



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 13, 2024

Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER at 4:01p.m. and announcements by Chair Pohl	
Staff in Attendance:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner, Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist, Sara Johnson , Administrative Specialist
Attending Members:	-
Remote Participants:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten, Thornewill
Absent Members:	-
Late Arrivals:	-
Early Departures:	-

Chair Pohl announced the removal of item number 20 from the consent agenda as it had already been approved. Decided to strike item number one at 14 South Mill from the Consent with Conditions section due to it being a like-kind replacement. Informed the audience that the discussion on 33 Quidnet Road pickleball, item number 16 on the New Business of February 6th, has been placed on hold.

Commissioner Oliver requested to schedule a future discussion to address the planning board's consideration of increasing building heights to 40 feet. Emphasized the necessity for the board to provide input on this issue and recalled a previous discussion about it. Asked staff to prioritize this topic as the first "other business" item on the agenda for next Tuesday, highlighting its time-sensitive nature.

ADOPTION OF AMENDED AGENDA	
Motion:	Motion to approve agenda. (Made by: Camp)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

I. CONSENT				
1. Ack Northstar Devel	2 Braeburn	Spa	39/41	Atlantic
2. RHACK LLC	20 Sherburne TPK	Railing Arbor	30/195	Atlantic
3. 20A Bishops Rise Invt	20A Bishops Rise	MH Rev Window Color Change	40/127	LFW
4. 20A Bishops Rise Invt	20A Bishops Rise	Garage Rev Window Color Change	40/127	LFW
5. 20A Bishops Rise Invt	20A Bishops Rise	New Cabana	40/127	LFW
6. 20B Bishops Rise Invt	20B Bishops Rise	MH Rev Window Color Change	40/127.1	LFW
7. 20B Bishops Rise Invt	20B Bishops Rise	Garage Rev Window Color Change	40/127.1	LFW
8. 5 Surfside Rd LLC	5 Surfside	MH Expand Deck	55/253	LFW
9. 5 Surfside Rd LLC	5 Surfside	Cottage Expand deck	55/253	LFW
10. Richard & Sarah Ward	69 S Shore	Addition	80/303	BPC
11. 14 Bishop Rise Nantucket	14 Bishops Rise	Rev Entry Door	40/124	Emeritus LTD
12. XXII Years LLC	3 Maxey Pond	Main House Addition	40/106	Permits Plus
13. XXII Years LLC	3 Maxey Pond	Guest House Addition	40/106	Permits Plus
14. Kevin Dineen	10 Newtown Rd	Fenestration change	55/198	LFW
15. NT Property Owner	5 Indigo	Handicap Ramp	68/862	LFW
16. NT Property Owner	7 Indigo	Handicap Ramp	68/863	LFW
17. NT Property Owner	13 Honeysuckle	Handicap Ramp	68/873	LFW
18. Jason Mendelson	69 Monomoy	Rev	43/102	Studio Park
19. Lori Geddes	13 Evergreen Wy	Rev	68/718	Reid Yenor

20. RMM Lemonade LLC	23 Masaquet Ave	Move Shed on Site	80/139	Jardins Intl
21. Mid Century Modern LLC	21 Vestal St	Porch Infill, Fenestration	41/175	Normand

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten
Alternates	-
Recused	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: Oliver) (00:05:51)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten (Aye)

II. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

1.	Uf Select Properties	14 S Mill Street	Roof	55.4.1/56.2	Gashi Const.
	• Add the date of the structure on the application.				
2.	Goldstuck Charles & Karen	8 Mooers Avenue	New Deck	30/248	WAPD
	• Add the date of the structure on the application.				
3.	Turner, Suzanne	9 Long Pond Drive	Rev 2021-09-4551	59/33	Botticelli & Pohl
	• Add the date of the structure on the application.				
4.	McCollum, Susan	35 Eel Point Road	Rev 2023-10-9346	32/63	Botticelli & Pohl
	• Add the date of the structure on the application.				
5.	Varty, Judy	4 Dooley Court	Pool	68/152	Val Oliver
	• Submit prior approval or as-built to verify the location of the house.				
6.	Butler, Henry & Cassandra	3 Evergreen Way	New Dwelling	68/726.1	K Megna
	• Rear slider to be 16 pane, pane size to match "C" window.				
7.	Wise, John	18 Williams Street	Move Reno	55/371	Normand
	• Windows to be TDL (not SDL) on this historic structure. Rebuilt chimney to have BWNIM corbelling.				

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates	-
Recused	Pohl, 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 Consent with Conditions. (Made by: Thornewill) (00:06:48)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

III. COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND VOTE

1. Clarifying Requirements for Minutes

Discussion	Welch - Discussed how minutes handling and staff approvals have evolved, with a focus on using Exhibit A for approvals requiring significant modifications. - Explained that Exhibit A helps streamline the process by detailing mid to high-level modifications, making the approval process more efficient. - Argued that the Historic District Commission (HDC) should not require minutes for staff approvals, as these should be simple in nature and clearly outlined in the motion itself. - Emphasized the importance of making staff approvals straightforward and having the motion text fully support the required actions to lighten the staff's workload. - Suggested clarifying this approach to all parties involved, including applicants and staff, to ensure understanding and compliance.
------------	--

- Noted that other boards do not rely on minutes to define motions and highlighted the challenges of capturing multiple changes in motions, hence the reliance on Exhibit A for detailed modifications.
- Proposed that motions for staff approval should be reserved for simple architectural changes, like modifications to dormers or color changes, with the aim of making these approvals straightforward and not requiring detailed minutes.

Oliver

- Expressed agreement with Stephen, noting that the current process is becoming overly complicated for individuals seeking permits, and commended the clarity of the explanation provided.

Holly Backus, Preservation Planner

- Acknowledged the usefulness of Exhibit A in staff approvals, but also highlighted the occasional need for minutes to clarify discrepancies between the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and Exhibit A.
- Shared experiences of inconsistencies between the COA and Exhibit A, necessitating clarification from commissioners who were involved in the motion or creation of Exhibit A.
- Understood the intention behind the current process and mentioned receiving a public comment, which was forwarded to the board and Town Administration. However, highlighted that the suggestion to include links for each motion in Zoom meetings was deemed too burdensome and not required by open meeting law.
- Expressed hope that the minutes taker could address the recent lapse in meeting minutes documentation, while also appreciating the role of Exhibit A in mitigating discrepancies between COAs and minutes, thanking the commission for implementing this process.
- Emphasized the need for clarity and conciseness in motions and what is documented in the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) as well as in Exhibit A, to ensure applicants fully understand the requirements set forth.

Welch

- Stressed the responsibility of the motion maker to ensure their motion is accurately and succinctly recorded at the time of the meeting.
- Highlighted the necessity for those making motions during Zoom meetings to visit the office afterward to confirm or write down their motions, noting this as not a significant burden.
- Made exceptions for certain members, like Diane, suggesting alternatives such as having a designated person to help write motions to accommodate any limitations.
- Concluded with the assertion that all details to be recorded, especially for Exhibit A, must be clear and precise, reinforcing the earlier comments on staff approval motions needing to be accurately documented.

Pohl

- Summarized Stephen's explanation by clarifying that when creating an Exhibit A, the document itself represents the specific details being voted on for approval, and whatever is contained within Exhibit A constitutes the board's official approval.

Thornewill

- Addressed the procedural implications for applicants, noting they no longer receive Exhibit A directly and must instead reference meeting minutes for necessary revisions.
- Explained that applicants must now proactively visit the office, consult with staff, such as Holly, and review their file, including the COA, any notes, and Exhibit A, to understand the requirements for staff approval changes.
- Clarified this process as the current method for applicants to obtain the information needed to make the approved changes, emphasizing the absence of online minutes as a resource for this information.

Welch

- Clarified that the suggestion was not about changing the fundamental process but ensuring the accuracy of staff approvals on the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and that Exhibit A precisely reflects the motion, enabling staff to rely on these documents.

- Highlighted the issue of delayed minutes and the challenges it presents, without placing blame on any specific party, acknowledging the high volume of minutes to be processed and some expectations for individuals to generate their own minutes.
- Proposed practical steps for applicants to obtain necessary information: taking a picture of Exhibit A at the meeting and doing the same for staff approval details at the desk, simplifying access to this information without depending on minutes.
- Emphasized the goal of simplifying the process to ensure accuracy and efficiency, without suggesting fundamental changes to the existing procedures.

Backus

- Reinforced the method of obtaining Exhibit A information by advising that attendees of in-person meetings can approach the desk to take a picture of Exhibit A immediately after a motion is made, as Stephen suggested.
- Mentioned that in cases where Joe drafts the Exhibit A, he directly emails a digital copy to staff, ensuring a digital record is available.
- Clarified that while staff can forward this digital copy of Exhibit A to agents upon request, it is not staff's responsibility to proactively provide it to agents.
- Recommended that agents either take a photo of Exhibit A during the meeting or visit the office if they missed doing so, emphasizing this approach over relying on staff to supply the information.

Thornewill

- Agreed with Stephen's points, emphasizing that it is the applicant's responsibility to acquire the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and Exhibit A, whether by taking a snapshot at the meeting or visiting the office.
- Clarified that minutes are not necessary for processing staff approvals, reaffirming the bottom line that the essential documents are the COA and Exhibit A.

