



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, February 20, 2024

4 Fairgrounds Road and Remote Participation via Zoom
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

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

CALL TO ORDER AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Pohl called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and announced the following amendments to the agenda:

- Struck Item 2, 26 Quidnet Path, and Item 3, 32 Pocomo Road, from the Old Business of January 30th agenda.
- Removed several items from the February 13th agenda under Old Business:
 - Item 1: 8 North Mill Street
 - Item 3: 12 Angola Street
 - Items 36 and 37: Both pertaining to 15 Deer Run Road
- Noted that these items are not being heard on their respective nights but will be scheduled for future meetings.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to approve, as modified. (Made By: Coombs) (00:03:46)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion:	Oliver • Discussed zoning provisions that grant automatic entitlements if a proposal includes a certain percentage of affordable housing. • Mentioned that such proposals could allow for building heights up to 40 feet. • Identified the Planning Board as the presenter of this proposal. • Decided to take no action on the matter until the next meeting, allowing time for members to review the proposal language more thoroughly.
-------------	---

I. CONSENT

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. RMM Lemonade LLC	23 Masaquet	Shed move	80/139	Jardins Intl
2. RMM Lemonade LLC	23 Masaquet Ave	Garage	80/139	EMDA
3. Congdon & Coleman	57 Main St	Roof	42.3.1/221	James Lydon
4. 19 ALW NT	19 Austine Locke	Relocate pool rev 9467	82/57	Atlantic Land
5. Family Ties Ack LLC	11 Alliance Ln	Driveway	39/24.1	Atlantic Land
6. Hans Dalgaard	57 Weweeder Ave	Door window rev 9311	88/12	Thornewill
7. Luckity Trust	Tuckernuck	roof	96/8	Val Oliver
8. Barrie Fee Grant Sanders	14 Dennis Dr	Solar roof	67/363	Acksmart
9. Landbank	18 Ocean Ave	rev beach stair	73.2.4/16	Normand
10. Jaff, Derick	16 Paul Jones	Pool & Hardscape	41/97.1	Waterscapes
11. Ferguson, Norval	2 Corby Way	Pool Hardscape	67/3	Waterscapes
12. Wynnshield LLC	5 Friendship	Shed		Mike Wynne
13. Suni & William Harford	60 Wanoma Wy	Relocate garage on site	92/3	Emeritus LTD
14. McNeill Family	10 Mattapoissett	Shed	82/117	Val Oliver
15. Don Allen Ford	24 Polpis	Windows doors	54/177	Val Oliver
16. Valencia, Rudy	33 Daffodil Ln	shed	68/743	NAG

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

17. Steven Lewis	124 Tom Nevers	Basement window	91/43.2	EMDA
18. Ack Easy St LLC	10 Easy St	remove green add shed	42.3.1/78	EMDA
19. 4 BrothersAck LLC	30 Tashama	Remove walkout add window	55/455	EMDA
20. Jacobson Amanda	9 Jennifer Ln	Apron	49.3.2/4	Atlantic
21. Fleur-De-Lis Property Trust	8 Shimmo Pond	Fens revs 05-8442	54/258	Botticelli & Pohl
22. Benson Family	152A Surfside	Move on house	80/33.2	Val Oliver
23. Cicchetti	17 Sesapana rd	Add portico over front door	68/92	Val Oliver
24. RadioAcktive LLC	5 Columbus	Replace roof	59.2/175	Lera Keller
25. Jesse Dutra	2 Sea Fox Circle	Window Well	55/107.4	Waterscape
26. Janet DeCosta	4 Waydale Rd	Roof	55/83	Bob DeCosta
27. Airport Gas Inc	10 Airport Rd	Alterations	68/310	Val Oliver
28. Burn, Todd	23 Longwood Dr	Shed	76/76	NAG
29. Silkenat Katherine Anne Trst	37 Orange St	Window doors repairs	42.3.2/215	Todd Stout
30. Landbank	125 Somerset	Roof	66/69	Eleanor Antonietti
31. Landbank	50 Old South	Fence driveway	68/18.1	Eleanor Antonietti
32. Westmoor Club	10 Westmoor Lane	New garage	41/809	Adam Davis
33. Gaynor, Paul	10 Eat Fire Spring	New shed	20/63	Thornewill
34. Gaynor, Paul	10 Eat Fire Spring	Reno cabana	20/63	Thornewill
35. Clifford Muller	144 Polpis Rd	Roof	44/10	Jim Lydon
36. Michael Stone	6 Marcus Wy	Rooftop Solar	91/9.1	AckSmart

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	Pohl, Oliver, Thornewill
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Coombs) (00:07:25)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)

I. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Old Thumper LLC	29 Youngs	Storage Container	67/690	Val Oliver
• Approval good for 3 years, due to lack of visibility. -SW				
2. Valencia, Rudy	33 Daffodil Ln	pool	68/743	NAG
• Per sheet A1; and, not visible at time of inspection or thereafter, no grade change from original application submission and prior existing - SW				
3. Catherine Brown	3 Hatch Cir	Apron fencing gate	66/276	KMLD
• 6' fence, wherever installed without plant material shown add persistent vine-type plan at (1) per alternating fence sections; 7' wire fence to limited visibility, due to plantings. -SW				
4. Pazone, RE Trust	14 Waquoit Rd	Move house	89/9	Normand Residential
• Revised siting to reflect as close to the existing cardinal points as possible. That will retain a better setting for this historic structure. -JP				
5. Scimone, Branden	6 Sandpiper	Rev Pool, Hardscape	76/89	Waterscapes
• Not to be visible at time of inspection or in perpetuity and no grade change. -JP				
6. Westmoor Club	10 Westmoor Lane	Shed demo	41/809	Adam Davis
• Date of construction to be added to COA. -AC				

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul
Alternates:	Thornewill
Recused:	Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Camp) (00:08:04)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)

I. OLD BUSINESS 01/30/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
----------------	----------------	---------------	------------	-------

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

1. Ospray LLC 12-9577	25 Willard St	Hardscape & fence	29/33	Edgewater Landscape
Voting:	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:				
Recused:	-			
Representative:				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner			
Public Comments:				
Commissioner Comments:				
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By:) (00:00:00)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

Hold for representation.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. 26 Quidnet LLC	26 Quidnet Path	New Dwelling	21/150	Emeritus LTD

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3. Whitney Gifford Tr.	32 Pocomo Rd	Gate, driveway, & fence	14/77	Emeritus LTD

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. Kathryn Cook 12-9637	85 Low Beach Rd	Glass Connector rev 10-7257	75/31.3	Rich Gammons

Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Rich Gammons, Cross Rip Builders			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Commission discussion ensued during which they expressed a need to physically inspect the site in the dark to properly observe the glass connector, as current photos do not provide a clear view.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for a view. (Made By: Thornewill) (00:18:42)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
5. Robert Stock 08-9002	50 Squam Rd	As-built Fence	31/13	Cohen + Cohen

