



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 9, 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 Welch called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to the agenda, subject to revision for the next meeting and any necessary adjustments to the deadline dates. (Made By: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Pohl (Aye)

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

I. DISCUSSION & VOTE

Updated meeting schedule April – July 2024	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Noted that in April, with five weeks, the commission will meet for four weeks, excluding the school vacation week. - Confirmed that the hybrid meeting scheduled for April 16th would then be canceled.
Discussion of Article 38, ATM 2024	Oliver - Represented both myself and the HDC at the civic league forum, addressing one of the questions and doing a commendable job of presenting our point of view. - Proposed a collaborative effort involving the planning board, HDC, and housing folks before the town meeting to come up with a solution. - Volunteered to take the initiative to organize the meeting.

II. SIGNS

<u>Property Owner Name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of Work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. VTT Management	1 Miller Ln	Freestanding sign	68/888	Cara Marquis
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representative:	Cara Marquis provided an overview of the application and responded to Commissioners questions.			
Staff Comments	Billy Saad , Zoning Administrator & Land Use Specialist - Mentioned that at the last Tuesday's meeting, the Sign Council did not approve the sign because it is freestanding, which is prohibited by the sign guidelines. - Noted that at the last meeting, the board had a different application under slightly different circumstances due to a pre-existing sign that had been removed and reapproved in 2013.			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

Public Comments	-
Comments/Concerns	Oliver - Considered the need to think carefully about making exceptions, suggesting that if exceptions are made, the sign committee might need to develop new regulations. - Expressed reluctance to overturn what the committee has maintained thus far. - Acknowledged that while the sign is not offensive, the decision is based on principle. Coombs - Agreed with Val, expressing concern that allowing exceptions could lead to many new freestanding signs along Southshore Road and Old South Road. - Emphasized that the rule was established years ago due to an overabundance of signs. - Believed that people will find their way without additional signs and stressed the importance of adhering to the sign committee's regulations. Welch - Aligned with the commissioners and recognized that the sign committee has established and consistently applied rules for many years. - Emphasized the importance of relying on the committee's advisory role. - Suggested finding a creative way to meet sign requirements, possibly considering alternative locations. - Additionally, proposed that a memorable drink with a catchy name could attract more attention than a sign. - Encouraged the applicant to find a solution that works within the guidelines. Camp - Didn't find the sign offensive but acknowledged the importance of adhering to the guidelines. - Noted that an excess of signs, such as at the turnoff for Bartlett Farm, could become problematic and understood the rationale behind the regulations. - Acknowledged that the sign advisory committee has their guidelines and emphasized the importance of adhering to them. - Agreed that if an exception were to be considered, it should be within the guidelines, taking into account the rural, out-of-town context. - Expressed uncertainty about how to phrase such an exception to avoid setting a bad precedent, but personally did not find the sign offensive. Pohl - Concluded that there isn't much support for the freestanding sign, despite its attractive design. - Agreed that the board should not act against the advisory committee's recommendations and long-standing rules. Welch - Acknowledged that the sign committee rules and guidelines are part of the HDC's regulations. - Emphasized that the sign committee advises on conformance without compensation, and the board should heed their advice. - Stressed that going against their recommendations would also mean contradicting the board's own rules. - Highlighted the concern that allowing exceptions could lead to commercial districts being lined with signs, which is inconsistent with the historic character and setting of Nantucket. - Explained that the hesitation is not about the design or individual location but about the cumulative impact on the presentation of commercial corridors. Saad - Updated everyone that the previous two signs were approved at last Tuesday's HDC meeting. - Noted that the applicant for The Rotary had requested to come before the board, but this current applicant did not. - The board wanted to review this application to understand why one sign was allowed while another was not.
Motion	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch) (00:17:35)
Roll-Call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

III. CONSENT

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Newman, Robert	6 Topping Lift Road	Front door change	66/308	Self
2. Jesse Dutra	80 Hummock Pond Road	Alpaca shed	56/124	Oliver
3. US REIF Mar. Nan. Fee	6 Bayberry Court	Fenestration/add dormer	55/706	Emeritus
4. Harimon Preston	9 Cedar Cir	New Shed	55/494	Self
5. Steven Kara Gibson	5 Arrowhead Dr	Roof solar	69/304	Sunwind
6. Wright, Bill	5 Goose Cove Ave	Garage	59.4/367	Oliver
7. Charles Bruno	10 Monohansett Road	Hardscaping	79/142	LFW
8. Cascabelles Dos, LLC	5 Shawkemo Hills Ln	Fenestration change	27/40.5	Jonathan Raith
9. Owen Franks	2 Sherburne TP	Addition	30/179	Chip Webster
10. Matt Matthews	43 Union St	Re-issue 2020-02-0968	43.3.2/29	EMDA
11. Whitney Matthews	43 Union St	Re-issue 06-9920	43.3.2/29	EMDA
12. Mark & Amy Tercek	30 Burnell St	Window & Door change	73/2.3	EMDA
13. 256 Polpis LLC	256 Polpis Rd	MH Addition Pergola	25/25	Botticelli & Pohl
14. 9B Crows Nest LLC	9B Crows Nest #2	Rev 2023-11-9497	12/20.2	Botticelli & Pohl
15. Jacob Lilley	19 Ridge Ln	Fence	38/77	Self
16. Anderson Duncan	31 Okorwaw	addition	79/153	NAG
17. Danielle De Benedictis	1 Magnolia Ave	Deck extension	73.3.1/123	Emda
18. Town Line LLC	4 Field Ave	New Dwelling	80/171	Kris Megna
19. Town Line LLC	4 Field Ave	New Dwelling	80/171	Kris Megna
20. Gregory & Angela Furtaw	11 Roberts Ln	New second dwelling	56/36	Normand Res.
21. NHA	6 Norquarta Dr	Solar/ac	67/504	LFW
22. NHA	7 Norquarta Dr	Solar/ac	67/504	LFW
23. NHA	8 Norquarta Dr	Solar/ac	67/504	LFW
24. NHA	9 Norquarta Dr	Solar/ac	67/504	LFW
25. NHA	10 Norquarta Dr	Solar/ac	67/504	LFW
26. NHA	11 Norquarta Dr	Solar/ac	67/504	LFW
27. NHA	12 Norquarta Dr	Solar/ac	67/504	LFW
28. 61 Fairgrounds LLC	63 Fairgrounds Road	Lot D Fencing	67/173.2	LFW
29. 61 Fairgrounds LLC	15 Parker Lane	Shed	67/173	LFW
30. Marybeth Ferro	104 Surfside Road	Move off cottage	67/349	Val Oliver
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	Oliver, Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent. (Made By: Coombs) (00:19:17)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)			

IV. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. NiSHA	1 Evergreen Wy	Move off demo	68/727	Emeritus
•	Date of construction and elevations/dimensions of the structure to be included. (no heights provided for potential move)			
2. Macfarlane, Dudley	27 Bosworth	Pool, driveway	92.4/95	Atlantic
•	Not visible at time of inspection or thereafter; no grade change from prior existing at time of application.			
3. 17 Cannonbury Lane LLC	17 Cannonbury Lane	Hardscaping	73/4.5	LFW
•	Not visible at time of inspection or thereafter; no grade change from prior existing at time of application.			
4. 6 Todd Circle LLC	12 Willard Street Rev	Roofwalk color	42.4.1/53	LFW
•	Color change (White to NTW) only.			
5. NHA	50 Prospect St	New door old mill	55.4.4/25	LFW
•	Subject to door detail (1/2" scale of both interior and exterior) to reasonably match prior existing shown in historic records, to be reviewed by staff (Holly) for incorporation into the application and COA materials—prior to release of COA.			
6. NHA	50 Prospect St	Hardscape	55.4.4/25	LFW
•	Subject to 1/2" scale plan drawing showing placement of edging, labeling materials, to be reviewed by staff (Holly) for incorporation into the application and COA materials—prior to release of COA.			
7. Gregory & Angela Furtaw	11 Roberts Ln	Addition to existing structure	56/36	Normand Residential
•	Slightly increase overall width of arched-roof portico while transitioning from half-round to half-elliptical (to allow front door, frontspiece and casings room to breathe).			
8. Daly, Thomas	72A Hummock Pond Rd	Roof Solar	56/72.6	Cotuit Solar
•	Subject to proposed evergreen plantings, as shown and annotated in submission/plan view.			
9. Kyle Ambrester	21 Berkley Ave	New basement windows	54/160	Mark Avery

