



Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 30, 2024

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

Commissioners: Stephen Welch (Chair), Ray Pohl (Vice-chair), Abby Camp, Vallorie Oliver, Angus McLeod

Associate Commissioners: Connie Patten, Carrie Thornewill

Staff: Sara Johnson & Fiona Johnson

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Welch called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.

Staff in Attendance:	Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist; Sara Johnson , Administrative Specialist
Attending Members:	Stephen Welch (Chair), Connie Patten, Abbey Camp, Joe Paul, Abby Camp, Angus MacLeod
Remote Participants:	Ray Pohl (Vice-Chair)
Absent Members:	Val Oliver, Carrie Thornewill

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to approve agenda. (Made by: MacLeod)
Vote	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Patten, Paul, Camp, MacLeod (Aye)

I. DISCUSSION & VOTE

	"Old Business/New Business alternating schedule begins August 5th"
Hold until following week's meeting.	"Value of Written Submissions & Submission Deadlines"

II. CONSENT

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Thank you Aline Nom Trust	3 Wyers Way	Pool rev	41/380	Botticelli& Pohl SW
2. Thank you Aline Nom Trust	3B Wyers Way	Pool rev	41/380.1	Botticelli& Pohl SW
Voting:	Pohl, Patten, Paul, Camp, MacLeod			
Recused:	Ray Pohl			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve consents. (Made by: Paul)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Patten, Paul, Camp, MacLeod (Aye)			

III. OLD BUSINESS 06/18/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. 450 Green Park LLC	2 Stone Alley	Railings	42.3.2/211	Emeritus
Voting:	Welch, Thornewill, Paul, Camp			
Motion:	WITHDRAWN PER APPLICANT 7/29/24			

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Ack Mid Island LLC	18-26 Sparks Ave	Rev Building A	55/231.1	LFW
2. Ack Mid Island LLC	18-26 Sparks Ave	Rev Building B	55/231.1	LFW
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Camp, Paul, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	George Berg			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			

Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Appreciation for changes to dormers, including removing cornerboards, adjusting cheek wall depth, and converting double dormers to single. - Changes improve roof mass visibility and reduce the "top-heavy" look. - Preference for "Option 2" hip dormers, especially for Building B. - Highlighted Building B's visibility from Sparks Avenue and support for differentiation between Buildings A and B through design and color. - Hip dormers on Building B reduce the severity of the cheek wall. - Overall support for the application with hip dormers on Building B. - Acknowledged that the first-floor design, including commercial windows with heavy trim separating the first floor from upper levels, aligns with evolving architectural elements on the west elevation. - Highlighted the addition of a porch running between the gables on the west elevation, contributing to the design's push-and-pull effect. - Agreed with the suggestion to project gables out by 4–6 inches to create shadow lines and enhance visual depth. - Found the west elevation of Building A more successful than the east elevation, where the storefront design wraps around only one or two bays. - Suggested subtle detailing, such as projecting upper gables or flaring shingles slightly, to create shadow lines and improve the design's refinement. - Noted that incorporating a rake overhang is necessary for creating such shadow lines. - Emphasized that as the design progresses and massing adjustments are finalized, the dialogue often shifts to fine details to ensure a cohesive result. - Expressed overall satisfaction with the progress, noting significant improvements and suggesting further refinement of details. - Viewed the discussion on details, such as Steph's rake suggestion, as a positive sign of the project advancing toward a polished design. - Highlighted the consensus favoring hip dormers for Building B and suggested exploring their application across the entire structure. - Recommended viewing a complete rendering of Building B with hip dormers to confirm the design direction and ensure consistency. - Suggested using renderings to evaluate and refine subtle distinctions between the buildings and to incorporate detailed elements that enhance the design. - Praised the "romantic sketch" showcasing the hip dormer concept, describing it as attractive, appropriate, and a promising direction. Camp - Concern expressed that the redesigned dormers appear out of proportion with the roof and continue to draw attention to the height. - Belief that the massing should align more closely with nearby buildings such as House Fitters, CBies, and the auto shop. - Preference for three smaller buildings instead of the current proposal to better match the existing streetscape. - Criticism that the height is excessive and incongruous with the neighborhood, which includes ranch-style houses of smaller scale. - Acknowledged the redesign but maintained that the overall design feels more suitable for the Cape than the current context. - Overall conclusion that the building remains out of scale despite improvements. Patten - Acknowledged the changes and efforts to reduce the size of the dormers, which were a prior concern. - Expressed no strong preference between Option A and Option B but respected Joe's comments on their differences. - Appreciated the variation in colors between the options. - Concluded with positive feedback, stating the design looks good overall. Welch - Reaffirmed previous comments, emphasizing that the current design would not be approved as appropriate for the area if submitted for the first time.
-------------------------------	--

