan, expressing concerns about its lack of detail and potential inappropriateness for the location.			
Concerns:	Coombs - Agreed with Mickey's observation about the formality of the walkway, stating that it is much too formal. - Expressed concerns about the glass feature mentioned in the plan, believing it to be inappropriate for the location. - Appreciated the change to the driveway material but emphasized that the surrounding walkways around the building are not suitable for Easton Street. Paul and Patten - Concurred with the previous comments made by Diane and had no further comments. Oliver - Appreciated the changes in the front, specifically mentioning the use of brick and the driveway material. - Agreed with the idea of making the Bluestone walkways a little less formal. Welch - Concurred with all previous comments. - Expressed that the project hasn't materially changed, still appearing very finished and significant in quantity. - Referenced the guideline that material changes should occur within three applications or may result in a denial. - Stressed the need to move the project along for fairness to all parties involved. David Bartsch - Suggested breaking up the blue stone into a less formal material like Goshen stone. - Acknowledged significant changes to the driveway and sidewalk. - Proposed making a change to the plan to specify the alternative stone material, either through staff or during the meeting. - Clarified that the flexibility issue is not with blue stone itself but with the base beneath it. - Noted that blue stone drained well, similar to any other surface. - Clarified that the suggestion to use a different stone material (e.g., Goshen stone) could apply to both the sides and the rear of the site. Paul - Recommended incorporating vegetation between the pavers to improve the oblique view. - Suggested using Goshen stone for a more organic shape, with vegetation or moss in the joints. - Agreed with the need for a side-by-side comparison with previous submissions to better understand the incremental changes. - Recognized the importance of presenting a comprehensive view for better evaluation. Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Proposed reducing the amount of stone further. - Favored the direction of using Goshen stone but suggested incorporating steppingstones for a more suitable appearance. - Emphasized the need for real spaces between the stones, especially along the sides, to enhance the overall aesthetics. Welch - Proposed approximately a 30% increase in open space along the left and right sides. Suggested using Goshen stone with more spacing to create a visually open and enhanced green space			
Motion:	Motion to approve the layout, as submitted - Exhibit A (through staff) change blue stone to Goshen stone, reduce the amount of hardscape on the sides of the building by 30% per side. (Made by: Paul) (02:39:37)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)		Certificate #HDC2023 – (as noted)	

2.	NIR 09-9216	19 N Water St lot 7	New dwelling	42.4.2/3	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	None				
Representative:	Matthew McEachern				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus – comments read by Esmeralda Martinez - Acknowledged the changes to the front steps. - Noted revisions to the door and fenestration on the facade. - Appreciated the effort to make it more symmetrical. - Highlighted the example of clapboard on the 1850 Circa Bungalow at 82 Easton. - Clarified that the proposed design is not a bungalow but rather an eclectic Victorian.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Appreciated the changes made by Matt overall. - Questioned the choice of clapboard on the front facade, finding it awkward, especially around simple double-hung windows. - Suggested reverting to shingles for the front facade. - Expressed concern about side-facing steps, noting that they are not typical in the area. - Recommended eliminating the front hipped porch roof to allow for a simpler run of steps down to the sidewalk.				
Concerns:	Oliver - Agreed about the side stairs and suggested they come straight up. - Commented on the French doors with a kick panel, finding the grill pattern somewhat anomalous. - Expressed a slight concern about the outdoor fireplace. - Appreciated all the other changes made. Paul - Stated having no concerns about the sideways stair, feeling it addresses the main view down the street and will be welcoming. - Liked the little projection with the hip roof, considering it a nice detail. - Favored the proposed porch configuration and found it appropriate. - Expressed approval of the chimney on the back with the fireplace. Patten - Declared having no real concerns. - Didn't mind the sideways stair, mentioning it seems to balance out with one on Lot Nine. Thornewill - Agreed with Val and Mickey about the stair going straight down from the porch without the hip roof. - Shared the view that the outside fireplace is unnecessary and visible from an alleyway. - Found the clabber on the front unnecessary and adding an extra detail element. - Expressed that the friendship stair on the side seems a bit much, suggesting simpler detailing. Welch - Expressed concern about various aspects, with the primary one being a perceived change in height at the foundation level. - Noted the discrepancy in the number of steps and the fascia height between different sections of the structure. - Sought clarification on whether the observed step height increase is intentional or not. McEachern - Clarified that there was an increase in the crawl space elevation for necessary crawl space access. - Emphasized that the overall height of the structure has not increased despite adjustments in the floor-to-floor elevation. Welch - Expressed concern about the perception of height due to the close proximity to the street and pedestrian interaction. - Acknowledged that some atypical elements contribute to the character and are not inappropriate. - Suggested eliminating the Friendship stair on the side. - Highlighted the beneficial visual interest created by the front-facing stair. - Emphasized the importance of ensuring the presence of a sidewalk. McEachern - Indicated that eliminating the Friendship stair on the side seems feasible. - Mentioned that the hip roof adds an additional layering effect. - Explored the possibility of keeping the projecting Gable while reducing its depth.				