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

- Date of construction added to the COA
- 10. US REIF Mar. Nan. Fee 6 Bayberry Court Fenestration/add dormer 55/706 Emeritus
- Date of construction added to the COA
- 11. 32 Chuck Hollow LLC 32 Chuck Hollo Road Move ON garage from 1 Swift Rock 75/68 Normand Residential
- Date of construction added to the COA (c.1991)

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent with Conditions. (Made By: Coombs) (00:19:55)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

V. NEW BUSINESS 03/19/2024 - VIEW

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. John Esposito	14 Eat Fire Spring Rd	Spa	20/61	BPC
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Joe Paul, BPC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Familiar with the road, noted that it becomes quite remote near the property. - Initially concerned about the pool projecting far from the house, but ultimately believed it is not very visible. - Mentioned that the shed might be visible down the driveway, but did not consider it a problem. - Concluded that the spa is acceptable. Camp - Originally concerned but now somewhat less worried. - Suggested adding a few strategically planted indigenous trees, like cedars, to ensure the pool is not visible from the road. - Noted that there's a lot happening on the property and emphasized the importance of covering all bases to prevent visibility from Eat Fire Spring. - Proposed this as a caveat to ensure the pool remains hidden from view. Coombs - Recalled a past discussion about a shed used as an office, where it couldn't be seen, which justified its location. - Believed the land is well-suited for the pool due to abundant planting and vegetation. - Noted that the pool can't be moved easily due to underground work. - Confident that the pool won't be visible in the summer because the area gets full coverage. - Agreed with Abby's suggestion to plant a few trees around the corner and believed that the pool won't be visible from the street, as it feels like driving through the woods out there. - Concluded with no problems regarding the project. Patten - Stated no concerns with the spa due to lack of visibility			
Motion:	Motioned to approve, with the condition that it may not be seen at the time of inspection or thereafter and there shall be no change to the existing grade prior to the time of the application. (Made By: Coombs) (00:34:10)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

2. John Esposito	14 Eat Fire Spring Rd	Pool	20/61	BPC
3. John Esposito	14 Eat Fire Spring Rd	Hardscape	20/61	BPC
4. John Esposito	14 Eat Fire Spring Rd	Shed move	20/61	BPC

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Joe Paul, BPC
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motioned to approve the pool, hardscape and shed move, with the condition that it may not be seen at the time of inspection or thereafter and there shall be no change to the existing grade prior to the time of the application. (Made By: Coombs) (00:35:31)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten, Thornewill (Aye)

5. Turk Family LLC 15 Marsh Hawk Lane Pool/Patio 56/113.6 LINK

Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Vitoria "Tori" Ewing, LINK
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Noted that the submitted plan does not show any extra screening. - Insisted on adding additional screening given the driveway's location and its direct, straight-on view. Ewing - Acknowledged the circles on the plan, indicating they represent the screening. - Confirmed that the driveway has been curved according to the previous meeting's comments to avoid a straight-shot view. Coombs - Emphasized the importance of vegetation to ensure the property is not visible from Marsh Hawk Lane, which has a lot of activity. - Highlighted the significance of proper screening due to the visibility of houses on that street. - Noted that vegetation should be arranged to avoid any questionable views. - Mentioned concerns about landscape lights surrounding the pool, which would illuminate it. - Suggested that the pool should not be lit up, as there's no need for such lighting in that area. - Recommended adding more vegetation, avoiding straight lines, bending them around, and removing the lights around the pool if the pool remains in its current location. Thornewill - Visited the site and noted the pool's proximity to the street. - Suggested reducing the length of the pool and shifting the shed to create a clear barrier to the street. - Recommended adding more vegetation to the left where the driveway swings in to prevent any glimpses of the pool when turning around in the driveway. - Confirmed that the shed closest to the pool has not been built yet, so it could be elongated to extend to the end of the pool if the pool is shortened. - Suggested that the shed's doors could face either direction, which should solve the visibility issue.

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

Paul

- Agreed completely with Carrie's description and suggestions.
- Noted curiosity about the flexibility with the shed and saw it as an opportunity to address many concerns.
- Suggested that if the shed's shape and location were adjusted to run alongside the long side of the building and the pool was moved up slightly, it would help mitigate the issues.
- Observed that it looks like there's a strict adherence to not having the pool overlap the front corner of the house. From the board's perspective, the pool is in front of the house since it's between the house and the road.
- Recommended sliding the pool up on the plan, creating more of a landscape buffer toward Marsh Hawk Lane, and using the shed to screen the view from the driveway, which would put the project in good shape.

Welch

- Commented on the elevation, noting that the depiction of vegetation as a black blob is not helpful for understanding visibility, likening it to an image taken during an eclipse. Emphasized that this doesn't aid in understanding what will or won't be seen, making it rather useless for assessment.
- Agreed with Carrie and Joe, reiterating Joe's points about the pool being perceived as in front of the house. Suggested two key actions to mitigate this issue:
 1. **Shortening the Pool:** Reduce the length of the pool to approximately 36 feet or less.
 2. **Shifting the Pool Back:** Move the pool at least 8-10 feet away from Marsh Hawk Lane toward the driveway area.
- These changes would allow for better landscaping so that the pool is not immediately visible when walking from the driveway to the front door. Additionally, it would ensure that the pool is not visible from Marsh Hawk Lane.
- Recommended indicating the existing location of plant material more clearly on the site plan, particularly in the southeast and southwest areas. Proposed supplementing any non-existing vegetation with naturalized plant material, focusing on the street side and the visible side along the driveway.

Ewing

- Clarified that the printed version of the elevation of plant material for the driveway included with the paper copies might be more helpful than the digital version.
- Stated that the intention is to plant vegetation over six feet high at the head of the driveway along both sides, completely covering any visibility to the area.
- Acknowledged the commissioner comments and expressed willingness to discuss them with the clients.
- Emphasized that the printed elevation clearly shows the planned six-foot-high vegetation, and the photographs submitted with the original application also demonstrate substantial existing vegetation that will remain in place.
- Confirmed that you cannot see anything through the existing vegetation, even before the additional planned plantings.