Voting:	Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Steve Cohen, Cohen + Cohen			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	Robin Winter, Abutter - Highlighted that Mr. Cohen represents the applicant and advised the Board to consult their own counsel before making a decision. - Reiterated the applicant's claim from the August 22 meeting that the fence was for deer control, yet pointed out that the fencing does not enclose the property completely, thus not serving its stated purpose. - Noted that the fencing leaves a substantial unenclosed area through which deer can freely enter. - Criticized the plot plan submitted for discussion as lacking a professional surveyor's stamp and not being adequate for official purposes. - Reiterated the Board's previous concerns about the fence's appearance, inconsistent styles, unsuitability for the rural setting of Squam Road, excessive height, lack of vegetation or screening, and the need for the fence to be set back from the property line.			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	• Stressed that the fencing does not comply with Nantucket's guidelines that prioritize visual openness and discourage fences that disrupt the natural landscape, especially where large lots and open areas are involved. • Emphasized that while fences are sometimes necessary for specific functional reasons like enclosing animals, they should be of a design that allows for visibility of the landscape.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver • Reiterated the challenge of enforcing aesthetic standards for structures not visible from public vantage points, limiting the Board's authority to intervene. • Criticized the ongoing trend of building practices on Nantucket that prioritize individual preferences over community aesthetic standards. • Proposed that, at minimum, penalties such as fines should be applied to discourage such practices. Paul • Agreed with the previous speaker and suggested that the situation with the fence could lead to policy changes. • Criticized the fence as an example of exploiting the "lack of visibility" clause, which allows property owners to bypass community standards. • Expressed frustration over the limited jurisdiction the Board has in such cases where visibility is not an issue, sympathizing with the affected neighbors. Camp • Agreed with colleagues that both the style and height of the fence are inappropriate for the rural location. • Cited guidance from interviews with the Historic District Commission (HDC) on how to determine visibility from a public way, emphasizing that assessments should be made assuming no trees or landscaping obstruct the view. Coombs • Proposed consulting with legal counsel to understand the potential ramifications of approving a structure that significantly deviates from established standards. • Emphasized the visual impact of the fence when viewed without any trees or landscaping, describing it as hideous. • Expressed concern about the visibility of the fence from neighboring properties. • Questioned the legal protections available to prevent such undesirable developments from becoming more common. Patten • Expressed agreement with fellow Commissioners. • Criticized the fence as being unneighborly and not in keeping with Nantucket's community standards. Cohen • Acknowledged the fence's lack of attractiveness, historical appropriateness, and neighborliness, labeling it as "ugly." • Pointed out that the legal question before the Commission is whether they have the authority to disapprove the fence based on visibility. • Asserted that the fence is legally approvable due to its lack of visibility, despite its unattractiveness. • Criticized the lengthy process his client has undergone, including multiple requests for additional information from the Commission, which he deemed legitimate but exhaustive. • Urged the Commission to make a fair judgment based on the complete information provided and the rules governing visibility, suggesting that it would be improper to prolong the process further. Oliver • Expressed frustration with the limitations of the Commission's jurisdiction due to legal constraints, finding it inappropriate.

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Suggested that if the fence is approved, the property owner should be required to pay a fine. Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Mentioned that Ms. Robin Winter, a neighbor and previous speaker, sent an email in November, also involving her attorney, raising concerns about the fence. - Highlighted a survey discrepancy reported by Nantucket Engineering and Surveying PC, and another performed for the Builtman property by Nantucket Surveyors LLC, indicating that the fence encroaches onto the Builtman property. Cohen - Confirmed that the fence has been relocated.
Motion:	Motion to approve the fence installation reluctantly due to its lack of visibility from public areas; Proposed a fine of \$500, calculated as ten times the usual fee; and included conditions that if the fence becomes visible from public areas in the future, continuous fines will be imposed until it is adequately screened and requested that the applicant consult the board prior to construction in any future developments. (Made By: Oliver) (00:35:30)
Vote:	Failed 2-3 // Oliver, Patten (Aye) // Camp, Paul, Coombs (Nay)
Discussion:	Paul - Suggested that the applicant could choose to withdraw the application for the fence. - Clarified that the fence is not encroaching on the neighbor's property, addressing earlier concerns about boundary issues. - Expressed frustration about being compelled to approve the fence based on its lack of visibility, noting the unusual position it puts the commission in. - Emphasized that typically there are equitable solutions that satisfy all parties involved. - Questioned the purpose of the application since the fence is already constructed and not pending a building permit. Cohen - Expressed sympathy towards the suggestion of withdrawing the application. - Committed to discussing the suggestion with the clients for further consideration.
Motion:	Motion to continue. (Made By: Paul) (00:42:15)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)

I. NEW BUSINESS 02/06/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
7. John Wise	18 Williams	New Driveway	55/371	Normand
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ben Normand, Normand Residential			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that the historic house dates from circa 1904 to 1923, which aligns with Sanborn maps from that period. - Observed that the driveway appears to have been relocated from its previous position, requesting further clarification. - Suggested that the dimensions of the driveway should comply with Zoning Bylaw 139-20.1, noting these are currently not indicated on the plans. - Acknowledged that the choice of Belgian block for the driveway material fits the neighborhood, referencing similar materials on Cherry Street. - Expressed satisfaction with the existing asphalt but still recommended conducting an actual survey of the property division to provide clear distinctions on the site plan, which is deemed crucial for understanding changes to the property layout.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group Stated that for house of this period, believes that brick would be a more appropriate apron.			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Expressed agreement with the use of a brick apron for the driveway. - Showed uncertainty about using shell material, suggesting pea stone as a preferable alternative. - Discussed the appropriateness of Belgian block, with a reservation about its historical accuracy compared to brick, which was deemed more suitable for the setting. Oliver - Expressed a desire to understand the overall property division context, which might influence material choices. - Noted a lack of existing brick driveways in the vicinity, indicating that such a design might not fit the local context. - Stated a preference for the currently proposed Belgian block for the driveway, suggesting it is more suitable than brick for the area's aesthetic, which leans away from a country-style look. Thornewill - Expressed the opinion that Belgian block might appear too gentrified for the character of the street, suggesting it may not be the best fit. - Recommended sticking with asphalt for the driveway to maintain consistency with the area's current style, acknowledging that the driveway has been shifted to accommodate a newly subdivided property. Coombs - Expressed that while she doesn't find the Belgian block particularly attractive, she agrees that it fits in with the existing pavement and overall context. Pohl - Described Belgian block as reading too formal and opulent for the environment. - Suggested cobblestone as a great alternative but noted that brick would be acceptable and appropriate as well.
Motion:	Moved to approve the driveway materials with Exhibit A specifying asphalt for the apron and shell for the main driveway. Requested that the subdivided site plan be included as part of Exhibit A. (Made By: Camp) (00:49:57)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
8. Wynn Shield	5 Friendship	Door window	66/249	Wynne
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Michale Wynne			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve, emphasizing the need to include appropriate details in the application, such as the size of the windows. (Made By: Oliver) (00:53:13)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
9. Mid Century Modern	21 Vestal St	hardscape	41/175	Normand
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Ben Normand, Normand Residential
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Recorded that the dwelling on the lot is a circa 1925 contributing structure. - Expressed concerns regarding the amount of Goshen stone used and its proximity to the side setback line. - Recommended reducing the amount of Goshen stone to make the setting more organic and less rigid, which would be more appropriate. - Suggested that additional vegetation could be retained or added to soften the appearance, especially given its proximity to the property line.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group Stated no concerns.
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Acknowledged Holly's point about the problematic nature of a rigid edge, particularly near the property line. - Noted that despite initial reservations, the compelling nature of the provided photos alleviated concerns, as it appeared the area would be softened by vegetation. - Concluded that the proposed changes represent an improvement over the current condition. Oliver - Concurred with Joe. Camp - Expressed that extending the Goshen stone up to the setback line is excessive. - Suggested using natural stones to create a footpath effect, while keeping the driveway itself as Goshen stone. Coombs - Agreed with Abby's suggestion for a less formal approach to the driveway's design, favoring a more relaxed aesthetic. Pohl - Examined the Goshen stone on the West elevation and compared it to the existing pressure-treated retaining wall depicted in the photograph. - Noted that the current retaining wall is taller and less attractive than the proposed Goshen stone and appears higher than depicted in the drawings. - Concluded that replacing the current structure with Goshen stone represents a net improvement. Paul - Sought a balance in the landscape design, referencing Diane's suggestion about material continuity. - Proposed extending the brick from the driveway down the walkway to the terminus of the wooden deck. - Suggested reducing the pathway of Goshen stone to form a rectangular patio area, rather than using it for the entire walkway. - Envisioned a design where the transition from stairs to ground level would end on brick, enhancing aesthetic coherence.
Motion:	Moved to approve the proposed changes with an Exhibit A, specified that the stretch of Goshen stone should be replaced with brick in the revised plans. (Made By: Paul) (01:02:14)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner 10. Seahorse LLC	Street Address 5 Grant Ave	Scope of Work GH fen change	Map/Parcel 30/143	Agent Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

