



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, March 5, 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

Chair Pohl called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Modifications/Revisions:	Chair Pohl announced the following modifications/revisions to the agenda: Movement of Old Business Items: Two items originally scheduled for March 5th have been moved to earlier in the meeting under Old Business of February 13th. Both items pertain to 12 Angola Street: - The first application involves a hardscape driveway. - This will be followed by two applications from Joe Topham for architectural works: one for a dwelling and another for a garage studio. Striking of Items: Under Old Business of March 5th, Items 9, 10, and 11 will be removed: - These items include applications for 18 to 26 Sparks Avenue, 126R Main Street, and 250 Madaket Road. - The first application under New Business for March 5th at 103 Washington Street. New Business 03/05/24: - Applications for 39 Monomoy Road (total of five) are unlikely to be heard during this session.
Motion:	Motion to approve modified agenda. (Made By: Coombs)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

SIGNS

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. NIR	4 Harbor Sq	Wall Sign	42.2.4/1	WAPD
2. NIR	4 Harbor Sq	Wall Sign	42.2.4/1	WAPD
3. NIR	4 Harbor Sq	Wall Sign	42.2.4/1	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Documentation:	Recommendation from Sign Advisory Council			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner Mentioned the Sign Advisory Council met and recommended Items 1,2,3,6, and 7 to be held.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to hold Items 1,2,3,6, and 7. (Made By: Camp)			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			
Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. Frances Macdonald	9 S Water St	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/131.1	Cara Marquis
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Documentation:	Recommendation from Sign Advisory Council			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated that the Sign Advisory Council approved with a white border and the size must be no larger than 4 square feet.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve per the Sign Advisory Committee recommendation. (Made By: Camp)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
5. NIR RETAIL LLC	44 Straight Wharf	Wall Sign	42.2.4/15	Sign Here
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Documentation:	Recommendation from Sign Advisory Council			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Stated the recommendation from the Sign Advisory Council was to approve.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Camp)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
6. VTT MANAGEMENT		Projecting Sign	42.3.1/1	Sign Here
7. VTT MANAGEMENT		Projecting Sign	42.3.1/1	Sign Here
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner Mentioned the Sign Advisory Council met and recommended Items 1,2,3,6, and 7 to be held.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to hold Items 1,2,3,6, and 7. (Made By: Camp)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

OLD BUSINESS 01/30/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Ospray LLC 12-9577	25 Willard St	Hardscape & fence	29/33	Edgewater Landscape
Voting:	Pohl, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative	Paul Cronin, Edgewater Landscape			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner • The main dwelling, named "Salt Air," dates back to circa 1881-1882, originally built by James Gibbs and moved from Herbert Avenue. The building and site have an approved historical determination. • Concerns were raised about the formality of the proposed Belgian apron, seen as too formal for the setting. Surroundings on Willard, which are less formal, are more appropriate for the Colonial Revival style.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- The rigid pavers were mentioned as overly formal and not suitable for the beachy feel appropriate for the Colonial Revival style. - Recommendations were made to ensure the outdoor kitchen area is not visible from the road, suggesting that the proposed vegetation should be sufficient to shield it. - There is a suggestion to reduce the formality of the design, consistent with feedback provided by the commission in December.
Public Comments:	Angus MacLeod, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Described as very formal for the area, the patio stones selected may not suit the natural setting. - Noted is a dense cluster of natural vegetation to the south of the smaller driveway that should remain undisturbed to provide additional buffer. - Raised were concerns about the visibility of the outdoor kitchen through the opening in the hedge, especially during the winter months, suggesting it should be moved to a more discreet location.
Commissioner Comments:	Coombs - Expressed were concerns about the necessity of the long pathway connecting two parking lots on Willard Street, questioning the need for two parking spaces and describing the pathway as overly formal and hidden behind trees. The necessity of this pathway between the two parking spaces is called into question. Thornewill - Noted was the rectilinear and highly paved nature of the plan, which contrasts with the natural surroundings and wetland area. - Mentioned were concerns about the visibility of steppingstones, questioning if they are laid in grass, gravel, or surrounded by stabilizing elements like herbs, which might help them blend into the landscape. - Expressed was a preference for the patios at the rear and a suggestion that the steppingstones might visually disappear if integrated well. - Suggested was repositioning the outdoor kitchen to back up to the patio with its back facing the street, potentially hiding it behind the smaller upper parking lot to enhance privacy and integration with the natural setting. - Recommended was placing the outdoor kitchen closer to the house, behind the stoop on the right side, utilizing the steps up to the stoop to obscure it from view and push it closer to the building. - Stated no concerns with the use of Belgium Block, as it was noted that the brick supports on the raised building are likely to be obscured by the surrounding vegetation, making the choice of material appropriate in this context. Pohl - Concurred with the opinion that once steppingstones are placed around the stone, they are unlikely to be visible, which supports their use. - Pointed out was the formal appearance of Belgian block compared to other materials like cobbles or brick. A preference was expressed for using either brick or cobbles, noting that there is precedent for all three materials on the street as evidenced by provided photographs.
Motion:	Motion to approve (through staff) the use of a cobble apron with the condition that the outdoor kitchen must not be visible at the time of inspection and remain so thereafter. (Made By: Thornewill) (00:24:51)
Vote:	Carried 3-0 // Pohl, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

2. Kathryn Cook 12-9637	85 Low Beach Rd	Glass Connector rev 10-7257	75/31.3	Rich Gammons
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, 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:	Thornewill - Stated that the large glass wall is not visible from down the road or from the front of the driveway. Coombs - Dissatisfaction was expressed about the structure being beyond what is typically expected near the water. It was suggested that it should not be there. Camp - Agreement was initially with Diane's concerns, but upon visiting the site and observing the structure's lack of visibility, acceptance was ultimately expressed. Welch read Commissioner Joe Paul's statement into the record. - After viewing 85 Low Beach both in the afternoon and again at night, it was observed that the concerning features in the elevations were not visible from any public way. Based on these observations, support was expressed for approving the application as submitted. Welch - No concern about the structure due to its lack of visibility.			
Motion:	Motion to approve. (Made By: Thornewill) (00:29:00)			
Vote:	Carried 3-1 // Welch, Camp, Thornewill (Aye) // Coombs (Nay)			

NEW BUSINESS 02/06/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. MacTaggart, Ian	1 Brook Farm Road	Cabana	41/222.8	MCA
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Max Duce, Mark Cutone Architecture +			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Concern was expressed about the potential visibility of the structure, specifically its top, when viewed directly from the road. Noting that the cabana is reported to be 23 feet high, which seemed excessive, there was a query about the possibility of reducing its height. Additionally, there was a question about whether it could be seen over the top of the right wing off the main mass of the house. Thornewill - Agreement was expressed regarding concerns about the height, noting that the structure appears as a tall tower with low wings, which may result in awkward proportions if it were visible over the top of the group. Information about the height of the right-hand wing from the front was requested for better context. - Mentioned were concerns about the proportions of the doors, windows, and lights, which were described as funky and potentially problematic, although it was acknowledged that these might not be visible from certain perspectives.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	Coombs • Visibility concerns were expressed, along with a dislike for the windows on the second floor of the cabana. It was suggested that there should only be two windows, and they should match the six-over-six style seen in all the windows of the main house. Duce • Confirmation was provided that the form on the right in the front of the building, which had its height questioned, stands at 18 feet. • Observations were made about the perspective from the road, noting that it would be difficult to see the cabana over the ridge line due to the presence of tall evergreens and the specific vantage points required. It was suggested that finding the exact spot where the cabana is visible from the road is quite rare. Welch • Expressed that the structure is atypical, and a cross-section was requested to assess its visibility. • Stated that if the structure is going to be visible, this information is crucial; however, if it is not visible, then there is less concern. Pohl • Concerns were raised about the building's lack of architectural congruence with the main house, noting discrepancies in roof pitch and window styles. The building was described as very vertical compared to the main house. • Pointed out was the fact that the building is currently obscured by Leyland Cypress trees located on the neighboring property, not the property under discussion. It was highlighted that the visibility of the building could significantly increase if these trees were removed. • Emphasized was the potential future visibility of the building, urging board members to consider this scenario when reviewing the application. • Expressed strong reservations, noting there was almost nothing in the proposal that they could approve of.
Motion:	Motion to hold the application for some major revisions and to provide a cross-section to better assess the building's design and integration with its surroundings. (Made By: Welch) (00:37:38)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. Ack N Back	33 Quidnet Rd	Pickleball	21/27.2	Ahern LLC

