



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, February 6, 2024

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:02p.m. and announcements by Chair Pohl

Staff in Attendance:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner, Billy Saad , Zoning Administrator & Land Use Specialist, Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist, Sara Johnson , Administrative Specialist
Attending Members:	Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul, Patten
Remote Participants:	Coombs, Thornewill
Absent Members:	Pohl
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	-

ADOPTION OF AMENDED AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to approve agenda. (Made by: Oliver)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver (Aye)

ALL SIGNS CONTINUED TO 02/13/24

I. SIGNS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Salvador Aguilar	5 Macy's Lane	Wall Sign	68/40	SHN
2.	Salvador Aguilar	5 Macy's Lane	Wall Sign	68/40	SHN
3.	Barbara Lewis	130 Pleasant St	Wall Sign	55/164	SHN

II. CONSENT

1.	Thomas & Kerry Donovan	104 Surfside	Move off house	67/349	EMDA
2.	Pohl Botticelli, Camille	10 R Gray Ave	Studio addition	67/178.1	Botticelli & Pohl
3.	Nantucket Landbank	54 Madaket Rd	Rev Apron	41/583	E Antonietti
4.	Nantucket Landbank	166 Hummock Pond	Demo Green house	65/13	E Antonietti
5.	Nantucket Landbank	166 Hummock Pond	Green House	65/13	E Antonietti
6.	Fredericks, Dave	4 White	Roof	80/215	Val Oliver
7.	NISDA	25 Wauwinet Rd	Roof top Solar Barn	20/80	Karen Alence
8.	Nantucket Landbank	7 Nobadeer Farm	Electric vehicle port	69/1	Laura Sinatra
9.	Town of Nantucket	4 Bathing Beach	Electric vehicle port	29/1	Laura Sinatra
10.	Town of Nantucket	166 Surfside	Electric vehicle port	87/131	Laura Sinatra
11.	Schwed Family	32 Vestal	Roof	41/46	Val Oliver
12.	Richard Ho-Shue	31A Beach Grass	Shed	68/378	Val Oliver
13.	30 Pearl LLC	30 India St	Fencing, hardscape gate	42.3.4/137	Jardins Intl.
14.	21 Comm. Wharf Nom Trust	21 Comm Wharf	Window Repair	42.2.4/6	Norton
15.	Nantucket Landbank	14 Cathcart	Fenestration	43/101	Gryphon
16.	MacTaggart, Ian	1 Brook Farm Rd	Spa new	41/222.8	MCA
17.	MacTaggart, Ian	1 Brook Farm Rd	Garage new	41/222.8	MCA
18.	MacTaggart, Ian	1 Brook Farm Rd	Main house addition	41/222.8	MCA
19.	54 Prospect St LLC	4 Birdsong	Pergola hardscape	55.4.4/80.5	Ahern LLC
20.	Hatches	129 Orange St	Window reshingle	55/147	Val Oliver
21.	Salata Elizabeth J Etal Trust	32 Jefferson	Rev walls patio gate board enc.	30/132	Ahern LLC
22.	RMM Lemonade LLC	23 Masaquet	Game court hardscape	80/139	Jardins Intl

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten
Alternates	Paul
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve Consent. (Made by: Coombs) (00:01:24)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

1. Dennis Keller 3 Nosegay Ln Solar Roof 73.1.4/14 AckSmart
 - Screening shown within application (Photos A, B, & C) to remain, maintained in perpetuity and replaces as necessary.
2. Rebecca Moesinger 13 Bartlett Road Move on House 67/11 self
 - Subject to min. 20' setback from the lot line along Bartlett Rd; and, front door facing the existing shell/dirt drive.
3. Rebecca Moesinger 13 Bartlett Road Move on Garage 67/11 self
 - Subject to fitting on the lot; connection to the existing structure (if/when later required) requires amended approval.
4. Walter Wick 17 Burnell St Replace staircase to roofwalk 73.4.2/1 Sarah Maneikis
 - pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.
5. David Brown 39 Chuck Hollow Rd Move off 75/109 Kate Sayle
 - Add date of the structure to COA: c. 1973 per NHL data
6. Kathy Reagan 49 Pleasant St Window change skylight 55/19 Paul Dreher
 - Provide comparison elevations "existing & proposed" w/ changes clouded on the proposed elevations.

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten
Alternates	Paul
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve Consent with Conditions, with the language appended to Item #4 (17 Burnell Street) struck. (Made by: Camp) (00:02:20)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

IV. OLD BUSINESS 01/02/2024

- | <u>Property owner name</u> | <u>Street Address</u> | <u>Scope of work</u> | <u>Map/Parcel</u> | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Mariyana Cavalier 08-8982 | 4b Goldfinch Rd | Addition & dormers | 68/597.1 | Mariyana Cavalier |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: None Recused: None. Last heard 09/12/23. | | | | |

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates	-
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Paul - Concerned that the front of the house will feature windows of two different colors: one color chosen by the homeowner and a different one for the view from the neighbors' perspective.
Motion	Motion to hold until next meeting, allowing time to submit photographs that will help assess the property more accurately. Specified the need for pictures showing the front of the house from the street and a side view at an oblique angle from the neighbor's perspective. (Made by: Oliver) (00:13:55)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

V. NEW BUSINESS 01/9/2024

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. O'Spray LLC	25 Willard St	Main house revision	29/33	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul			
Representative	Matt McEachern			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Discovered through survey work that the circa 1880s structure was originally built on Hulbert Avenue and moved to its current location in the 1920s and 1930s, with extensive documentation confirming its status as a contributing historic structure. - Noted approval of proposed changes, aligning with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for the new addition and previously approved work, which included specific use of SDLs (simulated divided lights) on the addition, while retaining all historic windows in the historic main mass. - Expressed that approving SDLs seems disingenuous given the structure's historic significance. - Suggested that the skirting should remain as previously approved, with bricks being more appropriate to ground the structure. - Recommended that a double window would be more suitable than the existing triple ganged window. McEachern - Clarified that the documentation they have access to dates the house around 1924, expressing interest in seeing any additional information available. - Took issue with the use of the word "disingenuous," pointing out it has been used twice and feels it suggests an intention of deceit, like a bait-and-switch tactic, which is not their intent; their only aim is to replace windows.			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.			
Motion	Motion to hold. (Made by: Coombs) (00:21:29)			
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)			
			Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

VI. NEW BUSINESS 01/23/2024

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Ack N Back LLC	33 Quidnet Rd	color change studio Rev COA	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates	Paul			
Representative	Michael Luft-Weissberg			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Questioned whether black is significantly more detrimental than gray, expressing skepticism due to the site's wide-open nature. Camp - Expressed openness to black sash if there's a precedent for it, but voiced a preference for gray, considering it more subdued and less harsh than black, particularly appreciating the gray-on-gray aesthetic. Coombs - Expressed doubt about the suitability of black sash for the location, favoring the gray-on-gray approach for better integration of the house with its landscaping, rather than making it stand out with black.			