	- Acknowledged the dormer modifications in Option B, which begin to mitigate the oversized appearance of the buildings. - Criticized the design as oversized residential structures inconsistent with Nantucket's commercial identity and massing. - Suggested incorporating more hip roofs or clipped gables to improve appropriateness. - Emphasized the need to address the perception of the structures' large scale and expansive gable planes. - Proposed additional detailing to break up large planes, such as: - Layering elements like a second-floor Garrison-style pop-out. - Recessed windows or other subtle texture and plane variations. - Recommended modifications to improve the visual presentation and align with the surrounding context. - Highlighted the importance of incorporating detailing to break up large masses, using existing facial work over the first-floor window as an example. - Suggested that similar detailing could create focal points and provide relief on the gable visible from Sparks Avenue near the high school. - Recommended adding layered changes to the massive gables for improved visual balance. - Emphasized that modifications are necessary for the design to be approvable. - Declined to propose specific design solutions to avoid unintentionally compromising the project's intent. - Suggested introducing close rakes on the gables to create slight overhangs, adding depth and visual interest. - Criticized the overly simplistic flat fascia currently proposed, noting its lack of depth or shadow lines. - Emphasized the importance of shadow lines in architectural design to provide visual relief and make large structures more appealing. - Used the new school building as an example of a structure lacking visual interest, highlighting its flat facade as out of character for Nantucket commercial buildings. - Stressed that incorporating these elements is vital to achieving a successful and appropriate design. Pohl - Expressed approval of the dormer revisions. - Supported Joe's suggestion to visually differentiate the two buildings by using hip roofs on Structure B and shed dormers on Structure A. - Observed a topographical difference between the property and the nearby Stop and Shop parking lot, which is approximately four feet higher. - Noted that the Stop and Shop building, despite being single-story with dormers, is 30 feet high and comparable in perceived massing impact to the 34-foot-high proposed structure. - Indicated readiness to vote in favor of the proposal, including being the tiebreaking vote if necessary. - Proposed pulling the rakes off the building by 2–3 inches to create shadow lines and enhance the building's visual appeal. - Asserted that this adjustment would significantly improve the design. - Expressed confidence that the suggestion would find agreement among the board members.
Motion:	Motion to hold for detailed revisions to the elevations. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Paul, Patten (Aye)

V. NEW BUSINESS 06/25/2024

1.	23 Sankaty Head Trust	23 Sankaty Head Rd	Demo Garage	48/4.1	BPC
Voting:	Welch, MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Patten				
Alternates:	-				
Recused:	Joe Paul				
Representative:	Joe Paul				
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner, ready by Sarah Johnson - Holly confirmed the structure's date as circa 1982 and classified it as a non-contributing structure.				

	- Suggested that moving the structure would be preferable to demolition.
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Expressed reluctance to approve the removal of a building that appears appropriate without knowing what will replace it. - Emphasized the importance of ensuring any replacement structure is appropriate before allowing the current building to be taken down. MacLeod - Agreed with prior comments about preserving the building. - Preferred moving or reutilizing the structure, potentially incorporating it into any future additions on the property, rather than demolishing it. Pohl - Acknowledged that the building is non-contributing but noted its attractive design. - Pointed out that, if nothing replaces the structure, the area will remain as open space. - Expressed confidence that any replacement structure would undergo appropriate architectural review. - Stated opposition to requiring the future design to be known before approving the demolition of a non-contributing building. - Supported the demolition of the structure. Patten - Expressed a general dislike for building demolitions. - Indicated willingness to approve this demolition.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Made by: Patten)
Vote:	Carried 3-2 // Patten, Pohl, Welch (Aye) MacLeod, Camp (No)

2. Suni & William Harford 60 Wanoma GH color change 92/13 Emeritus

Voting:	Patten, Paul, Pohl, Camp, Pohl
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Matt MacEachern
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Noted that the placement of the stairs appears odd. - Highlighted the standard preference for an 8-foot setback for stairs, suggesting the current design deviates from that norm. Paul - Expressed no concerns about the design due to its lack of visibility from a public way. - Agreed with Abby's comment but emphasized that the visibility impact is effectively zero. Patten - Agrees with the other commissioners.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Patten, Paul, Pohl, Pohl (Aye) Camp (No)

3. Webster Trust 44 Madaket Rd 2nd floor alterations 41/322 CWA

Voting:	Patten, Paul, Pohl, Camp, Welch
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Lucas Fell
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Noted that the changes are limited to the back of the house, with no alterations to the front, which is frequently visible to the public.

	- Expressed a preference for the existing quieter, additive massing but acknowledged that the proposed changes would not be visible. - Indicated support for the proposed changes based on their lack of visibility. Pohl - Stated that the addition is grossly inappropriate in design. - Acknowledged that the addition will not be visible from public view. Paul - Agreed with previous comments about the proposal. - Appreciated that the beautiful front of the house, originally worked on in 1998-1999, remains unchanged. - Acknowledged that the house's footprint is constrained by wetland setbacks, leaving no alternative location for the addition. - Noted that the addition is hidden behind wild vegetation and is not visible from public view. - Concurred that the addition would be inappropriate if visible but expressed support for the proposal given its lack of visibility. Patten - Had nothing further to add to the discussion.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Mady by: Patten)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Patten, Paul, Pohl, Camp, Welch (Aye)