Held until there is a five-member board, at the representative's request.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3. 25 ACK LLC	25 Pleasant Street	New Dwelling	55.4.1/111	EMDA
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ethan McMorrow, Ethan McMorrow Designs, Inc. (EMDA)			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner • The main dwelling, known as the Carry House, is highlighted as an individually significant structure dating back to 1720. It features a lean-to, two and a half stories, four bays, and a central entry, making it one of the older and nationally significant buildings in Nantucket's history. • The smaller stature of the proposed secondary dwelling relative to the historic main dwelling is appreciated.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- Concerns were noted about the similarity in layout to the main house, which gives a "trailer type" vernacular impression, not typical additive massing. - Appreciation was expressed for the similar window vocabulary and some aspects of the additive massing, though it was suggested that these could be enhanced. - A specific concern is raised regarding the 16-light barn door on the north side, which, although facing inward, imparts a garage-like appearance, conflicting with the intended aesthetic of opening up to the yard.
Public Comments:	Angus MacLeod, Historic Structures Advisory Group - The scale and design of the structure were viewed positively. - It was noted that the current location of the structure is very close to the front of the main house, which negatively affects the historical setting. - A recommendation was made to rearrange the structure into an L-shape and tuck it into the southern corner to avoid encroaching on the space directly in front of the main house.
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - The design was described as very charming and appropriately sized, similar in length and width to the historic outbuilding at 36 Lily. - No specific concerns were raised about the proposed design, indicating overall approval. Thornewill - There was agreement with Stephen that the structure appears a bit long. - Positive remarks were made about the inclusion of a chimney, which enhances the perception of the building as an authentic, old structure that has been restored for continued use. - The stone foundation was noted for adding to the historical feel of the building, with its appearance resembling the stone retaining wall already present on the property, thereby creating a cohesive look. - Overall, the feedback was positive, expressing satisfaction with how the design integrates historical elements and matches existing features on the property. Camp - The design was described as extremely appropriate and well-suited to its context. - Concerned that the structure's length might compete with the historic building it is near. - Suggested to reduce its length by 10 feet to prevent it from overshadowing the older structure. - Proposed that the stonework on the foundation could be complemented with plantings to soften its appearance. Coombs - Agreed with the suggestion to shorten the structure slightly to enhance its integration with the surrounding historical setting. - Overall, the design is seen as satisfactory. - Concerned about the windows in the barn doors being overly busy. - Suggested to either reduce their number to 12 or narrow them to better match the shape and proportion of other windows in the structure. - The recommendation is to make the windows in the barn doors smaller, ensuring they harmonize more closely with the building's existing window design. Pohl - Agreed with previous comments about the size of the windows in the doors being potentially problematic.

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- Noted that the focus on the windows might not be as intense as expected due to their viewing angle, which is described as oblique and fleeting. - Concerned about how close the northern corner of the building is to the front of the existing house. McMorrow - Discussion centered around the site plan which includes vegetation and notable features like a patio, which serves as the outdoor living space. - The design intent behind the barn doors is to facilitate an open indoor-outdoor living space, tying the building directly to the adjacent outdoor area. - A hedgerow already present near the main house creates a natural division, leading up to where the new building's corner will be, forming a courtyard. Camp - The size of the doors is noted as excessively large, with a suggestion to make them smaller so they can fold back on themselves when opened, which would fit more seamlessly with the structure. - Recommended to reduce the size of the glass in the doors to make them less dominant. - Emphasis was placed on ensuring that modifications respect the historical context of the house rather than focusing solely on current usage preferences. - Suggested to reduce the length of the structure by eight feet, adjust the door design for better functionality and proportion, and reduce the glass area to better align with the historical aesthetics of the old building. Welch - While noting the concerns raised, it was pointed out that typically, constructions in such locations extend from property line to property line, filling the entire lot. - The design in question was described as probably the most sensitive and considerate seen in this type of location over the last six years.
Motion:	Motion to approve, per Exhibit A (through staff) subject to the condition that the width of the carriage doors be reduced by one foot overall, which equates to six inches per leaf of the door. (Made By: Welch) (00:51:25)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye) // Camp (Nay)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. 26 Fair LLC	26 Fair Street	Addition	42.3.2/171	EMDA
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ethan McMorrow, Ethan McMorrow Designs, Inc. (EMDA)			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The main dwelling, known as a circa 1868 Queen Anne, was designed by Charles H. Robinson, a notable architect on Nantucket. - Appreciation was expressed for the use of the newly updated Form B's, also known as HDC Surveys, funded by a federal grant. - The structure under discussion is an infill guest house built in 2004, designed to complement the historic structure on the lot. - No concerns were raised about adding a dormer; in fact, it was noted that the addition makes the structure more symmetrical and conforms well with Nantucket building regulations regarding setbacks. - The two over two 4-unit bi-fold door was deemed inappropriate for the style of the historic main dwelling.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- While understanding the intent to expand an existing door and remove another, the style of the new door was felt to not complement the original Queen Anne design by Robinson. - A suggestion was made to retain and possibly relocate the existing door while modifying the proposed new door to a double rather than a quad configuration to better fit the architectural style. - Appreciation was noted for the design detail of the bracket.
Public Comments:	Angus MacLeod, Historic Structures Advisory Group Stated no concerns.
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners stated no concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Welch) (00:55:42)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
5. 4 Brothers ACK LLC	30 Tashama Ln	Revisions porch	55/455	EMDA
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative	Ethan McMorro, Ethan McMorro Designs, Inc. (EMDA)			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - The current design, where the porch is flush with the massing of the building, was identified as problematic. - It was proposed that the porch be slightly disconnected from the main structure to create a visual break. Specifically, setting the porch back six inches or a foot from the corner board was recommended to enhance the architectural separation. Pohl - The idea of breaking the porch roof, which is currently a "broken back" design, was discussed. It was pointed out that such a roof laying on top of the main roof might not achieve the intended architectural effect. - It was noted that a "broken back" roof design works well only in its current form and not as an in-rebated porch, which could lead to structural and aesthetic issues. - Suggested to reconsider the continuity of the main ridge line down to where the eave meets, as seen on the left-hand side of the East Elevation.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Welch) (00:57:38)			
Vote:	Failed 2-3 // Pohl, Welch, (Aye) // Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Nay)			
Discussion:	Thornewill Suggested that the architect, Ethan, could refine it to make it appear more typical or aligned with expected standards.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Thornewill) (01:04:00)			
Vote:	Carried 3-2 // Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye) // Pohl, Welch (Nay)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
6. KAC Holdings LLC	156 Madaket Rd	Pickleball Driveway	39/41	Atlantic
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative	Lindsay Congelton, Atlantic Landscaping			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner • The lot is a double frontage lot with a dwelling built in 1985. • It is important to consider the visibility from Massasoit Road. • There is an appreciation for the proposal to infill vegetation to enhance privacy or aesthetics. • It was noted that dimensions of the driveway apron flanking the bike path should be shown and must comply with zoning bylaw 139-20.1. • Question was raised about the legality of changing the driveway access from Massasoit Bridge to Madaket Road, especially given the lot's location on a bend in Madaket Road and similar access restrictions on neighboring properties. • Clarification is sought on whether the property has the legal authority to make such a driveway change. • Although there were mentions of other public comments concerning pickleball courts on other properties, it was clarified that no specific comments had been received for this particular proposal at the time.
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Welch • Concerned about the historical character and setting of courts like tennis courts, which are typically found in commercial settings or near a dwelling at a residential home. • Stated that it seems inappropriate to have a pickleball court located anywhere other than within 20 feet of the main dwelling, similar to the placement of game courts like basketball courts. • Although currently holding this position, there was an openness expressed to possibly reevaluate this stance in the future. Coombs • Pointed out that the current proposed location of the pickleball court is too close to a neighbor's property, which could be considered inconsiderate. • Suggested to relocate the pickleball court to a more central area on the property, closer to the house. • Recommended that the court be turned to fit more harmoniously within the property layout, avoiding an orientation that runs parallel to the side property lines, which might be more disruptive to neighbors. Thornewill • Noted that due to the proximity of the court to a small road and the location of an old driveway, it would be challenging to effectively screen a fence (ranging from 8 to 10 feet high) from view. • Concerned about the difficulty of planting vegetation that could adequately make the pickleball court invisible from the road at the time of inspection. • There is a strong sentiment that placing a pickleball court closer to a neighbor's property than to the owner's main dwelling is inappropriate, emphasizing the need for thoughtful placement to respect neighborly relations and privacy. Camp • Concerned that a significant portion of the property, particularly the left side, is becoming overly dominated by hardscaping due to the planned driveway and additional structures. • The current siting of the pickleball court and related hardscaping is viewed as insensitive, particularly in how it impacts the aesthetic and functional use of the space.