Welch

- Highlighted that plant material elevations are not typically approved and that the site plan dictates what will be on site and what will be inspected. Emphasized the need for a site plan that shows the locations of existing plant material so that clear references can be made about what will be required to stay.
- Outlined the following requirements based on the commissioners' comments:
 1. **Detailed Site Plan:** Include the locations of existing plant material and specify what will remain.
 2. **Supplemental Planting:** Provide additional planting along the driveway, as viewed from Marsh Hawk Lane, and along the entire property line.
 3. **Pool and Shed Modifications:** Decrease the length of the pool, shift its location, and move the shed.
- Noted the commission's best practices, mentioning the three chances to make material modifications consistent with the request for revisions. Warned that after these

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	opportunities, if a supermajority vote results in a no, it could lead to a two-year denial. Encouraged informing the owner to take the commission's comments seriously and make the necessary modifications so the project can move forward at the next hearing.
Motion:	Motioned to hold for revisions. (Made By: Coombs) (00:50:30)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

VI. NEW BUSINESS 03/19/2024

1. Great Harbor Yacht Club Inc 96 Washington Add 2 nd floor covered porch/roof 55.1.4/8 Emeritus LTD	
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that the Great Harbor Yacht Club's proposal to cover the second-floor porch roof should adhere to guidelines defined within the "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Emphasized that porches should avoid excessive complexity and maintain simple, additive massing. - Mentioned that the second-floor deck should not exceed the "John McLaughlin rule," which was not clearly seen in the plans. - Suggested that covering the porch on one side versus both sides might be preferable, ideally on the side not directly facing the harbor but rather on the side elevation.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Asked if the decks are existing and just being covered, confirming that they are. Noted that there were no major concerns about the porch roofs but highlighted that the new porches extend the ridges on an already long ridge, making it even longer. - Suggested two main ideas to address this: Drop the Ridge and Porch Massing: Lower the entire porch massing, including the roof structure, just below the rafter board to break the continuous line. Experiment with a Hip Roof: Try a hip roof to shorten the ridges. Consider a modified hip (or Dutch hip) that might have a smaller gable extending from the peak. This would reduce the broad triangular face of the proposed gables and the shingled mass area. - Also suggested that the porch roofs themselves could be lowered slightly to improve the overall elevation appearance.
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Agreed that a clipped gable approach might work and suggested conducting quick studies on hipped or clipped gables due to the overall impression this structure creates in the harbor. - Noted that these are existing second-story deck areas and believed that, if the rooflines can be worked out, covering the porches could be a net benefit. - While generally supporting the idea of having negative spaces on a second floor, in this case, covering the existing uncovered second-floor decks might be advantageous. Oliver - Expressed that the current proposal is acceptable as is, considering the nature of the structure, which is not a residential house. - Mentioned understanding the 8-foot rule but noted some flexibility on that in recent cases. - Concluded with no problem with the proposal in its current form. Camp - Agreed with the previous comments about dropping the roof to avoid the long extension and considering a hip or clipped gable design. - Expressed overall approval of the proposal. - Suggested that the gable could feature a more decorative window, such as a lifesaver

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	design, to align with the yacht club's character, instead of the current simple square window. Coombs - Agreed with the previous comments, emphasizing the importance of breaking up the roof length. - Supported the idea of a Dutch roof or similar modification to achieve this. - Noted that while the structure might seem large on its own, its location within the cluster of the yacht club makes it fit in appropriately. Pohl - Agreed with Mickey's comments about the overall ridge, noting that it is particularly evident in the side elevation. - Acknowledged that the current design extends an already long ridge even further. - Expressed interest in seeing a design with a hip or Dutch hip roof to break up the length of the ridge and improve the overall appearance.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Coombs) (00:57:52)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

1. Steven Cohen	72 Pocomo Road	Demo Main House	15/37	WAPD
2. Steven Cohen	72 Pocomo Road	Demo Guest House	15/37	WAPD
3. Steven Cohen	72 Pocomo Road	Demo Garage	15/37	WAPD
4. Steven Cohen	72 Pocomo Road	Demo Outbuildings	15/37	WAPD
5. Steven Cohen	72 Pocomo Road	Demo Pool/Spa	15/37	WAPD

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD, Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law PC
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged that the structure, built in 1990 by Sam Hill and designed by Gerard (last name not mentioned), holds some cultural prestige despite not contributing to local or national historic registers. - Noted it was formerly the mansion of Yankee Candle Company founder Michael Kittredge and designed with the fundamentals of Building with Nantucket in Mind. Highlighted the main block's Cape-style design with simple gable dormers and flanking additions, emphasizing its length rather than traditional 19th-century Nantucket additive massing off the back. - Expressed support for the proposed salvage plans, recommending maximizing salvage efforts as part of the town's sustainability goals. Suggested that any reusable parts and pieces could help address housing issues on the island. While echoing others' concerns, emphasized the importance of documenting this information for the file.
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Questioned why renovation is not being considered as an alternative to demolition. - Despite giving a tentative okay, conveyed a strong preference for finding a more sustainable and less wasteful solution. Coombs - Expressed being appalled by the situation and the thought of removing all the existing elements. - Despite the strong feelings, acknowledged that if demolition is necessary, then it must be done. - Emphasized the importance of having asked all the questions and received all the answers, ultimately seeing no other solution but to proceed with the removal.

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted, the demo of the main house, guest house, garage, outbuildings, pool and spa. (Made by: Oliver) (01:10:05)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

6. Steven Cohen	72 Pocomo Road	New Main House	15/37	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD/APD, Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law PC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Pointed out appreciation for Andrew's gable-forward design approach, noting that it aligns with the principles of Building with Nantucket in Mind. - Cautioned about the amount of glazing, even though it might not be visible from a public way. - Emphasized that the ocean and harbor are part of the public experience and that excessive glazing could create a glare affecting anyone in the water. - Highlighted the commission's past concerns about glazing's visual impact, urging consideration of this aspect.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Thanked Andrew for the simplicity of the massing of the structure and appreciated the color choice. However, expressed concern about the use of glass connectors, noting potential issues with night sky visibility and the glow they might create in the dark. - Mentioned reservations about the large, tall windows but acknowledged that everything else was well done. - Also noted that the chimneys seemed a bit robust. Welch - Acknowledged that the design features traditional massing and subdued details, contrasting positively with other structures in the area. - Commended Andrew for his successful self-editorialization in design, maintaining a traditional Nantucket style without oversizing. - Expressed sensitivity to Val's point about the glass connectors and suggested that Andrew conduct a light study to assess potential glare. - Proposed that if the connectors are made of clear glass, considering using matted glass on the ocean-facing side, at least for a portion of the vertical height. - Also recommended studying the angle of inclination and visibility from different distances to determine the impact. Camp - Expressed concern about the excessive glazing and the height of the structure, particularly the peak at 29 feet. Coombs - Expressed concern about the light problem caused by the excessive glazing, particularly the positioning of the glass between two buildings. - Appreciated the design of the buildings and how it integrates with the surrounding vegetation, but emphasized the need to conceal the amount of light facing down the harbor. - Suggested exploring types of glass that do not transmit light or other solutions to reduce light pollution. - Complimented the choice of color, noting it will fit well with the environment, and contrasted it with the much longer Gamble house. Pohl - Considering the comments on glazing and light pollution affecting the night sky, acknowledged that the proposed changes are a net benefit to the site.			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	- Appreciated the building's quieter and simpler design and the choice of gray, which blends well with the surroundings. Welch - Acknowledged that after closely examining the neighboring properties, some concerns have been alleviated, noting that the proposed structure is significantly smaller in proportion compared to the existing house. - Despite this, maintained that the relative proportion of fenestration (window and glass area) to the massing (overall structure) remains a valid and reasonable concern. - Appreciated the willingness to conduct further studies on this aspect to ensure it aligns well with the surrounding environment. Camp - Noted that the proposed 9-foot doors, if illuminated, will appear as tall, narrow rectangles of light, deviating from the usual door sizes. - Expressed concern that this modern design element will stand out and not blend with the traditional aesthetic, reading as a contemporary square of light rather than the norm. Welch - Emphasized that in the dark, the relative masses of the buildings become less discernible, and what stands out are the points of light. - Requested Andrew to provide a visual comparison of the bluff and the proposed structure when lit up.
Motion:	Motion to hold for additional information. (Made by: Welch) (01:28:40)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

7. Steven Cohen

72 Pocomo Road

New Guest House

15/37

WAPD

Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill
Recused:	-
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD/APD, Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law PC
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner •
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group •
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Noted that the trim color is listed as light gray and the sash and doors as dark gray. - Asked for exact shades of gray to be specified for better clarity and evaluation. Coombs - Noted the inclusion of a roof walk, which goes against the typical guidelines for one-story buildings. - Expressed concern that allowing this exception could set a precedent, similar to issues with solar panels and other features. - Although acknowledging the roof walk's aesthetic appeal, reiterated that it conflicts with the established guidelines and principles regarding roof walks on one-story houses. - Acknowledged that the guest house fits in well with the surroundings, being tucked away in the back. Welch - Expressed some concern about the roof walk but acknowledged the overall presentation of the design as subdued and fitting for the beach cliff area, almost rural in its dune design. - Noted that despite some contemporary elements, the design remains traditional and appropriate for the location. - Highlighted that, aside from the open porch and dimensions of some structural members, the design is tremendously traditional and suitable for a rural beach area. - Stated willingness to revisit the issue of the roof walk at a later date, possibly once the

