

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



REGULAR MEETING

August 13, 2024

**Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road &
Remote Participation via Zoom
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov**

Pursuant to MGL Chapter 30A, § 18-25 All meeting notices & agendas must be filed, & time stamped with the Town Clerk's Office & posted at least 48 hours prior to the meeting (excluding Saturdays, Sundays & Holidays)

Commissioners: Stephen Welch (Chair), Ray Pohl (Vice-Chair), Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod and Joe Paul

Associate Commissioners: Carrie Thornewill, Constance Patten, and Joe Paul

Staff: Holly Backus, Fiona Johnson, and Sara Johnson

Building with Nantucket in Mind 1992 & Building with Sconset in Mind- Sconset Trust

<https://nantucket-ma.gov/537/Building-With-Nantucket-In-Mind>

AGENDA

Called to order: Chair Welch called the meeting to order at 4:03pm.

Chair Welch announced that the meeting was being recorded for the Town's YouTube channel. Attendees are reminded to be mindful of what they say or display. Participants were also asked to direct their comments through the Chair after being recognized, to maintain order and help with accurate minute-taking.

Adoption of Agenda: MOTION/VOTE: MacLeod made a motion to approve agenda and the motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Roll Call Vote: MacLeod (Aye) *Commissioner*, Camp (Aye) *Commissioner*, Oliver (Aye) *Commissioner*, Pohl (Aye) *Commissioner (remote participation)*, Paul (Aye) *(remote participation) Associate Commissioner*, and Chair Welch (Aye) *Commissioner*

I. COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

- "Value of Written Submission & Submission Deadlines"

Discussion: The Board agreed to skip item one to move things along. Proceeded to the "Consent" agenda items.

II. CONSENT

1. Greg Coffee	1 Lowell Place	Renew COA #62928 MH	41/858	NAG	JP
2. Greg Coffee	1 Lowell Place	Renew COA #62671 Move off /demo	41/858	NAG	JP

Discussion: Chair Welch asked if anyone needed to recuse themselves (no one did).

MOTION/VOTE: Oliver made a motion to approve the consent agenda items listed above and the motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Roll Call Vote: Oliver (Aye), Camp (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Pohl, (Aye), Chair Welch (Aye)

I. NEW BUSINESS 07/09/2024 – FROM LAST WEEK

1. Sam & Craig Cordts Pearce 76 Pleasant St Front Dwelling addition 55/367 Sanne Payne

- *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Patten; - Last heard August 6, 2024*

Representing: Sanne Payne

Discussion: Chair Welch – Previously requested revisions to the drawings.

Payne - Reviewed updated plans. Front Dwelling – The chimney was moved inside to the north end as requested, a second door was removed and replaced with two windows and the addition's size reduced slightly.

Backus – This is a Circa 1850 Greek Revival one and half Story 5 bay. Changes were appreciated however recommended raising the window and door headers into the eve, eliminate shingle course for all three elevations, and possibly relocating the second door to another elevation if possible. Also, new chimney should have corbeled detail consistent with the “*Building with Nantucket in Mind*” and requested a floor plan for a proposal basement. Brosco ADL not appropriate. If any windows being proposed for changes need window survey.

Chair Welch - Confirming who is sitting on this application, Chair Welch, Camp, MacLeod, Pohl and Patten.

Representing the Historic Structures Advisory Group: Mickey Rowland, Jason Finger, Mary Bergman, Marsha Fader, Sandy Kendall and Diane Coombs reviewed design updates. They suggested French door facing street should have kick panel and be a 12-light or 9-light door, rather than a full-pane French door. Recommended pulling the new North windows (on either side of the chimney) closer together if possible. All windows seem to be replaced and advised having a survey to assess the condition of the old windows. Discourage using Andersen windows. Front door should be verified if replacement is necessary, if not it should be reused or restored.

Pohl – Agrees with Backus and Rowland's comments. Suggested eliminating the shingle course between the Window and the eave, which seems easy to do. Noticed the window schedule mentions Brasco windows, however, didn't see any indication of SDL (Simulated Divided Lights) versus TDL (True Divided Lights). After clarifying its single pane, thinks that's fine for the new construction however supports Rowland's recommendation for the existing structure. If plan to replace old windows, advice doing an inventory to assess their age and condition.

Patten – North elevation windows could be pulled in a bit for aesthetic reasons however had nothing else to add.

MacLeod – Agreed with the earlier points and suggested the door facing Pleasant Street would be better placed on the side, making it less noticeable. If a door must be there, it should have less glass and look less like French door, maybe with a panel and four lights.

Camp – Opposed the French door on the new addition, suggesting two windows instead, and corbelling on the chimney.

Chair Welch - Supported replacing the windows, if they are Brasco TDL (True Divide Lights). If have window wells or stair wells must have window schedule. French door should include a bottom panel for a more traditional look. Corbeling on the chimney would be appropriate. Lastly, raise the window headers to align more closely with the top plate of the walls. There was a brief discussion to making changes to the building plan, such as moving the window header to the top plate of the walls to reduce the space between them. The Commissioners discussed creating an “Exhibit A” subject to a window schedule from a survey available on HDC website. Pohl favored a “four light door”, which is seen as a conservative option. The Commissioners agreed to move the process forward quickly.

MOTION/VOTE: Patten made a motion to approve subject to an “Exhibit A” and a window survey and the motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Roll Call Vote: Patten (Aye), Pohl (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Camp (Aye), and Chair Welch (Aye)

2. Sam & Craig Cordts Pearce	76 Pleasant St	New Dwelling in rear	55/367	Sanne Payne
------------------------------	----------------	----------------------	--------	-------------

- *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Patten; Last heard August 6, 2024*

Representing: Sanne Payne

Discussion: Chair Welch – Sent an email through Backus to Payne explaining that there are some issues with the current drawings. The smaller gable is missing, and the chimney isn't accurately shown where it should straddle the ridge. There's missing profile of the dormers on the front and side. The Commissioners has two options, either hold off until next week to fix these details or provide feedback now and decide whether to approve the project today.

Pohl – There's a key concern with the building that should be shared now to help the applicant, to make the necessary revisions which will allow her to move forward.

Chair Welch - Asked the Commissioners how they want to proceed (no issues from the Commissioners). Payne was asked to explain the changes she made and walk through the elevations, recap the main concerns to make sure everyone understands it clearly.

Payne – Walks through the changes made to the elevations. Breaking up the ridge, improving window symmetry, lowering parts of the roof and shrinking the roof walk. Outlines specific changes made to each elevation and stressed the need to correct the chimney's direction.

Backus - The adjustments to the design help however the L off the front secondary mass appears strange, unsure if it was mentioned, thinks it would be a small gable instead of a shed, the addition of flush shed dormers on the façade which is on the West not shown on the profile of the North and the South respectively, the East which is the rear does not show the flanking secondary mass and the chimney corbelling should follow with *Building with Nantucket in Mind* or look at Historic structure on the lot. Wanted to confirm what the windows are in the OHD (Old Historic District). Points out that the streetscape was not included in the revisions (**Payne** – Said streetscape was submitted). If not scanned would not be in the pdf.

Rowland (Historic Structures Advisory Group) – Pointed out a few remaining drawing errors. Street view needs to be provided and the long projecting shed on the west elevation looks awkward. A gable roof might help however the shed's length is still an issue. On the left side, the plate height should gradually decrease instead of going up and down. The second-floor windows on the north and south should be spaced apart. The roof walk is too wide and adds unnecessary height, and suggest it be removed. Recommends that the building should be a story and a half, not two stories, to better match the main house and surround buildings.