Camp

- Raised concerns about the accessibility of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and Exhibit A for applicants who attend meetings via Zoom, particularly those who are off-island and cannot physically go to the office.
- Highlighted the potential difficulty for individual applicants without architectural office support.
- Suggested that the current process might be overly burdensome for such applicants, calling attention to the need for a more accessible method for remote or individual applicants to obtain necessary documentation.

Backus

- Clarified that off-island agents or applicants needing a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) can contact staff to request a copy, which is typically mailed to them, ensuring accessibility despite geographical barriers.
- Added that if any part of the process, such as Exhibit A, is completed digitally by a Commissioner, staff can easily forward it, further facilitating the process for those who cannot physically visit the office.

Oliver

- Discussed the past practice where individuals were asked to resubmit minutes for old business due to delays in official minutes preparation, resulting in submissions that were essentially outlines rather than official minutes.

Pohl

- Clarified that minutes created by applicants are not formalized in the official record but serve as a temporary reference for understanding discussions on applications reviewed in past meetings.
- Acknowledged that while these applicant-generated minutes help recall specifics of discussions from months prior, they cannot be officially adopted as it would equate to applicants monitoring themselves.

Welch

- Reminded everyone that applicants are only required to submit their version of minutes or a summary when it is explicitly requested as part of a motion for revisions, highlighting that outside of this specific scenario, submitting minutes is not a standard requirement.

	Backus - Stressed that self-written "minutes" by individuals are intended to assist with old business discussions and are not formalized in the official record. - Noted that official minutes remain the authoritative document. - Made a clarification that if the commission approves anything through staff, it will be accompanied by a detailed Exhibit A, eliminating the need for minutes except in cases where the commission explicitly includes a request for minutes in their motion.
Motion	Motion is as follows: - Exhibit A Revisions: All revisions detailed in Exhibit A shall be recorded directly on Exhibit A. This ensures clarity and direct association of revisions with their respective approval documents. - Staff Approval Motions and Requirements: All motions and requirements pertaining to staff approvals are to be accurately recorded on the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). Accuracy in both Exhibit A and the COA is paramount to uphold the integrity of the approval process. - Minutes Requirement: • Revisions: Minutes detailing revisions are required only when explicitly requested by the commission. This applies to all cases where revisions to applications or proposals are discussed and determined. • Approvals: Similarly, minutes detailing approvals are mandated solely upon the commission's request. This ensures that only critical discussions and decisions necessitate formal minute documentation. (Made by: Welch) (00:26:30)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten (Aye)

After some technical difficulties, Commissioner Coombs was able to join the meeting. (00:28:00)

IV. 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
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Stated that per the recommendations of the Sign Advisory Council: * Approve item one for 5 Macy's Lane, with the condition to mandate the removal of all unapproved signs within 30 days of stamped approval.				
Public Comments	-				
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.				
Motion	Motion to approve, per the Sign Advisory Council's recommendation. (Made by: Oliver) (00:29:00)				
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)				

2.	Salvador Aguilar	5 Macy's Lane	Wall Sign	68/40	SHN
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Stated that per the recommendations of the Sign Advisory Council: * Approve item two for 5 Macy's Lane, with the conditions to mandate the removal of all unapproved signs within 30 days of stamped approval and include an updated dimensional sheet in stamped approval				
Public Comments	-				
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.				

Motion	Motion to approve, per the Sign Advisory Council's recommendation. (Made by: Oliver) (00:29:00)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

3. Barbara Lewis 130 Pleasant Street Wall Sign 55/164 SHN

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Stated that the Sign Advisory Council recommends approval.
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve, per the Sign Advisory Council's recommendation. (Made by: Oliver) (00:29:30)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

V. NEW BUSINESS 01/09/2024

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. O'Spray LLC	25 Willard Street	Main House Revisions	29/33	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Representative	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Received the updated draft Form B, highlighting the importance of updating historic cultural resources and the continuous effort to secure Federal funding as a Certified Local Government (CLG). - Discussed "Salt Air," originally constructed in 1881-1882 by James H. Gibbs, a well-known builder, and moved to its current location in 1938 by the Constable family from 45 Hulbert Avenue. - Noted that all supporting documentation has been provided to the Commission and to architectural historians for updating the HDC survey, emphasizing the value of accurately updating such records. - Commended the Commission's approval of an appropriate addition made by Matt, which included SDL windows for the addition while retaining the original windows on the main block of the structure, underscoring the historical significance of the original section that was moved. - Mentioned a window survey conducted last year aimed at retaining existing windows and integrating SDLs in the proposed addition, highlighting efforts to preserve the structure's historical integrity. - Acknowledged the sensitivity of the changes made to the historic structure over time, preserving its character while meeting modern standards. - Appreciated the modifications to the South elevation to replace a triple gang window with a more appropriate double gang setup and discussed the structure's adaptation to FEMA flood regulations through elevation and the inclusion of piers, referencing compliance with the design guidelines outlined in "Building with Nantucket in Mind" for resilience and historical preservation.			
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Echoed Holly's comments, emphasizing the importance of preserving old and historic windows in the original building, noting their potential age of 80 to 100 years and advocating for their retention to maintain the building's historic character. - Addressed the topic of the brick piers, agreeing with Holly that while the original building did not feature them and was positioned lower, the elevation necessary for FEMA compliance introduces a significant change in appearance.			

	- Highlighted the preference for retaining the brick piers to help ground the structure and mitigate the modern look that elevation can impart. Linda Williams - Conducted a window survey and provided numerous photos for review. - Noted that not all windows are original, with several being replaced on the south side for a new addition. - Observed modifications such as brass sashes and vinyl tracks, indicating changes from the original construction. - Investigated the building's history, stating it was not present in aerial photographs from the 1880s and 1890s. - Mentioned personal involvement in relocating and reconstructing the building on its original site before moving to Willard. - Reviewed historical aerial images and could not find evidence of the building's original existence as indicated by GIS data marked "1920 something." - Highlighted difficulties in sharing digital resources but confirmed having accessed and reviewed correct ledge profiles, noting a Nantucket profile with a thinner frame compared to what was discussed in a previous meeting. - Urged the committee to consider the newly observed window profile, emphasizing its similarity to standard frames from known brands and its suitability given the building's distance from the street. - Emphasized the replacement of inefficient triple track windows with double-paned wood windows for improved functionality. - Related the situation to a personal experience with a similar building, highlighting consistency in window replacement decisions by the committee.
Comments/Concerns	Welch - Requested to see a sample, emphasizing the building's significance and the appropriateness of the proposal. - Expressed no concerns regarding changes to the fenestration, other than the specific aspects discussed. - Advocated for the retention of brick piers in the foundation, highlighting their importance in grounding the building and providing a sense of traditional structure. - Critiqued current trends in foundation planning, arguing for a consistent approach that maintains traditional elements such as brick piers over more modern, platform-like structures. Coombs - Agreed on the necessity of replacing the post and skirt, aligning with Holly and Steve's recommendations to enhance the structure's grounding. - Speculated on the building's construction era, suggesting it might date back to the 1890s, which raises questions about the longevity of the original windows. - Inquired about the availability of a window survey detailing the number and age of the existing windows to assess their historical accuracy and condition. MacEachern - Confirmed that a comprehensive window survey was conducted and documented through photographs by Linda, covering every window from both inside and outside perspectives. - Noted that the photographs clearly indicate which windows have vinyl interiors, supporting the assessment of non-original windows. - Agreed with the observation that none of the windows appeared to be from the 1880s, acknowledging the presence of numerous replacements. - Emphasized the availability of detailed photographic evidence for each window within the structure. Coombs - Questioned the necessity of replacing all windows in the house or only specific ones to achieve a uniform appearance. - Expressed a preference for consistency in the windows' design to enhance the building's aesthetic coherence.

	- Highlighted the importance of windows due to their visibility from all around the building, advocating for the selection of a design that is both recognizable and fitting. - Expressed appreciation for the reduction in the number of windows from three to two in a certain area, indicating approval of this modification. - Voiced no major objections to other aspects of the proposal, noting that the changes seem appropriate for the building's context. - Emphasized the goal of matching the windows as closely as possible to their original state or repairing them if feasible, provided they are age-appropriate for the building. - Conveyed a desire to see a chosen example of the proposed window design to ensure it aligns with the historical accuracy and aesthetic objectives. Oliver - Agreed with many previously expressed points but raised concerns about limiting acceptable window brands, suggesting this could significantly impact costs for property owners. - Proposed that any brand preferences be publicly posted. - Highlighted the challenge of balancing energy efficiency with the high costs associated with certain preferred brands. - Mentioned that, except for buildings with a historic designation, total renovations are required to meet stringent energy codes, underscoring the tension between preserving historical integrity and complying with modern energy standards. Backus - Pointed out that the building in question has already been granted a historic determination by the HDC, which could exempt it from certain modern requirements. - Emphasized the relevance of this historic determination in the context of discussions about energy efficiency and window replacement standards. MacEachern - Clarified that buildings with a historic determination may be issued permits by the building department that exempt them from complying with current energy codes. - Acknowledged the trade-off of potentially higher heating costs due to less energy-efficient features in historically determined buildings. - Rationalized the decision on windows, noting that not all are original, with many replaced in the past 25-30 years, thereby not strictly adhering to historical authenticity. - Highlighted that omitting triple-track storm windows contributes to a more architecturally consistent and aesthetically pleasing detail for the building. Camp - Decided to endorse Green Mountain Windows for their consistency and quality throughout the building. - Advocated for retaining the brick pilings to preserve the building's character and historical essence. - Suggested that due to the building's location, being somewhat isolated, it presents an excellent opportunity to assess the impact of these choices on the area's aesthetic and historical integrity. Welch - Emphasized to the board the importance of not endorsing specific window brands over others but rather approving windows based on their conformity to the detailing appropriate for the neighborhood and context. - Clarified that window approval should be based on architectural details rather than brand, allowing for a range of brands like Green Mountain or Marvin, provided they meet the required standards. - Agreed on the importance of restoring the brick piers to maintain the building's character. - Stated the need to review the detailed designs of the window jambs and sills, regardless of the brand, to assess the appropriateness of the muntins, sash, and stops in relation to the building's historical architecture.
Motion	Motion to approve, with the following conditions: 1. The elevation of the first floor must not exceed the minimum required design flood elevation as per 780 CMR. 2. The piers must not be removed and will be required to remain as part of the structure.