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	Patten - Expressed uncertainty regarding the choice of black windows. Welch - Mentioned that from Quidnet Road, the structure, garage, or studio are not visible, indicating a lack of visibility for the property. - Recommended conducting a site visit despite the mentioned lack of visibility to better assess the situation.
Motion	Motion to hold for a view for this Item and Item 2 (color change MH Rev COA). (Made by: Oliver) (00:28:15)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

2. Ack N Back LLC 33 Quidnet Rd color change MH Rev COA 21/27.2-27.4 WAPD
Action taken with Item #1.

3. ACK N BACK LLC 33 Quidnet Rd Revision 08-6785 21/27.2 Ahern LLC

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates	Patten
Representative	Miroslava Ahern
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Expressed concern over the simulated photos showing the height of the walls, describing them as "ginormous" and indicating the images were alarming. Camp - Assumed that the area around the monolithic cement structure would be fully planted with grasses or similar vegetation to obscure its appearance. - Expressed concern specifically from the view from the pond itself. Coombs - Questioned whether the pond is considered a public way, suggesting the need for visibility considerations. - Raised concerns about the presence of concrete walls, noting their challenge to conceal and their discordance with the house's aesthetic and the surrounding less formal area. - Expressed a desire for alternative solutions to the concrete retainage and steps, seeking options that better harmonize with the setting. - Inquired about the Georgian Granite pavers' appearance, specifically whether they are cut to have very straight edges. Paul - Confirmed the retainage is located between the cabana and the house, making it internal to the lot and not encircling the pool. - Clarified the retainage is specifically situated in the triangular area formed by the parking, main house, and cabana, emphasizing its concealed nature. - Concluded that due to the retainage's lack of visibility and its misrepresentation in precedent images as more exposed than it actually will be, there are no concerns. Welch - Sought clarification on whether the retainage and the pool would be visible from across the pond, to which it was confirmed they would not be.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted, with the standard condition that the project cannot be subject to visibility at the time of inspection and thereafter. Added a stipulation that no grade changes are to be made without the approval of the commission. (Made by: Oliver) (00:38:28)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

4. Richard & Deborah Hohlt 121 Madaket Rd Pickle Ball Court 40/60.1 Botticelli + Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates	Paul
Representative	Lisa Botticelli
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Mentioned not seeing any pictures but went out to inspect the visibility across the pond, noting the project site is on the far end, closer to Cliff, and appears to be situated at a lower elevation. - Expressed doubt about the project's visibility from the current information available. - Raised a concern regarding potential visibility at night or additional lighting needed. Coombs - Posed a question regarding what measures are in place to prevent visibility of the structure from surrounding areas, specifically referencing Maxi's Pond and noting the lack of tall vegetation around it. - Expressed a desire for detailed information or a proposal outlining what vegetation, or barriers would be implemented to shield the structure from view. Welch - Agreed to hold the remainder of the deliberations until Botticelli receives additional information. (00:44:08) Discussion resumed at (00:55:25) Thornewill - Expressed a strong stance against approving pickleball courts in a residential neighborhood, citing a concern that such courts are often closer to neighboring homes than to the owner's, which is deemed inappropriate. - Voiced uncertainty about potentially violating Historic District Commission (HDC) guidelines with this opinion but stood by the belief that the placement of pickleball courts in such settings is wrong. Welch - Suggested having an alternate member participate in the decision-making process until clarification is obtained regarding the appropriateness of voting on an issue when there is a known predisposition against it. Botticelli - Confirmed being okay with the change of the board composition. Camp - Chose not to provide specific reasons for the opposition at this time, indicating that they are still formulating a coherent and legitimate rationale for their stance. Patten - Voiced concerns regarding the proposed pickleball court. - Noted that, based on the site plan, the court appears to be closer to the neighbors than to the owners, amplifying concerns about its placement and potential impact. Welch - Clarified that concerns about noise fall outside the committee's jurisdiction, suggesting that those issues should be addressed through town meeting for a noise bylaw modification. - Shared personal opposition to the concept of the pickleball court, aligning with concerns about it being loud, annoying, and poorly located for neighborly relations. - Acknowledged, however, that the primary consideration for the committee is visibility, not noise. - Suggested stipulations for approval that include ensuring the tall fence and any grade changes are not visible at the time of inspection or thereafter, and recommending the fence be painted in "invisible green" to minimize visual impact. - Concluded that, with these conditions met and focusing on visibility as the committee's mandate, a vote in favor would be necessary despite personal reservations.
Motion	Motion to approve through staff, with conditions including:

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- The installation of a dark green fence, no taller than what is typical for pickleball courts, adjusted to 8-10 feet based on clarification. - The stipulation that the pickleball court and fence must not be visible at the time of inspection or thereafter. - No changes to the grade from what currently exists or is depicted in the original application. (Made by: Welch) (00:44:21)
Roll-Call Vote	Failed 2-3 // Welch, Oliver (Aye) // Camp, Coombs, Patten (Nay)
Further Discussion	Welch - Suggested the possibility of revisiting the decision, mentioning that to do so would require a motion to reconsider the previously voted upon matter. - Proposed that, should the motion to reconsider pass, the subsequent action would be to hold the application for revisions and additional information. - Mentioned the typical approach of striving for a consensus on decisions, especially in cases of negative votes. - Emphasized the practice of providing the applicant with an opportunity to address concerns and make adjustments, aiming for an agreement among all parties rather than circumventing a rejection. Botticelli - Highlighted the importance of the fence height in the discussion, suggesting that it is a key factor to consider. - Indicated a willingness to revisit the topic if the debate centers on the choice between an 8 to 10 foot versus a 4-to-6-foot fence, unless the primary issue is related to noise. - Suggested that in terms of visibility, the height of the fence significantly impacts the decision.
Motion	Motion to reconsider previous motion. (Made by: Oliver) (01:06:00)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5:0 // Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Welch (Aye)
Motion	Motion to allow the applicant to gather and submit additional information, which could lead to a more informed decision-making process. (Made by: Oliver) (01:06:55)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5:0 // Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Welch (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

5. Balaji Gandhi

9 New Jersey Ave

Move House onsite

60.3.1/408

Shelter 7

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates	Paul, Thornewill
Representative	Jason Olbres
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Raised a question regarding whether the driveway is being relocated, based on the site plan's appearance. - Voiced concern over moving a contributing structure due to the existing leach field, acknowledging the health issue but expressing hesitation about the action. - Expressed relief that there are no changes to the architecture but maintained concerns about the site plan and the proposed driveway location, which appears to be shifting.
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Stated no specific concerns with the application itself but requested that information regarding the septic system's location, to justify the structure's relocation, be added to the file for documentation and clarification. Patten - Expressed agreement with the previous statements and indicated having no concerns. Coombs - Questioned the meaning of a specific detail on the site plan, referencing a red rectangle labeled as "New Jersey Ave." near the label "Ave," expressing confusion about what that area represents.