	- Suggested that by adjusting the depth, it might be feasible to retain the hip roof element with a reduced projection.	
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) specifying changes: - The projecting first-floor element wrapped in clapboard would be changed to shingles, with clapboard remaining only under the porch covering. - The Friendship stair on the side would be a single stair, likely facing towards the rear. - The front stair would be a straight-on stair between the posts with the hip roof above it. (Made by: Paul) (02:58:26)	
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye) Thornevill (Nay)	Certificate #HDC2023 –09-9216

3.	NIR- HOLD 12/19	19 N Water St lot 7	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern LLC
	• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornevill</i>				
4.	NIR 09-9203 HOLD 12/19	19 N Water St lot 11	Hardscape	42.4.2/3	Ahern LLC
	• <i>Commissioners: Camp, Oliver, Thornevill, Patten, Paul; Alternates: Welch; Recused: None. Last heard 11 28 23</i>				
5.	George Metri 05-8496 HOLD 12/19	12 Angola St	MH Revisions	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
	• <i>Commissioners: Pobl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornevill; Alternates: Patten Recused: None Last heard 10 24 23</i>				
6.	George Metri 10-9317 HOLD 12/19	12 Angola St	Free Standing garage	55.4.4/78	Topham Design
	• <i>New Business application to track OB- new dwelling</i>				
7.	George Metri HOLD 12/19	12 Angola St	Hardscape	55.4.4/78	Katy Mitchell
	• <i>New Business application to track OB- new dwelling</i>				
8.	Valerie Osley HOLD 12/19	305 Polpis Rd	Fence	25/9.7	Sandcastle Construction
	• <i>Commissioners: Pobl, Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Paul; Alternates: Camp, Patten; Recused None. - last heard 11 14 23</i>				

Concerns: Applications not opened.

Motion: No action.

9.	CMR 11 Osprey Way LLC 10-9352	11 Osprey Way	Move off or demo dwelling	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch.
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul				
Alternates:	None				
Recused:	Welch				
Representative:	Christopher Hall				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	Oliver - Stated no problem with the structure being moved off or demolished, considering the condition of the original structure. - Expressed satisfaction that the trusses are being saved. - Mentioned an appreciation for the massing in the new design but indicated that the amount of glass may need to change in the future. Paul - Echoed Val's comments. - Commended the applicant for representing how a structure has evolved over time graphically. - Expressed enthusiasm for the concept sketch with a potential exception for some glass. - Acknowledged that the decision on the demolition cannot be entirely based on the future design but suggested that if it stays at the current scale, it would be well-received. Patten - No concerns with the move-off or demo. Coombs - Expressed support for the moving off, especially considering the reuse of trusses and other elements. - Made no comment on the proposed new house at this time. Camp - Expressed appreciation for saving smaller structures. - Appreciated the commitment to maintaining a one-story structure. - Suggested a potential reduction in fenestration in the middle of the proposed design.				
Motion:	Motion to approve the move-off only and the retention of the trusses. (Made by: Coombs) (03:12:17)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)		Certificate #HDC2023 – 10-9352		