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	structure is framed out, if there is strong resistance to it. Oliver - Agreed with appreciating the simplistic masses and acknowledged the connection via a small glass entryway. - Accepted that this design trend is becoming more common and expressed a willingness to adapt to it. Camp - Stated nothing further to add. Pohl - Supported the idea of holding off on deciding about the roof walk until the structure is framed up, allowing for an assessment of its visibility.
Motion:	Motion to approve subject to the removal of the roof walk, at this time, and without prejudice. (Made by: Welch) (01:35:55)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

8. Steven Cohen	72 Pocomo Road	New Garage	15/37	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD/APD, Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law PC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp and Oliver - Stated no concerns. Coombs - Agreed that the design is very simple and fits in well with the surroundings.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Welch) (01:38:15)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

9. Steven Cohen	72 Pocomo Road	New Gym	15/37	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD/APD, Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law PC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	Tobias Glidden - Expressed gratitude for the inclusion of gray trim in the design, appreciating how it tones things down. - Acknowledged that the new design is likely to look better than the current structure. - Additionally, suggested that the location is ideal for solar panels and encouraged their consideration.			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Stated that the design is fully appropriate. - Emphasized that each commission member has thoroughly reviewed these drawings in advance. While it might seem like we're quickly moving through the approval process, this is due to our prior review and the simplicity and self-editorialization of the design.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions (Made by: Coombs) (01:41:13)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

10. Steven Cohen	72 Pocomo Road	New Shed	15/37	WAPD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/APD/APD, Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law PC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners made no comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Camp) (01:42:25)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

11. 72 Pocomo Trust	72 Pocomo Road	Pool Hardscape	15/37	Ahern LLC
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners agreed that given the lack of visibility, they had no concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, with the condition that it may not be seen at the time of inspection or thereafter. (Made by: Welch) (01:56:50)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

12. 72 Pocomo Trust	72 Pocomo Road	Pergola	15/37	Ahern LLC
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern LLC			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Commissioners made no comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (01:57:19)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

13. Brian-Linda Davis	108 Surfside Road	Roof Solar	80/5	Sunwind
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Timothy Holmes, Sunwind LLC.			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Reviewed this on my consent list and noted the absence of follow-up information. - Highlighted that there was no layout or representation of the placement on the structure			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	in the site plan. Pohl Requested some pictures and asked for clarification on which roof planes are being addressed.
Motion:	Motion to hold for more information. (Made by: Camp) (02:01:06)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)

VII. CONSENT – ITEM ADDED FROM NEW BUSINESS APRIL 2, 2024

9 Thirty Acres LLC	9 Thirty Acres	Fence revs	67/115.7	LINK
Discussion:	Welch - Requested to move the first item under section nine, New Business of April 2nd, "930 Acres LLC fence revisions," to a consent item for approval. - Noted that it missed last week's agenda and confirmed that it is suitable for consent approval.			
Motion:	Motion to approve 9 Thirty Acres fence revisions by consent. (Made by: Welch) (02:04:25)			
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Patten (Aye) // Camp (Abstain)			

VIII. OLD BUSINESS 03/19/2024

1. Joshua Leffler	22 Pleasant St	Addition to garage	42.3.2/50	Val Oliver
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Val Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged for the record that the main dwelling is the circa 1923 Craftsman Pederson house. - Noted that the house was built by Peddler and Henrietta Pederson, both born in the 1860s and 70s, putting the timeline in perspective. The main structure was constructed in 1923, and the date range of 1923-1926 is based on Sanborn Maps from 1923 and the HDC survey, which indicates the garage was built after 1949. - Updated that the historical commission is working on a draft updated survey for the garage as part of the Fish Lots neighborhood project, collaborating with a consultant to update historical resources now that they are a CLG. - Clarified that the current application is to add an addition to the existing garage rather than demolish and build new. - Appreciated the desire to utilize the existing contributing garage but suggested using more than just six feet as an appendage. - Mentioned that the proposed clipped Dutch hip roof is appropriate for the Craftsman architecture of the main house but should be more subordinate in height to the main house, as the current design appears just as tall. - Emphasized that the structure is a contributing element to the district, highlighting the importance of outbuildings to the character and setting of the local and National Historic District. - Noted that while one structure might be in better condition than the other, both exhibit architectural qualities in character with the main Craftsman house. - Concluded by reinforcing that these structures are contributing to the district. - Mentioned having comments on the other application, which are typically consistent throughout the review process. - Based on the vintage of the structure and its association with the main structure on the			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	lot, the comments align with the approach taken for this application. Although unable to read them verbatim, affirmed that the feedback would be consistent with the points made for this particular application.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Acknowledged that this is new material and was not reviewed earlier, so was not aware of prior comments Oliver - Summarized the discussion about the Angola Street or Candle House Street demo of the garage: - Noted that HSAG had no concerns. - Holly confirmed the garage is considered contributing, based on a 1949 Sanborn map, and suggested clearly defining the difference between what is being retained and demolished in the plan. - Expressed doubts about the salvageability of the garage in its current condition but provided relevant photos for context. - Confirmed that there were no concerns from other members. Rowland - Expressed a preference for retaining the existing building and incorporating it into a combined structure. - Noted that the current addition overwhelms the small existing garage, leaving only about 6 feet of garage length, making it look like a house with garage doors on the front. - Suggested a better approach would be to move the garage to the side, leave it mostly intact, and add a small cottage beside it, retaining the scale and character of the existing house.
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Questioned the applicant about the location of the portion of the garage being saved. - Asked if the portion of the garage being saved is at the same distance from the road as it currently is or if it is closer to the street. - Clarified that the garage is slightly forward. - Noted that the main house and guest house relate well to each other in terms of design language and scale, maintaining a hierarchy. - Mentioned that the secondary structure feels appropriate relative to the main house. - Considered whether the garage is contributing and worth saving part of it. - Suggested using more of the existing garage structure. - Noted that the existing garage doors, not used as such, might not need to remain, allowing for simple fenestration on the front. - Mentioned that retaining more of the single-story mass of the garage could be beneficial. - Expressed that the current site plan and addition approach seem incongruent due to the existing garage door placement. - Acknowledged that the scale and details of the proposed guest house are attractive and appropriate. - Suggested incorporating more of the garage structure or even considering removing it completely. Thornewill - Actually thought the thing that made the garage significant was the siding, which is being used in the cottage, and the roof style being mimicked. - Considered that the roof of the garage should be replaced with a shed roof. - Noted that the main house has a thin shed roof mass, resembling a bay window, and suggested that if the garage roof is only six feet, it might serve better as useful ground floor space. - Thought that a shed roof would help ground the building and prevent it from looking too tall. - Commented that the current look of the garage, with a house seemingly placed on top, appears awkward and reminiscent of the Wicked Witch of the East. - Acknowledged the integration of the architecture but suggested simplifying with a shed