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- Noted that the placement might lead to ongoing problems and may need to be addressed further in the future. Congelton - Suggested to rotate the pickleball court and shift it closer to the main house. This would utilize part of the area which is also proposed for a guest house. - Stated that he will discuss with the client the possibility of relocating the pickleball court to a more suitable location near the planned guest house or finding space to tuck it next to that structure.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Welch) (01:13:07)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

OLD BUSINESS 02/13/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
NIR LLC 12-9661	Straight Wharf	Rebuild roof w dormer	42.2.4/1	Paul Beaulieu

This item was not discussed, and no action taken due to only having two Commissioners present.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
40 Warren's Landing N T	40 Warren's Landing	Shed 04-8218	38/45	Normand
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ben Normand, Normand Residential			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The site previously hosted the circa 1935 Bright Lights Ramsdale cottage, which has been removed but preserved, earning appreciation for its conservation. - Acknowledgment was given for the recent shift from a Gambrel roof to a simpler Gable roof in the design, which is viewed as an improvement. - Suggestions were made to remove the pent roof and possibly reduce the number of panels in the sliding door to enhance the design. - It was noted positively that the light configuration on the new structures matches that of the main house, showing attention to detail and consistency across the property's architecture.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Welch) (01:19:16)			
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Robert Sarkisian 11-9409	8 N MILL	Hardscape	55.4.4/78.2	KMLD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Katy Mitchell, KM Landscaping Designs, Inc.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The site is noted as an infill within the Quaker neighborhood and the Old Historic District (OHD). - There is appreciation for the proposed changes, including the introduction of native plantings. - A request was made to see more details about the gates and materials being used, and possibly a cross-section, to better assess the design and compatibility with the neighborhood.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	• It was reiterated, based on previous discussions and confirmation with the zoning enforcement officer, that aprons are not required on dirt roads. However, some material to delineate the driveway from the road might still be beneficial. • It's unclear if there's a subdivision requirement from the Mueller property development that necessitates a specific type of driveway delineation. • The proposed driveway material, particularly the use of bluestone steppers, was considered a bit excessive and formal for the setting. A recommendation was made for a more organic, irregular, and less formal approach to the driveway materials. • Aside from the specific suggestions on the driveway materials, no other concerns were noted about the current proposals for the site.
Public Comments:	Angus Macleod, Historic Structures Advisory Group • Cobblestone is recommended as a less formal and more appropriate driveway material compared to the current plan. • There's a call for the plan to include existing topographical lines alongside proposed modifications to better assess the impact on the terrain. • A question was raised about the absence of a cross-section through the retaining wall, which was previously requested by Stephen to better understand the structural implications. • Concerned that the design includes an upper retaining wall over 5 feet tall and a lower one just under 4 feet, collectively creating the appearance of a 9-foot wall. • Suggestions were made to eliminate the upper wall by shifting the lower wall north and allowing the grade to slope naturally to its top, reducing the visual impact. • It was noted that the upper retaining wall would be clearly visible from Candle House Lane near the Landbank property, raising aesthetic concerns. • Strong feedback was provided that the upper retaining wall is not suitable for the area and should be completely eliminated to preserve the natural landscape and aesthetic integrity of the neighborhood. Ann Dewez • Expressed significant confusion about why the Hardscape plan is being reviewed in isolation, especially given a previous request to delay this review. • Stated that Joe had asked Katie to hold off on reviewing the Hardscape plan for this location and the adjacent property at 12 Angola until the structures at 12 Angola were reviewed. The rationale was that the Hardscape plans for both properties are interconnected. • A specific concern was raised about a "really objectionable" 9-foot retaining wall that extends for approximately 140 feet, which seems impractical to review without considering the adjacent property's landscape. • A request was made for clarification on how the two landscape plans will be reviewed together to ensure a holistic approach. This clarity is sought to understand the review process better and to facilitate more informed feedback from the group represented. • The major issue reiterated is the presence of a massive retaining wall, approximately 135 to 140 feet long and rising to 9 feet in height. This feature is considered highly inappropriate for the neighborhood's character. • The wall is expected to be visible from multiple nearby public areas, including the pony field, Garden of the Sea, and Landbank lands on West Mill Street, adding to its unsuitability.

