



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, August 20, 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, Joe Paul

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Pohl called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm

Staff in Attendance:	Fiona Johnson , Administrative Specialist, Holly Backus , Preservation Planner,
Attending Members:	Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod, Connie Patten, Joe Paul, Carrie Thornewill
Remote Participants:	Ray Pohl (Chair), Abby Camp
Absent Members:	
Late Arrivals:	Stephen Welch @ 4:40pm
Early Departures:	

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to the agenda. (Made By: MacLeod)
Vote	Oliver MacLeod, Patten, Thornewill, Pohl

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Value of Written Submission & Submission Deadlines

Item not discussed

I. CONSENT

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. 1. Jennifer Garren	36 Pocomo Rd	Renew 68574 shed demo	14/79	NAG R
2. 2. Audrey Sterk	6 Marsh Hawke	Rev shed	56/396	EMDA RP
3. 3. Scott Jube	10 Oak Hollow Ln	New dwelling	56/77	K. Megna RP
4. 4. Take it Easy LLC	6 Captains Ln	Addition	30/619	Val Oliver RP
5. 5. 6A Marble Way LLC	6 Marble Way	New Dwelling	66/103	K. Megna JP
6. 6. Squam Partners LLC	89 Squam Rd	Renew COA #64019	13/3	Thornewill JP
7. 7. 5 Wauwinet Rd LLC	5 Wauwinet Rd	Rev 2023-10-9343	20/74	Val Oliver JP
8. 8. Conway Family Trust	11 Western Ave	Rev 2021 08 4328	87/117	Val Oliver AM
9. 9. Gibson Steven & Kara Trst	5 Arrowhead Dr	New Dwelling	69/304	K. Megna VO
10. 10. Eleven Lincoln Ave Tr	32 Jefferson Ave	Rev to 9274 fens/color	30/132	Botticelli & Pohl VO
11. 11. 1. Eleven Lincoln Ave Tr	32 Jefferson Ave	Rev to 9964 color	30/132	Botticelli & Pohl VO
12. 12. Torres, Jessica	43 Old South Rd	Add egress window wells	68/81	LINK CP
13. 13. ACK Weatherly Pl LLC	3 Weatherly Pl	Revise COA Front Door	67/950	LINK AC
14. 14. Sulzer Jim Elder Barbara	12 Back St	Eliminate window asbuilt	55/352	Thornewill VO
15. 15. William Woldorf	50 Madequecham	Valley addition	88/74	EMDA V

Voting:	MacLeod, Patten Paul,
Recused:	Thornewill, Oliver, Pohl
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent. 6 Captains Ln WITHDRAWN FROM CONSENT (Made By: PAUL
Vote:	Carried 3-0 //MacLeod, Patten Paul (AYE)

The following was pulled from CONSENT to be reviewed separately:

4. Take it Easy LLC	6 Captains Ln	Addition	30/619	Val Oliver	RP
Voting:	MacLeod, Camp, Pohl, Patten,				
Alternates:	Hold for revisions				
Recused:	Joe Paul, Carrie Thornewill, Abby Camp, Ray Pohl, Angus MacLeod				
Representative:	Val Oliver				
Documentation:	window change				
Staff Comments:	Holly -This should be a revision to a previously approved hardscaping plan that therefore you all wouldn't have all these questions - we must look at the application and the site plan and I believe that he's also asking for changes around the pool with the patio, but with that the application not indicating that it's -maybe it would be best to hold this for additional information				
Commissioner Comments:	Angus - I saw a shed or a parking space in the back then with the addition of the pool the parking that should be in the back or the side is going between the house and the street, and I didn't think that that was appropriate Val - neighborhood has parking in front of your house, and I felt like it wasn't a departure from what was already in the area so um I was okay all right, so I think that's what's missing is the extra information Ray - can I have a motion from some member of the board sitting on this to hold this for revisions that - that are explicit on what's being applied for a motion to hold for - revisions thank you Angus okay so on that motion Abby				
Motion:	change my motion to hold for revisions okay that was Abbey's motion				
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // MacLeod, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, Patten,(AYE)				

II. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. LCCACK LLC	142R Cliff Rd New Cabana	41/78 Metz RP		
• Approve due to lack of visibility.				
2. Chris Emery	7 West Way New Shed	38/135 Self JP		
• Sash color to match MH & be annotated on COA				
3. Yellow Dog Nom Trust	224 Polpis Rd Additions Alterations	26/22.3 Emeritus LTD VO		
• Approve due to lack of visibility.				
4. 61 Fairgrounds LLC	63 Fairgrounds Rd Parking patio	67/173.2 JBStudio VO		
• Provide photos of the existing structure and driveway area				
5. Durham Station LLC	76 Pocomo Rd New shed	15/38 LFW VO		
• Applicant to provide photos of the existing structures for the file.				
6. Seven Pines LLC	78 Pocomo Rd New shed	15/39 LFW VO		

- Applicant to provide photos of the existing structures for the file.
7. NOTLIH LLC 55 Burnell St Rev 2024-02-10017 49.3.2/1.4 LFW CT
- Approve due to lack of visibility.
8. GHYC 19 Nobadeer Farm Rd Move off demo 69/83 LINK CP
- Move Off Only; provide data sheet with floor plan dimensions and elevation heights for file.
9. Ainslie 9 Howard St Front Door Color change 42.3.3/54 Mike Freedman VO
- Date of construction (HDC Survey NAN.529 c.pre-1750 “Zaccheus Macy II House” added to the COA.
10. 41 Washaman Trust 41 Washaman Ave Demo fireplace add walls patio 55/558 Ben Champoux VO
- Fire pit not to be seen at time of inspection and in perpetuity.

SIGNS

- Recommended for approval

Motion -Val Oliver

Vote - Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Macleod (Aye)

- Recommended to hold for revisions

Motion – Val Oliver

Vote - Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Macleod (Aye)

- Recommended for approval

Motion - Val Oliver

Vote - Camp, Coombs, Patten, Paul, Macleod (Aye)

III. OLD BUSINESS – FROM LAST WEEK

106 Squam Rd LLC	106 Squam Rd	New dwelling tertiary	12/37	Wayne Elliot SW
Voting:	Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Joe Paul, Connie Patten,			
Documentation:				
Motion:	Joe Paul, Connie Patten, Abby Camp,			
Vote:	Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Joe Paul, Connie Patten,			
Public Comments:	Jennifer Kini Clarkson			

Jennifer Kini Clarkson, I live at 104 Squam Road uh next door to um The Elliots um I understand the process has moved along quite significantly um and I've been keeping track of the meetings um a couple of weeks ago you were focused on the tertiary and um one of our big concerns as a neighbor is the east-facing deck on the tertiary as it overlooks our entire backyard and um wipes out all the Privacy that we have, concern about the decks, and the structure was that it was visible from the road and there was a re-recommendation to revise these.

The applicant stated that it was not visible from the road, and it is quite visible, so I just felt that um stating that sort of in defense of keeping the two decks um wasn't quite right and I just wanted to put that on the record.

Commissioner Comments:

-Val, I said that seems counterintuitive to it

-Joe- should we go to the options where Mr. Chair, option A is um what I believe to be hearing in in you know again we were talking about the roof line, so we took that Gable end and met the fascia Eve um which I believe someone said and I you know this is our preference this is kind of where we started option two or B is what Joe recommended and I don't know if I um gave it justice Joe, but I tried it's where it is and then C is just if we didn't like A or B C is a whole different spin on it but we don't. have to go there.