Pohl - Agrees with Rowland's concerns, stressing that the surrounding neighborhood features well-proportioned story and a Half buildings. The current design is a full two-story structure with too much wall compared to the roof, creating a narrow and tall appearance. Suggest changing this to better match the neighborhood.

Camp – Agrees, stating the design doesn't fit well with the smaller house in front. Suggest a one and a half story design, possibly with a saltbox or telescoping structure, to better match the style. Feels other details are less important if this main issue is addressed.

MacLeod – Agrees with the previous comments however adds that the west elevation is designed as if it's facing the street, even though it's just 10 feet from the back of the main house. Suggest reorienting the building to better align with one of the Streets, like Camelia Lane. The current design looks like a separate house, not a guest house. Figure out orientation of house. Agrees that the second story should be a story and a half, narrower buildings need lower roofs to avoid looking too tall and vertical.

Patten – Nothing else to add then what's already been said.

The Commissioners agreed to have the applicant bring these corrections back with the next round of revisions. There were more drawing errors still need to be addressed.

MOTION/VOTE: Camp made a motion to hold for revisions and the motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Roll Call Vote: Camp (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Pohl (Aye), Patten (Aye), and Chair Welch (Aye)

IV. OLD BUSINESS 07/02/2024

1. Cohen Steven L TR c/o Area 51 Tr 51 W Miacomet Pool hardscape 81/52 Ahern LLC

• *Commissioners: Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill and Patten; Alt: Paul- Last heard June 18, 2024*

Representing: Mirka Ahern from Ahern LLC

Discussion: Main concerns visibility and aesthetics of the handrail and the potential glow from lighting.

Mirka – pool itself is minimally visible from the street, with photos showing that the railing and other structures would be hard to see. Suggested using ‘turtle glass’, a special type of glass that limits glow and reflection.

Thornewill – likes use of “turtle glass and likes the natural weather modern fence.

Patten – Agrees with Thornewill’s comments. Had no other concerns.

Oliver – Felt that the fence looked odd, looks like a solid wall. Asked if wall going to be just concrete (**Mirka** – yes, parched) or blinds and prefers something more transparent.

Camp – Prefers posts and wires.

Mirka – Prefers the steel posts because they blend better with the surroundings. The local vegetation like blueberry bushes and grass that turn reddish in the fall.

Chair Welch – The rail is seen as atypical however acceptable due to its limited visibility, although a wire option might be preferable since it would be less noticeable. Turtle glass makes a huge difference. Suggested to approve the project on a test case basis, to avoid a lot of similar structures appearing before seeing how it looks in practice. Questioned the accuracy of color renderings (**Mirka** - clarified that these are more for massing). Asked what the consensus.

Oliver – No all around, pool was fine however the rest.

There was a split opinion on whether to use a solid rail or wire, however the wire option seemed to have more support because it would mask light better. It was agreed that the well area must use. The glass on the house application should be turtle glass and this will need to be coordinated. The rail should be modified to use Corten steel wire and posts. The wells approval is contingent upon using turtle glass and the rail should use Corten steel wire and posts.

MOTION/VOTE: Camp made a motion to change the wooden safety fence to a design using Corten steel posts and wire rail. (Corten steel, which develops a protective rust layer however doesn’t continue rusting), with turtle glass as a condition for the well installation. Approved based on limited visibility and it’s treated as a test case to see how the project works. If the well becomes visible from the road, vegetation will need to be added to hide it, making sure it’s not visible during inspection, as Exhibit A. The motion passed with 3 in favor and 2 opposed. Camp (Aye), Patten (Aye) and Chair Welch (Aye). Oliver (Nay) and Thornewill (Nay).

V. OLD BUSINESS 07 16/2024 - VIEW

1. Dan Driscoll 15 Madaket Rd Solar Roof 41/299.3 AckSmart

- *Commissioners: Pohl, Welch, MacLeod, Camp and Oliver- Last heard June 11, 2024*

Pohl acting chairman in place of Welch.

Representing: Tobias Glidden

Discussion: Glidden presented the proposal for a solar panel on a building in the back of a lot with three structures. The panels are slightly visible from the road through a small gap. There was a mix-up in the roof description. It was originally red cedar however has since been replaced with an asphalt roof, which was approved in 2022. The Commissioners discussed visibility concerns.

Oliver – Drove by and photo B in the second set clearly shows what you see, a straight-on view that differs from the earlier picture. Need to be consistent with our rules. Panels shouldn't be on the front of houses when they're visible from the street. Not in favor of this. If the visibility can be reduced, might reconsider, however as it stands, it doesn't meet guidelines.

Camp – Agrees with Oliver. Had discussed moving the driveway or adding something to that circle to block the view. Add more foliage, maybe a big tree in the center, which could help conceal it. Thought had a discussion to shift the driveway or add vegetation to the circle to block the view.

Glidden – Could add some more foliage, smaller shrubberies in the center of the circle or could put a big tree.

Camp – If adjust the driveway a bit and add some vegetation, like trees or shrubs in the center, okay with panels on the porch roof or the back of house. Having panels on the front is too much.

MacLeod – Sent note to the Commissioners about the guidelines. Entry is narrow and the house is set far back. Concern that it doesn't meet the current guidelines. Felt that the panels are too visible from the front and suggested moving them to the back or side of the house where less visible.

Welch – Agree with part of MacLeod and Oliver's comments. Asked for clarify the approximate distance from the road (**Glidden** – About 200 feet back, maybe closer to 150). Need some vegetative screening. The idea that the speed of passing vehicles should affect our rules as interesting, however need to be careful. If start making exceptions based on speed, whether someone is driving 35 miles per hour or 25 it opens the door to bending the rules for other things too. Recognized that the panels are only visible for a short moment, stressed the importance of maintaining consistent rules regarding solar panel visibility.

Acting Chair Pohl – Suggested adding trees or other vegetation to block the view, however it would take years for the trees to grow enough to fully obscure the panels. Another option would be to move the driveway to help with screening. The main concern is that solar panel should not be visible on a two story- roof facing the road, which is the case here. While the black Roof does provide some mitigation, the panels are still very noticeable.

Oliver- Asked if a ground array (solar panels on the ground) could be considered.

Glidden - Explained that there are trees in the way, and they try to avoid cutting down trees. Also, the other buildings on the property is not suitable for solar panels.

Acting Chair Pohl – Suggested to hold the project for revisions,

MOTION/VOTE: Camp made a motion to hold for revisions, duly seconded by Welch for discussion.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION:

Welch – clarified adding vegetation to block the view of the solar panels or adjusting the driveway layout to include more plants on one side.

Glidden – Agreed to work with the Commissioners on this, however previously replaced a historic wood roof with a black

roof to meet the guidelines. Questioned what specific change the Commissioner is concerned about regarding the solar panels on the roof.

Oliver - Not visible from the front of the main house.

Welch - Reduce the visibility of the panels. Wants to make sure that the guidelines are followed consistently mainly regarding the solar panels on the front of houses. Want to work together to find a solution that meets everyone's needs.

Roll call vote to the motion: Camp (Aye), Oliver (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Welch (Aye) and Acting-Chair Pohl (Aye)

VI. OLD BUSINESS 07/16/2024

1.	Barnes C Joan Trust	12 Sunset Hill	Lowered Roof & Setback addition	41/450	NAG
----	---------------------	----------------	---------------------------------	--------	-----

• *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Patten- Last heard June 4, 2024*

Representing: Stephen Theroux – Nantucket Architecture Group

Discussion: Theroux – Provided update on the changes made to a building since the last meeting in June. Addressed nearly all the Commissioner's requests, including lowering the front rake, reducing the roof height by 1.5 feet, making dormers uniform, and stepping back part of the elevation by about 1 foot 10 inches.