	3. An image of the proposed windows in their entirety must be reviewed by the chair and approved prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). (Made by: Welch) (00:56:21)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

VI. VIEW 01/23/2024

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Ack N Back LLC	33 Quidnet Road	Color Change Studio Rev COA	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Representative	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	Rick Atherton (01:30:20) - Expressed a preference for gray over white, specifically in the context of discussing colors. - Sought clarification on a previous discussion regarding the color black, indicating uncertainty about whether the black was intended for the windows only and not the trim.			
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Suggested that a darker color, rather than white, would be more suitable given the building's rural context, but confirmed the visibility of the structure. Welch - Observed that the shadow and glass make the assembly appear as a single dark element. - Given the distance from the street and the limited visibility, expressed approval. Coombs - Suggested introducing variation in color to diversify the visual landscape, noting the area's original character. - Proposed that while maintaining a darker hue for the subject property, opting for a distinct color from the neighboring houses could enhance the neighborhood's overall appearance. Camp - Expressed tentative approval for the current proposal but shared concerns similar to Diane's about the potential for an overabundance of black sashes, deeming it too harsh for the Quidnet area. - Stressed the importance of considering the broader neighborhood's aesthetic when deciding on color schemes, emphasizing that color choices significantly impact the streetscape's overall appearance. Welch - Expressed full support for the use of a dark sash, arguing that it would be less conspicuous in a low-visibility context compared to a white sash. - Appreciated the consideration for a darker color scheme, suggesting gray as an alternative but did not find black to be objectionable in this setting. - Clarified that one application is for a studio and the other is for the main house, with the intention to apply the approved color changes consistently to both the studio and the main house to maintain aesthetic coherence.			
Motion	Motion to approve the color change for both the studio and main house (Next Item Listed on Agenda). (Made by: Camp) (01:07:27)			
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

2. Ack N Back LLC	33 Quidnet Road	Color Change Main House Rev COA	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Representative	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			

Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Commissioners expressed no comments or concerns.
Motion	Please see motion above.
Roll-Call Vote	Please see vote above.

VII. NEW BUSINESS 01/23/2024

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Jesse Dutra	2 Sea Fox Circle	Pool & Hardscape	55/107.4	Waterscapes
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates	Patten, Paul			
Representative	Jesse Dutra, Waterscapes Clarified confusion regarding the application's description, noting that it inaccurately mentions a pool and hardscape project. Specified that the actual project involves merely an expansion of the driveway.			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that Jesse plans to expand the driveway without altering the existing apron, simply adding an additional parking spot. - Advised against modifying the pre-existing apron, aligning with zoning requirements that typically mandate an apron but not necessarily its expansion for such projects. - Suggested the usefulness of a detailed site plan to clarify the proposed changes, specifying that the final driveway dimensions are planned to be 20 feet wide by 35 feet long. - Recommended that the driveway expansion allow for turning into the new parking spot without increasing the apron's width.			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Inquired about the inclusion of an apron that intersects the sidewalk and its composition. - Highlighted the importance of considering driveway regulations set by the Department of Public Works (DPW) in the decision-making process regarding the apron's material and design. Coombs - Recognized the property as a corner lot, noting the large driveway size and the lack of surrounding vegetation, which contributes to a barren appearance at the intersection. - Expressed concern about the aesthetic impact of the driveway on the neighborhood, suggesting potential modifications to integrate it more seamlessly with the area. - Proposed not altering the apron entrance but perhaps reshaping the nearby grass area to better align with the streetscape and adjacent driveways. - Highlighted the need for some planting or landscaping to mitigate the barrenness and improve the visual transition between the two busy streets. - Questioned the necessity of a 20-foot-wide driveway, suggesting that it appears excessively wide. Thornewill - Stated no concerns. Welch - Noted that zoning regulation 139-21 addresses landscaping requirements and believes the proposed driveway meets the maximum allowed width without needing a special permit, but it exceeds the typical length. - Suggested that driveways typically feature an apron with a flare, which is more attractive, and recommended any approval be contingent on compliance with zoning bylaws, especially since zoning review is generally triggered by new building permit applications. - Raised a point about the driveway's material, inquiring if the proposed large stone gravel matches existing materials or if it's just the rendering's depiction.			

	- Emphasized that concerns are not with the gravel size per se but with ensuring the rendering accurately represents the proposed materials. - Concluded with recommendations that landscaping and apron modifications should be addressed in accordance with zoning regulations and considered in the approval process. Pohl - Expressed agreement with the proposal but echoed Holly's sentiment against widening the apron to match the expanded parking area's dimensions. - Advised to keep the apron at its current size and restrict the expansion to the area specifically marked in red in the proposal.
Motion	Motion to approve a condition that both the driveway layout and the landscaping must comply with zoning regulation 139-21. (Made by: Welch) (01:17:40)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

2. 23 Sankaty Head Trust		23 Sankaty Head Road	Alterations to Garage	48/4.1	BPC
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten				
Alternates	Thornewill				
Representative	Joe Paul, BPC				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	-				
Public Comments	-				
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Expressed appreciation for the modification of the gable elements, highlighting initial concerns about their design. - Noted the prior incongruity when comparing the proposed gables to the existing house's use of shed dormers. - Thanked for the adjustments made, ultimately finding the changes both acceptable and appropriate for the project. Coombs - Commended the revised roofing as charming, light, and fitting for the location at the end of the road. - Expressed satisfaction with the removal or modification of dormers, noting how their previous design added visual weight to the building. - Appreciated the adjustments made to the building's design, indicating a positive reception to the changes. Welch and Patten - Stated no concerns.				
Motion	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, including the proposal and minus the two appended gable dormers. (Made by: Welch) (01:26:54)				
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)				

3. Jeff & Michele Krohn		14 Center St Sconset	Roof/outdoor shower	73.1.3/104	SMRD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill				
Representative	Steve Roethke, S.M. Roethke Design				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Emphasized that any roof work on the historically significant Whales Cottage, "Heartsease" from 1700, must adhere to specific guidelines: replacements "like kind" can be approved by staff, but material changes require a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) from the commission.				

	- Mentioned the building's historical significance as Richard Macy's blacksmith shop, noting there is an HDC survey on file. - Expressed no concerns with the proposed shower relocation or enclosure. - Raised concerns about the proposed condenser placement within the town's right-of-way, suggesting it needs to be relocated outside of this area. Mentioned the possibility of an error on the site plan and suggested that a surveyed plan could clarify the condenser's exact location. - Highlighted a broader concern about structures in the heart of Sconset encroaching on established town rights-of-way, noting it as a significant issue without other concerns regarding the application.
Public Comments	Rob Benchley, Sconset Advisory Group - Reviewed the changes and found them acceptable, particularly noting that the screened shower is well-concealed behind a hedge. - Echoed Holly's concern about the placement of utilities within the right-of-way, aligning with the need for careful consideration of such installations. - Commended the overall maintenance and care demonstrated for these houses, expressing satisfaction with the stewardship of the properties.
Comments/Concerns	Roethke - Referenced a site plan by Jeff Blackwell from circa 2014, expressing confidence in its accuracy and noting that no changes have occurred since then. - Confirmed, based on this site plan, that the proposed condenser relocation is indeed within the right-of-way. - Shared an observation that, upon surveying the village, several condensers were noticed within the right-of-way, although it was not specified whether these installations had received appropriate approvals from the Historic District Commission (HDC) or other regulatory bodies. - Indicated a willingness to consider the board's feedback on the proposed condenser location, acknowledging the need for review and approval within the guidelines of the conversation and the board. Backus - Clarified that any proposal within the town right-of-way requires approval from the Town Administration and/or Select Board. - Emphasized that this board does not have the authority to approve any installations or changes within the town right-of-way. Camp - Highlighted the primary concern regarding the placement of the condenser within the right-of-way. - Upon learning that such an installation might be against regulations, advised finding an alternative location for the condenser. - Expressed satisfaction with all other aspects of the proposal aside from the condenser issue. Welch - Clarified the board's limited authority, emphasizing they can assess the architectural merits of a structure's placement but cannot authorize violations of other jurisdictions' regulations. - Stated that approval from the Historic District Commission (HDC) does not imply consent to violate other authorities' rules, underlining the importance of adhering to all jurisdictional requirements. - Expressed concerns about finding a suitable location for the condenser, noting obstacles on both sides of the proposed area, and suggested the backyard as a potential site. - Opened to approving the proposal conditionally, pending the applicant obtaining necessary authorizations for the condenser's placement. Oliver - Concurred with what has been said. Coombs - Expressed hope that newer models of such equipment might be smaller and less obtrusive, making them easier to conceal or integrate into the landscape without detracting from the property's aesthetic.