-Joe - interesting well I won't get into C we'll see where it goes but C might have some issues anyway some of which we discussed last time um Joe I think I heard you pipe in there a moment ago well, it was only because I was going to suggest that we review the options in here so Joe we just did I'm happy to go first if you okay thank you that would be great so option Option C I think is um awkward and uh option b I did describe but um I like um option A of the three I think it's in keeping with the other buildings that have been um approved so as far as roof forms go um that one, I find to be um appropriate uh and I appreciate option b you're showing the well I guess on all the options you're showing this future an addition that might be happening to the existing Ranch structure um and I think that that helps even though we're not talking about that here, but it is for me starts to make the tertiary dwelling and the main housework together um was the tertiary feels it's a little bit tall relative to the existing house I could see that it has it's not quite there um a barn vernacular and with the the barn you would it wouldn't be unusual for the barn to be taller than the the primary um structure here um and by the way some of this is semantics because the building that's closer to the street is the guest house, I think the perception is that that's going to be the main building um it's taller and it's closer to the road um right so of the three, uh I prefer option a um concerning the balconies uh we have approved a balcony on the secondary dwelling that's quite visible so I don't know that the balconies even if they are visible and I do believe they're visible based on the photographs I've seen now um I don't know that they're offensive uh if they became Juliet balconies The View wouldn't change much from the street frankly um I think that the balconies feel oversized and that they could come in um left and right to align with the columns that are below them which would still give you probably an eight- or 10-foot deck and a little bit more roof line uh that you'd see on these and um I think that would be my only concern would be the size of those balconies and if you could reduce those but overall, I think it's I think the language is in keeping with the other approvals okay Joe thanks uh appreciate

-Abby- I agree with what Joe said I didn't know if they became more Juliet balconies if it would work architecturally um but I think it would not and so much attention, yeah, I'm I would be also in favor of option

-Val- I also agree with Joe, but I would ask the applicant is there a possibility to perhaps eliminate one of the balconies I was wondering if the applicant was going to offer that in in this discussion, I agree with option A yeah.

-Connie - I agree I um would be in favor of option A with a reduction in the balconies but would be more in favor of the removal of at least one of the balconies as possible thank

-Joe-yeah, the more I look at this the East

Elevation especially since you started focusing on that door and the ground floor having that deck on the second floor narrow up and align with the post below and your description about essentially centering the posts about that door and then having them align with the above um I would approve through an exhibit a the reduction in that deck which would be approximately a two to three feet reduction on the left side and the right I think it's probably closer to two, so you'd have a net reduction of four to six feet across that deck on the on the East and the west.

1. Jeff Kaschluk 86A/88 Old South Rd New Commercial Bldg 68/400&419.1 LFW

NEW BUSINESS AUGUST 20, 2024

Voting: Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Macleod,

Recused:

Representative:

Staff Comments: Carrie, Abby, Angus, Val,

Public Comments:

Commissioner Comments:

Ray- for minor revisions to be heard next week at the beginning of the meeting

Val - I'm looking at the materials chart you know it's there's an Overhead Door that's tan I get that what is the door brown shelter is that the surround around the door is the only thing I'm not quite clear on I see Hing his head yes that's the um the the rubber material you see this a lot with industrial these kinds of buildings where um there are the protection that connects the back of the truck to the uh I've learned all these things to the to the building um but um they are normally black, and we were able to Source this um uh brown color that we felt would work better thank you it's nice-looking building thank you.

1. Jeff Kaschluk 86A/88 Old South Rd Hardscape 68/400&419.1 LFW

Val - hold for some minor revisions and heard uh beginning of next.

Ray-. and I'm in favor now um The Hardscape should we have that

Abby- sidewalk um and so the degree that you can plant there

Carrie - I don't think the turning radius is into the road, so I think giving 5 feet of that 10-ft setback for a little green strip of hedge or something would be great I don't think you're a truck driver, but I was, I don't think you can turn a truck around on that asphalt driveway I think they're going to have to back out

Angus - motion to uh hold for minor revision and track with the building

Motion to hold for minor revision and track with the building under new business

Carried 5:00// Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, MacLeod, Pohl

3. Sharon Fruit 14 Pond View Entrance gate 81/8 Graham & Graham

Voting: Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Pohl, Welch, MacLeod
 Recused: Welch, Paul
 Representative:
 Documentation.
 Staff Comments:
 Public Comments:
 Commissioner Comments:

Val - we don't like fences to be right on the line because then there is no screening on your neighbor's side right, we try to avoid that