Alternates:	Patten
Recused:	Pohl
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that the house, originally Victorian eclectic, was built by James H.H. Gibbs in 1870. - Appreciated the appropriate pane dimensions of the doors and their true divided light (TDL) construction. - Acknowledged the replacement of existing 2 over 2 windows with new ones. - Expressed concern about the amount of glass but was reassured by the limited visibility from public viewpoints. - Relieved to hear that the second door on the facade, previously planned, will not be installed. Botticelli - Mentioned that the windows are double glazed. - Discussed the window specifications across different parts of the property, noting uncertainty about the window type in the main house due to its new build status or previous renovations. - Recalled that new windows were installed in the garage, likely simulated divided light (SDLs).
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Appreciated the photo provided from inside the property, noting that it clearly shows the changes to the elevation. - Described the view from the property as looking towards the street and noted the significant vegetation between neighbors. - Acknowledged the extensive use of glass in the design but concluded it is acceptable since it is mostly visible only to the homeowner. Oliver and Paul - Stated no concerns based on the visibility. Coombs - Stated no issues. - Suggested that any potential visibility concerns might be revisited when the pool is installed. Camp - Expressed a preference for a single set of French doors with a kick panel to maintain historical authenticity. - Accepted the current design due to its limited visibility.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Coombs) (01:08:42)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
11. 32 Hulbert Trust	32 Hulbert	New shed	29/72	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that the site is an infill within the Brandt Point neighborhood, with a previously approved gambrel already in place. - Considered the shed to be approvable, mentioning a concern that the window appears fairly large for the size of the structure but concluded that it remains appropriate overall.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	Stated no concerns.
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners stated no concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Patten) (01:13:00)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
12. Red Horse LLC	88 Quidnet Rd	Fen revs	21/109	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Clarified that the cottage dates back to the early 1900s, originally built for Mr. Richardson, and was moved to its current location in 1920. - Recalled that the commission previously approved some work on the property a few years ago. - Appreciated the recent revisions, particularly the restoration of the brick chimney and the complete removal of stone. - Praised the reduction in scope, finding it highly beneficial for the contributing structure.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners expressed appreciation for the changes, noting that the board skirting is much more appropriate than the original stone.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Oliver) (01:17:03)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
13. Stone Post Way LLC	7 Stone Post Wy	New Dwelling	74/79	K Megna
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Kristopher Megna, Dreamline Modular Homes			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged that the architecture fits well within the neighborhood's infill vernacular. - Voiced concerns about the design of the front door, noting that the combination of both sidelights and a craftsman style door are competing elements. - Recommended removing one of the features to harmonize the facade, suggesting possibly replacing the craftsman style door with one that better matches the fenestration of the sidelights and the 2 over 2 windows for a more cohesive look.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Affirmed that the design fits well with the neighborhood. - Expressed approval of Holly's suggestion, considering a 4-panel door with sidelights as a viable option to complement the 2 over 2 windows. - Thanked the presenters for incorporating additive massing, which is highly appreciated in the design. Camp			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Agreed with previous comments about the front door's design conflicting with other elements, suggesting that a regular panel door might be more suitable. - Noted that the door should harmonize with the 2 over 2 windows. - Critiqued the positioning of the shed dormer on the far right, describing it as too low and giving the impression of being 'down around your ankles.' - Suggested making the shed dormer more prominent to better balance the facade's proportions. - Expressed concerns about the dormer appearing too small and low for the architectural plane it occupies. Coombs - Approved of the front design generally, but emphasized the need to reduce the amount of glass flanking the front door. - Recommended reducing the glass to three typical panels on each side, if glass must be included. - Expressed concern that the extensive use of glass on both sides of the door does not align architecturally with the existing house. Patten - Confirmed agreement with the concerns about the front door. - Suggested that changing the door itself would be beneficial. Camp - Commented on the verticality of the first-floor windows, noting that they appear almost Victorian due to their narrowness. - Suggested that making these windows slightly wider would enhance their appearance, making them look more appropriate for the "Sconset" style and more visually pleasing due to their generous size. Pohl - Expressed a shared sentiment regarding the unusual verticality of the windows, referencing a similar issue previously noted with a new school project. - Responded to comments about the shed dormer's height, explaining that it cannot be raised any higher without its peak reaching or exceeding the main roof's ridge. - Acknowledged that the current positioning and height are due to architectural limitations, specifically the transom in a cathedral setting. - Offered an understanding of why the dormer appears as it does and suggested that if it remains an issue, relocating the dormer to another side of the roof might be a feasible alternative.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, specifying changes to the front door configuration to a 4-panel door and sidelights adjusted to 3 lights with a solid pane underneath. Included a directive to downsize the "C" windows by reducing one size in height vertically. (Made By: Oliver) (01:26:26)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
14. Tamara King	52 W Chester	Omit addition, fen changes	41/381	Emeritus
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that the property is a circa 1850 Greek revival with a gable end. - Recalled a review conducted in 2020 regarding a previous addition. - Appreciated the recent reduction in scope of the rear addition, deeming it appropriate. - Suggested ensuring that the date of the historic structure is indicated on the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). - Expressed no further concerns with the proposed modifications.			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group Stated no concerns.
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners stated no concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Oliver) (00:00:00)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten (Aye)

Item 15 - Hold for representation.

Property Owner 15. MacTaggart, Ian	Street Address 1 Brook Farm Rd	Scope of Work Cabana New	Map/Parcel 41/222.8	Agent MCA
Property Owner 16. Ack N Back	Street Address 33 Quidnet	Scope of Work Pickleball Court	Map/Parcel 21/27.2	Agent Ahern LLC
- There was no discussion or action taken on the item due to the provision of new information. - Chair Pohl indicated that additional time is required for the Commission and public members to review the information appropriately.				