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Sought clarification on whether it indicates something being added or removed from the site, or what the purpose of that space is. - Received an explanation that the mentioned area represents a setback being created as part of the project.
	Camp - No concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Camp) (00:50:15)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

6. Drake Real Estate LLC 5 Davis Ln Rev to previous 7911 82/72 Val Oliver

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul
Alternates	Thornewill
Representative	Val Oliver
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Coombs) (00:52:10)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

7. Richard Gioiosa 4 Whitetail Circle Replace doors 71/23 John Kuszpa

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates	Paul, Thornewill
Representative	John Kuszpa
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (00:53:40)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

8. Ceylon Elves LLC 3 Wyers Way Renew coa 72818 41/380 Botticelli + Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates	Patten, Thornewill
Representative	Lisa Botticelli
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (00:54:51)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

9. Ceylon Elves LLC		3B Wyers Way	Renew coa 72941	41/380.1	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	Patten, Thornewill				
Representative	Lisa Botticelli				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	-				
Public Comments	-				
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.				
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (00:54:51)				
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)				
				Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

10. Richard Arnold		12 Winn St	New Barn	56/203	Sandcastle Construction
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill				
Alternates	Patten, Paul				
Representative	Charles (Chuck) Lenhart				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	-				
Public Comments	-				
Comments/Concerns	Thornewill - Voiced a desire to see the proposed barn, complimenting its appearance and deeming its location as the perfect setting for such a structure. Oliver - Agreed with the appropriateness of the barn's location and design, with the exception of the visibility of the glass door from Milk Street, especially at night.				
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Camp) (01:10:46)				
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)				
				Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

11. Richard & Gale Valero		7 Waydale Rd	Addition	55/84	Val Oliver
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul				
Alternates	Thornewill				
Representative	Val Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	-				
Public Comments	-				
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.				
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Camp) (01:12:59)				
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)				
				Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)

12. CMR 11 Osprey LLC		11 Osprey Way	Main House	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill				
Alternates	Patten, Paul				
Representative	Christopher Hall				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	-				

Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Thornewill - Appreciated the low massing and single-floor design. - Expressed concern about the full walls of glass on the center main mass, front and back, making it completely see-through, which was deemed inappropriate. - Noted that the ridges seem unusually long without provided dimensions, particularly seeking measurements for the north to south direction on the bedroom mass. - Mentioned the plans were on a very small scale without clear dimensions, causing some concern. - Described the chimneys as almost industrial in appearance due to their height and placement. - While appreciating the single-story massing, called for mitigation of issues related to fenestration and long ridge heights. Camp - Expressed a desire to see reduced glazing on the pond side for interior views, suggesting it is excessive. - Stated that the stone landscaping on the pond side as inappropriate and too harsh for the delicate, fragile terrain of the area. - Discussed the massing on the site, contrasting it with a previous layout that had buildings scattered randomly. - Mentioned the current proposal creates a block-like appearance that will be perceived as such from both the road and the water. - Understood the concept of desiring privacy for the pool and using the buildings for screening but found the overall massing overly large and boxy. - While appreciating the story and a half design, called for a softer approach to the architecture and landscaping to better suit the marshland environment. Coombs - Shared similar concerns with Abby and Carrie about the project's appropriateness for Osprey, noting the original house allowed for the main structure to be seen without revealing what else was there, preserving the area's character. - Voiced specific concerns about the center part of the proposal, suggesting it deviates from expected standards, especially in proximity to the pond. - Critiqued the west elevation for issues with fenestration, observing an imbalance in window and door placement, with many clustered on one side and a lack of windows on the other due to a neighboring driveway and nighttime driving activity causing headlights to shine into a bedroom. - Suggested that it is not the HDC's role to address issues caused by car headlights shining into windows and emphasized that the structure will be visible. - Expressed a dislike for the proposal based on these concerns, emphasizing the need for larger windows and criticizing the chimney's width as excessive. Oliver - Expressed appreciation for the color scheme and the building's lower stature. - Agreed with concerns about excessive glass on both the North and South sides, especially on the South side, which should resemble the front of a building. - Noted the building's unusual width at 80 feet, making it stand out in the area as it extends almost from setback to setback. - Voiced a broader concern about the presence of too many structures on the property Welch - Highlighted potential concerns with the extensive fenestration on the pond side, suggesting modifications might be needed if the project progresses. - Proposed revisiting the design once the structure's frame is up to better assess visibility and make necessary adjustments, noting this approach allows for flexibility in window or door orders. - Approved of the low ridge heights and the breakup of the ridge lines, deeming them acceptable for this particular structure. Oliver - Suggested the necessity for floor plans with more detailed dimensions of the building to gain a clearer understanding of the proposal. - Remarked that such detailed plans are typically required for review.

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	Welch - Recommended the creation of perspective views from both the pond and the street to visualize the entire ensemble as it will appear after proposed revisions. - Stated the requirement and benefit of showing views from the sides of the project to capture any oblique angles that might reveal structures visible from the pond. - Suggested that, given the capacity for such visualization, views from both the left and right sides should be provided. This would allow commission members to fully understand what would be visible from the pond, requesting these additional perspectives to supplement the current documentation. - Requested additional perspective views from the street side, specifying the need for left, right, and center angles. - Highlighted the value of visual representations in understanding the project's impact, emphasizing that a picture is worth a thousand words. - Suggested that these visual aids will assist the Historic District Commission (HDC) in making informed decisions based on visual assessments. - Indicated that these images should be included in the project file for review, stating that if the visual representations are deemed acceptable, the project can proceed; otherwise, adjustments will be necessary.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions and additional information as discussed. (Made by: Camp) (01:33:03)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

13. CMR 11 Osprey LLC 11 Osprey Way Secondary Dwelling 82/3 Christopher Hall Arch

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten, Paul
Representative	Christopher Hall
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Appreciated the single-story design but pointed out the absence of a distinct front door, noting the central area is open to courtyards. - Expressed concern about visibility through the open space and building to the pond, similar to issues with a previous application. - Mentioned the lack of architectural elements that convey the building as a welcoming home. - Voiced concerns about visibility into the courtyard and through the structure, especially at night. - Inquired about the material of the connector wings, questioning if they are made of barn board intended to naturally weather, to which the answer was affirmative. Coombs - Highlighted a discrepancy between the mentioned width of 80 feet for the structure and the Historic District Commission's (HDC) preference for a maximum width of 60 feet. - Criticized the design for resembling two block-like structures without integrating the existing vegetation and landscape. - Noted concern over the development of seven buildings on the property, which could significantly reduce the natural landscape. - Requested a streetscape or waterscape view to visualize how all the proposed structures will appear together on the double lot, emphasizing the need to understand the cumulative impact from different perspectives, such as from the pond. - Stressed the importance of seeing a comprehensive view to accurately assess the project's overall effect on the area. Welch

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Clarified the request for a two-dimensional streetscape representation to illustrate the view as seen from both the pond and the street. Thornewill - Agreed with previous comments, expressing concern over the building's length and its fortress-like appearance, which seemingly contradicts the intent to conceal the pool due to an opening leading directly to it. - Criticized the overall development plan for forming a large rectangular block, which does not align with the neighborhood's character, where buildings typically are positioned more irregularly and scattered across their lots. - Described the proposed structure as a monolith, which is highly atypical for the area, suggesting a more random and organic organization would be more fitting. - Commented on the architectural style as being rigid and although aesthetically pleasing, not suitable for the Madaket area. Camp - Echoed the use of terms like "monolithic" and "setback to setback" used by others to describe the proposed structure. - Highlighted concerns that, despite potential vegetation on Osprey, the structure's very long, unbroken ridge line would still be visible, further emphasizing its incompatibility with the landscape. - Critiqued the project for not integrating with the natural environment, describing it as block-like and fortress-like. Welch - Observed that the appearance of the proposed structure is significantly longer than the other primary dwelling, deeming it inappropriate due to its size. - Described the plan as ambitious but suggested a need for reduction in its horizontal extent ("less left to right") and for the massing to be diversified across different axes, particularly along the perpendicular axis, to integrate the desired square footage more effectively. - Supported the idea, initially proposed by Diane, of providing an elevation streetscape in addition to perspective drawings to give a comprehensive view of how the structure integrates with its surroundings.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions and additional information, specifically a perspective view of the South elevation, and a streetscape view from the pond and from the house on that South elevation, as well as views of the main building from the pond. (Made by: Camp) (01:56:06)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

14. CMR 11 Osprey LLC 11 Osprey Way Cabana 82/3 Christopher Hall Arch

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten, Paul
Representative	Christopher Hall
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Coombs - Expressed confusion regarding the perceived height of a chimney, noting discrepancies in its appearance between different views in the provided images. - Suggested that adding topographical details to the land's presentation could clarify the chimney's height relative to the property's slope. - Commented that the Cabanas' design and positioning seem acceptable, but the chimney appears disproportionately tall and lacks typical surrounding architectural features, which might not be unfavorable. - Expressed a desire to know the proposed structures' distance from the property's edge to assess visibility concerns, especially through glass areas that might offer views through the building.