Backus – Commented on the importance of maintaining the historical context of the building and expressed concerns about the foundation's horizontal banding, suggesting it should align more with typical foundations in the historic district, possibly using brick.

Theroux – Retaining wall that runs around the existing property. The foundation is existing, the shingle line is common with all the other shingle lines that are out there.

Rowland (Historic Structures Advisory Group) – Raised concerns about the roof pitch being too steep (12 pitch) and suggested it should be reduced (9 or 10) for it to be more appropriate for the neighborhood. Also recommended that the east side addition be set back further to lower the ridge line, suggesting that the size of the dining room in the addition could allow for this change. Expressed that the front dormer is too large and dominates the roof, suggesting it should be smaller and more proportional to the house's character.

MacLeod – Shares the same concerns that have been brought up, primarily the front of the building, that the steep roof pitch and large dormer dominate the design. Suggested that if dormers are included, they should be smaller with minimal shingle exposure and setback further from the edge of the roof.

Camp – Agreed with MacLeod's concerns about the steep pitch looks odd, the need for changes to better fit the buildings character.

Pohl – Usually prefer a higher roof pitch however suggested lowering the roof pitch to 10.

Oliver – Addressed the concerns.

Chair Welch – Expressed support for a taller first-floor top plate and a reduction in roof pitch. Suggested that the main Roof's pitch should be closer to 10/12 rather than 12/12, which would improve the building's appearance. Also lowering the pitch would align the window headers and dormers better with the top plate. Minor adjustments, including lowering the addition's roof pitch. Asking the Commissioner if they are willing to make the proposed changes

Theroux – Okay with returning the front eave height to its original position and reducing the roof pitch to 10/12. Suggested lowering the right-hand mass by another 6 to 8 inches. Proposed documenting these changes as Exhibit A.

Oliver - Acceptable

Camp – Finds the proposed change of lowering the addition by 6 to 8 inches acceptable however suggests considering a full foot instead.

Chair Welch – Proposed going back to the original eave height, changing the main roof pitch from 12/12 to 10/12 and reducing the height of the secondary mass by an additional 6 inches. This would result in a total reduction of about a foot compared to the original design.

MOTION/VOTE: Oliver made a motion to returning to the former eave height from previous submission, dropping the dormer window header to align with the fascia, reducing the secondary mass roof ridge by an additional 6 inches and changing the overall roof pitch to 10 instead of 12 as Exhibit A. The motion was approved with a vote of 3 in favor and 1 opposed.

Roll call vote: MacLeod (Nay), Patten (Aye), Oliver (Aye), and Chair Pohl (Aye)]. Welch left the room at 5:12PM and was absent during the vote.

2.	Romano	55 Easton St	Hardscape pergola	42.4.1/86	Julie Jordin
----	--------	--------------	-------------------	-----------	--------------

• *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp- Last heard June 25, 2024*

Discussion: Board agreed to skip this agenda item.

3.	Killen, Patience	1 Old N Wharf	Addition	42.3.1/80	Val Oliver
----	------------------	---------------	----------	-----------	------------

• *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Thornewill- Last heard June 11, 2024*

• **HELD PER APPLICANT**

4.	Holby Elizabeth	19 Low Beach Cottage	Solar Roof		Ack Smart
----	-----------------	----------------------	------------	--	-----------

• *Commissioners: Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Paul and Patten- Last heard June 25, 2024*

Representing: Tobias Glidden

Acting Chair Pohl - Confirming who is sitting on this application, Acting Chair Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Paul and Patten.

Discussion: Glidden – Already installed solar panels on the main house and addition. Now seeking to install solar panels on the porch roof, which had been excluded earlier. The Commissioners previously requested more landscape screening to reduce visibility and had added rendering showing trees for this purpose.

Backus – Appreciates the photos however the roof color should be black instead of gray for consistency. Also, appreciate the addition of trees to mitigate the visibility of the solar panels since the panels will be on the front of the structure.

Glidden – Driveway was originally in the front of the structure however relocated and moved it to the back of the parcel. Trying to be proactive in their approach to addressing concerns.

Acting Chair Pohl – Expressed concerns about the placement of trees and the panels being visible due to the building being an open area with historical homes nearby.

Camp – Expressed concern about the impact on the streetscape, particularly on Low Beach Road where the contrast between a historic house and a solar powered house might be too stark. Concern that adding vegetation could alter the character of the area too much, changing the streetscape, making it difficult to balance preserving history and adding modern elements like solar panels.

Paul – Addressing the challenge of deciding whether to approve solar panels on a lower roof, given that panels were already approved on the upper roof. The visibility of the upper panels can't be reduced, and this raises a question, should they allow the lower panels too, since a precedent has already been set, even though it goes against their usual guidelines. Suggested adding another tree to improve screening. Okay with approving the lower panels if there's some additional screening.

MacLeod – Explains that the solar panels on the main house are only on the rear side, not visible from the street. The approvals of those panels shouldn't automatically justify allowing panels on a secondary building. Expressed concerns about landscaping

challenges. On Low Beach Road, where the area is open, it's difficult to block views with trees. Suggested placing trees on the sides of the house to better screen the solar panels on the lower roof.

Patten – Feels need to be consistent with her previous statements. The front of the house has a gray roof, doesn't find it appropriate to approve the solar panels, based on the guidelines.

Acting Chair Pohl – Supports MacLeod's idea that moving the screening closer to the road would help block the view of the solar panels, however, don't want a tall hedge. Recommend relocating the existing lime green trees closer to the house for better coverage. The panels on the lower shed roof to be a more suitable option. Propose planting two trees nearer to the house. Agrees with MacLeod that positioning trees on either side of the front door will hide the panels and asked the Commissioners to consider as an Exhibit A.

Commissioners - agreed as an Exhibit A.

MOTION/VOTE: MacLeod made a motion to approve as submitted with a section A showing where the location of two deciduous trees would be. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion carries with 3 votes in favor and two against.

Roll call vote: Paul (Aye), Camp (Nay), Patten (Nay), MacLeod (Aye) and Acting Chair Pohl (Aye).

2.	Romano	55 Easton St	Hardscape pergola	42.4.1/86	Julie Jordin
----	--------	--------------	-------------------	-----------	--------------

• *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp- Last heard June 25, 2024*

Representing: Julie Jordin

Discussion: Jordin – There were debates about using brick versus no brick based on neighborhood aesthetics. Submitted photos for reference. Front walkway was originally blue stone. To make it look less modern, changed to shell with an antique Belgian block edge. Parking area remains shell with an antique Belgian block apron. Decided to eliminate connection from the privet hedge to Easton Street, resulting in a grassy edge that feels less formal and aligns with the neighborhood's aesthetic. During the house approval process, there was a strong preference from the HDC to replace the original brick columns with shingled ones, eliminating any brick elements from the house. There is a concern about the historical value of gray Belgian block, therefore chose the antique tan version to complement the old house's style better, avoiding anything that feels too new.

Backus – Winward Circa 1912 Radford Bungalow kit house. HDC has previously approved a historic determination for an addition made to this structure. Brick apron for the driveway, as historically appropriate, however it applies only to the apron, not the entire driveway. The driveway must meet the dimensions required by zoning bylaw 139-21. The walkway should be brick, as it historically was and not blue stone or Belgian block, which feel too formal for this style of house. The raised stairs were approved last week, however, still find the proposed grill inappropriate. The original character of the house was to remain visible and feel that the current landscaping masks that character.