Property Owner 17. Town of Nantucket	Street Address 24 Surfside	Scope of Work Demo	Map/Parcel 55/243	Agent John McMeeking
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	John McMeeking, SMRT Architects and Engineers			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Mentioned that no specific date was initially associated with the property, but tax records and updates to the National Historic Landmark (NHL) indicate it is circa 1957 for both the dwelling and the garage. - Commented on the garage, expressing regret that it could not be adaptively reused for the school's purposes.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver Expressed opposition to the proposal, noting that it involves a demolition when it could possibly be a “move-off.”			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Camp) (01:55:45)			
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Paul (Aye) // Oliver (Nay)			

Property Owner 18. Town of Nantucket	Street Address 24 Surfside	Scope of Work Addition/Windows	Map/Parcel 55/243	Agent John McMeeking
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	John McMeeking/Alecks Janjic SMRT Architects and Engineers			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Recorded that the property, a circa 1957 contributing dwelling, is planned for conversion to offices and an apartment above with a small addition for a school. - Appreciated the project for maintaining a residential vernacular and appropriate scale. - Suggested including existing elevations in the application along with proposed ones to clarify the changes being made. - Expressed concern about the exterior stairs facing Surfside Road, which is atypical as they normally face the rear, recommending if possible to switch their orientation. - Approved of the simulated divided light (SDL) windows being proposed. - Noted that the site plan includes two proposed curb cuts, which will likely require approval from the planning board and a future hardscaping plan to be presented to the Commission. - Commented positively on the inclusion of a bio-retention area to manage runoff from proposed impervious surfaces, but reiterated concerns regarding the placement of the exterior stairs.
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Pointed out concerns regarding the staircase facing the road, suggesting a reevaluation of its placement. - Recommended if the staircase cannot be flipped to the other side, to consider adding architectural elements like a squared-off trellis to integrate it more seamlessly into the environment and reduce its prominence. - Emphasized that the visibility of the staircase needs to be addressed due to its eye-catching nature. Oliver - Expressed appreciation for maintaining the house's traditional appearance from the road. - Raised a question regarding the second egress for the apartment on the second floor, inquiring about the provision of an additional stairway given the absence of interior access. - Clarified the inquiry by emphasizing the current plan shows only one exterior stairway, prompting a query about how egress requirements will be met. Thornewill - Agreed with the concerns raised about the staircase issue. - Suggested that if the staircase is the main access point, it should be located inside the building to better match the scale and aesthetic of the property. - Recommended enclosing the stair and deck within a small addition to improve its integration with the overall structure and maintain architectural harmony. Coombs - Supported the idea of relocating the exterior stairs indoors, noting that such external stairs facing the street are unusual and not typical. - Questioned the compliance of the stair placement with accessibility standards, suggesting further investigation into whether the building meets the under 500 square foot exemption. - Insisted that the stairs, as currently designed, need to be repositioned. - Suggested making the windows larger, as the current ones are too small for the house's scale. Pohl - Questioned the necessity of the balusters in the design, suggesting they might not be needed. - Requested further research be conducted regarding the exterior stair design in response to the concerns raised by the board.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Coombs) (02:07:25)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

Items 19-21 - Requested to hold by the applicant.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
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

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
22. Foster, Jonathan & Roni	43 N Liberty St	Rev 2023-12-9566	41/153	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Recorded that the building is a 1930s Cape that has undergone recent revisions, including changes to a north-facing window. - Noted that the revised window, a 4 over 4 pane style, is likely only obliquely visible, contrasting with the majority of the fenestration, which is 6 over 6, and mentioned there might also be an 8 over 8 window. - Expressed concern that the 4 over 4 window style might appear inconsistent with the other windows. - Pointed out that the north-facing window uses simulated divided light (SDL) and assumed that other replaced windows are likely SDL as well, emphasizing that the property is in the Old Historic District (OHD).			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group Reported no concerns.			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners stated no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Oliver) (02:12:13)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
23. Youngman, Thomas	32 York St	Window replacement	55.4.1/101	Val Oliver
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Val Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Confirmed that the property was built between 1881 and 1892, referencing an 1881 Bird's Eye View painting that shows the Nantucket streetscape and highlights the building. - Located the property within the Old Historic District (OHD), noting its central position extending to Prospect Street and towards New Lane. - Appreciated the provision of photos documenting the current window conditions but pointed out that the schedule of conditions, which is typically necessary for historic houses, was missing. - Reviewed file information indicating an extensive renovation in the 1990s, raising questions about whether all windows were replaced during that period. - Expressed concern about the use of Anderson simulated divided light (SDL) windows, suggesting they might not be appropriate for a historic structure with a gable end and the traditional 6 over 6 double-hung window style. - Valued the intention to maintain the house's current appearance despite the renovations and material changes.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Clarified that his comments pertain primarily to the front of the house, which is the oldest and most visible part. - Suggested that if there are any original windows remaining, especially in the front section, they should be maintained and restored rather than replaced. - Acknowledged the need for energy efficiency but advocated for enhancing old windows with storm windows or other efficiency methods instead of full replacements. - Disapproved of the proposed use of Andersen windows, stating they are inappropriate for the historic nature of the house. - Recommended using traditional wood sash windows instead, indicating that SDL windows would be acceptable.			
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Highlighted the extraordinary view from the two windows overlooking the harbor, describing it as one of the most spectacular aspects of the property. - Emphasized the importance of retaining the traditional true divided light (TDL) windows in the front to preserve the architectural integrity of the 1890 building. - Expressed a strong preference against moving the building or making significant alterations, stressing the building's perfect preservation of its historical character. Camp - Observed that the windows shown in the photographs appear to be in great condition, expressing surprise at the proposal to replace them given their apparent quality. - Commented on the modern features of the windows, such as the three-track system that indicates a recent update. - Advocated for maintaining the true divided light (TDL) windows at the front of the house to preserve its historical character. Thornewill - Expressed agreement with the decision against using Andersen windows on the quite old structure. - Indicated openness to using simulated divided light (SDL) windows from Green Mountain with a truly historic profile, suggesting these could be acceptable if they mimic traditional aesthetics closely. - Commented on frequently driving by the property and noted that the new SDL windows might not be noticeable if they maintain a very narrow, historic profile. - Shared a quandary regarding the side elevations of the main block, noting that while these windows are not the focus, the three front elevation windows should ideally be preserved. - Remained open-minded to potentially using Green Mountain SDLs throughout if necessary, emphasizing the importance of maintaining the house's historical integrity. Patten - Expressed opposition to using Andersen windows, citing their profile as the main issue. - Indicated hesitation about the proposal, specifically not being fully convinced about the front design. Pohl - Acknowledged the consensus against using Andersen windows on the property. - Agreed with the need for careful scrutiny of the main, older front section of the building, suggesting it should be held to a higher standard than the newer rear L additions. - Acknowledged the durability and weather-tightness of Andersen windows but pointed out that the distinct flange is not aesthetically appropriate for historic settings due to its prominence and modern appearance.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for more information. (Made By: Camp) (02:25:43)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			
Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
24. Grant Cambridge	40 Easton	Hardscape, gates, Fence	42.1.4/20	Champoux Landscape
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Patten			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
Recused:	Paul			
Representative:	Ben Champoux, Champoux Landscape			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Recorded that the property proposed for hardscaping is an 1898 eclectic style residence within the Brant Point section, located in the OHD. - Approved the use of a Belgian block apron as fitting the character of the area but requested specific driveway dimensions to ensure compliance with zoning bylaw 139-20.1, which specifies an apron depth of 10 feet. - Raised questions regarding the use of reclaimed granite curbing and its placement relative to the town's right-of-way, seeking clarification on whether it is positioned on the property line or adjacent to the town sidewalk. - Expressed concerns about the appropriateness of the proposed Pennsylvania fieldstone as it is not typically used in the Brant Point area. - Criticized the design of the proposed driveway gate as inappropriate for the location, while noting the side gate's design is atypical. - Doubted the suitability of a 5 and one privacy fence in the Brant Point area, suggesting that the existing fencing style is more appropriate for the district.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Disagreed with the appropriateness of using Belgian block for the apron, advocating for continuity by using brick to match the existing sidewalk instead of introducing a different material. - Opposed the installation of a gate on the driveway, expressing concerns about its potential to create exclusivity in a traditionally informal neighborhood. - Commented on the proposed stone walls, noting that although they are intended to be low, they still establish a formal border which may not suit the area's informal character. - Suggested alternatives to stone walls for leveling differences near the driveway, such as grading the land down to the driveway rather than using retaining walls. - Raised concerns about the visibility of A/C units in front of the garage, recommending a fence over relying solely on vegetation for screening. - Concurred with Holly's previous comments regarding the inappropriateness of a 5 and one privacy fence in this neighborhood, aligning with the view that it disrupts the local aesthetic.
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Agreed with Mickey's opinions, particularly on the use of brick for the apron to maintain consistency with existing materials in the area. - Suggested the installation of vents for the air conditioners on the garage structure to ensure they are adequately concealed. - Expressed a desire for a more cohesive flow of landscaping, particularly in terms of the plantings around the property. She emphasized the need for the landscaping on one side of the property, where there is freedom in front of the building, to seamlessly transition around to the other side. - Advocated for uniformity in the planting scheme to avoid a disjointed appearance and to ensure continuity across the property's landscaping. Patten - Expressed agreement with previously voiced concerns, particularly focusing on the issue of the driveway gate. - Opposed the installation of a gate on the driveway, arguing it promotes exclusivity, which may not be desirable in the Brant Point area. - Stated that a personal gate is acceptable but noted that the style of the fence is somewhat atypical for the area, implying a need for careful consideration to ensure it fits the neighborhood's character. Paul - Expressed no objections to the proposed walls, especially given their description as replacements for timber walls and their modest height of less than 18 inches. - Discussed options for enclosing the air conditioning condensers, mentioning recent approvals of enclosures resembling shower structures and suggesting a solid board, natural-to-weather fence if needed on the front of the building.