	- Admitted to not having a clear solution for the placement of the condenser, recognizing the difficulty in situating it in a way that is both unobtrusive and compliant with regulations. Pohl - Highlighted the peculiar situation where an application involves placing a structure (in this case, a condenser) on property not owned by the applicant, noting this issue arises more commonly with driveway aprons that extend onto town property. - Expressed a strong reluctance to approve the relocation of the condenser based on the principle that it is not located on the applicant's property, setting aside the question of architectural merits. - Raised concerns about the broader practice of installing such units possibly without proper approval from relevant authorities, questioning whether they have been sanctioned or merely tolerated without formal objection. - Concluded with a willingness to approve all aspects of the proposal except for the proposed relocation of the condenser, citing its inappropriate placement as the primary issue. Roethke - Acknowledged the complexity of the situation and did not fully disagree with the concerns raised by others, recognizing some common practices in the area that might not align perfectly with regulations. - As the owner's agent, expressed a duty to explore options similar to those utilized by neighbors, attempting to implement these with consideration, such as proposing a classic fence enclosure for the condenser, which is more than what is provided for many other condensers in the village. - Pointed out the commonality of properties in the village having elements within the traveled rights of way, using the example of plantings around the subject cottage that, while contributing to its charm, are technically in the right of way. - Sought to highlight this as part of a broader discussion on managing such issues in Sconset Village, emphasizing the owners' role as stewards of the building. - Confirmed plans for a like-kind roof replacement, addressing a specific concern raised, and explored the possibility of proposing an alternate location for the condenser, either as part of the current motion or in a separate submission. Welch - Suggested consulting with Andrew Boris, who handles real estate matters on a consultant basis, about the possibility of obtaining a licensing agreement for the use of town right-of-way. - Expressed personal openness to approving the architectural merits of the proposed location for the condenser, contingent upon receiving approval from the town as the authority having jurisdiction. - Also indicated no objection to approving a location for the condenser on the Shell Street side, provided it is shielded by the proposed fence material and located near the basement access, emphasizing the importance of appropriate aesthetic and practical considerations in its placement. Backus - Acknowledged Mr. Roethke's observation about the various unregulated developments in the area, confirming that the Town Administration is aware of these issues. - Mentioned that the Department of Public Works (DPW) has been tasked with addressing encroachments that have occurred over time, many of which have not received formal approval from the town. - Emphasized the recognition of these concerns by town officials and assured that efforts are being made to manage and rectify these situations, noting the importance of this issue being officially recorded and considered in the context of the application and broader community standards. Oliver - Expressed agreement on the architectural acceptability of the proposal but raised concerns about zoning implications. - Questioned the need for a building permit for placing a condenser, suggesting that this is a matter that should be addressed.
Motion	Motion to approve the like-kind replacement of the roof and the relocation of the shower, but not approve the relocation of the condenser. (Made by: Oliver) (01:47:19)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

4. Steven Cohen Area 51 Trust 51 West Miacomet Rd Demo Move Off 81/52 WAPD

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul
Alternates	Patten, Thornewill
Representative	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Informed the commission about discovering the approximate date of the National Historic Landmark (NHL) data, which is around the year 2002.
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Stated no concerns. Welch - Expressed regret over the potential loss of a structure, acknowledging that while it's not historic, its removal is still lamentable. - Suggested the possibility of relocating the structure, proposing that the land bank, if owning land nearby, might facilitate the move, especially since the structure is considered a bit oversized for its current location. Coombs - Raised the question of whether there has been any outreach to local housing organizations or other housing entities, given the structure's quality. - Noted the building's relatively young age of 20 years and suggested that it should be feasible to relocate rather than demolish it. - Expressed a strong preference for finding alternative solutions to demolition, especially for well-constructed buildings. Kotchen - Shared optimism about finding someone interested in taking over the building, acknowledging the logistical challenges of relocating it, as highlighted by Mr. Welch, particularly the impracticality of widening streets to facilitate the move. - Emphasized the commitment to doing everything possible to ensure the building is preserved and passed on to a new owner, thereby giving it a second life and avoiding demolition. Paul - Stated no concerns.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Camp) (01:54:20)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye)

5. Steven Cohen Area 51 Trust 51 West Miacomet Rd New Dwelling 81/52 WAPD

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Representative	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	Thomas Barada (02:05:09) - Noted that the project entails splitting a building into two, with a total foundation size of 2500 square feet, despite a 1500 square foot limitation for the building structure. - Mentioned missing details in the drawings regarding an exterior atrium area and the overall hardscape plan, emphasizing the absence of visuals for the basement that will feature a large door impacting light pollution. - Raised safety concerns due to the lack of railing designs for the patio above the sizable basement foundation. - Questioned the materials for the chimney's stone border and cap.

	- Highlighted the unusually large sizes of the windows and door panels described in the plans, expressing that these dimensions might be overly substantial. - Voiced concerns about compliance with local zoning rules that typically restrict properties to one main structure, noting the project seems to be navigating these restrictions by connecting two parts of the building with an underground tunnel. Pohl - Clarified that many of the concerns raised, especially those pertaining to the basement, are outside the purview of the reviewing authority, as they involve elements not visible from the exterior. - Highlighted that underground features do not contribute to ground coverage calculations according to their guidelines. - Acknowledged the importance of the comments but emphasized the authority's focus on aspects within their jurisdiction, mainly visible external elements and their aesthetic impact.
Comments/Concerns	Coombs - Expressed admiration for the smaller building, considering it very good. - Expressed satisfaction with the addition of a chimney to the larger building, noting it as a necessary improvement. - Inquired about the width of the deck on the second floor, which was clarified to be 8 feet from the building. - Conveyed overall approval of the design, including the strategic integration of the smaller building to complement the larger structure's design. - Even though not typically a fan of mold (mullioned) windows, acknowledged that they fit well within the context of this project. - Concluded with no significant objections to the proposed designs and changes. Welch - Acknowledged the presence of some atypical elements in the project but noted that these elements do not render the design inappropriate. - Commended the project for its artistry, particularly highlighting the restraint and simplicity in the use of traditional forms, indicating an appreciation for the subtle and thoughtful approach to the design. Camp - Expressed concern that the windows might appear overly vertical, particularly with the sash being black, which could make them stand out more than desired. - Appreciated the organization of the windows but expressed a preference for slightly wider windows for better proportions. - Inquired about the chimney material, which was clarified to be parged, and the color of the parging, confirmed to be a natural gray. - Suggested reducing the glazing on the South elevation to lessen the visual impact and recommended pulling the deck in to just the other side of the French doors, making it smaller and possibly more acceptable. Paul - Praised the project's approach as fitting for the area, highlighting the compelling nature of the precedent images provided. - Clarified confusion regarding the chimney material, initially noted as white stucco on the application but discussed as parged gray during the meeting, and agreed that gray parging is preferable. - Noted the chimneys' location as not significantly impactful due to their distance from the street and their positioning relative to West Miacomet. - Concluded with no further concerns after clarification on the ground cover and confirmation that the project's height is below the maximum limit of 26 feet. Kotchen - Addressed a query about ground cover limits, referencing a conversation with legal counsel Steve Cohen, confirming the project adheres to a 1500 square feet maximum under specific conditions. Pohl - Expressed overall approval of the project.

	- Concurred with Abby's observation regarding the windows' vertical appearance, indicating agreement on this specific design aspect.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted, with the clarification that the chimney color will be natural gray parged. (Made by: Coombs) (02:04:28)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye)

6. Steven Cohen Area 51 Trust 51 West Miacomet RD New Shed 81/52 WAPD

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Representative	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD
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: Welch) (02:10:57)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye)
Further Discussion	Welch Requested explicit details in the future hardscape presentation, especially concerning the sunken area, due to the anticipated time gap between reviews.

7. Vaziki Ashkan 9 Woodbury Ln Hardscape 41/551 Atlantic Landscaping

Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Representative	Lindsay Congelton, Atlantic Landscaping
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Noted the property is an infill within the 1980s Woodberry subdivision and part of the Old Historic District (OHD), emphasizing the importance of its National Historic Landmark designation. - Recalled previous reviews of the project, approving the revision from a brick to a shell driveway as suitable. - Expressed concerns about the relocation of the garage, leading to an increase in hard surfaces and a reduction in greenery. - Acknowledged that while the proportion of impervious surfaces falls outside the Historic District Commission's (HDC's) direct purview, the prevalence of hard surfaces was still a point of consideration. - Clarified that the zoning designation of the subdivision is R1, contrasting it with RO zoning, where pools are not permitted. - Confirmed the property's location within the Old Historic District (OHD) boundaries, indicating its compliance with HDC regulations despite the zoning's allowances.
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structure Advisory Group - Stated he had no concerns.
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Deemed the project acceptable based on visible elements, aligning with the possibility of approval. - Agreed with Holly's assessment that the project may be a bit overdone, but acknowledged such considerations fall outside their jurisdiction. Welch - Concurred with Val.