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	roof. - Mentioned that garage doors may not be necessary and suggested high windows or detailing in the siding reminiscent of garage doors but considered that might be going too far. Coombs - Questioned the necessity of the garage roof and doors. - Noted that the garage looks weird. - Asked about the height of the entire building, including the garage and what's beyond it. - Confirmed that the height is 23'9". - Concluded that the garage does not add anything significant. - Suggested removing the garage but keeping the small roof detail to break up the structure. Camp - Agreed with Carrie's idea regarding the pop-out on the far left side of the main house. - Acknowledged that the garage looks very strange protruding from the structure. - Liked the incorporation of the cut-off Dutch roof and the siding, finding the guest house visually appealing. - Considered that using the garage in the current design might be more harmful than helpful. - Noted the awkwardness of the gable under a gable. - Suggested replacing the garage with a shed roof over two windows to better align with the main house's design. - Proposed moving the garage to the middle of the site and positioning the guest cottage more generously. Welch - Agreed with jettisoning the garage if it won't be materially intact. - Recognized that this is a different setting than Codfish Park, where retaining a small scale along the street was important. - Suggested that the garage could be advertised for salvage since it appears to be in decent shape. - Agreed with comments about incorporating a shed roof and making design adjustments. - Recommended setting the shed roof back given its location. - Proposed burying the window header into the fascia to help with the height on the second floor.
Motion:	Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Made by: Camp) (02:26:40)
Vote:	Carried 5:0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Paul (Aye)

2. Grant Cambridge	40 Easton St	Hardscape	42.1.4/20	Champoux
Voting:	Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ben Champoux			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Agreed that the dwelling on this lot is an 1893 eclectic style structure and acknowledged the approval of a garage addition in the last couple of years. - Noted that the Belgian block apron is appropriate to the character of Brant Point but emphasized the need for the driveway dimension to conform with zoning bylaw 139-20.1, including an apron depth of 8-10 feet. - Glad to hear that the curbing will be on the property. - Mentioned there was a discussion at the last meeting about concerns with the proposed gate, noting that while the neighbor (the Breakers) has historically had a gate, this may not be appropriate for Brant Point. - Pointed out that gates can segregate locations, which has been a concern for the Brant Point area.			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	- Suggested that the proposed curved gate design is not appropriate and should be straight and typical within design guidelines. - Expressed a preference for a typical type 2 cap picket or a similar design rather than a unique design, considering it more appropriate.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Noted that driveway gates in the Brant Point area are extremely rare and should not become the norm. - Emphasized that gates reflect an air of exclusivity and block the open glimpses of yards and gardens that have been standard for generations. - Expressed a desire to avoid approving many gates in Brant Point to maintain the area's open and welcoming character. - Commented that the five-in-one fence along the street is an odd choice, particularly in front of a garage. - Suggested that a simpler board fence would be more appropriate and would hide the AC units just as effectively without the decorative top. - Recommended moving the AC units to a different location to eliminate the need for screening them from visibility.
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Agreed with Mickey's comment regarding the five-in-one fence, noting that a simple board fence would be more fitting. - Acknowledged that the top part of a five-in-one fence is a strong, recognizable detail that feels a bit suburban. - Expressed support for the Personnel gate with solid boards below and an open top but suggested that matching it with the five-in-one fence would be too much. - Supported the Personnel gate and a board fence to hide the condensers, along with the landscape buffer. - Glad that the proposed gate is not like the tall fence at 42B Easton Street, which feels more like a tall fence. - Appreciated the options provided for the gate and expressed a liking for the curved option. - Found option number two appealing because its lowest point is only 42 inches off the ground, which seems more appropriate. - Noted that option one, at 54 inches, feels tall and less desirable. - Believed it is important to maintain the ability to see into properties, look at the landscape, and make eye contact when walking down the sidewalk. - Concluded that the scale of gate number two is more appropriate in terms of overall height. Patten - Agreed with Mickey about screening the air conditioner units. - Opposed the installation of the gate. - Disliked the exclusivity the gate implies. - Would not be in favor of a gate, whether curved or straight. Oliver - Agreed with what has been said. - Questioned if the board and lattice fence changes to just a board fence, does it need to be as high? Champoux - Agreed that the condensers are raised to get them out of the flood zone. - Recognized that the fence needs to be high enough to screen the condensers effectively. - Acknowledged that the six-foot height is necessary to cover the top of the AC units. - Expressed willingness to have whatever fence design the board prefers to achieve the needed screening. - Confirmed that there is no alternative location for the AC units. Oliver - Agreed with using just a plain board fence instead of lattice, at whatever height is necessary. - Expressed mixed feelings about the gate.

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	• Suggested that the gate could be designed to look like a continuation of a front picket fence or similar style. • Supported Joe's point about having something less high for the gate. Champoux • Stated that the gate's primary function is to prevent people from turning around in the driveway, particularly with boats and trailers. • Recognized that the gate is not intended to shut out the public but to manage driveway access. • Noted that the gate will likely remain open most of the time, serving more as an architectural detail. • Acknowledged the concern about exclusivity but pointed out that Easton Street is already somewhat exclusive. Coombs • Emphasized the importance of listening to the HSAG's recommendations. • Mentioned that a rope could be strung across the entrance to prevent people from entering, as an alternative to a gate. • Expressed concern about setting a precedent for multiple fences in the area, which could lead to a proliferation of fences and gates. • Suggested reducing the prominence of the fencing around the air conditioning units to make it less eye-catching. • Approved of a 14-inch high stone wall as appropriate for the area. • Questioned the width of the entrance to the parking lot, noting that it appears wider than it should be. • Recommended that the front of the building on the street should be simpler and in keeping with the classic Brant Point architectural style. • Stressed the importance of maintaining the character of Brant Point, avoiding unnecessary driveways and fences that detract from the area's traditional look. Backus • Recommended considering the "Building with Nantucket in Mind" addendum, "Resilient Nantucket Design Guidelines," which addresses flooding and adaptation strategies. • Highlighted the chapter that discusses porous surfaces for hardscaping areas in floodplain zones like Brant Point and recommendations for elevating utilities such as AC units. • Suggested looking into alternative enclosures for AC units instead of a 6-foot-tall board fence, decorative or not. • Mentioned the use of lattice around AC units as outlined in the guidelines, with examples of similar solutions approved in the past, such as those on Meter Street. • Encouraged pursuing alternative enclosures that better incorporate the AC units into the historic structure's facade, rather than using a board fence. Camp • Agreed that a simpler fence should be used to disguise the AC units. • Supported Holly's point that a trellis or other simple structure could work well to make the fencing less eye-catching from the street. • Emphasized the importance of effective screening to ensure the AC units are not visible. • Agreed with the idea of not having a gate, noting that Easton Street does not typically feature many gates and has an open, friendly atmosphere. • Recommended maintaining that open and welcoming character for the area.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, the five in one fence becoming a solid board fence (5 feet) and omit the gate from the application without prejudice. (Made by: Paul) (02:49:25)
Discussion:	Backus • Noted that having a board fence right up on the front of the structure is unique and unusual. • Suggested considering a trellis around the AC units, elevated to be out of the floodplain, which is typically seen on the side of a building, not the front.