10. 63 Hulbert Ave LLC 10-9290		63-A Hulbert Ave	MH addition & revision	69/9	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten, Paul,				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Matthew McEachern				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus – comments read by Esmeralda Martinez - Asserted that the changes were not substantial enough to address commissioner's concerns. - Noted that the street elevation south is still overwhelmed. - Mentioned the dormer on the garage as a new feature.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - No concerns. Caroline Baltzer - Expressed frustration regarding the confusion about the agenda item and the property address. - Recalled previous discussions where Commissioner Welsh, as chair, suggested moving additional bedrooms to the middle of the lot. - Pointed out that the placement of bedrooms on the side of the lot is obstructing the water vista from the public view, contrary to the Brant Point Area Plan. - Emphasized the importance of upholding Commissioner comments and the Brant Point Area Plan. - Mentioned that some Commissioners suggested renovating the existing structure instead of making significant changes. - Highlighted the suggestion made in the previous meeting about moving the garage to the other side to preserve the water vista. - Raised concerns about the perceived inconsistency in enforcing previous suggestions. - Noted that the current agenda item was not what was expected to be discussed. McEachern - Highlighted the presence of a view easement to the right of the site plan that prohibits structures within it, ensuring perpetual openness. - Emphasized that the property is unique with a deed-restricted view easement. - Mentioned the submission of photographs the previous week, focusing on new homes on Hulbert and Easton Street to illustrate the scale of recent developments. - Noted the existence of other beautiful houses in the area but questioned how they align with the Brant Point Plan. - Reiterated the significance of having a lot with a deeded view easement.				
Concerns:	Thornewill - Expressed appreciation for the 18-inch reduction in the proposed changes. - Acknowledged the simplification of the dormer on the street elevation and found it acceptable. - Stated that adding the proposed bump to the building isn't perceived as a significant problem. - Pointed out the purpose of the bump being for a garage and minimal space above, considering it proportionate to the existing building. - Mentioned that a lower garage with the original scheme might have seemed out of scale, supporting the proposed changes. Oliver - Expressed appreciation for the reduction in width in the proposed changes. - Suggested the complete removal of the little dormer, preferring a design more similar to the previously approved version. Patten - Stated she had nothing additional to contribute beyond what has already been mentioned. Paul - Reviewed the changes, comparing the current proposal with the one approved on June 27th. - Acknowledged that while there are some differences, the overall footprint remains similar. - Mentioned the increase in height, the addition of a dormer, and the absence of a front door. - Highlighted the unique property condition with a view easement. - Expressed the view that the evolution of the dormers has been successful, providing a new but appropriate interpretation of the primary gables. - Concluded that the current proposal is acceptable. Camp - Suggested that further reduction might be minimal and expressed the view that the proposal is sensitive. McEachern - Highlighted the limitation of 6'8" headroom on the first floor plan, emphasizing that the proposed				

	design has already been maximally reduced to meet this constraint.
Paul	- Expressed reluctance to consider the flipping of the garage due to potential challenges in maintaining open space and preserving the relationship between the main house and the guest house.
McEachern	- Highlighted the site plan, indicating that the lot is its own dependent lot with an adjacent property line, making it physically impossible to move the garage to the other side due to setback constraints.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Paul) (03:31:33)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Camp, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye) // Oliver (Nay) Certificate #HDC2023 – 10-9290

11. Whitney Gifford Tr.	32 Pocomo Rd.	Gate, driveway & fence	14/77	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew McEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	Oliver - Expressed appreciation for the pushed-back position of the trees, sought clarification on the scale, and inquired about the approval status of an 8-foot tall deer fence located on the property line, expressing concern about its impact on visibility and the need for proper screening. Paul - Suggested that additional information, including dimensions and a scale figure, would be helpful. - Recommended the inclusion or clarification of the deer fence in the site plan, and proposed a reduction in scale, suggesting about a 35% shrinkage. - Encouraged the presentation of multiple design options and noted that the gates might benefit from a lighter design for better proportionality. Coombs - Expressed a preference for a typical fence design, citing the simplicity of a Farm-like fence with straight angles. - Emphasized the need for a gate that aligns with the character of a simple property. Welch - Agreed with previous comments and suggested that the minutes may emphasize simplification and relocation of the fence away from the street. - Recommended documenting whether the deer fence is included or not, with a separate discussion on its approval if included. Camp - Suggested maintaining a rural setting, emphasizing the need for scale and dimensioning. Proposed removing the deer fence to avoid confusion on the matter.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions and further information. (Made by: Coombs) (03:41:31)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Paul (Aye) Certificate #HDC2023 – (as noted)			