Rowland (Historic Structures Advisory Group) – Believes the blue stone feels too contemporary for this neighborhood and the grill is also inappropriate. Both features will be visible from the street during the winter when the privet loses its leaves. The driveway appears quite wide, should ideally be limited to about 18 to 20 feet, which accommodates two cars. Haven't seen much Belgian block on that end of Easton Street or in the immediate area, brick would be a better fit for the street's character.

MacLeod – Agreed with everything that's been said.

Oliver – Concern about the pergola, assuming it will be natural to weather.

Pohl – Okay with the project due to clarifications that Jordin presented.

Camp – In favor of brick walkway leading up to the historic building, it matches the historic character of the house. The proposed blue stone patio too harsh and visible from the street. Suggest using a softer more natural looking material, like brick. Not in favor of the built

in grill on Easton Street, looks out of place. Would like the return of brick features, such as the brick apron, and suggest considering a combination shell driveway. Request these revisions to better suit the historic nature of the property.

Chair Welch – Questioning about the existing privet along the front and driveway. Suggest reducing its height to about 3.5 feet to create a more open and inviting look. Proposed a compromise where the existing tall privet is cut down, and new privet is planted on the back side of the driveway to help delineate private space from public space. Stressed the importance of maintaining a clear view across the public and semi-private areas to preserve the identity of the neighborhood. The built in grill wasn't part of the 1890's aesthetic, if it's not visible. Willingness to negotiate about its presence, suggesting that it could be removed entirely if needed.

Pohl – Agrees with lowering the privet to enhance visibility and create a more inviting atmosphere. Concern about exposing the outdoor grill if the privet is cut down. Mentions that Jordin suggested the grill could be removed or hidden with additional privet around the patio area, which could help remove the grill from view. In favor of making the yards more open, aligning with the overall vision of enhancing neighborhood charm.

The Commissioners – There seem to be a general agreement on keeping the front privet around 3.5 feet to promote visibility.

MOTION/VOTE: MacLeod made a motion to approve as submitted, have the front hedge kept at four feet or less, the back parking area to be 6-foot, add privet to screen certain areas for the deck and the bluestone patio and using brick for the apron and front walk, as Exhibit A. The motion was duly seconded and carried unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: Camp (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Pohl (Aye), Chair Welch (Aye), and Oliver (Aye)

BREAK AT 5:52 PM

MEETING RECONVENED AT 6:03PM

5.	Candle House 2 LLC	2 Candle House	Rev Hardscape	55.4.1/1.1	LFW
----	--------------------	----------------	---------------	------------	-----

- **Commissioners:** *Welch, Paul, and Thornewill Alt: Patten- Last heard July 2, 2024*

Representing: Linda Williams and Natalie Adams, Landscape architect from Verdant Landscape

Sitting Board: Chair Welch, Patten, Thornewill and Paul

Discussion: Williams – Update the revision to the hardscape. Explains the challenges related to grade changes between properties, unapproved fencing, and the proposed landscape modifications for a property. Property has significant elevation differences between the front garage and the back lot, which impact how the hardscape, like the driveway and walkway will be constructed.

Adams – Revisions to the plan based on the Commissioner's previous feedback from July. The Commissioners requested a 36-inch-high cedar board fence instead of the 42 inches on the west side, extending toward the neighboring garage. The fence follows the slope of the land without stepping. The retaining wall on the west side was revised to be sloped rather than stepped, aligning with the Board's previous request. The landscape plan now shows the use of bluestone steppers and includes references to existing materials, such as a fence that was removed from 21 Pleasant Street. Gave an update elevation drawing for each side of the house, showing how the fence and hardscape will look in relation to the building. The retaining wall will be finished with gray parging and a brick cap, a design element that is common in the neighborhood.

Chair Welch – Questioned about the grading and steps in the front yard of the Candle House property. The grade change isn't reflected in the current drawings, and they don't see any steps integrated into the retaining wall. Wood steps are shown at the side yard near the end of the driveway, there are no steps in the front yard. Would like clarification on what kind of step will be used to accommodate the grade change in the front, whether these will be granite or wood steps as part of the front entrance.

Adams – The edge of the asphalt runs consistently at about 35 feet across the property line, with a small retaining wall to hold the front yard. The height of the retaining wall is approximately 34 feet, and two steps lead down from Candle House Lane. The finished floor is slightly raised at about 35 feet. Nothing has been backfilled yet and the final ground levels are still pending.

Backus -Acknowledges the improvements in the plans however raises concerns about materials and neighboring properties. Suggest brick and cobblestone would be more appropriate than bluestone in the Old Historic District (OHD) and expressed concerns about the position of a neighbors' fence, which extends beyond the façade and is atypical for the area.

Rowland (Historic Structures Advisory Group) – The concrete retaining wall on the west side should be moved closer to the driveway, which could eliminate or reduce the height of the wall and create space for natural planting. Also suggested replacing the 12-inch-high brick-capped concrete retaining wall on the street side change to natural stone. Recommends lowering the fence along the front of the property from 36 inches to 32 inches.

Chair Welch – Decided not to address the fence on the northeast side of the property for now due to an issue with a neighboring property that has unauthorized work. It would be best that the Commissioners do not approve a fence that would conflict with the neighbor's so this part of the discussion is put aside.

Thornewill – The concrete retaining wall on the west side should be moved in closer to the house, suggesting the fence be placed on the outside of the wall to be less visible. Suggested replacing the brick cap with a granite cap, which would look more cohesive with the surrounding area. Appreciates the effort to keep the natural slope and eliminate excess walls.

Patten – Agrees with moving the wall and thinks the rest of the design looks appropriate.

Paul – Supports using a granite curb instead of a concrete wall and mixing materials like granite and concrete. Questioned if the fence and wall should swap positions to make the fence more visible to the neighbor's side instead of the retaining wall. Suggested extending the 5 in 1 fence from the back toward the street to hide the wall.

Chair Welch – Supports using a step-down retaining wall at the front, referencing its historical use at a nearby property, 21 Pleasant Street. Not in favor of a brick cap on the retaining wall, as he doesn't recall seeing that in similar designs. Expressed concerns about the neighboring fence and its grading, the frost protection issues that could arise. Suggested a different approach for the west wall. Instead of hiding the retaining wall behind a picket fence, he recommends moving the fence closer to the house and planting vines or another type of greenery that would grow over the retaining wall and camouflage it naturally.

Thornewill - The picket fence suggested being further back, possibly at the corner of the house. Feels that the current design may appear unfinished or without logical transition. Suggested that the design should offer a more cohesive look that would make sense to a passerby.

Paul – Like the idea using the vegetation to obscure the retaining wall.

Chair Welch - Suggested creating an "Exhibit A" to formalize the conditions and adjustments made to the proposed plans, regarding the retaining walls and fences.

MOTION/VOTE: Thornewill made a motion to approve that the retaining wall at the front of the property, will not have a brick cap, instead it will be parged without a cap, the picket fence on the west side will start no closer than the front line of the house, the fence will be set at 18 inches from the wall, and vines or other vegetative material will be planted at the top of the wall to help camouflage it.

Discussion: Chair Welch initially suggested not addressing the issue of the east fence, however changed his position. The Commissioners decided to approve the same style of fence for the east side, allowing the applicant the flexibility to either build it or opt for vegetation to hide the wall. If the applicant chooses not to build the fence, this decision will not hold up the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) process. The property can still be signed off as complete without the fence in place. Both front and west retaining walls will be planted to hide them from view, with no caps on the walls. As Exhibit A. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously 4-0.