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	- Recommended mitigating the visual impact with vegetation underneath the trellis. - Acknowledged the need for a visual representation to better understand how this would look.
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye)

3. Killen	10 Easy St	Hardscape parking	42.3.1/78	R Newman
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Chuck Lenhart, Sandcastle Construction			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted for the record that the main dwelling on the lot is a circa 1933 structure, representing a nice infill of the time. - Appreciated the proposed changes, including using field stone to match the existing field stone and brick. - Mentioned that there should be appropriate corner rounding and dimensions in compliance with zoning bylaw chapter 139-2.1. - Approved matching the walkway material as appropriate. - Expressed no concerns other than fixing the dimensions to ensure they are not too rigid and include proper corner rounding. Lenhart - Pointed out that the curb cut is existing and already meets the street. - Noted that the sharp point of the curb cut meets the corner of the fence, which aligns with the walkway up to the building.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group - Acknowledged that this proposal is an improvement over the solid brick. - Suggested incorporating some grass to break up the extensive brick area right on the road. - Admitted not having specific suggestions but recommended considering grass strips or a similar solution to enhance the overall appearance.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Considered this proposal appropriate given what is currently there. - Recognized it as a significant improvement. - Expressed satisfaction with the proposal. Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs - Concurred with Val's comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted. (Made by: Oliver) (02:59:15)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)			

4. Nantucket Island Resorts	19 N Water Lot 9	New Dwelling	42.4.2/3	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that this is an infill for the harbor area, previously part of the Harbor House complex. - Recalled that the complex used to have houses flanking either side of the driveway. - Appreciated the removal of the roof walk, especially given the absence of a chimney. - Acknowledged the design inspiration from 2 Harbor View Way, particularly with the			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	dormer design. • Commented that the structure reminds me of 2 Harbor View Way, which is positive. • Expressed gratitude for the removal of the cantilever on the side elevation. • Concluded that the changes are appropriate and well-received.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structure Advisory Group • Acknowledged that this design works better but still has an unusual asymmetrical roofline facing the east and west. • Suggested a simple solution of extending the rooflines down on the back to incorporate the porch into the roofline on the west side and create a faux thickness wall on the east side, achieving a symmetrical look. • Noted that the front balcony is wider than necessary and recommended bringing in the width tight to the windows, which would improve the appearance. • Commented that the front door is still uninteresting and could use improvement in detail. • Observed that the double windows in the third-floor dormer on the front seem over-fenestrated and recommended switching to one window to help balance the design.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver • Noted that the design looks significantly different and much more appropriate and pleasing without the roof walk. • Acknowledged that the previous narrow design has been improved substantially with the recent changes. • Expressed that everything has come together well with these adjustments. • Agreed with Mickey's idea of extending the rooflines on the sides to make them look even. Camp • Agreed about the second-floor deck, suggesting it should be pulled in as the spindles seem overwhelming compared to the shingles. • Suggested that bringing the entire deck in might address the issue. • Didn't mind the two windows and noted that the example pictures showed similar designs with two windows. • Proposed incorporating diamond windows on the uppers, similar to those seen on Easton Street houses, to add a decorative element to the design. • Specified that these diamond windows could be integrated into the gable or upper windows, potentially as one-over-one windows with diamond patterns. • Appreciated the design without the roof walk, noting that it sits nicely and looks more cohesive. Welch • Agreed with Val's comments. • Found the changes on the north elevation appropriate, both as represented and perceived. • Suggested making the left side of the second-floor deck on the west elevation a shingle wall to address the baluster length issue. • Expressed uncertainty about how the changes would work on the second floor without more detail. • Opposed the roof modification suggested for the west elevation, which involves extending the rightmost second-story eave down, as it would not be a minor modification and would significantly change the nature of that mass. • Concluded that other than the roof modification, the design is good and appreciated Matt working with the committee on this project. Coombs • Suggested adding more decorative elements around the front door to enhance its appearance, though not necessarily three windows. • Agreed that the deck above the front door should be brought in. • Supported the other suggestions made by Mickey. • Concluded that the structure will fit well in its position with these small additions. Pohl • Appreciated the changes, noting that changing the ridgeline to a single ridge has made

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	the house look much more like the example house on Harbor View. • Understood the decision to go with two windows, as it matches the arrangement of the example house, which is a good choice. • Agreed with Stephen that the asymmetry of the gables on either side won't be hugely apparent because the buildings are quite close together, and the focus will be more on the front-facing road view than the side alleys. • Supported the idea of making the second-floor deck narrower, bringing it in a bit, and having the roof embrace the dormer facing the road. MacEachern • Agreed to reduce the width of the deck per Mickey's suggestion, bringing it in to align with the window casing. • Suggested omitting the vertical balusters flanking the center section. • Proposed that the center section would have the open baluster, with shingled sections on either side due to the reduced overall width. • Confirmed that the design would feature a shingled section, an open baluster, and then another shingled section, as opposed to three sections of open baluster.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, reflecting the modification of the second-floor deck and deck railing (as discussed). (Made by: Welch) (03:10:15)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

5.	Nantucket Island Resorts	19 N Water Lot 10	New Dwelling	42.4.2/3	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner • Appreciated the changes in the roof pitches, the reduction in height, and the new roof walk on this structure compared to the previous one. • Noted that these adjustments are much better. • Specifically appreciated the changes to the pitches on the rear, finding them successful. • Expressed no concerns on the revisions.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group • Noted that the design still proposes a steeply pitched front gable marrying into a shallow eight-pitch on both the east and west sides. • Described this approach as unconventional and not typically found on old traditional buildings in town. • Strongly suggested that the pitches be made as similar as possible. • Mentioned that the roof walk is not appropriate for this style of building and is too large, with two panels wide on one side. • Recommended scaling down the roof walk if it is to be kept. • Commented that the front door is too simple and could use more detail. • Suggested that a chimney would look much better than the roof walk on the front.				
Commissioner Comments:	Welch • Appreciated the changes on the north elevation. • Agreed that the roof walk is inappropriate for this particular structure. • Noted that on the east elevation, the roof walk accentuates the incongruence in the roof pitches due to the axial and stacked relationship with the shallow gable. • Observed that the previous submission's shallow roof pitch didn't accentuate this issue as much. • Recognized that the roof walk will be viewed at an oblique angle, which further highlights the issue. • Recommended removing or reducing the height of the roof walk. • Supported the idea of adding a chimney, noting that it is more typical and would fit				

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	well with the design. - Highlighted that the north elevation, with its slightly taller and steeper pitch roofs, is particularly suited for a chimney on the right-hand side, which would be very appropriate. Oliver - Agreed with previous comments. - Identified the roof walk as the main concern. - Had nothing additional to add. Coombs - Agreed that the roof walk should be removed. - Expressed a desire to see a chimney added to the building. - Believed that a chimney would help the building fit better with its design. Camp - Suggested that a Victorian chimney with more corbelling at the top might be appropriate for this building. Pohl - Agreed with concerns about the two dramatically different roof pitches, aligning with Mickey's viewpoint. - Noted that the roof walk is problematic, particularly with its current placement on the continuous ridge, centered over the front-facing gable. - Suggested that if the roof walk remains, it might be better to center it on the lateral ridge rather than the front ridge to improve massing and balance. - Observed that the current placement makes the massing appear lopsided and heavy on the left-hand side of the front.
Motion:	Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, removing the roof walk and adding a chimney on the right-hand side of the front elevation. (Made by: Welch) (03:20:14)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

6.	450 Green Park LLC	2 Stone Alley	Railings	42.3.1/102	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged that this is Eliza Cod's barn, which she turned into a house circa 1858 to 1871, and that it is individually significant. - Appreciated the revisions but still found the structure overwhelming, as previously pointed out. - Valued the historic photographs provided, noting the importance of retaining the natural weathered look of the railings, as seen in the previous existing condition, despite them being painted at some point. - Recommended removing the newel caps to maintain historical accuracy, referencing the historic photograph of two Stone Alley documented by HABS, which shows no newel caps. - Suggested that these changes would be appropriate to retain the historic features of the structure.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Noted that adding a railing to the sunroom creates a very large second-floor deck, which is over eight feet deep. - Mentioned that this does not meet the design criteria from "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Pointed out that the addition of the railing accentuates it, making it a prominent feature, which is not desirable. - Concluded that the change is not appropriate and should not be made.				