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Indicated an overall acceptance of the proposed positioning but highlighted the need for more information to understand visibility and the project's integration with the landscape fully. Thornewill - Described the cabana as very contemporary and massive for its intended purpose, with a particularly clunky fireplace. - Suggested that closing the back wall of the fireplace instead of leaving it open would improve the design and recommended reworking the fireplace to make it less obtrusive, noting its unnecessary width extending above the ridge. - Highlighted a need for topographical and sectional views to understand the property better, particularly concerning the stone patio on the pond side, which appears raised significantly above grade, creating a flat platform extending to the cottage. - Expressed concern that this leveling creates a large, elevated platform across the property, noting an 8-foot drop from front to back but observing that the development appears to maintain a single flat plane, necessitating more detailed grading information. - Found the project challenging to assess due to its atypical nature compared to other properties in the area, acknowledging the site plan includes existing and proposed grades indicating a height increase for flood compliance purposes. Oliver - Expressed the opinion that the structure is unnecessarily large, particularly regarding the roof, suggesting that reducing its size could significantly minimize and simplify the design. - Recommended reducing a large portion of the chimney to help streamline the structure's overall appearance. Welch - Suggested that the design could be more modest, specifically mentioning the eave height, roof pitch, and chimney size. - Pointed out that the chimney only needs to extend 3 feet above its penetration point and be 2 feet taller than any structure within a 10-foot radius, indicating potential to significantly reduce its size. - Recommended the chimney could also be scaled down in width and depth to better align with the structure's size. - Emphasized that, given this is intended to be a secondary accessory structure, its current design does not appropriately reflect that status, suggesting a need for overall size reduction.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions and supplemental information, specifically adding numerical details to clarify the differences between existing and proposed grade changes. (Made by: Oliver) (02:07:36)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

15. CMR 11 Osprey LLC 11 Osprey Way Carport 82/3 Christopher Hall Arch

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten, Paul
Representative	Christopher Hall
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Expressed confusion about the necessity of the structure, noting its openness. - Observed that the continuous line in the first two projects (the main building and the second structure) creates a block-like appearance, which may be intentional but conflicts with the rural, marshy setting by the pond. - Criticized the design for its hard, boxy lines, suggesting it does not harmonize with the landscape and instead opposes the site's natural characteristics. Coombs

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Echoed Abby's points, questioning the need for a defined structure instead of simply allocating a parking space and designing the houses for wheelchair accessibility without specifying a particular location. - Commented on the site plan's geometric rigidity, noting that all elements are shaped as squares or rectangles, which contributes to a lack of diversity in form. - Stressed that the project requires revisions. Oliver - Noted that the carport appears significantly larger than other structures and is positioned closer to the road, with walls connecting it to the main house. - Mentioned a connector section of the house near the street that features a flat roof, contributing to a more complex and enclosed compound appearance. - Criticized the connected structures and walls for creating a fortress-like impression, suggesting it diverges from a more open and inviting residential design. - Suggested that the steep roof pitch of the carport is unnecessary, proposing a lower roofline could improve the design since there's no functional space above. - Emphasized the need for differentiation in roof heights and architectural details to break up the massing. Thornewill - Expressed the opinion that if the structure is intended to be a garage, it should be enclosed rather than open, as the current design suggests a series of buildings connected by walls without fully utilizing walls in the garage area. - Critiqued the approach of creating roofed structures primarily to circumvent ground cover limitations, suggesting it results in an unappealing massing strategy. - Proposed the alternative of a one-and-a-half-story second dwelling with an attached garage to consolidate space and reduce the footprint, aiming for a more efficient and aesthetically pleasing use of ground cover. - Highlighted concerns about creating a massive, uniform block due to the continuous roof line extending across multiple structures. Welch - Advised that the project, described as ambitious, needs to be scaled down overall to achieve a more proportional and successful design. - Suggested that the key to making the concept work is reducing the size of the secondary and accessory dwellings to a smaller scale, which would enhance their charm and contribute to the desired informality. - Highlighted the commission's policy that requires material revisions to be made within three meetings to avoid a potential denial, emphasizing the need for substantial changes in response to requests for modifications. - Clarified that this policy aims to prevent prolonged, incremental revisions over extended periods.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (02:16:24)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

16. CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Shed	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates	Patten, Paul			
Representative	Christopher Hall			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Commented that the proportions of the structure seem incorrect, suggesting that the gable side should be shorter, with adjustments needed for the eave orientation.			

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Advised awareness of the maximum height restrictions for exempt sheds, which is 16 feet, noting that the current design slightly exceeds this limit and providing this information as a helpful reminder for compliance.
	Welch
	- Emphasized the importance of proportions in the design, aligning with previous comments on the matter. - Expressed appreciation for the primarily one-story approach, considering it a successful concept and preferable to a two-story design, especially in contrast to larger two-story homes across the street.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (02:21:00)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

17. CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Pool and Hardscape	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch
18. CMR 11 Osprey LLC	11 Osprey Way	Spa	82/3	Christopher Hall Arch

Motion	Motion to track 11 Osprey Way – Pool and Hardscape/Spa. (Made by: Coombs) (02:21:10)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

19. Jesse Dutra	2 Sea Fox Circle	Pool & Hardscape	55/107.4	Waterscapes
-----------------	------------------	------------------	----------	-------------

This item was not discussed, and no action was taken.