Roll call vote: Thornewill (Aye), Patten (Aye), Paul (Aye) and Chair Welch (Aye)

VII. OLD BUSINESS 07/30/2024

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|----------------|----------------|-------|-----------|
| 1. | D Behrend | 12.5 Pequot St | New Main House | 80/20 | D Behrend |
| | • <i>Commissioners: Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul, and Patten- Last heard July 2, 2024</i> | | | | |
| 2. | D Behrend | 12.5 Pequot St | Demo Studio | 80/20 | D Behrend |
| 3. | D Behrend | 12.5 Pequot St | Demo shed | 80/20 | D Behrend |

Note: Chair Welch recused himself from agenda items 1-5, allowing Pohl as the acting chair to proceed for these agenda items.

Representing: Dean Behrend, Agent

Discussion: Reviewing the demo and relocation of a studio and a shed.

Acting chair Pohl - Proposed addressing demo requests as a group before moving on to other agenda items.

The Commissioners, Oliver, MacLeod, Paul, and Patten agreed to consider both structures demos in one review.

Behrend – Confirmed that there is an interested party to take the studio, in hopes to receive approval for a move off. Been working with a house mover in efforts to find locations for the structures.

The Commissioners discussed approving the studio for relocation instead of demoing. Paul made a motion to approve the move-off for the studio, however Acting Chair Pohl held off to check for any historic information from Backus.

Backus – Studio built around 2001 and was non-contributing.

The Commissioners discussed the shed briefly.

Backus – Assumed that shed dates to 1976, like the main house.

There was a brief discussion about moving the shed, however it was stated that the shed is in poor condition and that they have not received any interested parties.

Oliver – Application stated that the shed is 20X40 feet, however on-site plan shows that it's 150 square feet. The application needs correction.

MOTION/VOTE FOR STUDIO: Paul made a motion to approve the move off studio with the correct information on the application per discussion. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: Paul (Aye), Patten (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Oliver (Aye) and Pohl (Aye)

Discussion for shed: The Commissioners briefly discussed moving or demoing the shed due to its condition and with the corrected size.

MOTION/VOTE FOR SHED: MacLeod made a motion to approve the shed as submitted for a move off with the corrected size information filled out on the application 8X10 square feet. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: Patten (Aye), Paul (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Oliver (Aye) and Pohl (Aye)

Discussion on main house.

Behrend – Questioned if they have approval for the move-off for the main house.

Backus – On the April 30th meeting already had a previous move-off approval for the main house since it was in good shape.

Behrend – Main house revisions: to the front of the house include updating windows from 6 over 6 panes to 6 over 1, changing columns from 8 inches to 12 inches tapers, lowered the railings and the widows walk to the ridge line, cover the front door and switching the chimney material from stone to brick. North elevation: removed the gable drops over the garage and modifying the roof shape for a cleaner appearance. The garage doors were rotated to face west, creating a parallel to Weweeder or Pequot setup between the main garage and detached garage. South elevation: there is a fireplace in the pergola area, removed the breaks in the gable trim details and reduced the gambrel look.

MacLeod – Questioned the landscape plan showing a front driveway entrance which is different from the hardscape plan where both garages were accessed from the side of Weweeder Road. Appreciate the revisions however felt that the front door and side lights have too much glass, making them appear more like French doors. Suggested reducing the glass at the

front by having a four-panel door. The chimney seems conspicuous being outside and not being part of the main mass.

Patten – The seven doors seem to be excessive and not crazy about the fireplace externally.

Paul – Appreciates the revisions. Suggested relocating the driveway entrance slightly to provide more privacy for the front entrance, and to screen the front door with a landscape buffer along both sides of the property. Suggested adjustments to the columns on the north elevation, they seem to be overly tapered, and same concerns as MacLeod about the front door, recommending a taller panel for differentiation. The roof walk skirt should use vertical boards painted white or it should be natural cedar boards and not shingles. All the fenestration seems appropriate except for the two ganged windows forward facing gambrel seems to have too much shingle space in the middle, feels a bit mundane and could do something to the four windows to liven up the elevation. North elevation no comments on. West elevation not visible. West elevation garage door can be taller. This side of the house seems under fenestrated. Recommended some detailing of a small shadow board at the gambrel break, to break up the large shingle area.

Oliver – The roof walk not rendered properly, suggested that the posts should run through instead of stopping at the band board. The submission is incomplete due to lack of information on the windows, doors, and colors. Suggested that if they approve this project, it should be a condition that all missing information be provided.

Acting Chair Pohl – A complete schedule detailing all windows, doors, trim colors, and roof shingle type is required for review. The site plan needs a separate application and approval, with recommendation to reposition the driveway and orient the garage doors at the back. Roof walk posts should be continuous through the skirt with natural to weather vertical boards, and the front door should either have glass without side lights or be opaque with side lights. Suggested aligning the gambrel connector for a cohesive look and reducing the chimney height to fit code.

MOTION/VOTE: MacLeod made a motion to hold for revisions. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: Paul (Aye), Patten (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Oliver (Aye) and Pohl (Aye)

4. D Behrend 12.5 Pequot St New Pool 80/20 D. Behrend

Representing: Dean Behrend

Discussion: Acting Chair Pohl - Reminded Behrend that the site plan could only allow one curb cut per lot, indicating that revisions to the plan might be necessary. Stressed the importance of a complete landscape plan to show that the pool is fully screened from the public view by adding vegetation between the pool and nearby roads. The current site plan shows only minimal screening, is inadequate and requested an updated landscape plan. Suggest holding the review to gather additional information.

Oliver - Need to complete the application and track the main house.

MOTION/VOTE: Oliver made a motion to hold for revisions to track the main house and a complete application. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: MacLeod (Aye), Paul (Aye), Patten (Aye), Oliver (Aye) and Pohl (Aye)

5. D Behrend 12.5 Pequot St New Garage 80/20 D Behrend

Representing: Dean Behrend

Discussion: Oliver – Motioned to hold for revisions.

The Commissioners revisions include: The simplified design version seen on the plan for the main house should be applied to the garage. Inconsistencies between the garage application and recent renderings. The design in the current application differs significantly from what was shown alongside the main house. All four-garage elevation need to be included in the application. Hip dormers above the shed dormer, which was also present on the main house application.

MOTION/VOTE: Oliver made a motion to hold for revision and to make sure the garage design track with the main

House and the application is complete. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: MacLeod (Aye), Paul (Aye), Patten (Aye), Oliver (Aye) and Pohl (Aye)

6. More than Enough 30 Russell's Way Reduce height fenestration 77/8.1 CWA

Representing: Lucas Velle filling in for Chip Webster

Discussions: Velle – Provided updates to the main house design and addressing feedback from the previous meeting. Starting with the guest house revised the retaining walls. Main house height reduced to under 25 feet. The main roof pitch was increased, aligning the eaves with the window sashes on the front and back, which helped improve the North and South elevations. The porch depth and style were modified to match the approved porch on the main house. Some adjustments were made to reduce the visual impact and gravity of the structure.

Oliver – Questioned the height of other structures for comparison.

Velle – Single story open garage carport, has not been flushed out.

Oliver – Felt that house was too tall on the East side.

Pohl – Didn't think the building was that tall, the height wall to roof ratio on the narrow East elevation made the building appear like a large, flat wall, especially around the garage doors. The depth of the deck and the porch above were out of place.

MacLeod – Agreed with Pohl, adding that the low positioning of the awning above the garage looked awkward. The large wall area made the building look bigger than it is.