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Agreed with Holly's suggested modifications to the railing details, such as not having the newel caps break the top and keeping the natural weathered look. - Acknowledged that the current state of the railing feels unfinished. - Recognized that adding the railing creates a large deck, but believed there is precedent for it. - Considered that for this structure, adding the railing feels like bringing back a historical element. - Expressed being fine with the addition as long as the details match the historic photos. Oliver - Commented on the size of the proposed deck, having driven by the front and back to see the mockup. - Noted that from Union Street, other decks can be seen, but those houses appear larger and can support such features better. - Expressed that the proposed deck is too big and would prefer not having the entire area as a deck. - Suggested a compromise, such as having part of the area with railing and the other part designed differently. - Acknowledged the side deck that emulates what was historically there, which adds to the concern about the overall size. - Concluded that as submitted, not in favor of the entire area being a deck. Thornewill - Agreed that the example on Orange Street, being a massive two-story house, was more to scale with a full-height railing. - Described the proposed deck as humongous and disproportionate. - Pointed out that the original sunroom below was much smaller, making the current proposal seem too large. - Expressed not being in favor of the current proposal and suggested seeing a different approach. Patten - Supported the idea of having a deck if it could be made smaller and left to weather naturally rather than being painted white. - Acknowledged uncertainty about how to achieve a smaller deck but emphasized the need for it to be reduced in size. Welch - Agreed that the deck is slightly oversized, particularly in relation to the structure rather than the porch element. - Suggested reducing the deck from three bays to two to better fit the structure. - Supported the idea of having the deck natural to weather rather than painted white. - Acknowledged that opinions might change once the deck is in place, but starting with a natural finish is preferable. - Emphasized the importance of having the rail over post design to reflect the original historic elements.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Oliver) (03:29:55)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

7. Suni & William Harford	60 Wanoma	Addition Reno Garage	92.3	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Noted that the connector makes the building very long. - Appreciated the effort to soften the design by adding the baton doors. - Expressed concern that the length of the building is excessive. - Unsure about the precedents in the area but acknowledged that the change might not be very visible. MacEachern - Acknowledged that from the road, the site plan shows the building set down a long driveway. - Noted that the connector is likely not visible from the road due to the approach to the house being from the side rather than directly in front. Welch - Confirmed that the natural color for the connector and trim is acceptable. - Acknowledged that the door not being painted white will reduce its visibility, which is positive. - Asked if all the other requested changes were made and received confirmation. - Satisfied with the changes, especially with the natural color and other adjustments. Patten - Appreciated the changes made. - Had no further comments. Coombs - Noted that the only concern is that the building seems long.
Motion:	Motion to approve due to extremely low visibility. (Made by: Welch) (03:38:45)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten (Aye)

8. FP 4 N Water	4 N Water St	New dwelling	42.4.2/90	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matthew MacEachern, Emeritus LTD			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Acknowledged the infill next to the individually significant Obed Long House. - Appreciated the changes in the door surround and the removal of the hip-covered entry. - Noted that the addition of the half-round window gives the infill building a Colonial Revival or even Victorian element, which is appropriate for an infill. - Suggested that an off-center entry is more appropriate for this style, even for an infill, and would be the only recommended change. - Believed that six-over-six windows would be better suited. - Expressed appreciation for the changes made thus far.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Agreed that the primary concern is the center entryway. - Concurred with Holly about making the entry off-center to better fit the neighborhood, as there are no other center-entry buildings in the area. - Noted that center-entry buildings are rare in town and suggested that shifting it to the side would be a simple architectural change. - Mentioned that having a roof covering over the entry is very unusual for the area, creating a new, non-traditional element. - Suggested changing the front door style, as the current one does not seem to relate to the building's style and recommended a one-panel or two-panel door instead.			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Expressed a liking for the design, considering it to look like a little gem. - Believed that the design fits well with the rest of the street. - Commented that the half-round window might appear too big due to the red surround,			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

although it might be proportionally correct.

- Noted that the symmetry is appealing.
- Questioned if the windows on either side of the front door seem a bit low, suggesting that something might be slightly off with their positioning.

MacEachern

- Explained that the first-floor windows were increased in size to reflect historical research, which showed that first-floor windows were often larger than second-floor windows.
- Clarified that the same proportional glass size was used for the first-floor windows to maintain consistency with the second-floor windows.
- Indicated that the goal was to keep the proportional glass size consistent while making the first-floor windows larger, rather than arbitrarily changing the overall width and height dimensions.

Pohl

- Clarified that the concern is about the height of the windows' heads in relation to the frieze piece of the door.
- Noted that the windows seem to be positioned lower, creating the impression that they are sagging.
- Specified that the issue is not with the size of the windows but with how high the heads of the windows are placed.

Paul

- Found the streetscape helpful for evaluating the entryway.
- Considered the center entryway appropriate after seeing the streetscape.
- Noted that while the structure is slightly narrower than the one to the left and significantly narrower than the one to the right, both of those structures have off-center entries.
- Felt that the center entry works well for this structure.
- Recognized that shifting the entry to the side would make the three structures have entryways in the same location, which would feel repetitive.
- Concluded by supporting the application as revised and liking the design as drawn.

Thornewill

- Expressed being on the fence about the entry but leaning towards being okay with it.
- Noted that while the centered and perfectly symmetrical entry feels precious, it can also seem somewhat static.
- Mentioned that the kickback on the back of the building helps to offset the static feeling of perfect symmetry.
- Shared the same feeling as Abby regarding the half-round window, which seemed a little large.
- Concluded by being neutral and not strongly opposed or in favor of the design as it stands.

Pohl

- Agreed with Abby on the half-round window, suggesting it should not be wider than the window below it and ideally should be a little narrower.
- Observed the "sagging windows" and noted that the streetscape emphasizes this issue with a substantial band between the sills of the second-floor windows and the heads of the first-floor windows.
- Recommended raising the head heights of all first-floor windows to address this.
- Noted a minor issue with the entry porch, where the presence of piers under the columns creates an overly vertical appearance.
- Suggested remedying this by having boards go straight across, similar to the adjacent building, to create a more balanced look.

MacEachern

- Stated that they are happy to make all those revisions. They can reduce the half-round window to the suggested dimension, omit the piers on the supporting deck, and raise the first-floor windows by four to six inches.

Motion:

Motion to approve, with Exhibit A, to reduce the half round window on the front elevation to be less wide than the double hung window below it, raise the first floor

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	window heads six inches, and omit the piers on the supporting deck. (Made by: Camp) (03:49:40)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Camp, Paul, Thornewill (Aye)