20. Scarlett O'Hara LLC	43 Nobadeer Farm Rd	Demo/Move	69/17	Jamie Reid
-------------------------	---------------------	-----------	-------	------------

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten
Alternates	Paul, Thornewill
Representative	Jamie Reid
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Agreed that the structure in question is not historic, noting the absence of a construction date or information typically found on the property card, such as dimensions and elevations, which are usually required for review.
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Welch - Suggested that, for similar cases where approval is considered for consent, a copy of the property record should be attached as a condition of approval. - Recommended including dimensions, particularly the height of the tallest ridge, within the application information to ensure thorough documentation. - Emphasized the importance of having this information in the records for transparency and for the benefit of potential interested parties, allowing them to easily access detailed property information from the town's website before deciding to pursue further inquiries.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (02:25:50)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

21. Clifford Williams	11 Somerset Rd	Replace portico & add clapboard	56/96	Val Oliver
-----------------------	----------------	---------------------------------	-------	------------

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten
Representative	Val Oliver/Cliff Williams
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Camp

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Expressed a desire to maintain the aesthetic appeal of what is considered a very attractive house. - Emphasized the importance of seeing detailed plans for what will specifically be implemented in the renovation to ensure the house is restored or updated to its fullest potential. Coombs - Shared experiences of spending many hours inside the house, describing it as remarkable and suggesting its historical value might predate the previously thought year of 1950. - Expressed skepticism about the compatibility of a proposed portico with the house's front, describing it as potentially overpowering and incongruous with the existing architectural style. - Suggested a desire to see detailed drawings of the proposed changes, especially regarding the use of cladding instead of the existing shingle siding, to better assess the impact on the house's appearance. Thornewill - Expressed acceptance of the use of cladding for the house's exterior. - Suggested that if an entry portico is to be added, it should include posts to support the structure effectively and enhance its design. - Recommended that the front of the portico also be clad to ensure a cohesive appearance with the rest of the house's exterior. - Highlighted the importance of including trim details in the drawings to fully understand the proposed changes, indicating a preference for double posts to complement the portico's design. Paul - Concurred with previously expressed opinions, emphasizing the need for a drawing to accurately evaluate the proposed changes to the house. - Stated no objections to the use of clapboard siding as part of the proposed modifications. Welch - Expressed agreement with Joe and Carrie, underscoring the consensus on the need for a simple drawing to visualize the proposed modifications clearly. - Suggested the drawing should include the front elevation with clapboard siding, a deck with typical fascia depth, a step, and four posts to fully convey the design intent. - Added a specific request to consider the rake board's proportions, noting concerns from a Photoshop image that the rake appears wider in terms of height than is typical. - Clarified the focus is on the rake board, not the roof pitch, emphasizing the importance of ensuring the rake board's dimensions are appropriate and consistent with the main gable's design.
Motion	Motion to (hold/approve/?) proceed with clapboard siding in a quick gray and white trim. (Made by: Camp) (02:35:38)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

22. 15 CHR LLC

8 Chuck Hollow Rd

Remove chimney

72/31

Val Oliver

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul
Alternates	Thornewill
Representative	Val Oliver
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Expressed regret over the removal of the chimney but acknowledged that its absence is unlikely to significantly impact visibility. Paul - Concurred with Abby, suggesting that the chimney's removal would be more impactful if it were located on the front of the building. - Noted that due to its current placement, the chimney's absence does not significantly affect the building's overall appearance, thus supporting the decision for its removal.

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	Patten - No concerns Welch - Expressed a preference for retaining the chimney but recognized that many houses exist without them. Coombs - Concurred that the absence of the chimney does not detract from the house's appearance.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Camp) (02:39:00)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

23. 23 Sankaty Head Trust 23 Sankaty Head Rd Alterations to Garage 48/4.1 BPC
Hold until 2/13

24. South Cambridge LLC		4 S Cambridge St	Fenestration	59.4/111	JB Studio
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill				
Alternates	Paul, Welch				
Representative	Juraj Bencat				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Noted the absence of a construction date on the application but mentioned that National Historic Landmark (NHL) data suggests the house dates from the 1970s, placing it within the contributing status category. - Raised a question regarding whether the proposed changes represent a revision to a previously approved plan or a completely new proposal, as this was not clearly stated. - Expressed the opinion that the proposed fenestration changes are appropriate for the structure.				
Public Comments	-				
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners had no concerns.				
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (02:44:10)				
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)				
			Certificate #	HDC2024 – (as noted)	

25. The Westmoor Club 10 Westmoor Ln Reduce Alterations rev 12-7526 41/809 Goldsmith Architects

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates	Patten, Welch			
Representative	Adam Davis			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Paul - Observed that the scale of the structure appears visually diminished, which adds character to the building. - Acknowledged the significant number of changes, noting they are not minimal but substantial, requiring time to fully digest. - Expressed a feeling that the modifications are appropriate and did not identify any specific aspects to object to, especially when comparing the current proposal to what was previously approved. Oliver - Appreciated the reduction in height from nearly 23 feet to 19 feet 10 inches, viewing it as a positive change.			

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Agreed with Joe's perspective that the new elements added to the structure enhance its classic character. - Considered the changes both approvable and appropriate. Coombs - Affirmed the appropriateness of the modifications, recalling significant time spent discussing the project in previous years. - Noted that the structure has retained its attractiveness despite being reduced in size. Thornewill - Appreciated the reduced height and charming details of the structure.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Coombs) (02:49:00)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

26. Jeff & Michele Krohn 14 Center St Sconset Roof/outdoor shower 73.1.3/104 SMRD

This item was not discussed, and no action was taken. Hold.

Comments	Welch - Clarified that any item not heard during the current meeting will automatically carry over to the next agenda and will be considered in the next meeting. - Explained that the process will continue, with the agenda recycling itself until the item is addressed. - Noted that the final agenda for the upcoming Tuesday meeting will be posted by Friday afternoon, allowing interested parties to review it in advance. - Mentioned that if an item appears on the agenda for a second time and is still not represented, it will incur a delay before it can be heard again, emphasizing the importance of representation for items scheduled for discussion. - Highlighted the importance of applicants requesting in advance if they need to defer their item on the agenda. - Emphasized the desire to avoid situations where abutters or their representatives attend a meeting, only to find that there is no one from the applicant's side present to discuss the item.
----------	---

27. Steven Cohen Area 51 Trust 51 West Miacomet Rd Demo mov off 81/52 WAPD

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten, Paul
Representative	Miroslava Ahern
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identifying the structure as circa 1930s. - Expressed agreement with comments made by Rob.
Public Comments	Rob Benchley, Sconset Advisory Group - Discussed recent reviews of concerns regarding swimming pools and related structures on the east side of Baxter Road, noting that these concerns were not specific to the current application but to other cases in the area. - Mentioned that the visibility of the structure in question was assessed from both the footpath and Baxter Road. - Concluded that, in their opinion, the structure is well screened and unlikely to be visible to the public.
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Acknowledged Rob's concerns about the absence of swimming pools or spas on the ocean side of Baxter Road, noting that approving this proposal would establish a precedent. - Expressed appreciation for the planned screening, which could justify approval, but recommended reducing the pool's size to ensure it remains completely invisible.

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Mentioned the current dimensions of the pool as 7 by 13 feet, which aligns with a 100-square-foot area but suggested that a slight reduction in size would make the proposal more palatable. Coombs - Highlighted a precedent against allowing pools in the area, noting that whether termed a spa or a mini pool, the stance has been consistent. - Mentioned an ongoing discussion regarding a similar proposal on Baxter Road, emphasizing efforts to preserve the island's historic value. - Expressed concern about the gradual loss of the island's historical integrity. - Stated an intention to vote against the proposal based on these considerations. Oliver - Indicated agreement with Rob's position and stated having no concerns. Paul - Expressed no concerns with the proposal, due to the strategic layering and orientation used in the design. - Highlighted the positioning of the spa's narrow side towards the water as a smart choice. - Suggested that the presence of the spa would not be more intrusive or noticeable than a patio. - Concluded that the spa is likely to be unobtrusive and invisible from most vantage points unless viewed from above. Welch - Raised a concern regarding the elevation of the pool area, which is noted to be at 59 feet, making it about three feet higher than the nearby path area. - Questioned whether someone walking around the pool at this higher elevation, possibly in a bathing suit, would be visible from the path due to the difference in elevation or if the surrounding privet would effectively obscure the view and ensure privacy. Ahern - Mentioned a proposed privet hedge about six feet tall, as indicated in the plans, which is intended to serve as a visual barrier between the pool area and the surrounding environment, ensuring privacy. Camp - Discussed the size of the patio surrounding the pool, seeking clarification on its dimensions and whether it encompasses the entire area labeled as "Patio TME 240 square feet" on the plans. - Understood that the patio includes all four sides of the pool, with a depth of about 9 feet on one side, providing space for a few chaise lounges, and an additional patio area on the water side intended for dining. - Expressed additional concern about the cumulative patio space, feeling that the layered patio areas might be excessive.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted with the condition that the pool shall not be visible at the time of inspection or anytime thereafter and no grade changes are allowed beyond what exists or is depicted in the application. (Made by: Oliver) (03:06:14)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 3-2 // Welch, Oliver, Paul (Aye) // Camp, Coombs (Nay)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

Items 28-31 were not discussed and no action was taken.