	Camp - Expressed a preference for using brick for the driveway, aligning with other comments favoring a more traditional material choice for the area.
Motion	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (02:19:10)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver (Aye) // Camp (Nay)

VIII. VIEW 01/30/2024

1.	Richard and Linda Andersen	8 High Brush Path	New Fence	56/370	Link
	• Commissioners: <i>Pohl, Camp, Patten, Paul</i> Recused: <i>None.</i> Last heard 02/06/2024				
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Patten, Paul				
Alternates	Thornewill				
Representative	Victoria Ewing, Link Permitting and Design				
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) (02:24:35)				
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Camp, Patten, Paul (Aye)				

IX. OLD BUSINESS 01/30/2024

	Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1.	Ospray LLC 12-9577	25 Willard St	Hardscape & fence	29/33	Edgewater Landscape
	• Commissioners: <i>Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten; Alternates: Thornewill; Recused: None.</i> Last heard 12/19/2023 This Item was not discussed, and no action was taken.				
2.	26 Quidnest LLC	26 Quidnet Path	New Dwelling	21/150	Emeritus LTD
	• Commissioners: <i>Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul; Alternates: Oliver, Thornewill, Patten; Recused: None.</i> Last heard 01/16/2024				
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	Oliver, Patten, Thornewill				
Representative	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Acknowledged having seen the Planning Board's approval, confirming the property indeed shares a curb cut with an adjacent future property. - Affirmed the correctness of the process, mentioning it underwent a thorough review in 2015, addressing the initial concern.				
Public Comments	-				
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Suggested that the second-floor windows on the south elevation could be enlarged and positioned closer to the eave, noting their current size appears somewhat small. - Proposed that these windows could match the size of those on the first floor to enhance aesthetic appeal. - Despite this minor critique, expressed overall appreciation for the design, believing adjustments to the window size could further improve its visual harmony. Paul - Endorsed Abby's recommendations regarding the south elevation, agreeing that adjusting the size and placement of the second-floor windows could enhance the design. - Extended similar feedback to the west elevation, particularly suggesting the windows in the shed dormer could be positioned higher.				

	Welch - Voiced agreement with previous comments but raised a specific concern about the structure's squat appearance, noting its height as approximately 24 feet with a 10-foot first-floor and 8-foot second-floor ceiling height. - Suggested that the squat appearance of the building is not appropriate and recommended a design adjustment to address it. - Proposed increasing the pitch of the roof while maintaining the ridge height, which would involve lowering the top plate and potentially adjusting the second-floor height to improve the structure's proportions. - Mentioned the lack of a cross-section view for detailed examination of the proposal's vertical dimensions. Coombs - Critiqued the excessive use of mullioned windows on the west elevation, noting a disproportionate number of them compared to single windows, which contributes to a heavier appearance on the second floor contrary to the expectation that it should appear lighter than the first floor. - Suggested a review and likely reduction of mullioned windows to better integrate the building with its environment and enhance its cottage-like quality, arguing that the current design resembles a hotel more than a cottage. - Acknowledged the chimney's positioning as satisfactory but emphasized the need for adjustments in fenestration to achieve a more appropriate aesthetic for the area on Quidnet Road. - Expressed agreement with concerns about the roof pitch, indicating support for suggestions to modify it for better architectural harmony. Pohl - Discussed the roof pitch of the main house and the distance between structures, suggesting any differences might be subtle but could align with concerns raised by others. - Liked the idea of eliminating the shingle space between the dormer window head casing and the eave, proposing either to lower the dormer or to make the windows taller to achieve a similar effect. - Expressed openness to adjusting the roof pitch to a 9 in 12 ratio if it addresses the design concerns and is agreeable to the committee. - Mentioned the willingness to increase the size of the windows and considered the architectural implications of such changes, including the potential issue of the meeting rail not aligning with the eave if the eave is lowered while the window size increases, and the ridge height remains unchanged. Welch - Proposed an alternative solution of lowering the second-floor height, suggesting that this adjustment would allow for the entire window assembly, including the top plate, to be moved down, thereby resolving any concerns related to the alignment of the meeting rail without affecting the overall ridge height. MacEachern - Acknowledged receiving sufficient feedback regarding window size and roof pitch adjustments. - Expressed willingness to implement the suggested changes and to explore opportunities to separate ganged windows, especially those in more visible locations. - Indicated intent to address these concerns and then return to the board with revised plans.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (02:42:25)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye)

3. 1 N Swift Rock Tr. 1 N Swift Path New dwelling 40/2 Emeritus LTD
- Commissioners:** *Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Alternates: Patten, Paul; Recused: None. Last heard 01/16/2024*

Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates	Patten, Paul
Representative	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus Ltd.
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	Lisa Berger - Shared concerns with the board on two separate occasions, specifically on the 29th and 12th, focusing on the project's overall height and the number of windows. - Highlighted that the overall height of the building has not been significantly reduced, mentioning that the original application listed the height at 28'1", which has been slightly increased to 28'7", questioning how this reflects a reduction. - Noted that despite the board's request to reduce the number of windows on the south elevation, only one window was removed, leaving a total of 23 windows and eight doors, underscoring this as a primary concern. MacEachern - Clarified that after submitting a revision, it was determined that the changes were moving in the wrong direction, leading to a reevaluation. - Confirmed there has been a net reduction in height of six inches from the last version reviewed by the board. - Explained the decision to limit the reduction to six inches was influenced by concerns about maintaining the appropriate hierarchy between the two structures, ensuring the revised height reduction balanced overall design considerations without compromising the relationship between the buildings.
Comments/Concerns	Camp - Started with a critical viewpoint, noting the existing house's presence on the site and the historical limitation of having only two dwellings per site. - Expressed concern that the proposed 2700 square foot dwelling is twice the size of the original building, significantly altering the scale and mass within the context of the neighborhood's development. - While appreciating the design's aesthetic appeal, highlighted the importance of considering the context in which it evolved, indicating that the building's size and mass appear overly dominant for the setting. - Concluded with a suggestion to reduce the size of the new building to better align with the character and scale of the neighborhood. Coombs - Noted the counting of windows on the property known as Thrasher Away, located off North Swift Rock Road, a road stretching from Heel Point to Madaket through less developed areas. - Commented on the aesthetic appeal of the building designed by Matt but echoed concerns previously voiced by Abby and another local resident regarding the excessive number of windows contributing to the perception of the house as overly massive. - Suggested that a simpler façade would better integrate with the surrounding landscape, particularly in the more rural or undeveloped areas near Heel Point, as opposed to structures situated directly on the waterfront. - Recommended modifications to reduce the building's perceived scale and enhance its suitability for its setting at the beginning of North Swift Rock Road, advocating for a reduction in the building's overall visual impact. Welch - Expressed agreement with previously mentioned concerns and provided specific critiques not related to the overall size of the project. - Questioned the appropriateness of a roof walk on a primary mass that is one of the smallest elements of the structure, especially in terms of height.

	- Identified a potential issue with the meeting rails on the dormers, suggesting a discrepancy in their design or placement. - Stated that the railings seem unnecessary or inappropriate. Oliver - Voiced appreciation for the house's design, especially its additive massing, which is often lacking in modern constructions. - Expressed surprise at the minimal reduction of only 6 inches in overall height since height was a primary concern. - Appreciated the lowering of the connector piece to enhance the additive massing effect. - Raised concerns about how the new structure will coexist visually with the existing house on the site, fearing it may contribute to a "massive hotel" appearance due to the considerable size of the existing house. - Suggested the possibility of providing perspectives to visualize the overall composition of all structures on the site together. - Noted an area for potential reduction in the structure, specifically questioning the necessity and design of a large gable porch at the rear (South), suggesting alternatives that might lessen its impact. - Concluded with a call for overall reduction in the project's scale and an illustration of how it integrates with existing structures to fully assess its impact on the site's character. Pohl - Echoed the concern regarding the size of the expansive porch highlighted by a previous commenter, suggesting it could benefit from being reduced in size. - Aligned with the board's consensus on the overall height of the building, deeming a reduction of only six inches as insufficient.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (02:55:56)
Further Discussion	MacEachern - Acknowledged the board's feedback on the overall ridge height and the rear porch, indicating a willingness to reduce the porch size further. - Noted that much of the discussed visibility concerns might not apply from public viewpoints, but committed to addressing the highlighted areas of concern. - Promised to provide visuals showing the relationship between the new structure and the existing one, emphasizing the client's decision to retain the existing structure instead of demolishing it. - Highlighted the challenge posed by integrating the new design with the existing structure, suggesting a delicate balance in showcasing how both buildings will coexist. Welch - Clarified that reducing the ridge height alone might not address the broader issues, emphasizing the need for clarity and significant changes beyond just adjusting the height. - Reminded that this project is approaching its third review, invoking a guideline and rule about limiting attempts to make material changes to a maximum of three tries, aiming to prevent prolonged cycles of minor revisions without substantial progress. - Urged to consider making meaningful adjustments in the next submission to comply with this rule and avoid potential consequences, as outlined in the board's best practices available on their website. - Highlighted the importance of consistency in application and review processes, signaling a need for significant alterations in the forthcoming proposal to meet the board's expectations. MacEachern - Expressed a commitment to creating a clear hierarchy between the new primary dwelling and the existing secondary dwelling, aiming to avoid a scenario where it's challenging to distinguish which is which due to their comparative sizes and designs. - Explained the rationale behind only reducing the ridge height by six inches, despite the board's request for a decrease, was informed by a review of houses in the area of similar size and scale, with some examples included in the submission to illustrate that other structures in the vicinity share comparable heights or are even taller.