Angus- have like a cattle guard that they can't walk across um and that might be something to consider in addition to what's already been suggested of a natural

Ray - Ray so yeah, the gate a painted white, and B um that toll is a problem for me but um you know there is the cattle great thing which is one solution and the other one is you have a gate at a reasonable height say four feet and then you have a bar up at the top where you have a wire running across at about eight feet and there isn't no way a deer is going to jump underneath that or over it and so that's a preventative measure that a lot of landscapers are employing

Angus – I'll be more comfortable with a plan where it shows what height fence is where um surrounding the property and the vegetation that will be in front of it or behind it um and we'll be happy to make a motion for clarification and viewing

Motion to and I'll write up the exhibit a can you can you try that and I'll just do no issues so the uh perimeter fence on the side and the rear would move in between three and five uh subject to vegetation of either privet or uh Baltic Ivy or naturalized plantings to mitigate visibility No taller than 7 feet um the gate will be subject to review and approval of the chair or the vice chair the picket fence along the front behind the privet will not be visible time and inspection or thereafter uh no taller than three feet moved Mr. chair and the gate will be natural to weather gate natural weather so moved okay on your motion

Carried 3:0// Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, MacLeod, Pohl

Angus Macleod, Val Oliver - NO
 Abby Camp, Ray Pohl, Stephen Welch – YES

Joe Tirone	25 Honey Suckle Dr	Roof top solar	68/389	Isaksen Solar
Voting:	MacLeod, Pohl, Camp, Patten, Thornewill, Welch			
Recused:	Oliver,			
Documentation:	Solar panel			
Motion:	Motion to approve items on 25 Honey Suckle Dr. Solar Panel			
Vote:	Carried 5:0//Stephen Welch, Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Carrie Thornewill (Aye)			

Jeffery Ackseizer 14 Moors End Ln New Garage 43/216 EMDA

Voting:	Stephen Welch, Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Carrie Thornewill
---------	--

Recused:	
Documentation:	New Garage
Motion:	Hold for next time
Vote:	

Ack MWG LLC **10 Silver St** **New dwelling** **55.4.1/187** **EMD**

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul
Recused:	Stephen Welch
Documentation:	French doors,
Motion:	Motion to approve Exhibit a to revise the French door
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul(Aye)

Paul - Paul yes sir what's a chance I get you to do an exhibit at a happily do an exhibit a I won't address the chimney and I would make the um when you're looking at that door the window would be on the right-hand side of that door

21 Pilgrim Rd Trust 4 Sophie's Way/21 Pilgrim New Dwelling 41/213-213.2 S Metz

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	need some photos on the site of the house
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	View with Review
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul(Aye)

Dalibor & Liliana Kovacevic 3 Aster Ct Solar Roof 68/373 Ack Smart

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	Solar Panel
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	HOLD
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch(Aye)

Garret Roberts 1 South Mill St Rev change roof 55.4.1/61 EMDA

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	

Documentation:	REV CHANGE ROOF
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	HOLD
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch

Reinemo, Timothy 65 Lovers Ln New pool 80/214.1 Self

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	NEW POOL
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	Motion to approve
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch(aye)

23 Sankaty Head Trust 23 Sankaty Head Rd Folly 48/4.1 BPC

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	Folly
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	Motion to revisions
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch(aye)

Jeffery Greenberg 30A Orange St Lower main roof/fen. Revs 4940 42.3.2/200 Emeritus LTD

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Stephen Welch
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	Holly -changes to it uh I appreciate lowering the Ridge and reducing the size of the previously approved Dormers um my only um I guess I got a question is the need to remove the existing windows on the North because now there won't be any windows in that elevation and if they need to be moved if they could be reused elsewhere in the structure Angus - maybe six inches below the ridge Abby - Dormers up on the third floor there but um this seems a little pinched uh so I would make those a little smaller Stephen – it is more appropriate to knock down that top plate six inches the other item that I think would be appropriate to address um and it would pick up bury the um window header into the top plate and that'll lower your uh terminal point of the shed Ray - that shade tree that's growing in the front yard I'm not overly

troubled by the fact that we're losing the fenestration on that side

Public Comments:

Commissioner Comments:

Motion: **Motion to amenable to Exhibit**

Vote: **Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Stephen Welch(aye)**

Cohen Steven L TR/Dukes Rd Tr

2 Dukes Rd Pool Hardscape

41/187

Ahern LLC

Voting: **Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Val Oliver, Carrie Thornewill**

Alternates:

Recused: **Ray Pohl,**

Representative:

Documentation:

Staff Comments Holly – the vegetation you mentioned was moved thank you for that I think maybe photographs would be helpful for us to get that picture um but overall, I think it's you know I think there's a little bit of question on the elevation aspect so those are me come to comments for your consideration

Joe- the height of the wall where the head in um parking is as you come to this

Carrie – the grade has changed quite a lot because that driveway used to meander and go up and down

um and it doesn't anymore I am against flattening part of this property because it is a natural hill, and a lot of Dukes has been ruined because it's been flattened in tears, and you don't see the hill anymore, and I think that's a huge part of Duke's Road. Street vegetation if you can keep it to truly natural things so it Blends It's very natural in with what Dukes the whole beginning of Dukes. planting is going to be important to hide it I do think it's too big as well it's massive it's 44 by 22 22 by 44, yeah and I would think more like 18 by 36 would be appropriate or something like 18 by 38 I just think the 404 where you're getting into Olympic a swimming pool. Lot of Monolithic stone walls and it's not it doesn't it's not appropriate that we Road.

Angus - I agree with what's been said

Joe - the shape of the drive and the fact that it does open the view corridor right to the corner where the pool is now. I think it would make that wall feel more like a landscape wall and less like part of the house's foundation.

Abby - could get rid of the driveway just go Bringing you right up to the pool and bang there's the pool.

Public Comments:

Commissioner Comments:

Motion: **Motion to hold for revisions**

Vote: **Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Carrie Thornewill (aye)**

Boulevard Property Group LLC

20 Main St Pool Hardscape

73.3.1/50

LFW

Voting:	Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Val Oliver, Carrie Thornewill
Alternates:	Connie
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Public Comments:	Rob - seems that this pool is unnecessary and B un neighborly.
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	Motion to hold for revision
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Connie Patten (aye)

Staff Comments: Abby - I think the sighting of this pool is a bit off being right on road number one um and close to the neighbor property uh which is called Pal Deare and their apples all over the place because it is palling de May but it's right it would be Ro located right on their property uh line um and the pool doesn't seem to relate to this old historic sort of square C it just seems to be off to the side and it I don't it doesn't seem relate to the building which is quite classical and then the streetscape is very open on that corner and going down, McKinley hedges are going further down the road but at the site right there it's very open and it's nice because you can walk by and you look in and you can see you know the beauty of this building and the next and the building next to it is um they're just series of them that are quite nice so but so this doesn't this will this screening this will take away from that natural um Street

Vall - I think you could move it back to the east on this site plan unit has some wording in a box that says proposed Cedar 25 feet on Center.

Angus - the pools are further away the one that is on the corner of Mory in Maine is visible even though there are hedges and trees and everything else you still see the pool and it doesn't feel like old Sconset.

Connie - I'm concerned about the location um and I'm not sure even if this was moved

Ray - suggesting that as an alternative to this McKinley side because even with the proposed layer of Evergreen screening plus fence you're still going to be able to see it and then that takes no account really of the border between uh this piece of property and number two McKinley which is also going to be open and vulnerable so those are my comments we should hold this for some revisions.