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	• The neighborhood is described as a rural Quaker area historically known for its hill with windmills, which should be preserved according to community values and historical integrity. • There's uncertainty whether the plans reflect necessary grade lowering by the neighboring property, which could affect the overall landscape and retaining strategies. • Concerns were raised about the choice of deciduous trees for screening, as they lose leaves seasonally and would not provide year-round concealment of the retaining wall or buildings. • Pea stone is suggested as a more appropriate driveway material for the neighborhood, aligning with its rural character. • Discrepancies in the plans concerning garage locations and landscaping elements like privet hedges were noted, with privet deemed discordant for the area. • A warning was issued against deferring landscape plans until after building construction, as it might limit options for meaningful landscape changes and effective screening later. • A request was made for explicit depictions of the landscaping positioning and appearance, which have not been provided as previously requested. • Reference was made to another property across the street with a sloped wall and treed backdrop as a more sensitive and achievable example of how to handle elevation changes in the area.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp • The presence of a privet hedge at this location is questioned due to the naturalistic landscape of the area, suggesting it might not be the most appropriate choice. • The naturalistic setting prompts suggestions for alternatives like split rail fences and natural grasses, which would better complement the surroundings, especially near the Pony Field. • The use of bluestone pavers extending from the front stoop and around the property is seen as excessive. A preference is expressed for reducing the amount of hard surfaces to maintain the area's rural character. • The two continuous retaining walls extending into the neighbor's yard are criticized for their impact and the overly engineered appearance they impart to the landscape. Coombs • Recalls previous meetings where it was discussed eliminating or reducing the combination of a five-foot wall on top of a four-foot wall, yet notes that little to no change appears to have been made. • There is frustration over the absence of a cross-section, which was requested to better understand how the wall integrates with the landscape and impacts surrounding properties, particularly those on Angola. • Emphasis is placed on the need to see revised plans that accurately reflect the committee's past feedback, specifically regarding the wall's design and impact. • The speaker urges that substantial revisions be made to the plans, expressing dissatisfaction with the repeated submission of unchanged or minimally changed drawings. Thornewill • The integration of the garage foundation or wall as part of the retaining system is acknowledged. • There is concern about the absence of specific measurements regarding the height of the garage wall that serves as part of the retainage.

- Expressed a concern based on the understanding that any retaining wall four feet or taller is classified as a structure. Therefore, positioning such a structure right on the property line would typically be non-compliant with required setback regulations.
- The primary concern revolves around the two retaining walls proposed.
- Suggested to eliminate the upper wall, especially since it exceeds four feet in height and falls within the five-foot setback area, potentially violating structural regulations. By removing the upper wall and modifying the lower one to extend naturally into the neighboring property as a foundation for a back wing, a more seamless and natural landscape could be maintained.
- Suggested that a single retaining wall would allow the hill to slope naturally down to the wall, facilitating planting that would be visible from the garden, adding to the aesthetics and blending with the existing rolling landscape.
- If stone is used for the retaining wall, an organic shape is preferred over hard lines to complement the rural, rolling landscape.
- Questioned the appropriateness of a 5 and 1 fence between properties, suggesting instead that a picket fence, which aligns with other fencing on the property, would be more suitable.
- There is a desire to ensure that the garden and yard areas remain visible and accessible, enhancing the beauty of the property rather than being obscured by privet or other dense plantings.

Joe Topham

- Proposed to hold off on constructing the second tier of the retaining wall until the initial construction phases are complete. This approach is suggested to assess the visibility and impact of the wall after the area is more defined.
- The idea is to revisit the second-tier wall using plywood boxes or shells to simulate the actual construction, allowing for a visual assessment of whether the wall will be visible or obstructive.
- The use of a brick driveway is explained as a safety measure to facilitate easier access for an elderly relative with mobility challenges. This design consideration is crucial for ensuring safe movement from a sloped parking spot to the house.
- It was suggested to also hold off on installing the privet hedges, aligning with the overall cautious approach to the landscape development.
- Clarification was provided that the first tier of the retaining wall, closest to the lot line, meets code requirements and is not in the setback area. However, there is still a decision to delay this part of the project for further review after the initial constructions.
- It is acknowledged that previous concerns about visibility in prior applications necessitate a careful, step-by-step review. The commitment to return with plywood shells or frames aims to ensure that the wall's impact can be thoroughly evaluated in context.

Pohl

- Confirmation was given that the first-tier wall, which is part of the garage structure, will tie into another wall, allowing the property to slope down from the property line to a lower wall situated further into the property.
- The current design features two parallel walls of uniform height, which are seen as overly formal, strict, and potentially intrusive to the landscape. This has raised concerns about the architectural impact and the potential invasiveness of such a structured approach.
- Suggested that there be a reconsideration of the location of the lower wall to allow more space for a natural slope. This would reduce the rigidity of the

current wall configuration and better integrate the walls into the natural topography of the area.

- Noted the absence of cross-sectional diagrams that would provide a north-to-south perspective through the walls at various points, which are critical for assessing the actual slope and the spatial relationship between the walls.
- While acknowledging the desire for a sizable lawn area for personal use, it's suggested that there might need to be a compromise regarding the placement of the lower wall to achieve a more gradual and less obtrusive slope.

Mitchell

- Explained that the second-tier wall is necessary to maintain a 3:1 slope, which is crucial for stability and safety.
- Although the current design presents the wall in a very structured manner, there's an acknowledgment that it could be redesigned to appear more organic. This change aims to integrate the wall more naturally into the surrounding landscape.

Pohl

- Mentioned that theoretically, it's possible to eliminate all retaining walls by simply sloping the property down. However, this approach would mean not having a flat yard and would require building structures directly into the slope.
- The discussion highlighted the ongoing challenge of balancing the desire to maximize usable yard space with the need to manage the slope of the land naturally. This balance impacts how much of the land is flat (useful for yard space) versus how much is sloped (to reduce the need for retaining walls).
- There's a recognition that pushing to maximize yard space typically means more extensive use of retaining walls, which can have significant visual impacts and potentially disrupt the natural aesthetics of the area.

Welch

- Noted that there needs to be flexibility in the design of the retaining walls, particularly in achieving a more organic layout that doesn't strictly adhere to parallel lines. The incorporation of curvatures and varied alignments can create smaller, intimate spaces and reduce the visual impact of the walls.
- The importance of visualizing the walls in both plan and three-dimensional views was emphasized to better understand their spatial and visual impacts. This approach will help in assessing how the walls integrate with the natural contours of the landscape.
- Concerns were raised about the consistent height of the wall across different sections of the property, particularly how visible these walls might be from various vantage points like Angola or North Mill.
- Different strategies for implementing the retaining solutions were mentioned, such as varying the levelness and following the land's natural contours, which would add character and sensitivity to the environmental context.
- There was a call for detailed cross-sections to be provided, which are crucial for understanding the exact specifications and impacts of the retaining walls. These details are expected in future revisions of the plans, providing a clearer picture of the proposed changes.
- The retaining wall's design as a continuum and its relationship with adjacent properties were highlighted as critical factors. Understanding how these elements interact is essential for a cohesive and visually appropriate design.
- The appearance and impact of privet in a landscape depend significantly on how it is maintained. As an individual specimen, privet can be shaped to enhance its beauty without necessarily adhering to rigid, rectilinear forms.

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- Expressed concern about the broad expanse of brick used in the design, describing it as overly wide and potentially overwhelming in the landscape. - Suggested that alternative materials and design strategies could be employed to reduce the visual impact of the large brick areas. One idea is to use separator plant materials or other landscaping elements that could break up the expanse of brick, making it less dominant and more integrated into the surrounding landscape. Camp - Stated a concern regarding privacy for window wells, particularly along Angola. It's suggested that if privet hedges are not used, alternative solutions should be found to ensure these features are not visible from the street. - There is a strong recommendation against designing a single retaining wall that connects two sites. The preference is for each site to have individually designed retaining structures, which would avoid the problems associated with a large, continuous wall. - Emphasizing the need for tailored landscape design, advocated for each property to have a unique approach to its retaining walls, rather than implementing a one-size-fits-all solution. - A more naturalistic treatment of the hillside is favored, suggesting that such an approach would likely provide a net benefit in terms of aesthetics and integration with the natural environment. Backus - Noted that within the Old Historic District (OHD), the installation of split rail fencing requires approval from the Historic District Commission (HDC). - Outside the boundaries of the OHD, split rail fencing does not require HDC approval.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Coombs) (01:58:05)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
George Metri 09-8496	12 Angola St	Hardscape driveway	54.4.4/48	KMLD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Katy Mitchell, KM Landscaping Designs, Inc.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - While not required by regulation, there's a preference for including some type of apron to prevent driveway materials from dispersing onto the road, which would be beneficial for maintenance and appreciated by the Department of Public Works (DPW). - For the apron, materials such as cobblestone, brick, or possibly Keystone are suggested to minimize extensive hardscaping while still achieving functional and aesthetic goals. - Changes made in response to previous feedback are appreciated, signaling progress in the design approach. - Requested to see photos of the proposed materials to better assess their suitability and integration with the neighborhood's historic character. - There continues to be a desire to mitigate the impact of any proposed retaining structures as much as possible. Appreciation was expressed for the removal of one section of the retaining setup, suggesting sensitivity to the community's concerns.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