4. Pug Cottage Nom Trust 26 Jefferson Ave New dwelling 30/135.2 Botticelli& Pohl

Voting:	Welch, Camp, Paul, Patten
Alternates:	
Recused:	Ray Pohl
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli, Ray Pohl
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Supported the hip roof design as consistent with the neighborhood. - Appreciated the inclusion of grade information in the elevations. - Noted that the dwelling is located within a 2% flooding FEMA Zone and inquired whether an elevation certificate is required. - Requested the provision of the elevation certificate, if applicable, along with the FMIT map and clear depiction of elevations.
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - No major concerns with the design overall. - Observed that the front door and porch feel underwhelming and could benefit from more emphasis or symmetry. - Suggested considering options to enhance the front door's prominence, such as pulling the porch columns forward a few feet or adding a gable or extra hip to better articulate the front entry. - Recommended adding a chimney to improve the design's character and visual interest.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Found the design appropriate for the area and appreciated the hip roof, noting its resemblance to Bermuda-style architecture. - Commented on the charm of the 12-over-12 windows and suggested retaining them rather than switching to six-over-six. - Proposed addressing any issues with the front door by considering a storm door with a diamond window or a batten door to add Old World charm. Paul - Noted that the front door feels somewhat pedestrian. - Agreed with Abby's suggestion regarding enhancing the front door design. - Suggested considering options to call more attention to the front door, possibly with a hip roof detail. - Found the overall diminutive structure acceptable. - Requested the applicant explore alternative front door options. Patten - Had nothing further to add.

Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

	- Appreciated the simplicity of the design. - Supported the idea of enhancing the front door to give it more prominence. Welch - Appreciated the restraint in the design, describing it as a very charming building. - Expressed enthusiasm for the addition of plank frame trim windows and a small chimney to enhance the charm. - Acknowledged Holly's comments and noted the need to verify any follow-up actions, such as submitting additional information if required.
Motion:	Motion to approve through an Exhibit A with a batten door with a diamond window. (Made by: Camp)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Paul, Patten

5. Tuorto, Gregory & Aileen 20 Midland Ave Addition Reno 59.3/164 Gryphon Architect

Voting:	Camp, Welch, Paul, Patten, Pohl
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Ethan Gryphon
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted the dwelling is a 1972 contributing structure. - Found the shed dormer design appropriate, emphasizing it aligns with Nantucket's architectural style. - Encouraged considering Nantucket context for dormer and window placement. - Confirmed exterior stairs as a consistent and appropriate feature for Madaket.
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Described the revisions as benign and positive. - Appreciated the addition of architectural elements like rafter tails, which enhance the building's character. - Considered the dormers an overall improvement to the structure. Camp - Reviewed the proposal and found no issues. - Expressed approval of the design. Paul - Agreed with Ray's comments. - Considered the revisions an overall improvement. Patten - Had nothing further to add. Welch - Declined to debate details of the design. - Considered it a nice overall design.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Paul)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Paul, Pohl, Patten, Camp, Welch (Aye)

6. Ducks Crossing LLC 32 Easton St Cottage Window door replacement 42.1.4/17 Gryphon Architect

Voting:	Paul, Patten, Camp, Pohl, Welch
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Ethan Gryphon
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Noted that the structure is a circa 1948 contributing property located within the Old Historic District (OHD) boundary and on the water. - Appreciated the inclusion of the property's historic photos in the application. - Emphasized that true divided light (TDL) windows are important for the water and street-facing sides, while simulated divided light (SDL) windows are acceptable elsewhere.

Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

	- Specified that Anderson windows are not suitable. - Mentioned that Carrie had previously identified this for possible consent and noted her belief in the importance of TDL windows, seeking clarification from her.
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Generally approved of the proposed window replacements. - Noted that the current windows are a mix of different styles. - Suggested achieving more consistency in window styles, such as using six-over-six windows where possible, for a cohesive appearance.
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Expressed approval of the application as proposed. - Agreed with Ray's observation that many muntins are obscured from view. - Considered the removal of the triple-track storm windows a net benefit to the design. - Expressed approval of the application. Camp - Okay with the proposed changes. Patten - Indicated approval of the proposal. Pohl - Observed that distinguishing between simulated divided light (SDL) and true divided light (TDL) windows, or even counting the number of lights, is nearly impossible from a modest distance. - Pointed out that the existing windows, many of which are Andersons, are being replaced. - Expressed full support for the application, considering these factors.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Paul)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Paul, Patten, Camp, Pohl, Welch (Aye)

7. Ducks Crossing LLC 32 Easton St MH Window door replacement 42.1.4/17 Gryphon Architect

Voting:	Paul, Patten, Camp, Pohl, Welch
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Ethan Gryphon
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Confirmed the design is a repeat of elements from the main house.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Paul, Patten, Camp, Pohl, Welch (Aye)

8. NOTLIH LLC 55 Burnell Hardscape pool 49.3.2/1.4 LFW

Voting:	Paul, Patten, Pohl, Welch, Camp
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Linda Williams
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Noted that there is insufficient vegetation at the head of the driveway.
Public Comments:	Rob Benchley - Observed that the property is far from the road. - Expressed no objections to the proposal.
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Expressed approval of the proposal. Camp - Reiterated a previous concern about the direct line of sight from the driveway to the back of the pool. - Suggested moving the pool to the left side of the property to avoid a straight view from the

	driveway.
Motion:	Motion to approve with visibility clause. (Made by: Paul)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Paul, Patten, Pohl, Welch (Aye) Camp (No)