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Commented on the 5 and one fence, describing it as too suburban for the setting, and indicated a preference for a solid board fence which might be more fitting. - Shared concerns about the driveway gate, proposing the exploration of designs that could offer some level of transparency to lessen its visual impact. - Suggested that the applicant present multiple gate designs for consideration, noting that providing several options could facilitate decision-making and potentially enhance the likelihood of finding an acceptable solution. Oliver - Reviewed aerial images and photographs of the neighborhood houses, noting that there are no instances of board fences pre-renovation; all boundaries were traditionally marked with hedges. - Expressed disapproval of using board fences in the area, suggesting that they are not in keeping with the historical and visual norms of the neighborhood. - Acknowledged the necessity of screening A/C units effectively but remained critical of using solid fencing for this purpose. - Reflected on the historical context of gates, noting a shift in local practices where gates were once uncommon but have become increasingly prevalent, indicating a move toward a "gated island." - Agreed with previous sentiments expressed by others regarding the inappropriateness of gates and solid fencing in maintaining the traditional character of the area. Camp - Questioned the necessity of placing A/C units on the front of the house, suggesting that side placement could mitigate visibility issues. - Conceded that if the front is the only feasible location for the A/C units, they should be screened with solid boards rather than relying solely on landscaping, which might not provide adequate coverage.
Motion:	Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Made By: Coombs) (02:40:55)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul(Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
25. 90 Noah Liberty Prev Trust	90 N Liberty	Garage partial demo	41/22	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that there are two applications under consideration: one for the partial demolition of a 1930s garage known as the Herbert Gardner Garage, which is listed as a contributing structure, and another for the relocation of a shed. - Highlighted the historical significance of the Major Josiah Coffin House, circa 1724, to which the garage is proposed to be attached via a breezeway. The Coffin House is an individually significant structure with a lean-to that has been well-documented. - Expressed concern over the appropriateness of connecting the historic garage to this significant dwelling, even with a breezeway, suggesting that these structures should remain separated. - Requested an updated site plan to better understand the proximity and layout of all structures involved. - Called for clarity in the plans to precisely identify what parts of the 1930s garage are to be demolished and what new constructions are proposed, as the current plans seem to indicate a complete demolition. - Acknowledged the other application regarding the shed's relocation as a positive step in retaining the historic character and fabric of the site but maintained reservations and questions about the overall project. Botticelli			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Clarified that the existing garage, which includes a workshop attached to its back, is slated for demolition. - Mentioned that both the workshop and the shed are proposed to be relocated as part of the same application that also includes the construction of a new garage, which will be attached to the relocated structures. - Pointed out that the details of the proposed changes become more apparent when reviewing the east and west elevations of the building.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed strong reservations about the appropriateness of attaching a two-story garage to a very historic building, considering it highly unsuitable. - Commented on the structure's dimensions, noting that the garage appears very tall and massive, especially from the north elevation, which is highly visible from Cliff Road. - Suggested design alterations, recommending a one-story additive mass facing Cliff Road to reduce the overall height and massiveness of the building. - Criticized the garage's design, arguing that an accessory structure to such an old and historic house should emulate an old, historic barn-like appearance rather than a generic two-story garage, to better relate to the character and period of the main house.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Expressed appreciation for the effort to preserve elements of the property, highlighting a general approval for conservation. - Raised concerns about the clarity of the plans, specifically pointing out that connecting the structures with an all-glass breezeway might not be suitable. Suggested that a completely open structure could be a better alternative. - Criticized the current design of the proposed accessory structure for being too contemporary and suburban, especially with features like flush dormers. - Recommended a design that more closely resembles a historic barn to better align with the character of the main house and the surrounding area. - Suggested that maintaining separation between the structures might be a preferable solution, indicating that distinct but harmonious structures could better preserve the site's historical integrity. Thornewill - Expressed agreement that the proposed garage apartment is incongruous with the historic structure and overall inappropriate for the property. - Commented on the size of the property, implying that there is ample space to consider alternative placements or designs. - Praised the existing outbuildings on the property for their minimal scale and historic profiles, which complement the main structure and enhance its significance. - Suggested that a completely separate dwelling placed elsewhere on the property might be more suitable, emphasizing that the current proposal undermines the prominence and integrity of the main historic structure. Paul - Expressed agreement with previously mentioned concerns and suggestions, particularly endorsing the idea of adopting a barn vernacular for the structure. - Highlighted that a barn-style design might allow for a taller structure without it becoming an issue, as the simplicity of such a design could compensate for the height and eliminate the need for dormers, leading to a simpler and potentially more fitting structure. - Suggested that removing the dormers and opting for a simpler second-floor design might better serve the property, as the current dormers seem to overly influence the design. - Approved of a more tenuous connection between the buildings, such as an open breezeway, considering it a palatable solution. - Appreciated the character and charm of the existing structures at the rear of the property, supporting their retention and incorporation into the overall design. Camp - Expressed that the garage design could be simplified, noting that the presence of dormers gives it a modern appearance that may not be in harmony with the historic context.