Public Comments:	Angus Macleod, Historic Structures Advisory Group • Suggested that the upper two sections of the proposed retaining walls might be unnecessary. By slightly steeping the existing slope and retaining only the lower section, a comparable amount of usable yard area could be achieved without the complexity of a three-tier system. • The current design includes flat stone caps on the walls, which are seen as drawing undue attention. The recommendation is to remove these caps and lower the walls slightly, allowing the natural grade to slope gently onto the back of the walls, making them more discreet. • A question was raised about the purpose and appropriateness of a feature referred to as a "trash closet," indicating a need for clarity on its use and suitability within the landscape design. • Proposed that the lower retaining wall be shifted northward by several feet. Additionally, integrating part of the back of the house into the retaining system could potentially eliminate the need for the upper wall. Ann Dewez • Stated she represents 19 families in the neighborhood who have collectively signed a letter reiterating their appreciation for the diligent representation concerning the ongoing project. • There is strong opposition to the proposed retaining walls, described as "non-starters." The community insists on a maximum height similar to an existing wall at 3 North Mill Street, which is three to three and a half feet tall with a gentle slope behind it. The retaining walls currently proposed are deemed unacceptable due to their height and visual impact. • Concerned about the extensive earthwork intended to modify the natural slope of the lots, which were known to the buyers at the time of purchase. The speaker emphasizes that the natural hill should not be obliterated for the sake of flattening the land for development. • Noted that despite being situated below street level, the walls would still be visible from various open spaces cherished by the community, contributing negatively to the landscape. • A plea is made for the owners and their representatives to respect the natural beauty and community values of the area, which boasts some of the most attractive lots in Nantucket. • There is a reminder about a required grading change for a neighboring property, which has not yet been implemented. The community urges the commissioners to ensure this grading adjustment is completed as it significantly affects the overall landscape design and slope management of the adjacent lots. • The ongoing frustration with the minimal changes made to the retaining wall plans is voiced, with repeated meetings yielding little substantial alteration to the project's more contentious elements. • The community remains adamant that the retaining walls as proposed are entirely inappropriate, calling for their complete removal rather than minor adjustments.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp • Suggested that the top retaining wall be replaced with a berm that blends naturally with the existing hill, promoting a more organic integration with the landscape. • While the presence of the lower retaining wall is not opposed, its current rigid design is criticized. A preference is expressed for a more curvaceous form that complements the natural contours of the hill, enhancing the overall aesthetic and reducing the appearance of forceful alteration.

Thornewill

- Understood why straight walls are considered given the natural slope of the hill, there's a strong suggestion to make the retaining wall undulating and more aesthetically pleasing. This could involve losing about five feet of yard to allow the wall to naturally curve, mirroring the end of the house and garage.
- The idea is proposed to consolidate into one retaining wall combined with a slightly steeper hill, which is believed to enhance the beauty of the landscape significantly.
- An undulating single wall is thought to not only look better but also blend more naturally with the existing steep terrain, potentially creating a visually striking landscape feature.
- Five-and-one fences are deemed inappropriate for this setting. Instead, a pea stone driveway is recommended over brick to reduce formality and better suit the character of Angola Street.
- The use of privet hedges, discussed for the neighboring property, is also mentioned in a negative light for this project, suggesting a preference against its use.

Coombs

- Agreed with previous suggestions by Carrie and Abby, emphasizing the desire to eliminate the fences proposed in the plans.
- There's a worry that any temporary structures or solutions might become permanent fixtures if allowed to be installed, especially if they are argued to be necessary due to investments made, regardless of their initial acceptance or suitability.
- Stated a strong preference for the landscape to follow the natural contour of the hill without rigid or formal interventions like fences, which are seen as inappropriate for the site's natural and historical context.
- Suggested that the landscape design take a more organic approach, respecting the natural fall of the hill. This includes possibly taking a side cutting of the terrain to better understand and work with its natural features rather than forcing unnatural lines or structures.
- There is a call to consider the historical use and natural formation of the hill, aiming to restore or continue its natural state rather than altering it drastically.
- Expressed frustration with the ongoing issues regarding the hill's treatment and urges a reevaluation of the approach, indicating that what was previously done (presumably a more naturalistic approach) was successful and should be considered again.

Welch

- Suggested to modify the intermediate tier of the yard by raising it a couple of steps (instead of a minor 6-inch lift) to effectively utilize the available space and reduce the slope's steepness.
- The overall approach to retaining walls is noted as too formal. There's an acknowledgment that the design's formality and configuration need further refinement, but specifics will be worked out through ongoing discussions.
- A particular concern is raised about the wall height consistency along the left side of the secondary dwelling. The feedback points out that as the grade decreases, the top of the retaining wall should appropriately adjust to follow the contour of the land, avoiding a uniformly high wall where the land slopes down.
- A suggestion is made for the driveway design to be less formal, which could better complement the overall less formal approach recommended for the landscape.