	- Highlighted the challenge of working with pre-existing site conditions and maintaining the new structure's appearance as the primary dwelling without undermining this hierarchical relationship by making the new building too low in comparison to the existing secondary dwelling. - Emphasized that the minimal reduction in height was not out of disregard for the board's feedback but stemmed from concerns over compromising the intended hierarchy between the primary and secondary structures on the site.
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)(02:59:25)

4. Whitney Gifford Tr. 32 Pocomo Rd Gate, driveway, & fence 14/77 Emeritus LTD
- **Commissioners:** *Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: Patten, Thornewill; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023*

Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates	Patten, Thornewill
Representative	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus Ltd.
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Stated that the scale is much more appropriate. Paul - Expressed preference for a more appropriate scale of the gate options provided, specifically favoring option two for its additional diagonal element and option four for its proportional suitability. - Commended the improvements in proportion and appropriateness compared to previous designs, with a preference for the gate being set back from the road. - Raised a concern about the overall height of the gate, which is 7 feet 9 inches to the center point, suggesting that a gate approximately two feet shorter, around five and a half to six feet to the center, might have been expected. - Suggested that the gate's distance from the road might mitigate its tall appearance but proposed that a 3D perspective could provide a better sense of its visual impact. - Concluded with a recommendation for reducing the gate's height by about 25% to address concerns about its tallness. MacEachern - Explained that the primary reason for the gate's height is to deter deer, acknowledging their ability to jump over lower barriers, which necessitates a taller structure for effective prevention. Coombs - Shared personal observations on deer management, suggesting that even a 10-foot gate might not deter deer, hence questioning the necessity for a 7-foot gate. - Proposed possibly reducing the gate height and supplementing it with a wire barrier as an alternative deterrent, noting the visual impact of a 7-foot fence as substantial. - Expressed a desire for additional information on the land elevation where the fence is planned, highlighting the absence of height markers on the provided diagrams. - Reiterated preferences for gate options, specifically favoring option two for its lighter appearance and option four for its solidity, while expressing concern that option four might appear overly solid and imposing at a 7-foot height at the driveway's end. - Questioned the actual height impact of the fence at the driveway's grade change, suggesting a review of the fence options to consider their visual and functional appropriateness. Camp - Identified a problem with the gate's design, specifically the width of the posts, suggesting they are too narrow and contribute to a pinched appearance. - Recommended widening the gate by an additional two feet to alleviate its chunky look and to better align with the aesthetics of typical fences found in the Polpis area. - Expressed a preference for the broader, four-inch-wide members reminiscent of a "Union Jack" pattern, while advising the elimination of thinner elements to reduce visual clutter.

	- Suggested raising the bottom of the gate by about a foot to prevent it from appearing too low to the ground, which could help diminish the fence's massiveness and lend it a more rustic, country feel. - Emphasized the importance of getting the proportions right due to the gate's visibility, advocating for adjustments to ensure the design fits well within its context. Welch - Expressed satisfaction with the gate's location and deemed the height acceptable due to its significant setback from the road and the natural screening provided by surrounding vegetation. - Agreed with Diane's preference for option two, considering it a more traditional choice. - Concurred with Abby's observation about the gate's busyness, suggesting that a slight increase in width might mitigate this and alter the perception of its height. - Proposed modifying the soft arch to a more angular shape to enhance the gate's traditional appearance. Oliver - Observed a note indicating that the deer fencing, specifically the wire and posts, was removed from the application, leading to confusion regarding the gate's effectiveness as a deer deterrent. - Questioned the practicality of the gate in preventing deer from entering if the wire fencing component has been eliminated, asking if there are plans to reintegrate the wire fencing into the design for effective deer management. MacEachern - Clarified intentions to apply for deer fencing, indicating it's part of the plan but requires further consideration regarding its placement. - Explained the current focus is exclusively on the gate design, with plans to return to the board for approval of the deer fencing around the property in the future.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Camp) (03:09:00)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

5. Kathryn Cook **12-9637** 85 Low Beach Rd Glass Connector rev 10-7257 75/31.3 Rich Gammons
• **Commissioners:** *Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul; Alternates: Patten, Thornewill; Recused: None. Last heard 12/12/2023*

Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Representative	
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Noted that photos were sent, depicting the construction site illuminated by construction lights during the night, and these photos were distributed to all members of the board for review. Welch - Expressed that the photos mentioned were not recalled and requested that they be recirculated for review before the next meeting when the representative is present.
Motion	No action was taken due to a lack of representation.
Roll-Call Vote	N/A

X. VIEW 02/06/2024				
1. Dodgers Janis	9 Orange St	New parking spaces	42.3.1/150	NAG
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates	Paul			
Representative	Stephen Theroux, Nantucket Architecture Group, LTD / Steven Cohen			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Confirmed that the project had indeed been reviewed previously under a different owner.			

	- Informed that the property is now under new ownership, and the current owners have engaged consultants and professionals to navigate the review process, a change from the previous owner's approach. - Indicated that the new submission has taken into account the considerations and feedback provided during the last review. - Highlighted the house as a contributing and typical Nantucket property known as a Peleg Coggeshall House, built in 1774 by a cooper. - Noted that the HDC survey and file for this property are in the process of being updated with MHC CLG grant funding, and it falls within the Fish Lots neighborhood survey area. - Mentioned this is the second review of the driveway proposal, which now includes two cobblestone tracks with a new brick walk, raising a question about the relocation of the existing brick walk. - Expressed concern over the removal of the existing fence along Orange Street, which would change the streetscape character, and emphasized the importance of retaining the existing running bond pattern for the proposed brick. - Raised questions about how the proposal would affect the existing granite curbing, which in downtown and the Fish Lots area can be over 200 years old, and whether it would be recessed into the ground. - Inquired whether the corner rounding involves new material or will use existing granite to ensure consistency in age and appearance. - Brought up logistical concerns related to the driveway's placement within a fire lane, especially next to a church, but acknowledged that Town Administration indicated this proposal doesn't need to go to the traffic safety work group since it doesn't remove on-street parking. - Requested clarification on several points to fully understand the impact of the proposed changes on the historic character and logistics of the property and its surroundings.
Public Comments	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Expressed concern that the proposed driveway will place parked cars extremely close to the front stoop of the 1774 historic house, potentially obscuring its facade. - Noted the absence of a precedent in the Old Historic District for placing driveways or parking directly in front of such historic homes. - Highlighted the visual incongruity of situating modern cars in front of a historic property, underscoring the importance of preserving the site's aesthetic integrity. - Alerted to the potential adverse effects on views towards the historic Unitarian Church from Orange Street, emphasizing the church's significance and photographic value. - Concluded that the proposed driveway and associated parking arrangements would be inappropriate, impacting negatively on both the historic home.
Comments/Concerns	Welch - Recalled conducting a review that was placed on a viewing list, reminiscing about past practices where views were scheduled upon agenda release, allowing members to visit sites individually before any discussions. - Suggested that for future consent reviews, if a site visit is deemed beneficial, the reviewing member should inform the staff to list it under "view." This would enable members to examine the site in advance, optimizing the efficiency of hearings. Theroux - Clarified that the existing bricks will be reused to construct the new brick walkway, which will be relocated slightly towards Main Street. - Confirmed the brick pattern will remain unchanged, preserving the walkway's historical aesthetic with the original materials. - Explained that the granite for the curb cuts will be repurposed from the sections removed to accommodate the driveway entrance, ensuring the use of authentic, historic materials. - Addressed concerns about the visibility from the street by referencing historical context, indicating that in the 1800s, a larger house positioned in front of it obscured it from view.

	- Provided photographic evidence from the early 1800s to illustrate that the house was not originally visible when approaching up the street, due to the presence of a significantly larger structure in front, aiming to contextualize the current visibility concerns. Oliver - Expressed sympathy for individuals in need of parking space while also acknowledging the concerns raised by Mickey. - Appreciated the current application for its notable differences from a previous one, particularly its efforts to preserve existing lawn and green space. - Praised the use of cobblestone strips as a sensitive solution to integrating parking without sacrificing too much greenery, suggesting that perhaps limiting the solution to one parking spot could be a reasonable compromise. - Raised a question for Stephen to address later, inquiring whether the fence can be designed to appear like a continuous fence when the driveway is not in use, resembling solutions seen elsewhere. Coombs - Acknowledged that the original building set back from Orange Street might not be prominently visible but emphasized its proximity to the church and visibility to pedestrians approaching the church. - Reported that the DPW would reclaim the removed granite, indicating a need for careful consideration in the proposal's execution. - Expressed concern over the impact of placing parking in front of a house built in 1774, advocating for a reduction to one parking spot with cobblestone or brick strips to minimize intrusion. - Stressed the importance of preserving the historical character of the area and questioned the necessity of significantly altering the granite curb for parking. - Highlighted the church's frequent use beyond Sundays, suggesting that parking demands in the area require a sensitive approach. - Mentioned the existing picket fence running down between the buildings and inquired about the use of a parking area behind the Unitarian Church that was previously utilized by residents. Patten - Clarified that there isn't any parking behind the church due to a house being located there, based on personal experience of cutting through to Fair Street. - Expressed understanding of the need for parking, sharing personal difficulties in finding parking on Orange Street during the summer. - Voiced agreement that two parking spots may not be appropriate for the site, supporting the idea of a compromise involving only one parking spot, incorporating grass and cobblestones. Thornewill - Expressed agreement with limiting the parking to one spot but raised questions about the fence's role in harmonizing the property with the church. - Suggested that the parking spot might be better situated within the fenced area, equipped with gates similar to a solution implemented on Winter Street. - Proposed that the gate could be designed to open and close, allowing the property to maintain its current appearance while accommodating a parking track for one car. - Advised against introducing cobblestone for the parking area, recommending brick to match the existing walkways and maintain simplicity and coherence with the property's existing brick elements. Pohl - Concurred that two parking spaces, especially of the standard legal size, combined with concerns about proximity to the house, suggest a need for reduction. - Echoed the suggestion to ensure a buffer exists between any parked car and the house, minimizing the impact on the property's appearance and functionality. - Supported the idea of integrating gates for the parking area, specifying that these should be designed to swing inwards to avoid encroaching on the pedestrian walkway. - Emphasized that sufficient space should be provided so the car can park comfortably within the gated area, allowing the gates to close without issue.
--	---