12. Harold Bros. LLC	2-4 Highland Ave	New dwelling revision	30/288	Emeritus LTD
13. Harold Bros. LLC	6 Highland Ave	New dwelling revision	30/288	Emeritus LTD

- *Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul Alternates: None; Recused: None. Last heard 11 21 23*

Concerns: Application not opened.

Motion: No action.

14. WSTT Holding LLC		1 Sconset Ave	Pool & hardscape	73.4.1/8	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Patten				
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill				
Recused:	None				
Representative:	Lindsay Congelton				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , comments read by Esmeralda Martinez - Expressed appreciation for additional screening with evergreen and privet. - Inquired about the proposed picket fence around the shed affecting the visibility of pool equipment in the front. - Also, mentioned a pool caveat to be included if approved.				
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley , Sconset Advisory Group - Emphasized concerns about the perceived inappropriateness of the proposal being on a corner lot. - Agreed with the suggestion that the shed would assist in screening the pool.				
Concerns:	Coombs - Questioned the purpose of a walkway and suggested that a more informal walkway would be preferable, particularly considering the existence of two driveways. Oliver - Acknowledged the relocation of the structure and expressed understanding of the impact on neighbors but noted improvement in terms of public visibility. Welch - Stated that the site plan needs to show the tree that is staying. - Included that the project shall not be visible at the time of inspection or thereafter and that there shall be no grade changes from prior existing to time of application. Patten - Had no additional comments. Camp - Expressed concerns about the appropriateness of keeping both driveways on a corner lot, highlighting the impact on the streetscape and the potential loss of visual appeal.				
Motion:	Motion to approve with Exhibit A (through staff) with the condition that the front yard tree to remain and the tree to be removed accurately shown in both their locations, not visible at the time of inspection or thereafter, and no grade change from prior existing at the time of the application. (Made by: Welch) (03:54:41)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 3:2 // Oliver, Welch, Patten (Aye) // Coombs, Camp (Nay)				Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)

15. WSTT Holding LLC HOLD 12/19	1 Sconset Ave	New shed	73.4.1/8	Atlantic Landscaping
--	---------------	----------	----------	----------------------

VI. NEW BUSINESS 12/12/2023

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Robert Veghte	2 Anns Lane	Pool reduction rev 05-8469	49/59.1	Jaime Ranney
Concerns:	Application not opened.			
Motion:	No action.			

2. Crenshaw 11-9563	24 Almanack Pond Rd	Sidewall, doors, porch	25/37	Thornewill Design
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	Thornewill			
Representative:	Luke Thornewill			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Concerns:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (04:01:02)			
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 5:0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Patten (Aye)			Certificate #HDC2023 – 11-9563