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- It's emphasized that while many details will "come out in the wash" (be resolved in the process), the key focus remains on ensuring that the retaining walls, if retained, should follow the natural land contour and integrate smoothly into the site's topography. - The current system is critiqued for not effectively encouraging property owners to make necessary changes to hardscaping because these elements are segregated from the certificate of occupancy (CO) process. The lack of direct consequences tied to the CO may limit the urgency or willingness of owners to comply with desired hardscape modifications. - A suggestion is made to consider integrating hardscape approvals with the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. This change would mean that failing to meet hardscape requirements could directly affect the ability to occupy a building legally, thus providing a significant incentive (a stick rather than a carrot) for compliance.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Welch) (02:31:34)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Metri, George	12 Angola St	New Dwelling MH	55.4.1/78	Topham
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Joe Topham, Topham Design, LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Positive feedback was given for the removal of the shed dormer and adjustments to the shingle spacing between the first and second floor windows. - The simplification of the door surround with a mantle shelf and transom was highlighted as a beneficial change. - The choice of a wooden stoop was commended for its appropriateness in the Quaker neighborhood setting. - Repeated concerns were noted about the size of the "long L" on the west side of the building, with suggestions for its reduction to better fit the neighborhood scale. - Uncertainty was expressed about how the rear shed roof on the south side integrates with the "L" seen on the west, particularly after the ridge was raised, indicating a possible disconnect or misunderstanding in the plans. - The five-bay design was recognized as fitting for the Quaker neighborhood, aligning with historical styles and the guidelines outlined in "Building with Nantucket In Mind." - There is a continued recommendation to reduce the additive masses of the building as much as possible to ensure it does not overwhelm its historic context.			
Public Comments:	Angus Macleod, Historic Structures Advisory Group - The building still appears too tall and oversized relative to the surrounding neighborhood. - A practical suggestion to address the scale issue is to reduce the ceiling height of the first floor. This would effectively lower the overall height of the building, making it less imposing. - Additionally, adjusting the break in the roofline of the rear wing to the north of an adjacent window is recommended.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	Anne Dewez • Appreciation is expressed for the significant improvements made to the design of the structures, noting that they are now much more in keeping with the neighborhood's character compared to the initial proposals. • There is a respect shown for the insights and suggestions provided by Angus, Holly, and the Commissioners, acknowledging their expertise in guiding the design changes. • Attention is drawn to a specific change on the west elevation, where the roofline has been altered and the number of windows adjusted—from one to three. This alteration is perceived positively, enhancing the building's aesthetics. • A comment was made about the south roof appearing shorter, which contributes to a better proportional balance of the structure. This observation suggests that the design changes have not only been a visual improvement but also possibly involve functional architectural adjustments. • The removal of a third window from the L on the west elevation is also noted as improving the facade's appearance, making it more palatable and harmonious with its surroundings. • Gratitude is extended to the Commissioners, and everyone involved for their meticulous attention to detail, which has significantly enhanced the project's outcome.
Commissioner Comments:	Welch • Stated no concerns. Coombs • The addition of two windows on the first floor of the west elevation is highly appreciated. • The south elevation has been described as much improved due to its simpler and less cluttered appearance. Camp • The removal of a window in the additive mass on the right side of the building was noted as problematic, potentially creating a visually unbalanced area. The suggestion to replace it with a 12-over-12 window to match others and address the perceived blankness was raised. • The front door is considered to have appropriate dimensions, but its appearance is described as too vertical. It was suggested that making the trim pieces around the door wider could help balance its verticality and enhance its aesthetic integration with the building's facade. • Reintroducing or altering the window in the additive mass to a 12-over-12 style could potentially improve the visual harmony of that elevation. • Adjusting the trim around the front door to make it appear less vertically stretched and more proportionally pleasing was recommended. Thornewill • Expressed appreciation for the overall changes made to the architecture. • Attention is drawn specifically to the back wing of the building, with concerns that it may function as or relate to part of the retaining wall structure. Pohl • Acknowledged the changes made to the design and mentions that while additional modifications suggested by Abby could be made, they do not consider these changes necessary for their approval. • Carrie's suggestion to use the back of the building as part of the retainage system is recognized as a good point. However, it is noted that if Joe chooses

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	not to adopt this approach, he will need to find another acceptable solution for handling the retainage.
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Welch) (02:42:53)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Metri, George	12 Angola St	Garage/Studio	55.4.1/78	Topham
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Joe Topham, Topham Design, LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Positive acknowledgment is given for lowering the ridge, changing the doors to a more appropriate style, and moving the structure back three feet from the facade of the main dwelling, which enhances the overall aesthetics and compliance with the neighborhood's historical context. - It is recommended that the design could be further simplified to reflect a more utilitarian appearance, aligning with the functional nature of the structure as a garage and studio. - Feedback includes a suggestion to push the shed dormer further off the gable edge and adjust the positioning of the windows within the dormer. The current window arrangement is noted as atypical, with a suggestion to possibly add a third window or otherwise modify the layout to reduce its peculiarity. - While recognizing the dual function of the building, there's a call for the accessory structure to adopt a more utilitarian appearance, fitting the Quaker neighborhood's historical and aesthetic standards. - The changes made from the original plans are greatly appreciated, particularly noting the improvement from an attached to a completely detached structure, which signifies substantial progress in the project's development.			
Public Comments:	Angus Macleod, Historic Structures Advisory Group - It is suggested that the building should be positioned further towards the rear, as indicated in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." This adjustment would allow parking cars front to back rather than side by side, which is more typical within the Old Historic District (OHD) and is seen as a better use of space. - For the new plank doors, it is recommended to use iron strap hinges and a center latch. These details would enhance the historical authenticity and aesthetic appeal of the doors. - Feedback includes a specific critique of the shed dormer design, noting that, according to "Building with Nantucket in Mind" on page 72, the face of a shed dormer should predominantly feature windows.			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Positive recognition was given for the improvements made to the design. - The suggestion to add a third window to the dormer is supported, indicating that this change would enhance the overall appearance and balance of the structure. - There is a strong recommendation to push the dormer further back on the roof, and even further into the retaining wall. Welch - The idea of sliding the structure back a few feet is supported, with the belief that this adjustment would not negatively impact the overall design or			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	function. This change could provide additional space at the rear of the property. • It is suggested that some of the space gained by moving the building could be effectively utilized by incorporating part of the dwelling wall into the design, potentially integrating or disguising some of the building elements more seamlessly with the landscape. • There's an openness to reconfiguring the parking from side-by-side (tandem) to stacked if it enhances the use of space. • If the driveway remains double-wide, there is a strong preference for using less formal materials to better suit the neighborhood's character and aesthetic standards. Coombs • Recommended that the garage be moved further back. This adjustment aims to clear a window that is currently partially obstructed by the garage on the east elevation. Moving the garage back would ensure better visibility and access, enhancing both the functionality and aesthetic of that side of the building. • There is concern that adding three windows to the second-floor shed dormer might make it appear too "heavy" or overly dominant, which could disrupt the balance and proportion of the garage's design. It is suggested to reconsider the number of windows to maintain a lighter appearance. • By moving the garage back, there is potential to better utilize the space for fencing or retaining walls, which could integrate more effectively into the overall landscape design. • The design of the west elevation is viewed positively, indicating that no major changes are needed on that side, provided the garage is repositioned as suggested. Camp • Suggested that the shed dormer be moved towards the back of the property, away from the front, to avoid conflicting with the existing architectural lines. • Recommended to reduce the number of windows in the dormer from whatever the current number is to just two. • There are concerns about the roof of the secondary mass to the right of the main structure. The suggestion is to either reduce the pitch of this roof so it doesn't align exactly with the main garage roof or to modify it into a "brokeback" style, where it seamlessly connects with a lower angle, enhancing the architectural harmony. • The current relationship between the secondary mass and the main roof is perceived as odd. Adjusting the height or the style to differentiate it more clearly or integrate it better is advised. This might involve lowering the roofline a couple of feet or redesigning its connection to the main structure. Pohl • Suggested to add a third window to the dormer, which could be a faux window if necessary.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, to relocate 3 feet further back, add a third window to the Dormer, adjust the height of the wart according to shift in the grade and work out some type of strap hinge detail with the overhead door. (Made By: Welch) (02:57:19)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Eleven Lincoln Trust 11-9526	32 Jefferson Ave	Rev 10-9274 MH	31/32	Botticelli Pohl
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ray Pohl, Botticelli & Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Positive acknowledgment is given for aligning the second-floor dormer with architectural guidelines by pulling it three feet off the gable edge, which aligns with the principles laid out in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - The revised color scheme for the trim, sash, and doors is appreciated. However, there is a specific suggestion to avoid black and instead opt for "Nantucket gray."			
Public Comments:	Angus Macleod, Historic Structures Advisory Group Concurred with Holly's comments.			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners stated no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Coombs) (03:02:53)			
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Smiley 17 N Water LLC	17 N Water St	roof walk 01-9732	42.4.2/49	Emeritus
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew, MacEachern, Emeritus, Ltd.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Explained that this is the historic Easton house, a circa 1812 building. - Expressed concerns that the building's length appears slightly too long. It was noted that photo documentation suggests three bays, whereas the proposal indicates four bays, raising questions about the accuracy and appropriateness of the proposed length. - Appreciated the effort to reduce the building's width by two feet but suggested that further reduction might be necessary to better align with the building's historical proportions and scale. - Acknowledged no concerns regarding the restoration of the roof walk, as historical evidence supports that this feature was originally part of the building.			
Public Comments:	Angus Macleod, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Echoed Holly's comments regarding the dimensions of the building, particularly focusing on the need for adjustments to both the width and the length. - Specified that it is unusual for roof walks to exceed one bay in width, which typically means a maximum of eight feet. - Agreed that the building should be further narrowed ("skinny up") and that the length should also be reduced to better align with historical proportions and aesthetics.			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Agreed with the sentiments expressed by previous comments, adding further emphasis to the concerns regarding the building's current dimensions. - Commented that the building appears somewhat commercial due to its size, suggesting that reducing its dimensions could help restore a more historically appropriate and less commercial appearance.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- Suggested that the building's length specifically needs to be reduced ("shaved a little"), possibly by repositioning or adjusting the dormers to achieve a more compact and historically congruent structure. Thornewill - Identified that the current design appears disproportionate because the legs (supports) of the structure are notably longer than those seen in historical photos. In the photos, the legs are shorter, which is attributed to the structure being narrower on the gable end. - Suggested that the building should be adjusted to have three bays, like the historical example, rather than the current configuration. This adjustment would involve making each bay a little longer but narrowing the overall width of the structure. Coombs - Anticipated that reducing the length of the roof walk and adjusting the leg height will enhance the building's overall appearance. Welch - Highlighted a concern that the roof walk is too long according to the images provided, suggesting that it should terminate closer to the gables of the shed dormer rather than extending past them. Pohl - Observed that the apparent longer appearance of the roof walk legs is due to its deeper positioning on the roof. This depth causes the legs to extend further down, which impacts their perceived length. - Highlighted a significant design issue where adjusting the roof walk without altering its depth might result in the legs resting on top of the dormer roofs, which is structurally inappropriate. - Suggested making the roof walk less deep over the ridge, which would effectively shorten the legs and allow for narrowing the structure without causing the legs to impinge on the dormer roofs. - Advocated for reducing the width of the roof walk so that the supporting legs either fall into the valley between roof sections or rest on the main roof, but specifically avoiding placement on the dormer roofs. - Agreed with Carrie's point about the benefits of having three wider bays within a narrower overall structure, suggesting that this configuration will make the roof walk appear more proportional. Welch - Noted that the positioning of the posts relative to the dormers appears inconsistent, with one post being closer to the rightmost dormer than to the leftmost dormer, based on a two-dimensional drawing. - Suggested realigning the posts to create symmetry and proposed reducing the depth of the roof walk by about a foot and a half to avoid conflicts with the gable roof of the dormers. - Outlined that reducing the width and adjusting the depth from the street would allow the posts to be raised without interfering with the dormer roofs. Specifically mentioned a two-foot decrease in width might be necessary. - Discussed the possibility of the roof walk being deeper on the back than on the front, provided that the overall dimensions are adjusted accordingly. - Emphasized that to implement these changes effectively, shifting the entire structure back is necessary.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made By: Camp) (03:16:55)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner

Street Address

Scope of Work

Map/Parcel Agent

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

N Liberty St LLC 12-9701		13 N Liberty St	Window door rev	42/3.4/3	SMRD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Steve Roethke, S.M. Roethke Design				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted a personal connection to the house, mentioning that it was owned by relatives and that her great-grandfather worked on the 1930s colonial revival Gambrell. - Appreciated the proposed revisions and particularly noted the planned relocation of the 1930s garage, emphasizing that this change would require its own Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). - Commended the efforts to retain the circa 1930s wood windows on the facade during the renovation and addition processes. Also emphasized the importance of preserving or using true divided light windows on the sides of the house to maintain its historical integrity. - Requested that window surveys be conducted for any changes to the windows to ensure compliance with historical preservation standards. - Suggested that the site plan should clearly identify and indicate the existing square footage of the dwelling versus the proposed addition, as it was challenging to discern the overall scale and scope of the changes from the current documentation. - Asked for a comparison of the existing as-built conditions of the 1930s Gambrell to what will be approved, ensuring that all changes are documented and clear for historical records and review purposes.				
Public Comments:	Angus Macleod, Historic Structures Advisory Group Stated he had no additional comments.				
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Expressed appreciation for the renovation work on the house, complimenting the overall appearance and the improvements made. - Voiced concern about the "F" windows on the west elevation, noting that they detract from the overall improvements. - Suggested replacing the "F" windows with "C" windows, which are described as six-over-one windows that resemble a more appropriate style, perhaps akin to bathroom windows, for that particular area of the house. Thornewill - Agreed with Abby regarding the concerns about the window designs previously mentioned, reinforcing the shared viewpoint on the need for changes. - Highlighted that the four-light windows on the rear elevation appear too busy, suggesting that their design might detract from the overall simplicity and could potentially be visible from Lily Pond, affecting the external view. - Suggested eliminating the busy four-light windows altogether to streamline the appearance and reduce visual clutter on that elevation. Welch - Agreed with the consensus about the modifications, particularly praising the changes made to the front elevation as appropriate and tasteful. - Offered a slightly different perspective regarding the west elevation windows, suggesting that six-light windows might be preferable over the four-light configuration previously discussed.				

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- Commented on the specific details of the window jam and support, noting them as somewhat odd in detail, particularly when viewed in plan due to the built-up mullion. - Expressed openness to the windows being slightly wider and configured as six-light, regardless of whether they are fixed or operable. This flexibility extends to the window type, being fine with either style but showing a preference for a six-light design. Coombs - Identified that the current two-over-twos or four-light windows should be replaced with six-over-one windows. - Concurred with the overall positive feedback from others about the renovation, affirming that the project is generally well-conceived and executed, with the exception of the specific window style. Pohl - Acknowledged the choice to have a high windowsill, recognizing it as architecturally correct and appreciating the intention behind the design. - Suggested considering an alternative approach based on board comments: recommended transforming the existing C windows into a triple version. - Proposed a practical interior modification where the bottom sash of the new triple window setup would be blocked off internally. This would position the internal sill above the bottom sash, maintaining the desired high sill appearance while accommodating the new window configuration. Roethke - Expressed openness to the suggestions made about window configurations, indicating a willingness to explore various design options. - Contemplated using the six-light upper sash of typical A and B windows, considering whether to create three six-light windows aligned horizontally to form a ribbon-like appearance. - Reflected on the idea that a ribbon window could serve as a complementary architectural detail, especially when combined with the existing pattern of double-hung windows on the building. Pohl - Suggested taking the top sash of the "B" window and modifying it by removing the four-light configuration currently shown. - Considered the possibility of using the "A" windows instead, although noted that they might be a bit large for the intended design. - Proposed dropping the bottom sash to adapt the window design to fit above a headboard, facilitating the desired three-window arrangement while accommodating interior design needs.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A the following modifications: On the north elevation facing Lily Pond, remove the two "D" windows located in the gable ends. Replace the "D" window adjacent to the nine-light door with the top sash of an "A" window. On the west elevation, replace the existing triple four-light windows with triple six-light windows, matching the top sash of the "A" windows. (Made By: Camp) (03:33:12)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Carmine & Sheila Giardini	7A Clifford St	New dwelling 12-9634	79/19	Reid Yenor
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Reid Yenor, Yenor Design Company LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Addressed concerns that the 44-foot width appears visually extended to 60 feet in the current plans, potentially due to a dimensional error or misinterpretation in the plans as viewed. - Evaluated the spacing between windows which seems excessively wide for a typical five-bay structure. - Considered the appropriateness of the shortened front porch in relation to the building's overall facade. - Discussed the height transitions where the one-story mass on one elevation unexpectedly matches the height of adjoining structures, creating an excessively tall appearance. Camp - Viewed the architectural plans and noted that the building appears very substantial and lengthy on paper, raising concerns about its scale. - Suggested that a site viewing might be necessary to assess the actual dimensions and impact of the building in its intended setting, to ensure it fits appropriately within the neighborhood. Coombs - Viewed the building's design and suggested breaking up the long facade facing the street to reduce its overwhelming presence. - Proposed incorporating a telescoping effect if space permits. - Expressed a desire to see the front door positioned correctly to enhance the building's entrance aesthetics. - Recommended working out the structure's proportions to start with a four-bay section, then tapering down to a wing. Welch - Appreciated the recent changes, particularly noting that the overall massing of the front elevation, while substantial, is acknowledged. - Supported the concept of a site viewing, emphasizing that understanding the context within the neighborhood, where several large structures exist, is crucial for making informed decisions. - Highlighted issues with front elevation details, such as the misalignment of sidelight rails with the door rail, which affects the traditional aesthetic relationship and creates a visually confusing pattern. - Noted discrepancies in the rendering of door moldings and panel levels, which appear unusual compared to typical designs. - Pointed out that the window trim appears disproportionately small relative to the scaled-up windows, affecting the overall harmony of the facade. - Commented on the roof walk, suggesting that a two-bay roof walk might be more appropriate than the existing three-bay design to maintain congruence with other architectural elements. - Suggested raising the eave of the porch roof by about six inches and possibly widening the porch or changing it to a hip roof for a better design flow.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- Reviewed additional elevations, noting improvements but still suggesting changes, such as reducing the scale of the connector piece between the front and rear elevations and adjusting the roof pitch for a less imposing appearance. - Advised on adjustments to the roof walk width and other elements to ensure they align with previously approved projects, enhancing the structure's overall coherence and integration into its setting.
Motion:	Motion to view. (Made By: Coombs) (03:50:19)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