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Appreciated the effort to preserve and reincorporate the outer buildings, which are valued for their character. - Echoed the consensus on the value of retaining the small, character-rich outbuildings. Coombs - Expressed preference for a barn-like structure or a similar architectural style for the back of the property, emphasizing that it should not mimic the style of new modern buildings but rather adopt a more traditional or historically resonant design. Paul - Expressed conditional approval for the structure's current location, noting that the final stance might depend on how the design revisions are executed. - Acknowledged potential environmental constraints, pointing out that there are wetland issues at the back of the property which could affect placement. - Suggested that moving the structure further from the street might not meet any objections and could actually enhance the project. - Recommended making the recycled appendages (parts of the existing structure that are being reused) more prominent from the street side rather than positioning them towards the back near the wetlands, suggesting this could improve the aesthetic appeal from the public viewpoint. - Expressed conditional acceptance of the structure's current location, with the stipulation that design changes ensure it feels distinct and separate from the main house.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions, and that the application include elevations showing the existing house in relation to the proposed changes, to better understand how the new structures will relate to the current setup. (Made By: Coombs) (02:56:00)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
26. 90. Noah Liberty Prev Trust	90 N Liberty	Shed move	41/22	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to have the item tracked with the garage. (Made By: Paul) (02:57:20)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
27. FP 4 N Water	4 N Water	New dwelling	42.4.2/90	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

Alternates:	Oliver, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Clarified that although the application labels it as a new dwelling, it's more accurately described as an "infill" project meant to blend with existing historic structures, specifically the Obit Joy House from circa 1846. - Appreciated the inclusion of a detailed streetscape in the proposal, which provides a clear view of how the new structure will integrate with the historic context. - Acknowledged the thorough research and presentation of dimensions and relationships between existing and proposed structures, finding it very useful for understanding the project's impact on the historic site. - Expressed curiosity about the architectural styles involved, specifically mentioning the Gothic Revival or Carpenter Gothic and the Greek Revival and asked for clarification on how these styles are being interpreted or integrated into the infill project. MacEachern - Acknowledged the complexity of classifying architectural styles, especially when elements from different periods blend together, such as Victorian touches within Greek Revival. - Shared insights from extensive research, including examinations of historic photos from the NHA archives, noting that certain architectural features do not strictly conform to a single historical category. - Expressed reluctance to definitively label the new structure as belonging to a specific architectural style, such as Greek Revival, due to the presence of diverse elements like ornate railing details and unconventional roof pitches. - Outlined the design approach for the new building, emphasizing a desire to create a structure that is unobtrusive and simple rather than competing with the more distinctly styled neighboring properties. - Highlighted the goal to ensure that the building, while not overtly historic in appearance, harmonizes with the local context through appropriate massing, scale, and detailing.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed preference for the current approach over the previous application, appreciating specific aspects while noting areas for improvement. - Commented on the roof pitch, suggesting that it is quite steep (approximately a 12 pitch) and recommending it be made shallower to reduce the overall height of the building. - Questioned the appropriateness of the covered entrance, noting that similar structures were not observed on North Water Street, which could indicate that it is not characteristic of the area. - Pointed out the unusual placement of the door being centered, which deviates from the typical gable-forward buildings in the area that usually have doors offset to one side, thereby creating a symmetrical facade that is not common. - Addressed the vertical spacing between the front windows on the first and second floors, suggesting that lowering the ceiling height could reduce this gap and further decrease the building's overall height. - Discussed color choices, recommending against using white since the adjacent buildings are also white. Suggesting a different color such as gray or another tone could provide visual variety and enhance the streetscape. Steven Cohen, Abutters Representative - Acknowledged that while the space has historically been empty and is ready for development, the current proposal's scale and form are concerning. - Appreciated the architect's work but expressed reservations about the design being too modern and not fitting well with the historic context. - Criticized the building's height and roof pitch, suggesting that a lower pitch could reduce the overall height, making the structure less imposing. - Questioned the appropriateness of the covered entrance and the symmetry of the front facade, which is not typical for gable-forward buildings in the area.

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	• Pointed out the excessive shingle space between the first and second-floor windows, suggesting that reducing the ceiling height could address this issue. • Disapproved of the color choice, recommending a variation from the white used on adjacent buildings to better integrate with the streetscape. • Raised concerns about the building's proportion, noting that it appears lean and pointy, resembling a structure "jammed in" rather than thoughtfully integrated. • Suggested that the roof's design makes the building look disproportionate, advocating for a design where the upper story is contained within the roof to align with neighboring architectural styles. • Commented on the dormers, which are too large and numerous compared to those on neighboring buildings, suggesting they should be smaller and fewer to maintain proportionality. • Expressed a desire to see the building extended rather than heightened, to allow for a lower, more elongated form that complements the historic character of the area and preserves public views of significant historical structures. • Emphasized the importance of the new design being sympathetic to the historic visibility of neighboring properties, ensuring that it does not obstruct significant views from important public vantage points like the Wayley Museum.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp • Acknowledged the usefulness of the renderings for understanding the proposed building's context relative to neighboring structures. • Observed differences in architectural features compared to adjacent buildings, noting that the neighboring houses feature more siding and less fenestration, contributing to a simpler appearance. • Suggested modifications to reduce the building's complexity, such as removing a window or two or altering the shutters to make the design less busy and more in harmony with the simplicity of adjacent homes. • Expressed concern about the spacing between buildings, particularly on the left side where the new structure appears crammed. Recommended creating more visible space around the building to enhance its individuality. • Commented on specific architectural elements, such as the door on the first floor, which is perceived as resembling an elevator door. Suggested relocating this feature or converting it into a window to reduce its prominence. • Conveyed overall encouragement for the progress of the design, expressing optimism about the building's integration into the neighborhood and the potential for a successful project. Paul • Acknowledged the coherence of the building's stylistic narrative, noting that the inclusion of Gothic and Second Empire elements situates it appropriately within the architectural context of the neighborhood. • Expressed satisfaction with the stylistic direction, feeling that it aligns well with neighboring structures. • Reflected on the center entrance, which had been previously mentioned as a point of concern. The discussion suggested that it could warrant further consideration to ensure it fits harmoniously with the building's historical narrative. • Considered the scale of the building, noting that from certain perspectives, it might appear as a house that has been expanded over time, fitting the narrative of historical evolution typical in the area. • Commented on spatial relationships, highlighting the importance of the space between the new building and adjacent structures. Emphasized that while some areas may appear dark or cramped in the renderings, they might feel more separated in reality. • Discussed architectural details, such as the potential to simplify or adjust fenestration and the placement of certain doors to avoid confusion and enhance aesthetic coherence. • Conveyed a positive outlook, contrasting this proposal with previous ones that felt controversial. Expressed optimism about the project's potential as a beneficial addition to the community, appreciating its evolution towards a workable and appealing design.