28. Steven Cohen Area 51 Trust	51 West Miacomet Rd	New dwelling	81/52	WAPD
29. Steven Cohen Area 51 Trust	51 West Miacomet RD	New shed	81/52	WAPD
30. Conan & Brooke Laughlin	29 Baxter Rd	Spa & hardscape	49.2.3/9	Ahern LLC
31. Vaziki Ashkan	9 Woodbury Ln	Hardscape	41/551	Atlantic Landscaping

VII. OLD BUSINESS 01/30/2024

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Matt & Alison Smith 11-9537	232 Madaket Rd	MH Fenestration/dormer/porch	59.4/9/120.1	Brook Meerbergen
• Commissioners: <i>Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill</i> ; Alternates: <i>Welch, Oliver, Patten</i> ; Recused: <i>none</i> . Last heard 12/05/2023				
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates	Patten, Oliver			
Representative	Brook Meerbergen			

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Expressed concern about the second-floor design, particularly the configuration of two windows with a French door between them, facing the front towards Mut Road. - Suggested that the scale of these second-floor windows should be smaller compared to those on the first floor, potentially adjusting the meeting rails of the windows for better proportionality. - Found the inclusion of one French door on the second floor to be unusual or odd. - Apart from the concerns about the second-floor fenestration, did not have any other objections to the proposal. Coombs - Critiqued the placement and design of the dormer on the east elevation, suggesting it doesn't harmonize well with the rest of the structure and should be resized to align with the dimensions of the windows. - Expressed concern over the noticeable mold windows due to their darkness and recommended utilizing the available second-floor space above the French doors to distribute the mold windows more evenly. - Pointed out that the dormer and mold windows on the left side under the dormer, as well as the three mold windows on the small shed, should be better integrated into the design rather than standing out as odd. - On the south elevation, was generally accepting of the fenestration but indicated the three mold windows on the first floor might not be problematic. - Approved of the north elevation but advised that the east elevation's fenestration needs reduction. - Agreed with previous comments that the second-floor windows on the west elevation should be made smaller. - Suggested a thorough review of the fenestration across the structure for better integration and aesthetic coherence. Paul - Expressed difficulty in evaluating changes without comparing them to the previous submission, noting the attempt to keep the presentation clean by consolidating everything onto one page but highlighting the challenge this poses for assessing subtle adjustments, especially on the west elevation. - Commented on the perceived disproportion between the second-floor windows and the center door, suggesting a potential redesign of the door to better match the windows by possibly incorporating a wood panel at the bottom and adjusting the light configuration to align with the flanking windows. - Proposed that the proportions of the center door might be distorted due to the elevated header of the dormers, suggesting a possibility to slightly raise the dormers further for better balance. - Did not object to the size of the second-floor windows but recommended revisiting the railing detail to better complement the house's distinctive features, hinting at a more unique design that resonates with the home's overall character. - Felt that the current design of the center French door and the railing detail does not harmonize well with the rest of the house's architectural elements. Thornewill - Previously advocated for removing the second-floor deck on the west side, including the door, in favor of a simpler design featuring three doors with windows. - Praised the original main mass of the building for its beauty and simplicity, suggesting that the second-floor addition detracts from the overall aesthetic. - Expressed that this is the primary concern, viewing the second-floor element as an unnecessary complication to the design. Welch

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Expressed concerns about the architectural elements being incongruent, particularly noting the mismatch between the brackets on the porch and the multi-light windows (9 over 9, 6 over 9) that are historically significant to the structure. - Suggested that the current design doesn't reflect a coherent narrative of additive massing over time, which would typically be expected in historic structures. - Pointed out that the dormers, particularly their failure to align with the meeting rails, seem forced. This adjustment appears to have been made to accommodate taller first-floor windows, changing them from 6 over 9 to 9 over 9, in an attempt to increase the dormer cheek wall height based on previous meeting minutes. - Advocated for simplifying the front facade by potentially eliminating the dormers and maintaining the original window sizes to match the structure's massing style more closely. - Recommended removing the second-floor deck and the angled brackets on the porch to achieve a simpler and more coherent design. - Proposed conducting a site visit to assess the structure's visibility and the impact of these elements from the road. Camp - Suggested repositioning dormers under the eave as originally placed to preserve the structure's simplicity. - Questioned if this adjustment would be preferable or if a site view is necessary for decision-making.
Motion	Moved to approve, with Exhibit A, specifying that the three front dormers, the front second-floor door, and the second-floor deck be removed, along with the brackets on the covered porch. (Made by: Camp) (03:25:25)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

2. Matt & Alison Smith **11-9536** 232 Madaket Rd New 2nd dwelling 59.4/9/120.1 Brook Meerbergen
• *Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/05/2023*

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten, Oliver
Representative	Brook Meerbergen
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Paul - Approved the relocation of the door to a different side of the structure. - Expressed concern, with some hesitation, about the mismatch between the six-over-one window style of this structure and the fenestration on the main building. - Suggested that aligning the window styles more closely could enhance the cohesion between the two structures, making them feel more like part of the same property. Thornewill - Indicated no major concerns about the proposal, specifically noting that the deck facing the road is acceptable in this context since it doesn't disrupt the front elevation's aesthetic. - Suggested making the windows on this structure more similar to those on the main house, recommending 12 over 12s might be too large for the smaller building but suggesting six over six as an appropriate alternative. Coombs - Agreed on the importance of aligning the window styles with those of the main house, regardless of which structure undergoes changes. - Suggested adjusting the North elevation by bringing the roof in slightly to reduce the appearance of excessive space on either side of the door and windows, making the dormer narrower.