The following items were held.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds, Lot D	Dwelling rev's	67/173.2	LFW
61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds, Lot D	Pool hardscape	67/173.2	LFW
61 Fairgrounds LLC	61 Fairgrounds, Lot C	Pool hardscape	67/173.1	LFW

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Richard & Deborah Hohlt	121 Madaket Rd	Pickle Ball Court	40/60.1	Botticelli

Request to hold.

Discussion:	Welch - Noted that the application was last heard on February 6th, marking this as the first hold without advanced notice. - Outlined the penalty protocol for holding applications without advanced notice, explaining that while there is no penalty for the first instance, subsequent holds without notification can lead to increasing penalties. - Scheduled the application for future review, specifically noting that it will be included on the agenda for the following Tuesday
-------------	---

NEW BUSINESS 02/20/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Nyland Jonathan	93 Sankaty Rd	As built remove chimney	49/182	Topham
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Joe Topham, Topham Design, LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Identified the building status, noting that it is a non-contributing structure from 1983, setting the context for the proposed changes. - Confirmed the removal of the chimney, stating that Joe accurately reported the status as "as-built" for the chimney that has been removed. The fee associated with this change has been paid and is officially recorded. - Outlined the proposal for solar panels, explaining that the plan includes adding solar panels to infill the roof area where the chimney was previously located. - Highlighted the significance of the chimney, even though the building does not contribute to the historical context of the area, emphasizing that chimneys are generally seen as character-defining features in local National District dwellings.			
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley, Sconset Advisory Group - Stated no concerns. Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart Solar - Offered clarity about the initial solar panel design, noting that the original plan accounted for the chimney by leaving a space in the panel layout.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

	- Explained the situation discovered during construction, mentioning that the existing chimney was fake and leaking, which led to its removal upon your arrival at the property. - Proposed a modification to the solar installation, aiming to make the solar array look complete following the board's recommendations after the chimney's removal. - Clarified the absence of malintent in the chimney's removal, emphasizing that the decision was driven by practical considerations and not by any desire to circumvent regulations or standards. - Apologized for any confusion caused, expressing regret for any misunderstandings that arose during the process. - Expressed appreciation for Joe's diligence, acknowledging his role in bringing the issue to the board's attention and emphasizing a commitment to achieving the best design possible under the circumstances.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Signaled likely opposition to the chimney removal, suggesting a probable continuation of the stance taken against the solar panels, reflecting a preference for maintaining the original architectural features. Coombs - Criticized the motive behind the chimney removal, expressing disapproval of removing the chimney specifically to install solar panels, as it contradicts the preferred practices for integrating solar panels into buildings. Topham - Corrected a misunderstanding, acknowledging that the sequence of approvals might have led to confusion similar to the "telephone game," where information changes as it's passed along. - Defended the actions taken, suggesting that there was no intentional wrongdoing involved in the process, attributing the situation instead to human error and miscommunication. Thornewill - Acknowledged the occurrence of an unfortunate mistake, noting that sometimes drawings do not reach the right people at the right time, leading to errors. - Commented on the aesthetic impact of the chimney, recognizing that while the chimney is a nice feature on the building, its removal is not detrimental to the overall structure. Welch - Noted that Joe noticed the issue and subsequently brought it to the attention of the applicant.
Motion:	Motion to hold for additional information. (Made By: Thornewill) (04:08:56)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
John & Jill Petterson	5 Wigwam	Driveway Arbor Hardscape	77/5.3	Self
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Katy Mitchell, KM Landscaping Designs, Inc.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp Stated that if the vegetation on Wigwam is left undisturbed, you would be happy to approve the project.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, with the condition that the vegetation on Wigwam Road stays as is. (Made By: Camp) (04:12:15)			
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

The following items were held.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Meehan, James	50 N Liberty	Rooftop Solar	41/255	Cotuit Solar, Karen A
Kaiser, Nathan	5 Dovekie Ct	Rooftop Solar	68/561	Cotuit Solar, Karen A

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Milton Rowland	18 Mt. Vernon Street	New Shed	89/9	Normand Residential
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ben Normand, Normand Residential			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill Questioned the lack of a window on the south elevation, highlighting its visibility from the roads and expressing curiosity about the design choice.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Coombs) (04:15:00)			
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Pazone, RE Trust	14 Waquoit Rd	Move	55.4.4/32	Normand Residential
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ben Normand, Normand Residential			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Expressed gratitude to Mickey for providing a historical narrative about the building, noting the lack of existing structural surveys for that area. - Acknowledged the building's historical builder, understanding that it was possibly constructed by Mr. Norcross around 1925. - Recognized the need for relocation due to erosion, emphasizing the importance of preserving the building by moving it on-site. - Suggested maintaining the current orientation of the building, if at all possible, to preserve its historical setting. Noted that the building has stood in its current orientation for nearly 100 years and retaining this alignment would respect its historical context.			

HDC Minutes March 5, 2024; Adopted April 30, 2024

Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Thornewill) (04:18:32)
Vote:	Carried 3-0 // Welch, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Scheurell	28 Flintlock Rd	Move off	75/79	Topham
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Joe Topham, Topham Design, LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Camp) (04:21:57)			
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
Sylvia Bell	34 Chuck Hollow	Move on	75/67	Topham
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Joe Topham, Topham Design, LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made By: Coombs) (04:23:16)			
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)			

OTHER BUSINESS

Next HDC Meeting- March 12, 2024, at 4pm ***HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid**

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:23 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-d1u2bktADY>