9. Patrick Planche	3 Kite Hill Lane	As built fence	42.4.4/64	self
Voting:	Camp, Pohl, Paul, Patten, Welch			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Patrick Planche			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Noted that the property is within the Old Historic District (OHD) and the house dates to 1890 as a contributing structure. - Stated that a 6-foot fence on the property line is not appropriate. - Specified that a white board fence is also not appropriate. - Recommended the fence be natural weathered wood instead.			
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Agreed with Holly that a 6-foot fence on the front property line is not appropriate. - Emphasized that a white fence is especially unsuitable. - Suggested that, if a fence is installed, it should be a very low picket style. Jody Bishop - Highlighted a shared parking area that is very tight for maneuvering vehicles. - Noted previous issues with vehicles backing into illegal posts that were in place for several years. - Described the height and mass of the proposed fence as excessive and visually unappealing. Donna Marie McGrady - Stated that the constructed fence is out of character for the historic district and the street. - Highlighted that the fence does not align with the guidelines in Building with Nantucket in Mind, lacking lattice or post caps typically seen in Nantucket fences. - Described the fence as resembling a wall more than a traditional fence, making it highly visible from the street. - Noted that the fence hinders maneuvering for residents, garbage trucks, and landscapers. - Criticized the lack of plantings or features to soften the fence's appearance. - Raised concerns about the absence of survey stakes for property line verification. - Pointed out an inaccuracy in the view pack, with a portion of the fence bordering a hedge measuring 7 feet, supported by photographic evidence. - Described the fence as egregious, architecturally inappropriate, and in need of a more suitable design solution. Jeff Powers - Expressed concern about the passability of the area for emergency vehicles. - Agreed with previous comments regarding the tight space, especially when cars are parked in the shared parking area. - Highlighted the lack of survey posts as an issue. - Noted witnessing difficulties with maneuverability in the area, reinforcing the concern. Kyle McGrady - Echoed Donna's sentiment regarding the concerns with the fence. - Suggested that the fence be taken down in its current state, pending further consideration. - Reiterated support for Donna's points.			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Described the road as a rural street with significant character, featuring many historic Nantucket houses. - Suggested conducting a site visit to fully understand the context and the impact of the fence. - Emphasized that walking down the street would highlight how egregious and inappropriate the fence is within its surroundings. - Recommended replacing the fence with a privet hedge to better suit the context and alleviate tight spatial concerns. - Highlighted that, in an emergency, a privet hedge can be driven through, unlike a rigid wooden			

	structure. - Reinforced the practicality and appropriateness of using vegetation instead of a solid fence in this situation. Pohl - Emphasized that, regardless of practical concerns such as emergency vehicle access, the fence is fundamentally inappropriate. - Noted that a six-foot-high board fence at the front of a property is rarely, if ever, approved. - Highlighted that such a fence is especially unsuitable within the Old Historic District (OHD). Paul - Supported the idea of conducting a site visit to gain firsthand knowledge of the situation, noting it would benefit both the applicant and concerned parties. - Acknowledged Ray's comment but emphasized the importance of a view to fully assess the context. - Observed that while some white-painted elements on the house, like skirtboards, seem sensible, a six-foot-tall white fence is not practical. - Noted that maintaining the proposed fence would likely be a recurring issue. - Suggested vegetation as a more suitable solution than a fence. Patten - Opposed the height of the fence and its white paint from the outset. - Brought the matter before the commission due to these concerns. - Reiterated opposition to both the height and the white color of the fence. Welch - Open to conducting another site visit and walking down the area for further assessment. - Stated that the proposed fence is inappropriate as designed. - Suggested a more typical approach, such as a 42-inch Type II picket fence with privet or evergreen material behind it for privacy. - Noted that any visible fence should have vegetative screening on the interior to create a softer, more traditional appearance.
Motion:	Motion to hold for a view until the following Tuesday (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	No vote.

10. Patrick Planche	3 Kite Hill Lane	Deck	42.4.4/64	self
Voting:	Camp, Pohl, Paul, Patten, Welch			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Motion to hold for a view until the following Tuesday (Made by: Welch)			
Vote:	No vote.			

VI. OLD BUSINESS 07/02/2024

1. George Metri	12 Angola St	Driveway Curb cut	55.4.4/78	KMLD
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Paul, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Katie Mitchell			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Noted that the driveway is wider than necessary for a one-car width, suggesting it should be approximately 12 feet wide, with some flexibility.			

	- Pointed out an inconsistency between the site plan and the elevation: the site plan shows the garage overlapping with the house stoop, while the elevation shows the garage shifted back by three to four feet. - Questioned the difference in garage placement between the two representations and sought clarification.
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Stated that the elevations on the last page correctly show the garage and secondary dwelling unit shifted further back from Angola. - Highlighted a discrepancy between the site plan and the elevations, noting that the garage footprint on the site plan does not align with the shift shown in the elevations. - Clarified that, based on the elevations, the face of the garage would align with the rear edge of the stoop parallel to Angola, resulting in a longer driveway. - Recommended narrowing the driveway to better suit the context. - Preferred the driveway to be cobblestone, possibly incorporating grass for added character. - Expressed no other concerns. - Suggested narrowing the brick driveway to a 12-foot width for better proportionality. - Found the cobblestone strip in the center too decorative and unnecessary. - Proposed creating a cobblestone and grass pull-off area on the right to provide parking for two cars in a less formal manner. - Emphasized that a slightly less formal design would be more appropriate for this location. - Supported thinning the driveway, adjusting the apron accordingly, and incorporating the cobblestone pull-off on the right side for a more organic and context-appropriate approach. Paul - Expressed willingness to approve the proposal with a corrected site plan. - Suggested aligning the site plan with the third elevation. - Recommended narrowing the driveway by 12 inches on each side, reducing the total width by 2 feet. - Expressed willingness to approve the proposal with a corrected site plan. - Suggested aligning the site plan with the third elevation. - Recommended narrowing the driveway by 12 inches on each side, reducing the total width by 2 feet. Patten - Had nothing further to add. - Supported the proposal to reduce the driveway width by 12 inches on each Pohl - Observed that the driveway is too narrow for two cars but excessively wide for one car. - Agreed with Joe's suggestion to narrow the driveway by one foot on each side. - Supported keeping all other aspects of the design unchanged.
Motion:	Motion to approve with an Exhibit A (Made by: Paul)
Vote:	4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Paul, Patten (Aye)