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	- Expressed a preference for six over six windows for a larger glass size instead of smaller panes, implying that the building's design could accommodate this change. - Conveyed overall approval of the building's design, with the specific recommendation to modify the dormer's width. Welch - Voiced a concern regarding the use of six-over-six windows, suggesting they add unnecessary complexity to a small structure. - Open to alternatives, mentioning the possibility of using nine-over-one windows or eventually one-light sash windows to better relate to the main house, acknowledging this may not be typical but has been seen in other instances. - Understands the plan to eventually replace the main house windows wholesale at a later date, implying that matching the smaller structure's windows to the future main house windows could enhance cohesion. - Concludes that six-over-one windows are acceptable given the structure's location, its orientation, the distance from the street, and pending updates to the main house.
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, specifying that the shed dormer be adjusted by pulling it in a foot on each side. (Made by: Thornewill) (03:34:27)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye) // Camp (Nay)
	Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)

3. Matt & Alison Smith **11-9535** 232 Madaket Rd New shed 59.4/9/120.1 Brook Meerbergen
 • **Commissioners:** *Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/05/2023*

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten, Oliver
Representative	Brook Meerbergen
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	-
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Camp) (03:37:05)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)
	Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)

4. Matt & Alison Smith **11-9534** 232 Madaket Rd Driveway 59.4/9/120.1 Brook Meerbergen
 • **Commissioners:** *Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/05/2023*

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten, Oliver
Representative	Brook Meerbergen
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	-
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Thornewill) (03:38:50)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)
	Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)

5. Andrew & Stacey Roseau 148 Polpis Rd Addition 27/19 JMS Architecture
 • **Commissioners:** *Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill; Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: none. Last heard 12/12/2023*

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill
---------	---

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

Alternates	Patten, Paul
Representative	Jeffrey Spoelker
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Thornewill - Expressed a desire to modify the front (south) elevation by changing the new double dormer on the second floor to a single window and narrowing the dormer width, noting the absence of ganged windows on that elevation. - Suggested that the double window makes the elevation appear top-heavy, directing too much focus to that area. - Concluded that making these adjustments to a single window and reducing the dormer's width would resolve the concern. Oliver - Agreed with the previously mentioned suggestion, indicating no additional concerns beyond those already expressed. Coombs - Concurred with the suggestion of splitting the mold window, aligning with Carrie's observation. - Acknowledged the presence of other mold windows but noted the difficulty in visualizing the house with these features from a distance. - Commented on the abundance of windows on the north elevation but recognized that they appear to be existing features of the house. Camp - Acknowledged that most of the windows on the north elevation already exist. - Expressed initial concern about the number of windows but agreed with Carrie's points on the matter. - Reflected on the front elevation, suggesting that the area with excessive fenestration is primarily on the first floor. - Concluded that due to its positioning, this fenestration is likely to be more obscured from view. Welch - Mentioned no additional concerns beyond noting the potential challenge the window-to-wall ratio could pose in meeting the requirements of the stretch code. - Advised enhancing insulation to compensate, suggesting the current design might exceed the 50% window coverage limit.
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, converting the second-floor south elevation to a single shed dormer. Specified that this dormer should be narrower than currently proposed. (Made by: Camp) (03:55:48)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

6. ● Robert Stock **08-9002** 50 Squam Rd As-built Fence 31/13 Cohen + Cohen
- *Commissioners: Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul; Alternates: None; Recused: none. Last heard 11/28/2023*
- This item was not discussed and no action was taken, due to a lack of representation.**

7. NT Conserv. Fndtion **11-9489** 165 Cliff Rd New dwelling 41/65 Val Oliver
- *Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill; Alternates: Paul; Recused: Oliver. Last heard 12/05/2023*

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill
Alternates	Patten
Representative	Val Oliver
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

Comments/Concerns	Thornewill - Expressed strong appreciation for the comprehensive redesign aimed at making the structure more subdued and fitting for a rural setting. Coombs - Stated that the new design is satisfactory and visually appealing. Camp - Questioned the choice of doghouse dormers on the secondary mass to the left, suggesting that replacing them with a shed dormer might create a quieter and more cohesive appearance. Patten - Expressed appreciation for the modifications made to the design. - Stated having no concerns with the current proposal.
Motion	Motion to approve. (Made by: Thornewill) (03:55:30)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

8. ● Tigerlilly Nom Trust **01-7671** 7 Barnabas Lane Pool & hardscape 41/563 Ahern LLC
● **Commissioners:** *Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: Pohl, Thornewill, Patten; Recused: None. Last heard 01/09/2024*

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates	Patten, Thornewill
Representative	Miroslava Ahern
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted the project's location within the Woodberry subdivision, surprisingly part of the Old Historic District (OHD). - Expressed appreciation for the removal of pavers and the redesign of the driveway, considering it a suitable adjustment. - Commended the decision to relocate the pool and paving to comply with setback requirements, improving the proposal's appropriateness. - Raised a concern about potential visibility due to the openness of the back lot. - Suggested enhancing the vegetation planned for the rear setback to ensure adequate screening and minimize visibility issues.
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Clarified the distinction between being in the Old Historic District (OHD) and not being in the residential old historic district due to zoning nuances. - Acknowledged that the project is well within their zone of review. - Recommended moving the garage further from the street towards the pool, in line with suggestions from "Building with Nantucket in Mind" to position structures as far back as possible. - Commented on the square-cut pavers at the front of the property, noting they appear too formal for the area. - Expressed agreement with concerns about visibility, particularly from Barnabus Lane, noting that privet hedge might not provide sufficient screening for the pool in winter. - Suggested enhancing screening between the buildings to obscure the pool more effectively year-round.
Comments/Concerns	Paul - Expressed appreciation for the modifications made to the driveway and the relocation of the pool, recognizing the effort to address previous comments. - Voiced a residual concern about the potential visibility of the pool between structures, though not entirely convinced it would be an issue. - Acknowledged that ensuring the pool is not visible at the time of inspection falls to the applicant, indicating a willingness to rely on this requirement. - Stated having no specific additional comments based on the changes observed.

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

	Coombs - Concurred with the suggestion to move the garage further back, noting it could improve the pool's placement and visibility concerns. - Revisited previous thoughts on the pool's orientation, initially considering an "up and down" placement might be preferable to its current positioning, but acknowledged that visibility might be less impacted with the current layout. - Echoed the opinion that the pavers leading to the structure should be less formal, aligning with feedback about the driveway's design. - Shared observations from visiting in various weather conditions, highlighting challenges in maintaining privacy and visibility restrictions through vegetation alone. - Expressed reluctance towards introducing fencing as a solution due to potential complications. - Summarized that effectively concealing the pool area falls to the applicant's discretion and effort, emphasizing the need for a solution that maintains the area's aesthetic integrity while ensuring privacy. Oliver - Stated having no additional comments or concerns to contribute to the discussion. Camp - Mentioned the pool is excessively large and visible from Barnabas Lane between two buildings. - Expressed a preference to relocate the garage further back to extend the driveway, contributing to a more historic appearance by lengthening the driveway and positioning the garage at the rear.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted with the condition that the pool shall not be visible at the time of inspection or anytime thereafter and no grade changes are allowed beyond what exists or is depicted in the application. (Made by: Oliver) (04:04:46)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 3-2 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye) // Camp, Coombs
Certificate # HDC2024 – (as noted)	

Items 9-13 were not discussed and no action was taken, due to a lack of representation.

9. Ospray LLC 12-9577	25 Willard St	Hardscape & fence	29/33	Edgewater Landscape
10. 26 Quidnest LLC	26 Quidnet Path	New Dwelling	21/150	Emeritus LTD
11. 1 N Swift Rock Tr.	1 N Swift Path	New dwelling	40/2	Emeritus LTD
12. Whitney Gifford Tr.	32 Pocomo Rd	Gate, driveway, & fence	14/77	Emeritus LTD
13. Kathryn Cook 12-9637	85 Low Beach Rd	Glass Connector rev 10-7257	75/31.3	Rich Gammons
14. Richard and Lina Andersen	8 High Brush Path	New Fence	56/370	Link
Voting:	Camp, Paul, Patten			
Alternates	-			
Representative	Victoria Ewing			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed concern about the extensive fencing right on the property line and indicated that a lack of photos, which were not included in the online packet, prevents making a decision.			
Motion	Motion to hold for a view. (Made by: Patten) (04:21:55)			
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 3-0 // Camp, Paul, Patten (Aye)			
		Certificate #		HDC2024 – (as noted)

The remaining Items listed below were not discussed and no action was taken.