	Theroux - Assured that the character of the existing front fence can be preserved while incorporating a gate system, allowing the fence to maintain its current appearance and continuity. Cohen - Acknowledged the board's feedback as constructive, noting that the initial proposal for two parking spaces was influenced by recommendations from the Traffic Safety Committee, which, as clarified, is not a strict requirement, offering room for adjustment. - Indicated a willingness to revise the proposal in line with the commission's suggestions, showing flexibility in response to the feedback received. - Raised a question about material preferences for the driveway, referencing a past application by the prior owner that proposed brick, which the commission had concerns about, expressing a preference for cobblestone instead. - Sought consensus from the commission on whether brick or cobblestone would be the more appropriate material for the driveway, aiming to align the revised proposal with the commission's material preferences. Pohl, Oliver and Coombs - Spoke in support of the cobblestone.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (03:33:15)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

XI. 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>
1. Town of Nantucket	19 Waitt Drive	New Dwelling	67/925, 926, 927	J & J Construction
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Representative	Parker Helwig, J&J Contractors, Inc.			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Shared thoughts on the project, emphasizing that feedback aims to integrate the design more harmoniously with its surroundings rather than to criticize. - Acknowledged the evolving nature of the mid-island area but highlighted the predominantly residential character of the immediate vicinity, despite the area's mixed-use designation. - Pointed out that, aside from the police station, nearby structures are residential, including proposed Habitat for Humanity duplexes, underscoring the absence of similarly scaled buildings in the area. - Identified the project's challenge in balancing commercial and residential elements due to its location, stressing the importance of sensitivity to neighboring residents. - Noted the proposed height of 33 feet exceeds what the Historic District Commission typically approves, even though zoning allows up to 40 feet, referencing the precedent of maintaining a maximum height of 30 feet in previous projects like Stop and Shop. - Criticized the proposed roof pitch as not meeting the minimum acceptable pitch of 7 in 12 for a gable roof. - Suggested design modifications to break up the massing more effectively, noting the current design's rebates are insufficient for achieving true additive massing. - Proposed the inclusion of garden-level spaces with windows to offset any loss of space from lowering the building's height and to incorporate one-story and one-and-a-half-story elements to better anchor the structure within its context. Coombs - Agreed with Val's comments and inquired if guidance or resources were provided by the town of Nantucket to inform the project's design to be in harmony with local architectural preferences. - Highlighted the significance of designing with Nantucket in mind, emphasizing that although the area isn't within the Old Historic District, it possesses a distinct character that merits preservation.			

- Urged the importance of maintaining the neighborhood's uniqueness and avoiding the imposition of incongruent architectural styles.
- Advised reviewing specific architectural guidelines, such as roof pitches, as part of understanding the community's standards for new constructions.
- Recommended familiarizing with the Historic District Commission's agendas and outcomes to gain insights into acceptable design practices for Nantucket, indicating a learning opportunity for better integration into the local context.
- Acknowledged the proposal's effort but stressed the necessity of adapting the design to align more closely with the neighborhood's established character and expectations.

Welch

- Highlighted height as a primary concern, noting that the project, located in the town overlay district and part of CN zoning, has a maximum allowable height of 30 feet, which the current design exceeds by three feet.
- Suggested exploring garden-level spaces to add living area without impacting the structure's height negatively, emphasizing the importance of proper fenestration and natural lighting for quality living spaces.
- Recommended considering hip roofs or clipped gables to address roof pitch concerns and suggested slightly oversized windows and doors to help balance the building's scale.
- Advised focusing on design details like the width of corner boards for a Greek Revival presentation, enhancing the building's architectural character.
- Requested the removal of unnecessary annotations on elevations to clarify the presentation, consistent with HDC review standards, and recommended including cardinal direction labels on elevations for clarity.
- Mentioned a recent planning board discussion on a preliminary design review process involving both the planning board and HDC for projects seeking height exceptions, especially for affordable housing, suggesting such a process could prevent significant investments in designs that may not meet HDC guidelines.
- Indicated that implementing a preliminary design review could have benefited the project, highlighting an area for potential process improvement.
- Suggested there is potential to reduce the overall height by lowering the top plate on the second floor and possibly incorporating hip roofs or a mudsill, indicating flexibility within the current design to make adjustments.
- Advocated for a more fragmented architectural approach to the building to enhance its residential appearance, acknowledging the challenge of balancing such design modifications with the economies of scale the town is considering.
- Emphasized the importance of ensuring the building presents a residential, rather than dormitory-style, facade, hinting at a preference for the building to resemble single-family dwellings more closely.
- Referenced previous comments about the need to break up the building's mass to better integrate it into the residential context, reinforcing the value of such design considerations.

Camp

- Concurred with previously expressed viewpoints, emphasizing the importance of considering the existing neighborhood scale and architectural character.
- Suggested that the project could be reconfigured into possibly three separate buildings, including a story-and-a-half structure, to achieve better integration with the neighborhood.

Pohl

- Echoed concerns regarding height and massing, affirming agreement with the feedback provided by others.
- Highlighted issues with one of the side elevations lacking windows, noting this as a significant departure from HDC guidelines and standards.
- Criticized the proposed roof pitch for being lower than typically approved by the HDC, advising a review of the HDC Guidebook for better alignment with local architectural standards.
- Reiterated the need for adjustments to fenestration and building height to comply with established guidelines and blend more harmoniously with the surrounding context.

	Welch - Clarified that the project in question has not yet been constructed, acknowledging the extensive review time dedicated to it. - Referenced Tacoma Green, a nearby project approximately 100 to 150 yards away, which the board had previously reviewed and approved, to contextualize discussions on scale. - Emphasized the relevance of mentioning Tacoma Green as it represents a development of a larger scale than a single-family home, contributing to the dialogue on appropriate sizes for new constructions in the area.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (03:53:28)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

2. Reade Arthur Trust 19 Monomoy Rd Pool fence, patio, retaining walls 54/260 NAG

Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul
Alternates	Patten, Thornewill
Representative	Stephen Theroux, Nantucket Architecture Group, LTD
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments	-
Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Expressed relief over the clarification regarding the fence with the detail, initially thinking it was meant to encircle the entire property. - Welcomed the information that the existing planting will be preserved and that the fence will be situated inside of it, leading to the conclusion that the application is appropriate. Paul - Echoed agreement with Val's perspective, appreciating the shift from a potential vertical timber wall to a terraced approach that promises a softer appearance. - Expressed approval for the project on the condition that the site plan includes annotations clarifying the nature and placement of the blue fence, which was initially misunderstood to encompass the entire property. - Indicated no concerns with the fence upon receiving clarification about its application and design. Camp - Clarified that the new blue fence line depicted in the plans represents a simple wire fence, not the more detailed design shown on another page. - Inquired about the nature of Sandwich Road, clarifying whether it's a paper road or an actual road, and was informed it is a real road but currently planted out, making it invisible in aerial photographs. - Confirmed that the area at the corner near Sandwich Road is already fully planted, addressing concerns about the proximity of the fence to the corner. - Acknowledged the extensive nature of the proposed changes or the area in question. Coombs - Requested a visual representation (picture or drawing) of the fence planned to encircle the pool, as well as details about the fence going around the property's perimeter. - Clarified that the blue line in the plans signifies a simple old wire fence intended to blend into existing vegetation like privet hedges. - Commented on the location's unique visibility from the road, comparing it to another area where visibility is minimal due to topographical changes. - Concluded with no objections to the fence proposal, contingent on the preservation of existing plantings around it to ensure the fence remains unobtrusive. Pohl - Proposed that if there's any concern about the visibility of the wire fence, a motion should be made similar to those typically made for pools. This motion would stipulate that the wire fence must not

	be visible from a public way at the time of inspection or thereafter, ensuring consistency with how visibility concerns are addressed in other contexts. - Clarified that there will be vegetation on the exterior to screen the fence, ensuring it blends seamlessly with the natural environment. - Emphasized that using language similar to what is applied to pool fences for screening will offer consistent protection and aesthetic integration, aligning with community standards.
Motion	Motion to approve, on the condition that the wire fencing will not be visible at the time of inspection or thereafter. (Made by: Coombs) (04:06:49)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