2. Power Landscaping Inc 21 Clarendon St Solar roof Main House 76.1.3/106 Normand Res

Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, Patten, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Tobias Glidden
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Noted that the solar panels are installed on the front-facing roof of the main house, which is not a black roof, making them 100% visible. - Highlighted that this visibility runs counter to many solar guidelines. - Wished that the nearby Leland trees were taller to provide better screening, acknowledging that they may grow to offer coverage in the future but do not currently. Camp

	- Approved of the solar panels being installed on the back of the house. - Opposed their placement on the front-facing roof. Paul - Noted a nearby town-owned property on Dartmouth with highly visible solar panels, which is acceptable in the area. - Acknowledged existing guidelines discouraging solar panels on front-facing roofs but found the proposed placement sufficiently screened for the lot size. - Recognized precedent for visible solar panels in the neighborhood. - Expressed support for the proposal as submitted, including front-facing solar panels. Patten - Agreed with allowing solar panels on the back of the house. - Opposed the placement of solar panels on the front-facing roof. Welch - Expressed concern about the view from Clarendon past the parking area, emphasizing the importance of maintaining the area's character. - Highlighted the potential issue of tall Cypress trees altering the streetscape, leading to a significant change in the neighborhood's feel. - Supported solar panels on the back of the house as they align with current guidelines. - Proposed planting a deciduous tree along the driveway to provide screening for the front of the structure, instead of relying solely on tall Cypress trees. - Suggested limiting the height of Cypress trees to avoid creating a dense, green alleyway. - Encouraged diversity in landscaping and the addition of vegetative architectural elements to enhance the overall appearance.
Motion:	Motion to approve through an Exhibit A (Made by: Camp)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, Patten, Paul (Aye) Patten (No)

3. Third Point Holdings	39 Quaise	Garage	26/3	Smith and Hutton
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Jennifer Smith			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Expressed a preference for the previous design but acknowledged and appreciated the restraint in the current approach. - Confirmed that the proposed doors would be painted white. - Expressed concern about the choice of white-painted doors, as it would draw attention to the back of the structure. - Suggested that board-and-batten green doors might be more appropriate for the context. - Noted that the white-painted doors represent a significant change that may not align with the surrounding aesthetic. Paul - Expressed no concerns about the proposal. Patten - Noted curiosity about the door, particularly its designation as painted white, which caused some confusion. - Had nothing further to add to the discussion. Pohl - Expressed a concern specifically about the white garage doors. - Preferred the garage doors be painted in a color like Essex Green or another non-white option.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with the garage doors being platinum grey of something similar. (Made by: Paul)			
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Thornewill, Paul (Aye)			

Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

4. Third Point Holdings	39 Quaise	New dwelling	26/3	Smith and Hutton
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Described the existing house as lacking personality, noting features such as plain windows and a porch with unnecessary railing. - Criticized the dormers for feeling unfenestrated. - Appreciated the proposed changes, including the addition of two-over-two windows, which introduce a farmhouse vernacular to the design. - Supported the transition away from the unattractive gambrel roof, finding the changes significant but an overall improvement. - Initially reacted positively to the presentation, noting that the elevations feel like a net improvement. Welch - South elevation is appropriate and well-executed. - North elevation feels over-penetrated; suggested downsizing the B3 triple windows on the first floor by ~20%. - Recommended a shingle wall rail with a white cap on the second-floor North elevation to reduce visual busyness. - Suggested these changes would improve balance and appropriateness, especially for the ocean-facing side. Patten - Had nothing further to add. - Considered the proposal an overall improvement. Pohl - Fully agreed with Stephen's suggestion to replace white-painted rails on the second floor with shingle rails, noting it would create a calmer and less imposing appearance. - Questioned the visibility of the triple windows on the first floor, considering the house's location on a bluff. - Acknowledged that visibility might require being out in the harbor for a clear view.			
Motion:	Motion to approve through an Exhibit A. (Made by: Paul)			
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Paul (Aye)			

5. Shawn Bristow	31 Exeter St	Addition	76.4.2/285	Shawn Bristow
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Welch, Paul			
Alternates:	Patten			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Shawn Bristow			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
- Commissioner Comments:	Welch - Described the existing structure as a commercial design and noted the proposed structure feels more "frenetic," resembling a growing family home. - Acknowledged that in the Tom Nevers area, visibility is limited, with only the second floor and roof masses likely to be seen. - Mentioned concerns about design elements such as the expansive lattice on the west elevation, the tall chimney starting from the first floor, and the "rocket ship" style small bay, but concluded these elements are unlikely to be visible. - Supported the proposal as presented, citing limited visibility from public vantage points. Paul			