Camp – A lot of inconsistencies with the design element, features like the rocket ship look. Agreed with MacLeod's comment about the awning over the garage

Chair Welch – The height out of proportions, with 9-foot ceilings on the first floor and 8.5-foot ceilings on the second floor. Suggest lowering the ceilings, could improve proportion and energy efficiency.

Val – Proposed a motion to hold for revisions and provide retaining information.

MOTION/VOTE: Oliver made a motion to hold for revisions and provide retaining information. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

Discussion on the motion: Chair Welch – Need to see a complete scaled site plans with retaining wall details, grade changes and topographical information for clarity.

Roll call vote: Oliver, Camp, MacLeod (Aye), Pohl (Aye), and Chair Welch.

Velle – Wanted clarification about the retaining wall information.

Chair Welch – The top of the finished walls, any proposed grade changes and a scale plan large enough to clearly see the layout.

7. K22S LLC 126R Main St Fenestration & dormers cottage 42.3.3/98.1 JB Studio

• **Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp and Paul Alt: Patten- Last heard July 9, 2024**

Representing: Linda Williams - Agent

Discussion: Williams provided updates. **Williams** – modified the garage to meet HDC requirements. The gambrel structure height is 22 feet, designed as a barn style structure resembling one across the street. The roof and dormers, gambrel pitch changed to a 5/12 slope, dormers adjusted to shed style to better match with the roof, added a smaller dormer over the kitchen for more light. The doors and windows, front door now has a 12-light design with a kick panel, matching another door. The barn doors and rear dormer added, and the rear elevation changed with smaller windows. Clarified that this small structure is compliant with zoning, occupying less than 40% of the lot's ground cover and that the HDC previously

approved the hardscape plan.

Backus – Building is an infill structure located behind a historically significant circa 1750 house. The gambrel roof is seen as overly complex and uncharacteristic for an outbuilding in this area, where simpler gable roofs are typical. The new dormers should have less visible shingle space, as they currently appear oddly proportioned. The pitch change is appreciated, the dormers at the rear are seen as more appropriate than those on the façade. The pitch change raised the building height by 6 inches.

Rowland (Historic Structures Advisory Group) – The gambrel roof style is unusual for an outbuilding in the historic overlay district, where simpler gable roofs with secondary, smaller additions are more typical. The current design with a gambrel roof is seen as too boxy and out of scale for what would be expected behind a historic building of this age. With only one bedroom on the second floor, the narrower gable roof could likely accommodate the interior space more appropriately.

Oliver – Appreciates the adjustments to the roof pitches and stresses the importance of keeping the building's design simple, especially on the side facing the main house and street. Recommended removing the small dormer above the double French doors, however, it may not be needed due to existing windows and the cathedral ceiling. The variety of door styles on the front to be visually inconsistent and suggest a more unified approach.

Chair Welch opened the floor to the public:

Kevin, an abutter - Expressed concerns and urged the Commissioners to prevent this wall of oversized brand-new Development. It appears disruptive and out of place between homes from the 1700s and early 1800s. Repeated issues with the plans, including inaccurate depiction of a protected town elm tree, including of non-existing vegetation, and an unapproved roof walk reappearing in the plans after being specifically requested for removal. Also expressed inconsistencies in review process, where a new structure on the 126 Main Street lot was added to the consent agenda due to a lack of visibility, yet an equally visible structure farther from Main Street was given a full board review. The multiple new structures would disrupt the narrow modest character of Main Street by introducing a much wider and denser development, clashing with simpler, smaller historical homes. Expanding the existing structures would be more appropriate than adding multiple new buildings.

Sarah Alger, Attorney representing the owner of 124 Main Street – Agreed with previous speakers, including Oliver, Backus and Mr. To. The proposed development has too much structure and expressed that it needs for lower, simpler designs. The buildings as overly complicated, crowded, too tall, and too large, reinforcing the concerns that the new construction is inconsistent with the historic character of the area.

Camp – Agreed with earlier comments about the proposed development, it feels overbuilt and complicated with three structures and hardscaping. Suggested that a simple gable barn-style design would have been a better fit for the site, Reducing the visual clutter from Main Street. Criticized the mass of buildings that would be visible, and that the combination of structures doesn't align with the streetscape of Main Street.

Pohl – Recognize the Gambrell style as a suitable choice for an outbuilding. Suggested that it could serve as a workshop or barn located behind the main house. Appreciated the height and design changes such as the shed dormers. Minor concern about the eave height on the right side of the Gambrell recommending that it be lowered to match the height of the main eave for better visual consistency.

Paul – Agreed with Pohl, while the lot is independent and could allow a taller building, treating this as a smaller accessory building visible from Main Street feels right. The gambrell style softens the building's look, creating a layered view from Main Street due to its 116-foot setback. Felt that gambrell was not out of place. Suggested removing the corner boards on the dormers to create a smoother look with cottage-style edges that would blend into the roof. The design suits the Main Street setting, and any hardscape would be softened by surrounding vegetation making it less visible from the street.

Chair Welch – The previous north elevation with gable dormers offered a cleaner, more cohesive look along the roofline compared to the current proposal with shed dormers, which makes it look cluttered due to the extended upper chord. The South elevation, the previous design where the upper chord flows seamlessly over the dormer, provides a more fitting appearance in terms of design elements. The structure is about 35-40% larger than ideal, given its role as an infill on a hill.

As an outbuilding, the design feels overly complex and detailed, it creates a sense of overcomplication. Seeking a reduction in size and simplification in design.

There was discussion if next steps for revisions.

Chair Welch – At least three members have raised concerns around the structure’s size, complexity and whether it fits the character of an infill lot, independent or not. Suggested that Williams work with her client to propose some adjustments that would likely receive approval. Discussed elements like size, general massing, and whether all sections of the structure need to be in the gambrel style.

Rick Beaudette representing the applicant – Asked for some clarification. He didn’t hear Oliver raise concerns about the massing. Heard simplification as a priority along with possibly removing some dormers. Appreciate hearing Oliver’s comments again.

Oliver – The structure appears more as an outbuilding. Mentioned simplifying the mass on the right by removing the Dormer, as it has cathedral ceiling. Changing it to a shed roof could reduce the height and give it a more typical appearance for a back barn or simple structure. Also keeping the doors and overall design as simple as possible would help.

MOTION/VOTE: Oliver made a motion to hold for revisions. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: Oliver (Aye), Camp (Aye), Paul (Aye), Pohl (Aye) and Chair Welch (Aye).

8. K22S LLC 126R Main St Shed revisions 42.3.3/98.1 JB Studio

• *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp and Paul Alt: Patten- Last heard July 9, 2024*

Representing: Linda Williams – Agent

Discussion: Williams – Simplified the design significantly by removing some of the previous details, like the dormer, and align the ridge in the same direction as the approved shed at 126, per your previous request. It’s simply a shed.

Backus – The revisions make this a simple gable structure, which is much more appropriate for the district. Only concern is the double French doors, if possible, simplify further by using just one door.

Chair Welch opened the floor to the public:

Kevin, an abutter – Repeating previous comments, its too many structures, too complex, and very visible from Main Street. It changes the streetscape from open green space to a dense cluster of buildings.

Sarah Alger, Attorney representing the owner of 124 Main Street – Agree on the French doors, seems out of place for a small shed.

Stephanie Bradford, at 128 Main Street – Lot is very limited frontage, about 10.78 feet with a narrow driveway, far less than 50 feet required. Cramping multiple structures here feels inappropriate, even potentially a fire hazard. The way it looks now, with the shed slightly off to the side, resembles a wall of buildings, disrupting the open streetscape that has been a hallmark of Main Street.