VIII. VIEW 02/06/2024				
1. Dodgers Janis	9 Orange St	New parking spaces	42.3.1/150	NAG
IX. NEW BUSINESS 02/06/2024				

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

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

1. Town of Nantucket	19 Waitt Dr	New Dwelling	67/925, 926, 927	J & J Construction
2. Kinsella, Catherine	19B Hummock Pond Rd	Barn	56/468	Self
3. Reade Arthur Trust	19 Monomoy Rd	Pool, patio, retaining walls	54/260	NAG
4. Wynn Shield	5 Friendship	Door window	66/249	Wynne
5. Caroline Way LLC	1 Caroline Wy	Rev Shed	82/58-59	Vincent Burn
6. Golden Eye	5 Grant	Guest house doors	30/143	Patrick Ahern
7. 32 Hulbert Trust	32 Hulbert	New shed	29/72	Botticelli & Pohl
8. Red Horse LLC	88 Quidnet Rd	Fen revs	21/109	Botticelli & Pohl
9. Stone Post Way LLC	7 Stone Post Wy	New Dwelling	74/79	K Megna
10. Tamara King	52 W Chester	Omit addition, fen changes	41/381	Emeritus
11. MacTaggart, Ian	1 Brook Farm Rd	Cabana New	41/222.8	MCA
12. Ack N Back	33 Quidnet	Pickleball	21/27.2	Ahern LLC
13. Town of Nantucket	24 Surfside	Demo	55/243	John McMeeking
14. Town of Nantucket	24 Surfside	Addition/Windows	55/243	John McMeeking
15. RMM Lemonade LLC	23 Masaquet	Game court hardscape	80/139	Jardins Intl
16. 25 ACK LLC	25 Pleasant	New Dwelling	55.4.1/111	EMDA
17. 26 Fair LLC	26 Fair St	Addition	42.3.2/171	EMDA
18. 4 Brothers ACK LLC	30 Tashama Ln	Revisions porch	55/455	EMDA
19. Foster, Jonathan & Roni	43 N Liberty St	Rev 2023-12-9566	41/153	Botticelli & Pohl
20. Butler, Henry & Cassandra	3 Evergreen Wy	New Dwelling	68/726.1	K Megna
21. Youngman, Thomas	32 York St	Window replacement	55.4.1/101	Val Oliver
22. Jason Mendelson	69 Monomoy	Rev	43/102	Studio Park
23. Lori Geddes	13 Evergreen Wy	Rev	68/718	Reid Yenor
24. RMM Lemonade LLC	23 Masaquet Ave	Move shed on site	80/139	Jardins Intl
25. Grant Cambridge	40 Easton	Hardscape, gates, Fence	42.1.4/20	Champoux Landscape
26. John Wise	18 Williams St	Move Reno	55/371	Normand
27. John Wise	18 Williams St	New driveway	55/371	Normand
28. Mid Century Modern LLC	21 Vestal St	Porch infill, fenestration	41/175	Normand
29. Mid Century Modern LLC	21 Vestal St	hardscape	41/175	Normand
30. 90 Noah Liberty Prev Trust	90 N Liberty	Garage partial demo	41/22	Botticelli & Pohl
31. 90. Noah Liberty Prev Trust	90 N Liberty	Shed move	41/22	Botticelli & Pohl
32. Congdon & Coleman	57 Main St	Roof	42.3.1/221	James Lydon
33. McNeill Family	10 Mattapoisett	Shed	82/117	Val Oliver
34. Don Allen Ford	24 Polpis	Windows doors	54/177	Val Oliver
35. Old Thumper LLC	29 Youngs	Storage Container	67/690	Val Oliver
36. Valencia, Rudy	33 Daffodil Ln	pool	68/743	NAG
37. Valencia, Rudy	33 Daffodil Ln	shed	68/743	NAG
38. Richard & Sarah Ward	69 S Shore	Addition	80/303	BPC
39. Judy	4 Dooley Ct	Pool	68/152	Val Oliver
40. 14 Bishop Rise Nantucket	14 Bishops Rise	Rev Entry door	40/124	Emeritus LTD
41. FP 4 N Water	4 N Water	New dwelling	42.4.2/90	Emeritus LTD
42. XXII Years LLC	3 Maxey Pond	Main House Addition	40/106	Permits Plus
43. XXII Years LLC	3 Maxey Pond	Guest House Addition	40/106	Permits Plus
44. KAC Holdings LLC	156 Madaket	Pickleball, driveway	39/13.4	Atlantic
45. Ack Northstar Devel	2 Braeburn	spa	39/41	Atlantic
46. RHACK LLC	20 Sherburne TPK	Railing arbor	30/195	Atlantic
47. Uf Select Prperties	14 S Mill St	roof	55.4.1/56.2	Gashi Construction
48. Goldstuck Charles & Karen	8 Mooers Ave	New Deck	30/248	WAPD
49. Turner, Suzanne	9 Long Pond Dr	Rev 2021-09-4551	59/33	Botticelli & Pohl
50. McCollum, Susan	35 Eel point Rd	Rev 2023-10-9346	32/63	Botticelli & Pohl
51. 8 New St LLC	8 New St	Replace fnt door/color change	55.4.1/35	LFW
52. Kevin Dineen	10 Newtown Rd	Fenestration change	55/198	LFW
53. NT Property Owner	5 Indigo	Handicap ramp	68/862	LFW
54. NT Property Owner	7 Indigo	Handicap ramp	68/863	LFW
55. NT Property Owner	13 Honeysuckle	Handicap ramp	68/873	LFW
56. 20A Bishops Rise Invt	20A Bishops Rise	MH rev window color change	40/127	LFW
57. 20A Bishops Rise Invt	20A Bishops Rise	Garage rev window color change	40/127	LFW
58. 20A Bishops Rise Invt	20A Bishops Rise	New cabana	40/127	LFW
59. 20B Bishops Rise Invt	20B Bishops Rise	MH rev window color change	40/127.1	LFW

Minutes for February 6, 2024; adopted April 23, 2024

60. 20B Bishops Rise Inv't	20B Bishops Rise	Garage rev window color change	40/127.1	LFW
61. Harold Brothers Realty	2/4 Highland Ave	roofwalk	30/289&187	LFW
62. 5 Surfside Rd LLC	5 Surfside	MH expand deck	55/253	LFW
63. 5 Surfside Rd LLC	5 Surfside	Cottage Expand deck	55/253	LFW

COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS/REQUESTS

Coombs

- Noted the extension for the trailer at the old fire department, granted to the town, expired on December 27th, and the trailer remains onsite without any notification of future plans.
- Requested to add it to a future agenda for further discussion.

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- February 12th at 4pm *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**
- Discussion on type of zoning changes proposed in the Town Meeting Warrant.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:22 pm (Coombs)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 6-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1urz1PMlGOs&t=6269s>