	- Agreed with Stephen's comments and acknowledged a previous misunderstanding about the property's orientation. - Noted that if the building were oriented orthogonally to Exeter Street, there would be concerns about visibility. - Highlighted that the current angle effectively hides the least approvable aspects, such as the deck, stair, and rear massing, which do not align with typical additive massing principles. - Emphasized that the lack of visibility and the density in Tom Nevers reduce concerns about these design elements. - Stated that the elevation facing the road is an improvement over the existing structure. - Considered the proposal acceptable due to mitigating factors. Patten - Had no additional comments. - Found the north elevation, which is most visible, to be acceptable. - Approved of the other elevations, citing lack of visibility as a key mitigating factor. - Noted that if the structure were oriented differently, there would be significant concerns about the addition on the east elevation. Pohl - Agreed with the shared view that the addition is not entirely ideal but is acceptable due to its lack of visibility.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Welch, Paul (Aye)

6. 3 Pleasant St Nom Trust 3 Pleasant St Addition 42.3.3/155 Emeritus	
Voting:	Camp (Chair), Patten, Paul
Alternates:	Patten
Recused:	-
Representative:	Matt MacEachern
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Felt the design is improving but recommended reducing the plate height by another foot to address the structure's overall height. - Noted the windows in the addition feel tightly packed in the middle and suggested spreading them out. - Recommended changing the windows to 12-over-12 to better match the front of the house and fill the space more effectively. - Advised simplifying and modifying the three French doors, as they are likely to be visible and currently appear inappropriate. - Supported retaining the porch roof on the addition, as it helped break up the massing and worked well in the previous design.
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Agreed that the gable end was determined to have limited visibility, with prior changes made, including removing a bracket and altering the doors to include panels below. - Expressed approval of the current gable elevation design. - Found the porch to feel out of place on the simple house, as it introduces a foreign element and would necessitate doors, which might compromise the simplicity. - Noted the iterative design process, highlighting that the dormers were removed, the structure's height was reduced, and windows were split apart as requested. - Concluded that the current design reflects the adjustments requested throughout the process and feels appropriate. Patten - Indicated approval of the current proposal. Camp - Suggested pulling the additive mass on the right in by a couple of feet to improve proportion. - Agreed with Joe's recommendation to spread out the windows in a more traditional and evenly spaced manner.

Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

	- Acknowledged limited visibility of the side and back of the house, focusing concerns primarily on the view from Pleasant Street. - Confirmed that the massing is subordinate to the main structure but suggested refining it further with these adjustments. - Expressed potential approval if the additive mass and window spacing were revised accordingly.
Motion:	Motion to approve through an Exhibit A (Made by: Paul)
Vote:	Carried 3-0 // Patten, Paul, Camp (Aye)

7. 111 OSR LLC	111B Old South Rd	Mixed use structure	68/167	Emeritus
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Patten			
Alternates:	Thornewill, Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matt MacEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Liked the idea of the hip roof but felt it was not prominent enough, appearing as if a small section was removed. - Found the simpler gable-forward design acceptable. - Considered whether the second-floor boards should remain or be replaced with shingles but was undecided, preferring to hear others' opinions. - Thought the proposed cupola seemed slightly large but liked its presence, as it helps break up the long roof expanse. - Confirmed that the sash is black and the trim is natural, with no white paint in the design. - Expressed general approval of the proposal. Pohl - Shared similar thoughts as Abby regarding the vertical board on the second floor, finding it more aggressive than shingles, especially on a large building. - Suggested reducing the size of the cupola further, if possible, acknowledging that it has already been reduced but not perceiving a significant difference. Patten - Expressed approval of the proposal as it stands. MacLeod - Agreed with previous comments. - Appreciated the modifications made to the design. Welch - Appreciated the changes to the roofline, the addition of secondary massing, and the building's rotation. - Noted that the north gable now faces Old South Road, making the clipped gable more significant. - Suggested lowering the clipped gable by 6 inches to enhance its impact. - Found the vertical board siding acceptable but inquired about the intended board width. - Confirmed that the representation appears closer to 1x12, which helps make the structure look smaller. - Agreed that narrower boards (1x6 or 1x8) would create a more aggressive vertical appearance.			
Motion:	Motion to approve through an Exhibit A (Made by: MacLeod)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Patten (Aye)			

8. Cohen Steven L TR c/o Area 51 Tr	51 W Miacomet	Pool hardscape	81/52	Ahern LLC
Voting:	Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Patten			
Alternates:	Paul			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			

Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Held due to a lack of a full board.
Vote:	-