Rowland (Historic Structures Advisory Group) – This is supposed to be a small garden shed, however it appears more like a living space, adding to the already dense cluster of structures behind 126 Main Street and should be scaled down.

Pohl – Initially going to comment on the quad French doors, as Alger and others mentioned, however it’s worth mentioning that we as a board requested that the shed be rotated 90 degrees so that the shorter side faces Main Street. However, I wouldn’t object to changing it back to having the eave side face Main Street if that’s preferred. The four French doors are main concerns.

Oliver – The shed is simple in form, which is good, however with everything back there, the six doors add to the overall complication. IF the doors could be simplified and maybe the shed made a bit smaller, it would blend in more easily and align better with the shed in front, making it less noticeable from the street.

Paul – Thinks its appropriate overall. The four doors aren't going to be visible from the street. Having two stacked French doors might not be ideal. Maybe the gable end could have a single door with windows on either side or just a single door instead. As for orientation, fine either way. The gable facing Main Street works well. Only concern is that double French door facing Main Street.

Camp – The form is well designed and nicely proportioned, however within this grouping of buildings, it feels a bit large. Consider making it the same size as the shed on 126 Main to keep it from overpowering it. Simplifying by removing the dormer behind it could help too. Overall, it is becoming a complex site.

Chair Welch -While this is a small structure, and have worked to simplify it, the overall density and grouping of these structures feels overwhelming, with the natural grade increase in the back, add perceived height. Other areas up Main Street have some infill structures, however they still allow for space between them, unlike what is being shown here. The perception is that it's overly dense, and there's a lack of simplicity. The two-story addition on the main house contributes to this overall density. The existing grade difference isn't helping the overall perception.

MOTION/VOTE: Oliver made a motion to hold for revision. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: Oliver (Aye), Camp (Aye), Pohl (Aye) Paul (Aye), and Chair Welch (Aye).

9. Thomas Ripley

92 Washington St

New Dwelling

42.2.3/22

Marshall Harris

- *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Thornewill- Last heard June 18, 2024*

Representing: Leo Wilson

Discussion: Wilson – Didn't expect to get to application tonight due to the hour. Planning to be on the 27th for the next meeting for Old Business. Prefer to hold over to the next Old Business meeting.

Chair Welch – Requested to optimize pdf, due to trouble downloading to tablets, and laptops. It might be helpful to optimize your images before importing them and optimize your CAD files and combine them. This usually saves a lot of space.

Wilson - I wanted to check in about our last meeting. We talked about some changes we've made, and we're excited to show them to you. We also mentioned reviewing the garage and shed since we made those changes in line with your comments. However, I didn't see those buildings on the agenda. Can we make sure they're included in the next meeting?

Backus – Want to clarify, for applications that are held, like this one, it's the applicant's responsibility to submit any changes along with the revisions for the main house under old business. We have many applications, so we can't just add them back to the agenda without receiving the updated documents.

Wilson – Will gather the necessary paperwork and submit, including all three revisions.

Backus – Revisions need to be marked clearly for any changes done. Need to be highlighted.

Chair Welch - Submit those two additional buildings for the next old business meeting. This will help streamline the process, especially since we still have nine old business items to get through tonight.

10. 13 and 15 Nancy Ann LLC

13-15 Nancy Ann Ln

New Mixed Use Bldg

68/137-138

Emeritus LTD

- *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Patten- Last heard July 02, 2024*
- **HELD PER APPLICANT**

Discussion: Confirmed that the applications for 13 and 15 Nancy Ann Lane are on hold at the request of the applicant.

11. Wolfram Family Trust

7 Folger Ln

New dwelling lot 3 & 4

42.4.4/33.3

WAPD

- *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Thornewill- Last heard May 14, 2024*

Discussion: Ansley Wilson for Workshop APD attended on behalf of Andrew, who was unable to be present due to travel delays and requested a hold for their application.

Chair Welch – Asked if any abutters present.

Backus – There were no abutters present in the meeting.

Pohl - pointed out that there were errors in the cardinal directions on the submitted elevations: the pergola was facing west but labeled as north, and the chimney was facing north but labeled as east. Pohl advised that correcting these errors would be beneficial for the next review. Ansley acknowledged the feedback and agreed to inform Andrew about the necessary corrections.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS 08/13/2024 - VIEW

1.	Center of Town LLC	35 Center St	Solar Rooftop	42.3.1/3	AckSmart
----	--------------------	--------------	---------------	----------	----------

Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp- Last heard June 25, 2024

IX. OLD BUSINESS 08/13/2024

1.	106 Squam Rd LLC	106 Squam Rd	New dwelling secondry	12/37	Wayne Elliot
----	------------------	--------------	-----------------------	-------	--------------

• *Commissioners: Pohl, Oliver, Paul and Camp- Last heard July 09, 2024, Patten not in attendance*

Recused - Welch

Representing: Wayne Elliot

Discussion: There was uncertainty about whether a full board was available however it was clarified that Patten had Mullen and joined the meeting allowing the Board to proceed with five members.

Elliot – To preserve the existing historical house while adding secondary and tertiary dwellings. All structures would be painted in an approved gray color. Made several adjustments based on previous feedback, including lowering the ridge of the secondary dwelling and modifying window placements and porch roof designs.

The Commissioners - Expressed positive reactions to the changes, acknowledging the improvements made.

Paul – Praised the project's attention to detail and the dramatic improvements made to the structure. A concern regarding the side profile of the crossbuck rail and its interaction with the pitch of the porch roof, the north elevation facing the road. Suggested to use solid vertical boards painted to match instead of the current design as this could simplify construction and avoid potential complications. Appreciates using two over one windows to algin with the existing house's style.

Camp - Agreed with Paul's suggestion about the crossbuck rail, that it might be beneficial for it to follow the line of the hip roof for a more cohesive look. Supported the overall design and had no further comments.

Patten – Ditto, looks good about the side of the crossbuck.

Camp – Expressed concern about the four windows on the second floor of the west elevation, appearing cramped within the gable. Asked if anybody had an idea how it could sort of resolve itself.

Acting Chair Pohl - Suggested removing the shingle space between the windows to create a single quad window instead, arguing that since this area is at the back of the house, the shingle space is unnecessary and contributes to the crowded look. Proposed reverting to the previous submission to address this issue.

MOTION/VOTE: Paul made a motion to approve the application with that change to the four ganged windows on the west elevation. Agreed that the railing issue could be resolved during construction, it was shown in the previous submission as parallel to the roof plane and documented as Exhibit A. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion was unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: Oliver (Aye), Camp (Aye), Patten (Aye), Paul (Aye), and Pohl (Aye).

2. 106 Squam Rd LLC 106 Squam Rd New dwelling tertiary 12/37 Wayne Elliot

• *Commissioners: Pohl, Oliver, Paul and Camp- Last heard July 09, 2024, Patten not in attendance*

Recused: Welch

Representing: Wayne Elliot

Discussion: Elliot – The structure has been simplified, removing unnecessary elements and maintaining its mass. The north facing elevation was discussed, that the center window has been removed. The dwelling is designed as a carriage house with one bedroom, an upstairs living area, and a garage. Porches were retained to access water views on the property.

Camp - Concern regarding the 10/12 pitch of the roof on the east and west elevations, looked awkward. Suggested to alter the roofline to match the north and south elevations.