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	• Echoed previous comments on the importance of color in the building's design, agreeing with Mickey's suggestion that incorporating color could enhance the streetscape. Patten • Expressed approval of the current design approach, noting it as a significant improvement. • Found the streetscape rendering extremely helpful for visualizing the building in context with its surroundings. • Suggested a modification to the roof pitch, recommending a shallower angle to better align with the architectural styles of adjacent buildings. • Questioned the suitability and placement of the covered entrance, proposing that moving it off-center or to one side might better integrate it with the overall design and surrounding structures. Coombs • Acknowledged the effort put into the design, appreciating the work done so far. • Expressed concern regarding the central placement of the door, noting that it seems to disrupt the fit with the surrounding architectural context. • Requested more detailed visuals, particularly a site plan that includes views of the back buildings to understand how the structure integrates from all angles, emphasizing that the building will be visible from both the front and back. • Noted that there appears to be a lot of activity in the design that isn't fully understood, urging for more detailed presentations of the sides and rear to provide a complete picture of the proposed changes. Pohl • Supported the idea of reducing the roof pitch, agreeing that this modification would improve the building's integration with its surroundings. • Considered the implications of adjusting the eave height, noting that while raising it might benefit the main structure, it could also impact the dormers on the sides, potentially affecting their appearance or function. • Discussed the architectural style, identifying the building as Greek Revival and commenting on the appropriateness of certain design elements. Specifically mentioned the incongruity of a hipped porch roof with the Greek Revival style, noting that such a feature is uncommon in the downtown area where the building is located. MacEachern • Explained the design exploration process, noting that various porch styles were considered, including a full "coast to coast" farmers porch and a hipped porch. However, these were found to be incongruent with the desired aesthetic. • Shared the rationale behind choosing a simpler design, emphasizing that a centered, simple entry portico was selected because it appeared unobtrusive and respectful to the area's historical context. • Discussed the intention to maintain a low profile, aiming to infill the space between historic buildings quietly and respectfully without overwhelming them. • Mentioned considering other architectural elements, such as an entablature inspired by another local historic property, to blend the new construction seamlessly into the existing streetscape while respecting the area's architectural heritage. Pohl • Pointed out a unique feature on the building that hadn't been previously discussed, focusing on the peculiar projection of a roof section on the north and east elevations. • Described the unusual roof element, noting that it juts out in an unexpected way, which contrasts with typical architectural norms where such an element might be recessed rather than extended outward. • Expressed concern that this protruding roof could result in an aesthetically awkward appearance, suggesting it might not integrate well with the overall architectural design. • Aligned with previous comments from other board members, indicating general agreement with their observations and suggestions, but highlighting this particular issue as a distinct concern worth addressing. Backus
--	---

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Introduced an alternative design concept for the facade based on historical examples, suggesting the exploration of a recessed entrance, which is characteristic of some Greek Revival buildings found in the town, particularly on Centre Street. - Noted that historically, such recessed entrances are often off-center, offering a potential design variation that might better align with the traditional architectural style and add visual interest. MacEachern - Commented on the aesthetic impact of the shallower roof pitch when juxtaposed with the Gothic Revival and neighboring Greek Revival structures, noting that it appeared somewhat squat and diminished in presence, especially next to the taller, more imposing Greek Revival next door. - Opened the possibility for architectural adjustments, mentioning that there is flexibility to modify the building's design to better harmonize with its surroundings and historical context.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Camp) (03:26:05)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
28. 8 New St LLC	8 New St	Replace front door/color change	55.4.1/35	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Building identified Circa 1840, described as a typical Nantucket three-bay structure. - Involves a like-kind replacement, replacing existing elements with new ones similar in design and materials. - Staff do not have the authority to approve like-kind replacements for fenestration (window and door arrangements) within the OHD without further review. - No concerns about the proposal itself, indicating general approval of the like-kind replacement as presented.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Camp) (03:28:06)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
29. Harold Brothers Realty	2/4 Highland Ave	Roof walk	30/289&187	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Reminded the Commission that this project has been reviewed extensively over the past year. - Expressed concerns about the appropriateness of a roof walk, noting it appeared too squat and was inappropriate for a gable-forward design.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Raised no objections to the roof walk, acknowledging its compatibility with the area and appropriate sizing. - Suggested spacing the skirt boards with black material behind them to enhance aesthetics.			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Expressed no opposition to the roof walk but noted that its narrow width makes it appear disproportionately small, resembling a "top hat." - Suggested widening the roof walk to better complement the long expanse of the ridge, mentioning that its current squat appearance could be improved. Oliver - Expressed a different viewpoint to Abby's, noting that widening the roof walk could result in disproportionately long "legs" (supports), which can be problematic on the sides of the structure. - Brought up a future concern regarding the house coming in for a color change, specifically mentioning plans for black windows and white trim, which might impact the visual cohesion with the roof walk. - Highlighted the potential impact of the color scheme on the building's appearance, especially when combined with the roof walk, noting that the contrast between black windows and black shutters against white trim could present a distinct look. Coombs - Explained her inability to consent under the previous arrangement due to concerns about the placement of a dormer and the roof walk, describing the combination as ugly and visually discordant. - Expressed a strong preference for removing the skirt from the roof walk if it must be included, suggesting that this might alleviate some of the spatial and aesthetic issues. - Stated a personal opinion that this particular roof walk is unsuitable for its location, regardless of the prevalence of roof walks in the area. - Outlined her conditions for acceptance: removing the skirt entirely and ensuring the roof walk is painted white to perhaps integrate more softly with the building's architecture. Pohl - Expressed approval for the current proposal, noting the appropriateness of the roof walk's size and width. - Suggested a different presentation method, mentioning that a 3D rendering by Matt would likely alter perceptions by highlighting the roof walk's lesser visual impact due to its setback from the front gable. - Indicated that the current view, being an elevation, might not accurately represent how the roof walk will appear, emphasizing that its actual impact will likely be diminished. Patten - Expressed a preference for the roof walk to be painted white rather than left natural to weather, suggesting removal of the skirt.
Motion:	Motion to approve the roof walk with no skirt. (Made By: Oliver) (03:39:32)
Vote:	Carried 3-1-1 // Coombs, Oliver, Patten (Aye) // Camp (Nay) // Pohl (Abstain)

I. OLD BUSINESS 02/13/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Robert Sarkisian 11-9409	8 N Mill	hardscape	55.4.4/78.2	KMLD
Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. NIR LLC 12-9661	Straight Wharf	Rebuild roof w dormer	42.2.4/1	Paul Beaulieu
Voting:	Pohl, Oliver, Camp, Paul, Patten			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
Recused:				
Representative:	Paul Beaulieu			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged the historical context of the 1960s structure built during the Beineke era for the revitalization of Straight Wharf. - Expressed a preference for the building to resemble another successful project by a different architect, noting that the unchanged pitch in that project was beneficial.			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Appreciated the internal considerations important for the Commission, such as elevating mechanical systems inside, while stressing that internal factors should not dictate exterior appearances as per the guidelines of Building With Nantucket In Mind. - Suggested a modification to the dormer design, recommending that it be lowered from the ridge by about six inches to better align with architectural standards and still accommodate necessary internal ventilation. - Emphasized the visibility and significance of the structure's location on the wharf, underscoring the importance of thoughtful alterations to such a prominent building.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed similar concerns about the dormer's proximity to the ridge, noting its three-pitch height and the three feet clearance above the Siemens panel box, suggesting potential adjustments to lower it. - Speculated on possible modifications that could include using lighter framing materials or other structural variances to decrease the dormer's height, emphasizing the significant pitch change from the existing structure. - Recommended a change in window style, advocating for vertically paneled, six-light windows over the current square-pane design to enhance the building's aesthetic.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Suggested that the drawing would appear more historically accurate by incorporating trim around the doors and windows as depicted in the existing structure. - Pointed out the lack of visible trim in the proposed design, particularly around the doors, which diminishes the historical feel. - Recommended window style changes, agreeing with Mickey's suggestion for six-light windows instead of the modern-looking four-light ones to enhance the building's historic appeal. - Commented on the heavy appearance of the built-up rake, suggesting a reduction in its size to better align with the building's architectural style and reduce its visual weight. Paul - Highlighted potential inconsistencies in the trim and detailing compared to the existing structure, suggesting that the shingles may be obscuring the door trim, which could be an error in the drawing. - Questioned the accuracy of the door designs, noting that the boards appear wider in the proposed elevation and emphasizing the need for them to match the existing batten doors exactly. - Pointed out a missing corner board on the proposed front elevation, stressing the importance of these details in maintaining the building's historical integrity. - Commented on the shingles above the doorways, suggesting that the proposed design should emulate the existing structure where there are no shingles above the doors. - Noted discrepancies in the gable and dormer overhangs, suggesting that the proposed overhangs may not accurately represent what will be built, potentially affecting the building's appearance. - Discussed the side elevation's rake boards, mentioning that the proposed two levels of trim contrast with the existing building's simpler trim, which could make the renovation appear less faithful to the original structure. - Expressed overall satisfaction with the building's design but stressed that addressing these trim and detail issues would make the changes more in line with the existing structure's character. Patten - Suggested adjusting the dormer placement to pull it slightly away from the edge, which would still accommodate the internal electrical panel requirements. - Expressed agreement with previously stated comments on the project. Oliver - Inquired about potential changes to the building's floor system, expressing curiosity if there would be any alterations in that area, noting a perceived increase in size. Beaulieu