VII. NEW BUSINESS 07/09/2024

1. Off Shore Development	6 Tautemo Way	New Dwelling	85/19	Concept Design
Voting:	Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Pohl, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Steve Boukus			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Requested a site plan with contour lines to clarify grading changes. - Noted that the grade shifts in multiple directions, requiring better visualization. - Highlighted that elevations appear flat, but some cut and fill adjustments are occurring. - Emphasized the need for grading details to fully understand site conditions. - Found the front elevation simple and appropriate, with significant upper-floor visibility. - Was pleasantly surprised that the west elevation is not overly fenestrated and lacks excessive second-floor decks. - Noted the presence of "upside-down" houses nearby and an eclectic architectural context. - Recognized that cottages become smaller toward the water but noted that adjacent structures are relatively tall. - Suggested providing context photos for a clearer understanding. - Found the farmhouse vernacular appropriate but recommended varying the eave heights between the central mass and flanking wings to avoid a linear appearance in elevation. - Observed that the east elevation's continuous eaves create a problematic linear effect, while the west elevation benefits from gabled elements. - Appreciated the use of natural materials and the subdued color palette, including black sash windows. Pohl - Agreed with Joe's comments, particularly regarding the need for existing and proposed contour lines to show how the flat building site is being created. - Supported lowering the eaves on the two side wings to differentiate them from the main mass. - Noted concern about the south elevation's long, wide flush dormer with three windows centered, leaving large blank spaces on either side, suggesting revisions for better balance. - Recommended integrating the window heads with the eave, removing the visible shingle course above dormer windows for a cleaner look. MacLeod - Agreed with previous comments from Joe and others. - Appreciated the rural character of the area and the choice to eliminate corner boards and use natural colors. - Suggested incorporating more additive massing, as the current volumes feel too similar in size. - Acknowledged the staggering of volumes but recommended greater variation in their heights for improved visual interest. Camp - Agreed with previous comments about pushing the windows up into the fascia strip, if applicable. - Acknowledged that the structure feels boxy after Angus's observation, despite being well-proportioned. - Suggested lowering the heights of the additive masses to enhance visual push and pull. - Found the design exciting and appropriate for the rural character of the area. - Appreciated the decision to retain existing vegetation around the pool and emphasized the importance of maintaining it in perpetuity. Welch			

Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

	- Agreed with all previous comments. - Emphasized the importance of lowering the top plates of the wings from the front. - Suggested extending the height reduction around to the south and west elevations, particularly where the addition is located. - Noted that all secondary structure elements currently share the same top plate height, making the massing feel excessive. - Recommended varying the heights to improve overall composition and hierarchy. - Supported Angus's comment about incorporating more additive massing. - Noted that their own comment aligns with this idea but would welcome even more refinement in that direction.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Pohl, Paul (Aye)

2. Off Shore Development 6 Tautemo Way Cabana 85/19 Concept Design

Voting:	Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Pohl, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	-
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Had no objections to the cabana. - Requested a topographic plan for both the pool and cabana to assess them accurately. - Emphasized the need for this information before providing a final opinion.
Motion:	Motion to track with the New Dwelling. (Madey by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Pohl, Paul (Aye)

3. Off Shore Development 6 Tautemo Way Pool 85/19 Concept Design

Voting:	Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Pohl, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	-
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Noted the lack of information regarding the coping, terrace, and surrounding details. - Pointed out that the pool is currently represented as just a rectangle. - Requested additional information on these elements for a more informed review.
Motion:	Motion to track with the New Dwelling. (Madey by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Pohl, Paul (Aye)

4. Giles Gregory 48 York St Addition 55.4.1/55 Link

Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul, Patten
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	-
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	Micky Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Noted that the neighboring house also has a gambrel roof, making two in a row, which may overrepresent this roof style given that only about 1% of Nantucket houses are gambrels. - Suggested that a gable roof could work just as well as a gambrel in this context. - Pointed out that the 8-foot (or possibly smaller) addition to the east is flush with the front of

Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

	the house, disrupting the traditional five-bay format by stretching it to six bays. - Recommended setting the addition back to preserve the five-bay facade and shorten the ridge, which currently feels too long. - Found the rear shed dormer highly visible and overly long, suggesting it be broken up for better proportion.
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Fully agreed with Mickey's comments. - Clarified that the objection is not to the gambrel's proportions but to the fact that there is already a similar gambrel roof next door. Paul - Found the gambrel roof well-proportioned when viewed from the side. - Requested to see more context before forming a final opinion. - Respected the perspectives of Mickey and fellow board members and withheld further comments pending potential massing changes. - Agreed that an addition flush with the main facade, which lengthens the structure, is inappropriate. - Suggested that moving away from the gambrel roof design would likely gain more support. - Noted that the gambrel is visible in one of the aerial images. - Planned to conduct a personal site visit to assess the context further. Patten - Agreed with previous comments; nothing further to add. Welch - Found the gambrel roof form potentially acceptable but noted proportion issues, particularly with the first floor's height, making the structure feel top-heavy. - Suggested that for proper proportions, the top plate of the gambrel should sit on the first-floor rafters, as the current design makes the lower chords of the gambrel roof appear disproportionately long. - Identified a possible drafting inconsistency in the dormer roofline, where the South elevation suggests a break in the roof plane that is not indicated in the side elevations. - Suggested either extending the gambrel roof seamlessly into the dormer or lowering the dormer roof to align with the fascia but noted that the current dormer design is too long to be successful. - Recommended breaking the dormer into two separate dormers for better proportion. Emphasized the structure's extreme visibility in a highly trafficked location, making it critical for the design to be carefully considered and sensitive to its surroundings. - Stated that the structure's character must be preserved and modified thoughtfully to ensure a successful outcome.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Paul)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul, Patten (Aye)

5. Orenstein/ Amy Ted	5 Crows Nest Way	Pool	12/22.2	Robert Newman
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Patten, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Robert Newman			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Believed there would be limited to no visibility of the structure. - Supported the proposal with the standard visibility-related conditions. - Expressed approval of the design. MacLeod - Agreed with the previous comment. Patten - Approved the proposal with the standard caveat regarding visibility. Paul			