Paul - Suggested removing the "fake" features on the east and west elevations and replacing them with shed dormers to align with the gable dormer on the north and south elevations. This change aims to streamline the structure's appearance. The tertiary dwelling would not be visible from the road. It remains functional while addressing aesthetic concerns.

MOTION/VOTE: Camp made a motion to revise the roof design of the tertiary dwelling and return with the updated design, indicating a desire for a streamlined look based on previous discussions.

Discussion on the motion: It was clarified that only the elevations need to be revised with no need for larger renderings for it to be submitted and reviewed at the next meeting.

The motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: Oliver (Aye), Patten (Aye), Paul (Aye), Camp (Aye), and Pohl (Aye).

3. Off Shore Development 6 Tautemo Way Main house revs 83/19 S Boukus

Paul - The windows small and lacked balance in the overall design. Issues with the west elevation, specifically the shingled columns and the heavy appearance of the design. Suggested using traditional columns with a clearer expression of the deck line and fascia board to lighten the overall look.

MacLeod - Appreciated the design's complexity, however it appears too much like a two-story structure without significant variation in height. Suggested adding more noticeable height differences, ideally by a half-story, to make the house feel smaller and blend better with the landscape. For the upside-down design, recommended revisiting the layout to minimize large blank shingle areas around windows, especially in the dormer, to help it integrate more naturally.

Chair Welch – Agreed with MacLeod, concerned about the variation of height and straight, unbroken look of the two-story section on the east elevation side. Felt this part of the structure stood out too much compared to the surrounding area. Suggested adding features like covered porches, as seen in nearby houses like Ethan's, to help the building blend in better. Also recommended lowering the height of the right wing, possibly to a single story, to reduce its visual impact and create a more balanced look.

MOTION/VOTE: Camp made a motion to hold for revisions. The motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Roll call vote: Camp (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Pohl (Aye), Paul (Aye), and Chair Welch (Aye).

4.	Off Shore Development	6 Tautemo Way	New cabana	83/19	S Boukus
5.	Off Shore Development	6 Tautemo Way	New pool	83/19	S Boukus
6.	FP Martin House LLC	61 Center St	Rev Stair? Accessible lift	42.4.3/67	Emeritus LTD

• *Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp - Last heard July 23, 2024*

X. NEW BUSINESS 07/09/2024

1.	Jeff Kaschluk	86A/88 Old South Rd	New Commercial Bldg	68/400&419.1	LFW
2.	Jeff Kaschluk	86A/88 Old South Rd	Hardscape	68/400&419.1	LFW
3.	Sharon Fruit	14 Pond View	Entrance gate	81/8	Graham & Graham

XI. NEW BUSINESS 07/23/2024

1.	Joe Tirone	25 Honey Suckle Dr	Roof top solar	68/389	Isaksen Solar
2.	Jeffery Ackseizer	14 Moors End Ln	New Garage	43/216	EMDA
3.	Ack MWG LLC	10 Silver St	New dwelling	55.4.1/187	EMDA
4.	21 Pilgrim Rd Trust	4 Sophie's Way/21 Pilgrim	New Dwelling	41/213-213.2	S Metz
5.	Dalibor & Liliana Kovacevic	3 Aster Ct	Solar Roof	68/373	Ack Smart
6.	Garret Roberts	1 South Mill St	Rev change roof	55.4.1/61	EMDA
7.	Reinemo, Timothy	65 Lovers Ln	New pool	80/214.1	Self
8.	23 Sankaty Head Trust	23 Sankaty Head Rd	Folly	48/4.1	BPC
9.	Jeffery Greenberg	30A Orange St	Lower main roof/fen. Revs 4940	42.3.2/200	Emeritus LTD

10.	Cohen Steven L TR/Dukes Rd Tr	2 Dukes Rd	Pool Hardscape	41/187	Ahern LLC
-----	-------------------------------	------------	----------------	--------	-----------

11.	Boulevard Property Group LLC	20 Main St	Pool Hardscape	73.3.1/50	LFW
-----	------------------------------	------------	----------------	-----------	-----

XII. NEW BUSINESS 08/06/2024

1.	3 Back Street LLC	3 Back St	Demo	55/348	Thornewill	RP
2.	3 Back Street LLC	3 Back St	Partial Demo option 2	55/348	Thornewill	RP
3.	Brandon Eldridge	26 Arlington St	Solar Roof	76.1.3/281	Isaksen Solar	RP
4.	Centrall Family LLC	25 Masaquet Ave	New Shed	80/138	Edward Cantrall	JP
5.	256 Polpis LLC	256 Polpis Rd	GH Add Dormer fen rev	25/25	Botticelli & Pohl	JP
6.	Harford, Suni & William B Jr	60 Wanoma Way	Pool hardscape	92/13	Ahern LLC	VO
7.	Teasdale Arnie	24 India St	New Cottage	42.3.4/66	Thornewill	VO
8.	Jamie Kane	21 Ridge Ln	Rev COA 2021-09-4627	38/76	B Meerberger	VO
9.	New Street LLC	7 New Street	Window change rev 2024-10638	55.4.1/37	WAPD	VO
10.	42/44 Arb Way LLC	9 Arbour Way	Rev to 11-9503 infill porch	29/137	Botticelli & Pohl	AM
11.	Suzanne & Thomas Albani	39 Wanoma Way	Replace beach stairs	92.4/318	EMDA	AM
12.	John Roberts	15 Helen Dr	Roof change add dormers	66/146	KMLD	AM
13.	Roberto & Amy Finzi	26 Pocomo Rd	Addition	14/74	Smith & Hutton	AM
14.	Roberto & Amy Finzi	26 Pocomo Rd	New Garage	14/74	Smith & Hutton	AM
15.	Elizabeth Churchill	3 Emily St	Move build and addition	49.2.3/53	self	
16.	Elizabeth Churchill	3 Emily St	Patio deck	49.2.3/53	self	
17.	Jose Guiterrel	4 Cartwright Pl	Addition	55/220.2	Val Oliver	AM
18.	Marrett Victor	3 Baily Rd	Egress window	56/426	Self	AM
19.	Big Batch LLC	69 Hummock Pond	Renovate – Rev #8733	56/320	Emeritus LTD	CT
20.	Stark Point LLC	16 Easton St	Hardscape	42.1.4/11	Botticelli & Pohl	CT
21.	Nantucket Electric Co	32 Bunker Rd	New Commercial Bldg	78/2.7	LFW	AC
22.	Terry Anne Vigil Trst	26 Somerset Ln	New main house	66/10	JBStudio	CP
23.	Terry Anne Vigil Trst	26 Somerset Ln	New pool	66/10	JBStudio	CP

Approve Minutes –	None
Review Minutes -	None
Other Business -	Next HDC Meeting- August 20th @ 4pm. NEW BUSINESS *HYBRID & IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. -COMMUNITY RM.
Potential Items for Discussion-	- Review prior approved Best Practices. - Discussion on distinguishing between solid and veneer brick on chimneys and foundations. - Classification of street trees & vegetating mapping - Discussion of Wind Turbines - Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings and historic dwellings - Hardscaping - Discussion of salvaging demos - Discussion of options for house moves

XIII. Adjournment:

Pohl moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:35PM. The motion was duly seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously.

Roll call vote: Pohl (Aye), MacLeod (Aye), Camp (Aye), Patten (Aye), and Chair Welch (Aye)

Submitted By: Catherine Ancero

Links to 08-13-2024 HDC YouTube meeting: <https://www.youtube.com/live/HW0JVYK5cFY>

Links to 08-13-2024 HDC View pack: <https://www.nantucket-ma.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/08132024-14157?html=true>