9. Sayle, Kath	103 Washington St	Additions alterations	55.1.4/37	Topham
Voting:	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Linda Williams			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Recorded that this is Sail Seafood, circa 1975, marking the end of our contributing status there. - Mentioned that the site plan should clearly indicate the total square footage proposed for the addition versus the existing structure. Noted that there was an attempt to show this, but it's not clear. - Questioned the glazing percentage of the facade facing the harbor with the proposed changes, as it might exceed the requirement in "Building with Nantucket in Mind." - Appreciated the changes that the board requested.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Mentioned that corner-to-corner windows generally work downtown where buildings are tightly grouped but are not appropriate in an open space like this. - Granted that if the windows were wrapped around the corner like on an infilled porch, it would make more sense, but currently, there are blank walls on either side. - Suggested eliminating one of the windows on the front lower facade and clustering the remaining windows in the center, with shingles on either side, rather than having windows right up to the side corner boards. - Described the large window or door above as highly unusual, noting that you won't find an opening that size with French doors behind it in historical warehouse-type buildings or large waterfront buildings. - Researched in the NHA archives and found that the largest openings were small, single-panel barn doors, like the one at the Four Winds gift shop building. - Recommended being truer to historical features and types of buildings in that area, where the only visible elements on old buildings are double-hung windows on the second floors. - Concluded that the roof walk is not appropriate for an industrial building in this area, as historical photographs of the waterfront do not show any roof walks.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Acknowledged not having a problem with the previous design but appreciated the changes made. - Suggested removing the roof walk, but aside from that, recognized the design as a significant improvement over the existing structure. - Noted the industrial nature of the area, considering the presence of a big metal box next door. - Concluded that the anomalies in the design are acceptable given that it's an industrial area, not a residential one. Patten - Agreed with Val and appreciated the changes, noting the vast improvement. Oliver - Stated that the roof walk is not appropriate. - Considered the double windows on the second floor inappropriate, noting the lack of a porch or other feature to look out from. - Questioned the fenestration percentage on that elevation, comparing it to what it should be. - Emphasized that this is a fish market and should maintain that appearance, as it has			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	been a fish market since before 1973. - Concluded that the building should not look like a glorified house. Paul - Acknowledged that both this application and the previous one are far superior to what currently exists, which holds merit. - Suggested that the design narrative is of a warehouse building that has undergone various uses over time, currently functioning as a fish market, maintaining its industrial feel. - Justified the oversized fenestration on the center gable and the side, imagining a historical context where items were hoisted into the building, perhaps with a block and tackle above, and the glass front representing a loading dock that was infilled. - Noted that in warehouse building design, function would typically take precedence over form, making the eclectic nature of the structure appropriate. - Considered the building to be greatly improved, with the eclectic elements contributing to its character. - Expressed openness to the inclusion of the roof walk. Welch - Aligned with Joe's comments, noting historical precedents for utilitarian second-story doors that have been infilled. - Mentioned that although such doors are atypical and not commonly found in historical records, they do exist, with the Old Mill being a notable example. - Expressed flexibility regarding the roof walk, neither strongly supporting nor opposing it. - Appreciated the infill of the first-floor windows, reminiscent of a porch being filled in, as requested. - Supported the idea of having a two-width column of glass on the left and right sides of the door to create a balanced look. - Recommended reducing the number of windows to create proportionate column widths, maintaining the same window height but reducing one row. - Highlighted that this change would help complete the story in an authentic way, enhancing the building's historical feel. Paul - Supported Mickey's idea of wrapping the windows around the corner. - Sought clarification to ensure understanding: not adjusting the fenestration on the east elevation but wrapping a similar window around the corner to abut the doors. - Confirmed that this approach gives the sense that the porch wrapped the corner, avoiding a two-dimensional facade on the east.
Motion:	Motion to approve as revised, with windows on the North and South that would continue the fenestration rhythm established on the East elevation, per Exhibit A. (Made by: Coombs) (04:18:3)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Oliver, Patten, Paul (Aye) // Coombs (Nay)

I. NEW BUSINESS 04/02/2024 - VIEW				
1.	Sharp, Jeff	12 W York Ln	Roof Solar	55/99.1 Cotuit Solar
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornewill			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar, Jeff Sharp, Owner			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted for the record that this structure for the solar installation is an infill that was approved within the last couple of years. - Mentioned that this is a revision to a previous approval, which should be annotated as such on the application, but it currently is not, and it needs to be. - Highlighted that the solar panels were not approved on the street side of the south			

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	elevation. • Observed that the tree shown in the photo will not block the view as portrayed. • Suggested that additional plantings could be provided to mitigate the view further. • Emphasized that this is a revision to a previous approval.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group • Agreed with what Holly just said. • Believed that the solar panels are going to be visible. • Expressed uncertainty about where a hedge or trees could be planted to effectively screen the panels from the road.
Commissioner Comments:	Welch • Requested that comments be kept relevant to the legislative act and purview of the committee. • Noted that inappropriate comments could be grounds for contradiction on appeal. • Asked for focus on the appropriateness of the architectural elements relative to the guidelines. Oliver • Observed that this is a very visible roof plane, likely the reason the panels were not initially approved. • Expressed understanding of the desire for maximum energy efficiency but emphasized the importance of maintaining the historic district's integrity. • Addressed Karen, expressing resentment for bringing people in to influence the decision, knowing it is against the policy. • Emphasized the need to adhere to established guidelines and policies despite the potential emotional appeals. Coombs • Emphasized that the left-hand side addition was not approved because it did not adhere to the established rules. • Reiterated the importance of following the rules, as stated by Val. • Addressed Karen, stressing the need to listen to the board's efforts to balance everyone's needs while maintaining compliance with regulations. • Noted that the existing tree will not effectively block the view of the panels. • Stated that any new trees intended to block the view would need to be at least 20 feet tall from the start, not smaller trees that would take years to grow. • Concluded by stating disapproval of the new request. Camp • Agreed that solar panels on the front of the house in the historic district are asking too much. • Reiterated the importance of adhering to the established guidelines. • Recommended sticking with the guidelines to maintain the historic integrity of the district. Welch • Highlighted that the proposed solar panels present a series of disjointed lines that contrast with the roofline valleys, creating a visual distraction. • Described this inconsistency as visual pollution that draws unwanted attention to the eye due to the lack of consistency. • Argued that screening structures in the historic district should not be incentivized, comparing it to the issue of screening pools, which detracts from the essential character of Nantucket. • Emphasized that the visual appreciation and availability of historic homes from the road (public space) to the home (private space) create a human-scale element that is crucial to the character of the area. • Warned that over-screening would result in a loss of this essential character, leading to a landscape dominated by alleyways with trees. • Noted that the district's rules are adopted from the Secretary of the Interior's standards, and that Nantucket offers significant latitude in approving solar installations compared to other historic districts, as confirmed by research from WPI students. • Stressed the importance of maintaining the character of the historic district by

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

	considering how the proposed panels create disjointed lines that contrast with the roof valleys. • Concluded that there is a shared responsibility in preserving the essential character of the historic landmark, which includes maintaining the integrity of its buildings. • Expressed that suggesting one priority (e.g., solar panels) is more important than preserving the historic character is problematic. • Asserted that the Historic District Commission has performed its shared responsibility by providing guidelines that are perhaps more lenient than the national standard and allowing for thoughtful implementation of installations.
Motion:	Motion to deny based upon the rationale as stated by Commissioner Welch. (Made by: Welch) (04:22:32)
Further Discussion:	Mr. Sharpiro • Acknowledged that this discussion has been very helpful for understanding the process better. • Expressed appreciation for the insights provided, which helped in comprehending the findings. • Stated that there is no disagreement with the findings presented.
Vote:	Carried 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

II. NEW BUSINESS 04/02/2024					
1.	Wombat Point LLC	2 Prospect Lane	Window & Foundation Change	55.4.4/3	EMDA
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates:	Patten, Paul, Thornevill				
Recused:	-				
Representative:	Linda Williams				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner • Noted for the record that this is a circa 1830 Greek Revival house built by Aaron Paddock. • Mentioned that some history was sent to Ethan by the NPT. • Initially thought the application was for fenestration changes and had no concerns. • Glad to hear that the application includes foundation work, as the house needs it. • Expressed satisfaction with the owners' desire to do the necessary work. • Stated having no concerns regarding the proposed changes.				
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group • Noted that the main concerns were about reusing the brick. • Stated that if the existing brick is being kept in place and the house is not moving, there are no concerns.				
Commissioner Comments:	Welch • Agreed with the proposal, subject to additional photo documentation for the file.				
Motion:	Motion to approve, as submitted, with photo documentation prior to work. (Made by: Camp) (03:51:56)				
Vote:	Carried 5:0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)				

ALL OTHER ITEMS LISTED ON THE AGENDA WERE NOT DISCUSSED AND NO ACTION WAS TAKEN.

Minutes for April 9, 2024; adopted July 30, 2024

MINUTES	
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver
Documentation:	Draft Minutes.
Motion:	Motion to approve minutes of January 30, 2024. (Made by: Welch) (04:19:16)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye) // Welch (Abstain)

POTENTIAL ITEMS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION
• Discussion on distinguishing between solid and veneer brick on chimneys and foundations. • Discussion of Previously Approved Best Practices. • Classification of street trees & vegetating mapping • Discussion of Wind Turbines • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new Historic dwellings • Hardscaping • Discussion of salvaging demos • Discussion of options for house moves

OTHER BUSINESS
Next HDC Meeting- April 23, 2024, at 4pm *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid

ADJOURNMENT	
Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:28 pm (Made By: Coombs)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ESApB8aWUGk>