3.	Paul Grey	9 Coffin St	Add dormer rev 02-3060	73.4.1/15	B Wilson
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Bo Wilson				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , comments read by Esmeralda Martinez - Stated that option one was more appropriate.				
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley , Sconset Advisory Group - The amount of wall area on the dormers is disproportionately large compared to the window size. - Ideally, the dormers would shrink, but it seems the dormer size is constrained by the existing bathroom. - Option two is preferred. - Option three is discouraged as it overwhelms the one-story roofline. - If possible, dormer windows should increase in size to achieve a more harmonious balance with the wall area.				
Concerns:	Camp - Raised concerns that the two dormers in the roof are receiving too much attention. - Noted that the dormers are overwhelming the otherwise nice story and a half scale. - Expressed uncertainty if this is a step forward in the design. Coombs - Suggested that the windows be consistent, either two over twos or six over ones. - Expressed dislike for the varying window styles and their placement. - Advocated for the dormers to be brought in, regardless of covering the bathroom. - Voiced disappointment about the potential removal of the second chimney, considering its service. - Emphasized the need for clarity on the window design, whether two over twos or six over ones. Oliver - Pointed out that the only item under consideration is a dormer at the rear of the house. - Highlighted the existing mini window in the dormer and expressed a preference for two consistent sizes lower down, favoring option two.				
Motion:	Motion to approve Option 2. (Made by: Paul) (04:11:56)				
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried – 4:1 // Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Paul (Aye) // Camp (Nay)			Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)	

4.	Andrew Rosen	148 Polpis Rd	Addition	27/16	JMS Architectures
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill				
Alternates:	Patten, Paul				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Jeffrey Spoelker				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	-				
Public Comments:	-				
Concerns:	Thornewill - Stated that the front elevation (South) is appropriate. - Expressed concern about the excessive depth of the second-floor deck on the East, estimating it to be around 16 feet out from the building. - Suggested a reduction in the size of all decks at the back, emphasizing the need for a reevaluation of their depth. - Noted the extensive fenestration on the rear but believed it might not be visible from a public way. - Expressed acceptance of the addition but called for a reconsideration of the decks. Oliver - Concurred with Carrie's opinion about the decks being the primary concern, considering them overwhelming on that side. - Expressed concern about the substantial increase in fenestration. - Initially had no concerns until realizing that Chadwick Court is a public access way, raising additional considerations. Camp - Concurred with previous statements. - Expressed agreement with the notion that with the rural setting, the extensive second-floor decks are inappropriate.				

	Coombs - Stated that the elevation with numerous windows and a large deck, possibly the north side, is too busy. - Agreed with the previous comments about too many decks and excessive size. Welch - Expressed a preference for the prior existing four-light window on the second floor, finding it more appropriate than the current double set of double sliders. - Concurred with Diane on the fenestration and agreed with others on the excessive depth of the deck. Spoelker - Clarified that the lower deck is 12 feet deep from the elevation shown, while the balcony on the second floor is a little over nine and a half feet, not 16 feet. - Explained that the side elevation wrapping around the corner is no deeper than in the back. - Mentioned the desire to have sliders on the first floor, while acknowledging the increased penetrations on the second floor. - Emphasized that the windows to the left of the sliders are existing and not proposed to change. - Provided clarification on the depth of the decks, with the lower deck being 12 feet deep and the upper balcony being over nine and a half feet. Welch - Acknowledged that the deck is longer than the maximum of 8 feet for an unsupported deck other than post. - Highlighted the concern that the deck looks very long.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revision for the deck and fenestration, specifically on the North elevation at the rear of the house. This includes reducing the size of windows, sliders, and decks. Additionally, for the East elevation, aligning the fenestration with the correlating window. (Made by: Camp) (04:21:58)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried -5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye) // Certificate # HDC2023 – (as noted)

The following items were not discussed, and no action was provided.

5.	Over Here Over There Trust	82 Polpis Rd	Cottage fenestration	44/25.6	Gryphon Architects
6.	Deborah Campbell	11 Starbuck Rd	Shed	60/25	Jacob Martinson
7.	O'Spray LLC	25 Willard Lane	Hardscape fencing	29/33	Edgewater Landscape
8.	Jonathan & Roni Foster	43 N Liberty St	Revs 09-9167 Addition	41/153	Botticelli + Pohl
9.	Squam Holdings LLC	31 Squam Rd	Partial demo/move/additions	21/3	Botticelli + Pohl
10.	1 N Swift Rock Rd Trust	1 N Swift Rock Rd	New Dwelling	40/2	Emeritus LTD
11.	1 N Swift Rock Rd Trust	1 N Swift Rock Rd	Garage Demo/move	40/2	Emeritus LTD

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- December 19th at 4pm *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:25 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VOjzqLXor9M>