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Clarified the intent to maintain the existing architectural features such as the floor, plate height, walls, and doors, noting that only the roof would be modified for necessary clearances. Acknowledged an error in the depiction of the trim on the plans, confirming the intent to replicate the existing trim accurately. Pohl - Questioned the necessity for increasing the thickness of the roof framing members on the shed dormer, highlighting discrepancies between the new and old sections provided in the plans. Beaulieu - Addressed concerns about potential snow accumulation due to the shallow roof pitch, explaining the choice to adhere to this pitch in order to meet current building codes and safety considerations. Pohl - Suggested decreasing the size of the framing members to accommodate a steeper roof pitch. - Highlighted the potential to simplify trim by flush framing around the dormer windows, thus reducing the visual bulk and aligning more closely with the original architectural details.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions, with an Exhibit A. (Made By: Camp) (03:59:00)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Oliver, Camp, Paul, Patten (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
13. Stobie	60 Hulbert	Windows	29/58	Brian Puches
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	Thornewill			
Representative:	Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that the property is a circa 1880 Shingle Style Cottage constructed by Edwin Rutherford Smith, a renowned local builder on Nantucket. - Appreciated the extensive window survey provided, highlighting it as an excellent example for all window replacement applications. - Expressed concerns regarding the various types of windows, particularly noting that some appear to be original while others, replaced with vinyl, are infill. - Raised apprehensions about the profiles of the 2-over-2 windows, emphasizing the importance of accurate jam dimensions from the manufacturer to ensure historical integrity.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Noted the significant alterations to the windows, suggesting that restoration could be feasible if the sashes are salvageable. - Questioned the current state from a distance, acknowledging the need for an on-site judgment call regarding the windows' condition. - Inquired about the plans for additional window treatments, such as wooden storm windows or screens, to enhance preservation and functionality. Thornewill - Discussed the replacement of windows on a similar historic house with blue shutters on Hulbert Avenue, where the exact Lapage windows were approved by the HDC about three years ago. - Clarified that wood screens were not used in that particular project, but at 9 Woodbury, wood storm panels were implemented on the front of the house. - Explained that using wood storm panels is optional, with alternatives like a simple half screen for the lower half of the window or a full wood storm available. Rowland			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Suggested that wooden storm windows can sometimes be so thick that they make the exterior surface flush with the window casing, creating an appearance of a fat and wide casing, which is disproportionate. - Advised against using wooden storm windows due to the potential for creating a disproportionate look on the historic building.
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Acknowledged that the concerns previously raised were due to the small sample with many divided lights, making it appear chunky, but the new proportions are more favorable. - Observed that the new sash design of 2 over 2 windows lessens the chunkiness concern. - Discussed potential adjustments for screen installation, suggesting that if the side casing size is reduced, it could allow for the addition of screens or panels without making the trim appear excessively wide. Pohl - Rejected the previous suggestion about reducing the side casing size for screen installation, noting that it would cause the casing to look excessively narrow when the panel is removed. - Recommended using a half screen that fits within the casing of the lower window section to avoid making the casing appear too wide, as a full screen isn't necessary because the top half of the window doesn't open. - Pointed out that since these are insulated glass windows, there's no need for storm windows, which addresses both aesthetic and functional concerns. Paul - Expressed approval for the use of LaPage windows in this location, indicating no concerns regarding their application. Oliver - Expressed agreement especially considering the color consistency. Coombs - Explained the process of using a screen that fits into the area of the lower sash, which can be easily removed when necessary, sharing a similar concept for practicality during seasonal changes.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with modifications to the window sash. (Made By: Camp) (04:14:51)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. Matthew Roberts 11-9561	21A Daffodil Ln	Rooftop Solar	68/749	Empower Energy
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Rick Steehler			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Appreciated the color change in the roof and noted the removal of the front panels as excellent improvements. - Requested more focused information for future submissions, specifically clearer pictures of the roof and solar panels' alignment. - Expressed concern over the solar panels still being oriented in two different directions, describing the effect as chaotic. - Advised aiming for consistency in panel alignment to ensure they blend more seamlessly into the background. Thornewill - Convinced that visibility of the solar panels will be minimal. - Acknowledged the black roof, suggesting it will help the panels blend in more effectively.			

HDC Minutes February 20, 2024; adopted May 14, 2024

	- Expressed confidence that the panels' directionality will not detract from the overall aesthetics, despite being random. Coombs - Observed the inconsistency in the direction of the solar panels, noting that the front part of the roof has panels uniformly aligned, while the bottom section displays a mix. - Suggested aligning all panels in the same direction to achieve a more orderly appearance. - Pointed out that despite the house's height, the lack of substantial vegetation means the roof and panels will likely be visible from some angles. - Recommended striving for uniformity in panel direction, as has been done in other applications, to enhance the roof's aesthetic coherence. Steehler - Explained the placement of the solar panels and the green lines indicating fire code requirements, which dictate safe pathways for firefighters during emergencies. - Justified the varied orientations of the panels as an effort to maximize energy output for the homeowner while adhering to safety regulations. - Assured that despite the varied directions, the panels are designed to be less noticeable against the black roof, thus minimizing visual impact. Pohl - Agreed with Carrie that the solar panels on the dormers at the front of the house will likely not be visible. - Observed that the panels placed behind are also unlikely to be seen due to the positioning of the dormers. - Concluded that despite generally preferring a uniform grid for solar panels, the unique placement in this instance should not pose visibility issues or detract from the aesthetic, thus supporting the submission as it stands.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Camp) (04:27:50)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornevill (Aye)

Additional items listed on the agenda that are not included in these minutes were not discussed and no action was taken.

OTHER BUSINESS

Next HDC Meeting- March 5th at 4pm ***HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:29 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=xGL-YGBT99E&t=3923s>