3.	Kinsella, Catherine	19B Hummock Pond Rd	Barn	56/468	Self
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill				
Representative	Daniel and Catherine Kinsella				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments	-				
Public Comments	-				
Comments/Concerns	Pohl - Expressed that the barn is very straightforward but raised a concern about the uncommon choice of a green metal roof and whether it would be visible from a public way. Kinsella - Reassured that it would be impossible for the barn and its green metal roof to be seen from a public way due to the property being surrounded by neighbors, a graveyard, and obscured by a narrow driveway, established landscaping, and the positioning of the original dwelling which would conceal the barn from view, especially from the graveyard side. Oliver - Voiced difficulty in interpreting the provided drawings due to their lack of clarity, making it challenging to discern door and window sizes among other details. - Sought clarification about specific elevations, particularly questioning the North elevation and whether it features the pitched roof and shed depicted in the plans. - Expressed confusion over the absence of doors or windows on what appears to be a porch on that side of the structure, indicating a need for more detailed or clearer plans to understand the proposed design fully. Welch - Stated an openness to approving a metal roof for the structure and is not opposed to the color green, particularly if it's a dark shade known historically as "invisible green," which could blend well with the surroundings. - Advised against a sky-blue color for the roof, considering it less suitable. - Recognized that the applicant might need to place an order for the roofing material in advance and given the barn's location, expressed no concern over the use of a metal roof. - Suggested that if the board is inclined to approve a metal roof, the specific color could be finalized later, based on visibility assessments. Coombs - Expressed no issue with the presence of a barn, considering it a natural structure that doesn't necessarily need to be hidden. - Mentioned a new company offering interesting metal roof options that could be worth exploring for the barn. - Suggested that the barn could benefit from additional windows, depending on its intended use. - Opened to discussing whether the barn will feature a ridged metal roof or metal roof tiles, noting that these details could influence the building's appearance. - Observed that the barn's location likely obscures it from direct view, with only the roof potentially visible from a distance, suggesting that a final decision on the roofing material could be made once the barn's visibility is assessed.				

	Camp - Questioned whether there might be a missing line on the east and west sides of the plans, indicating an open porch area. - Confirmed that the area in question is indeed a porch, clarifying the structure's layout. - Asked about the nature of the barn doors, suggesting they resemble garage doors rather than traditional barn doors. - Received clarification that the doors will indeed function similarly to garage doors and will be made of Barn Pine to match the exterior cladding of the building. Pohl - Expressed the primary concern regarding the color of the green metal roof, noting a potential difference in perception between "Kelly Green" and "Invisible Green," and acknowledging the wide variety of green shades available. - Suggested possible approaches to address this concern: requesting a color sample for approval to ensure clarity on the exact shade of green or initially approving the project with a shingle roof, with the option to reconsider the metal roof color once the structure is framed and its visibility assessed. - Highlighted that the visibility of the roof color becomes a non-issue if it's determined that the roof cannot be seen from public viewpoints, allowing more flexibility in the choice of color. - Acknowledged the explanation that the rest of the building is unlikely to be visible, focusing the discussion primarily on the roof's visibility and color. Kinsella - Proposed a compromise solution involving the selection of a green architectural asphalt roof as an alternative, with a provision to switch to a "dual black" color to match the other buildings on the property if there are concerns with the green roof. - Indicated that choosing a "dual black" asphalt roof would be a more straightforward option for approval, suggesting flexibility in addressing the commission's concerns about the roof color while maintaining a cohesive aesthetic across the property.
Motion	Motion to approve, with the modification that the roof material be changed to an architectural asphalt shingle in a "dual black" color, moving away from the initially proposed green metal. (Made by: Camp) (04:17:52)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

4. Dennis Keller	3 Nosegay Lane	Roof Sola – Cottage	73.1.4/14	AckSmart
This item was heard at the previous meeting.				
5. John Wise	18 Williams St	New driveway	55/371	Normand
Due to lack of representation, this item was not discussed or voted on.				
6. Mid Century Modern LLC	21 Vestal St	Hardscape	41/175	Normand
Due to lack of representation, this item was not discussed or voted on.				
7. James Rodgers	9 Orange Street	Driveway	42.3.1/150	NAG
This item was heard previously on the agenda.				
8. Wynn Shield	5 Friendship	Door window	66/249	Wynne
Due to lack of representation, this item was not discussed or voted on.				
9. Caroline Way LLC	1 Caroline Way	Rev Shed	82/58-59	Vincent-Burin Architects
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Representative	Paulo Vicente, Vicente-Burin Architects			
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: Welch) (04:23:31)			

Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			
10. Golden Eye	5 Grant	Guest house doors	30/143	Patrick Ahern
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Representative	Ray Pohl, Botticelli & Pohl - Requested to hold without prejudice.			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments	-			
Public Comments	-			
Comments/Concerns	-			
Motion	No Motion was needed.			
Roll-Call Vote	No vote was taken.			

The remaining items were not discussed and no action was taken.

11. 32 Hulbert Trust	32 Hulbert	New shed	29/72	Botticelli & Pohl
12. Red Horse LLC	88 Quidnet Rd	Fen revs	21/109	Botticelli & Pohl
13. Stone Post Way LLC	7 Stone Post Wy	New Dwelling	74/79	K Megna
14. Tamara King	52 W Chester	Omit addition, fen changes	41/381	Emeritus
15. MacTaggart, Ian	1 Brook Farm Rd	Cabana New	41/222.8	MCA
16. *HOLD* Ack N Back	33 Quidnet	Pickleball	21/27.2	Ahern LLC
17. Town of Nantucket	24 Surfside	Demo	55/243	John McMeeking
18. Town of Nantucket	24 Surfside	Addition/Windows	55/243	John McMeeking
19. 25 ACK LLC	25 Pleasant	New Dwelling	55.4.1/111	EMDA
20. 26 Fair LLC	26 Fair St	Addition	42.3.2/171	EMDA
21. 4 Brothers ACK LLC	30 Tashama Ln	Revisions porch	55/455	EMDA
22. Foster, Jonathan & Roni	43 N Liberty St	Rev 2023-12-9566	41/153	Botticelli & Pohl
23. Youngman, Thomas	32 York St	Window replacement	55.4.1/101	Val Oliver
24. Grant Cambridge	40 Easton	Hardscape, gates, Fence	42.1.4/20	Champoux Landscape
25. 90 Noah Liberty Prev Trust	90 N Liberty	Garage partial demo	41/22	Botticelli & Pohl
26. 90. Noah Liberty Prev Trust	90 N Liberty	Shed move	41/22	Botticelli & Pohl
27. Congdon & Coleman	57 Main St	Roof	42.3.1/221	James Lydon
28. McNeill Family	10 Mattapoissett	Shed	82/117	Val Oliver
29. Don Allen Ford	24 Polpis	Windows doors	54/177	Val Oliver
30. Old Thumper LLC	29 Youngs	Storage Container	67/690	Val Oliver
31. Valencia, Rudy	33 Daffodil Ln	pool	68/743	NAG
32. Valencia, Rudy	33 Daffodil Ln	shed	68/743	NAG
33. FP 4 N Water	4 N Water	New dwelling	42.4.2/90	Emeritus LTD
34. 8 New St LLC	8 New St	Replace fnt door/color change	55.4.1/35	LFW
35. Harold Brothers Realty	2/4 Highland Ave	roofwalk	30/289&187	LFW

XII. OLD BUSINESS 02/13/2024

1. Robert Sarkisian 11-9409	8 N Mill	hardscape	55.4.4/78.2	KMLD
• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Patten; Alternates: Paul, Thornewill; Recused: Oliver. Last heard 12/19/2023</i>				
2. NIR LLC 12-9661	Straight Wharf	Rebuild roof w dormer	42.2.4/1	Paul Beaulieu
• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Oliver, Camp, Paul, Patten;</i>				
3. George Metri 09-8496	12 Angola St	Hardscape driveway	54.4.4/48	KMLD
• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill; Alternates: Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/19/2023</i>				
4. Matthew Roberts 11-9561	21A Daffodil Ln	Rooftop Solar	68/749	Empower Energy
• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Patten, Paul; Recused: none. Last heard 12/19/2023</i>				
5. 40 Warren's Landing N T	40 Warren's Landing	Shed 04-8218	38/45	Normand
• <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Oliver, Coombs, Paul, Patten; Alternates: Welch, Thornewill; Recused: none. Last heard 08/15/2023</i>				
6. Eleven Lincoln Trust 11-9526	32 Jefferson Ave	Rev 10-9274 MH	31/32	Botticelli Pohl
• <i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill; Alternates: Paul, Patten; Recused: Pohl. Last heard 12/05/2023</i>				
7. Smiley 17 N Water LLC	17 N Water St	roof walk 01-9732	42.4.2/49	Emeritus

<i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Camp; Alternates: Paul, Thornewill, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 01/30/2024</i>					
8.	N Liberty St LLC 12-9701	13 N Liberty St	Window door rev	42/3.4/3	SMRD
<i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/05/2023</i>					
9.	Carmine & Sheila Giardini	7A Clifford St	New dwelling 12-9634	79/19	Reid Yenor
<i>Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill; Alternates: Paul, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 01/16/2024</i>					
10.	61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot D	Dwelling rev's	67/173.2	LFW
<i>Minutes not provided</i>					
11.	61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot D	Pool hardscape	67/173.2	LFW
<i>Minutes not provided</i>					
12.	61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds lot C	Pool hardscape	67/173.1	LFW
<i>Minutes not provided</i>					
13.	Stobie	60 Hulbert	windows	29/58	Brian Puches
<i>Commissioners: Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill; Alternates: Welch, Oliver, Patten; Recused: none. Last heard 12/05/2023</i>					
14.	Richard & Deborah Hohlt	121 Madaket Rd	Pickle Ball Court	40/60.1	
<i>Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten; Alternates: None Recused: Pohl, Thornewill. Last heard 02/06/2024.</i>					

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 20th 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 8:28 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

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