	- Expressed approval of the proposal. Welch - Expressed an unspecified concern about the proposal but was unable to pinpoint the exact issue.
Motion:	Motion to approve with the proviso that the pool is not to be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, MacLeod, Patten, Paul (Aye) Welch (No)

6. Blaney, Bernard	6 Marion Ave	Pool hardscape	82/137	Ryan Blaney
Voting:	MacLeod, Camp, Welch, Pohl, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Ryan Blaney			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	MacLeod - Noted that pools are typically placed in the backyard rather than beside the structure. - Confirmed that the proposed pool is located to the right of the house rather than behind it. - Acknowledged that layered plantings provide some screening, which helps ease concerns. - Expressed unease about the pool's siting, feeling that something about the placement does not seem quite right. Camp - Emphasized the openness and natural character of the landscape. - Noted the ongoing struggle with pool approvals in this area over the years. - Highlighted that screening the pool would require introducing new vegetation, altering the existing landscape. - Opposed the installation of a pool in this location due to its impact on the natural setting. Pohl - Agreed with previous comments opposing the pool in this area. - Noted that multiple pool applications have been reviewed for this location, and a recurring issue is the inappropriate use of privet hedges for screening. - Identified problems with privet hedges, including being unsuitable for the outwash plain, overly formal, deciduous, and ineffective unless excessively tall. - Pointed out that unless screening is 6-7 feet high (which is inappropriate for the area), the pool would remain visible. - Suggested a more naturalized, full landscape approach rather than an expansive lawn with a pool in the middle. Patten - Had nothing further to add. - Agreed with previous comments. - Expressed concern that adding a pool would significantly alter the open landscape of the area. Welch - Agreed with all previous comments. - Stated that the proposed perimeter planting is inappropriate as designed. - Suggested that any necessary screening should be placed closer to the pool, be more naturalized, and have greater depth between the pool and the street. - Stressed the need for a complete application showing how the proposed pool and landscaping relate to the existing site, especially if a house is not yet constructed. - Allowed for some flexibility with the driveway as long as it does not interfere with planned landscaping or the pool location. - Emphasized the importance of distinguishing between existing and proposed elements on the same plan. - Suggested that revisions should include reconfiguring the house's orientation to bring the pool in tighter or simply adjusting the pool's placement for a more appropriate layout. - Noted that the landscape layout gives the impression of two lots, though it is likely one.			

Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions and more information. (Made by: Camp)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // MacLeod, Camp, Welch, Pohl, Patten (Aye)

7. NHA Properties Inc 7C Surfside Solar Rooftop 55/254 Ack Smart

Voting:	MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Welch, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Tobias Glidden
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	MacLeod - Typically considers solar panels best oriented south and west for efficiency. - Noted that the west-facing panels are positioned away from the road, making sense visually. - Acknowledged that existing trees provide natural justification for the chosen placement. Camp - Agreed with the reasoning provided for the solar panel placement. Pohl - Agreed with the reasoning provided for the solar panel placement. Paul - Agreed with the reasoning provided for the solar panel placement. Welch - Agreed with the reasoning provided for the solar panel placement.
Motion:	Motion to approve subject to shifting the panels to the farthest left possible facing from Surfside. (Made by: MacLeod)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Welch, Paul (Aye)

8. NHA Properties Inc 7D Surfside Solar Rooftop 55/254 Ack Smart

Voting:	MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Welch, Paul
Alternates:	-
Recused:	-
Representative:	Tobias Glidden
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - No concerns. Pohl - No concerns. Paul - No concerns. MacLeod - Noted that once the solar panels fully cover the roof, they will become less noticeable. Welch - No concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve to split the run of eight in half and push to the eaves on either side. (Made by: MacLeod)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Welch, Paul (Aye)

9. 102 Wauwinet Road Trust 102 Wauwinet Rd Historic Determination 11/24.2 Botticelli & Pohl

Voting:	Camp, Paul, MacLeod, Welch
Alternates:	-
Recused:	Pohl
Representative:	Ray Pohl

Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	-
Motion:	Motion to hold for the historic determination letter. (Made by: Camp)
Vote:	Carried 4-0 // Camp, Paul, MacLeod, Welch (Aye)

10. 14 Hussey St LLC	14 Hussey St	Front door color change	42.3.4/132	Olson Twombly
Voting:	-			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Applicant not in attendance.			
Vote:	-			

11. Family Ties Ack LLC	11 Alliance Ln	Rev 8521 cottage	39/24.1	Studio Park
Voting:	-			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	-			
Motion:	Applicant not in attendance.			
Vote:	-			

12. Carl Jelleme	29 Quaise Rd	Add Roof inset deck	26/8	MCA
Voting:	MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Patten, Welch			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Doug Mills			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - No concerns. Patten - No concerns. MacLeod - No concerns. Camp - No concerns. Welch - No concerns.			
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: MacLeod)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Patten, Welch (Aye)			

Minutes for July 30, 2024; Adopted March 18, 2025

Voting:	Pohl, Camp, Paul, MacLeod, Welch
Motion:	Motion to approve April 9, 2024 minutes. (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 3-2 // Pohl, Camp, Paul (Aye) MacLeod, Welch (Abstaining)

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn. (Mady by: MacLeod)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // MacLeod, Camp, Paul, Pohl, Welch (Aye)

YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eCbnE0uhrvw>