3 Back Street LLC

3 Back St Demo

55/348

Thornewill RP

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul,
Alternates:	Joe Paul
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	Holly - the board in May did approve um a move of this dwelling uh through the staff for more um dated information which Luke has provided before you tonight um I would just you know from a technicality perspective um you know it did bring up to Luke I was concerned with not having um that one COA being unfinalized because we were waiting through for information through staff before these two options came through muse it's kind of you know kind of the chicken in the egg so to speak um pun intended I guess. I think it would be um helpful if we had a little bit more information on its condition, I respect Luke 100% but for the file having photographs of its condition if it's in such disrepair we do have the letter from the abutter which you all have received.
	Ray - demo option two
	Val - I am okay with this being gone, you can put a little plaque somewhere that says thank you, Joe Lopes, or whatever. no redeeming history.
	Joe - I'm on the same page as Val
	Abby - I can go I um I agree with Joe and Val um I'm one of those pesky people who would love to see what's going in

Angus - structures that we're familiar with that create the street Scopes and the history and you know who lived where when and what the neighborhood was like.

Motion: Motion to approve sub-added documentation of the condition of the building for the file
Vote: **Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Val Oliver (Aye)**

3 Back Street LLC

3 Back St

Partial Demo option

2 55/348

Thornewill RP

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	Motion to approve is submitted
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul (aye)

Brandon Eldridge

26 Arlington St

Solar Roof

76.1.3/281

Isaksen Solar RP

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Vall Oliver
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	hold
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul (aye)

Central Family LLC

25 Masaquet Ave

New Shed

80/138

Edward Cantrall JP

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Vall Oliver
Alternates:	
Recused:	Carrie Thornewill
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	

Commissioner Comments:	Ray - the actual dimensioned version of The Shed how disoriented that kind of thing on a plan
Motion:	Motion to review and view - HOLD
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Val Oliver, Carrie Thornewill(aye)

256 Polpis LLC

256 Polpis Rd

GH Add Dormer fen rev

25/25

Botticelli & Pohl JP

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Vall Oliver
Alternates:	Vall Oliver
Recused:	
Representative:	
- Documentation: Location: Cottage at 256 Pulpis Road. - Situated below the road, making it less noticeable. - No footprint changes allowed due to restrictions.	
Staff Comments:	Holly - ☐ The structure in question is a secondary dwelling for the main house, referred to as "Leeds More."
☐ The Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) inaccurately states the dwelling is from the 1970s; it is pre-1940s. ☐ A photograph from NH shows both structures on the lot, highlighting the history of the building. ☐ Historical features include two-over-two windows and a rear L-shaped entry, which has lost shutters over time. ☐ The proposal to remove the rear L and add it to the main block is deemed inappropriate. ☐ Suggestion to move the addition to the middle, where the windows are, to create a larger bump-out instead. Angus - General opinion: The alteration is sensitive. - Recommendation to make the rear dormer a foot narrower on each side to pull it away from the edge. - Suggested reduction of the deck size by a couple of feet. - Concern regarding the side door being moved towards the front: - Suggest shifting the door further back for better integration with the older part of the house. - The current placement feels like a window was replaced with a door.	
ABBY- Appreciation for the preservation of the front of the building. ☐ Support for adding a small dormer on the back. ☐ Concern was expressed about the side (west elevation) and the loss of old-fashioned additive massing. ☐ Overall agreement with previous comments made by other commissioners.	
CONNIE - ☐ No additional comments to add. ☐ Supports the suggestions made by Angus. ☐ Agrees with Abby about missing the side gable.	
ANGUS - Clarification about the house's orientation: the front is not visible until you are past the house. ☐ The primary visual of the house comes from the western elevation. ☐ Concern noted about the dormer being too close to the gable end. ☐ Concern regarding the door's proximity to the front of the house.	
HOLLY - Agreement with the previous clarification about the house's visibility. ☐ Personal observation: drives by the site at least twice a day. ☐ Confirms that the western elevation is the primary view when driving down Pulpis Road.	
ANGUS - Motion to hold the proposal for revisions regarding: - The dormer. - The door location. ☐ The motion is left open-ended for further revisions.	

Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	Motion to revisions with review
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Val Oliver (aye)

Harford, Suni & William B Jr

60 Wanoma Way

Pool hardscape

92/13

Ahern LLC VO

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Vall Oliver, Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten
Alternates:	Connie and Carrie
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments: VAL- ☐ Wish for photographs from the back of the house for better understanding of the hardscape. ☐ Acknowledgment that the hardscape won't be prominently visible, so it may not require too much focus. ☐ Expresses ongoing concern about retaining walls. ☐ Overall opinion: comfortable with the proposal. CARRIE - ☐ Positive note on the retaining wall being visible from inside the site rather than the street. ☐ Concern was expressed about the size of the proposed pool (approximately 20 by 50 feet). ☐ General concern about the trend of large pools across the island. CONNIE - ☐ Agreement with the previous comments about visibility. ☐ Overall support for the proposal, noting it won't be visible. ☐ Acknowledgment of the pool's large size as a concern. ABBY - ☐ Concern was expressed about the pool and surrounding hardscaping in a delicate area near the pond. ☐ Noted that the pool is larger than the house. ☐ Recommendation for the pool size to be reduced, labeling it as insensitive. RAY - ☐ Acknowledgment that the proposal will not be visible from a public way. ☐ Expresses approval of the proposal as submitted. ☐ Asks for input from others regarding next steps. VAL - ☐ Motion to approve the proposal as submitted, citing lack of visibility. ☐ Acknowledgment that, due to it being a pool, usual guidelines apply. ☐ Discussion about a caveat regarding visibility. ☐ Val made the motion; Abby expressed opposition; Leen indicated understanding.	
Motion:	Motion to approve the proposal as submitted, citing lack of visibility
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Abby Camp, Vall Oliver, Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten (aye)

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Vall Oliver
Alternates:	CONNIE PATTEN
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	HOLLY - ☐ For the record, the main dwelling is a gable-ended Greek Revival style, dating to around 1900. ☐ The cottage is considered to fit in well with the low scale of the area. ☐ Fenestration is deemed appropriate, though there are many ganged windows. ☐ Kick panels within the doors are noted as a positive feature. ☐ Overall, the cottage is considered appropriate as a secondary dwelling within the district. MICKEY - ☐ Comment regarding the windows mentioned by Holly. ☐ Noted that the triple-ganged windows face north toward India Street and may be visible. ☐ Suggestion to separate the ganged windows into two individual windows for better aesthetics. VAL- ☐ Expresses approval of the proposal. ☐ Initially thought the windows were SDL (Simulated Divided Lite) but confirmed they are Boston sash windows. ABBY - ☐ Question raised about visibility from India Street: Which gable would be seen? ☐ Note that a high fence and vegetation may obstruct the view. ☐ If unobstructed, the triple-ganged windows would be visible. ☐ Suggestion to change the triple windows to two separate windows for a more historic appearance. ANGUS- ☐ Expresses overall satisfaction with the proposal, noting it is well-scaled and appropriately sited. ☐ The only concern is the ganged windows, which are out of character with the existing structure. ☐ Suggestion to keep three windows but place shingles between them for a more cohesive look. CONNIE - ☐ Expresses support for Angus's proposal regarding the windows. ☐ Indicates agreement with the suggested changes.
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	Motion to approve the proposal with the following conditions: • The three windows on the north side should be separated by about 6 inches. • Option to use Boston SDL (Simulated Divided Lite) windows to meet energy code requirements.
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Connie Patten(aye)

New Street LLC **7 New Street** **Window change rev** **2024-10638 55.4.1/37** **WAPD VO**

Vote: **Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Val Oliver**

Alternates:	JOE
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	HOLLY - ☐ Clarification on why the proposal was not placed on the consent agenda: it is an as-built condition completed without prior approval. ☐ Acknowledgment that this situation changes the context of the discussion. JOE – ☐ Request for corrected drawings to ensure that the clouded areas are removed from all previously proposed plans. ☐ Clarification that this will address only the relevant items discussed. Motion to approve the proposal as submitted, with the following conditions: • An as-built fee for the changes from a 6-over-6 window to a four-light window. • Corrected drawings to remove clouding from all smaller vignette elevations for clarity in the approval documentation. RAY- ☐ Addition to the motion: a humorous suggestion that Sam should wear a "hair shirt" for a month due to the as-built condition. ☐ Confirmation that Joe's motion includes: • Approval of the proposal. • Requirement to clean up the drawings by removing unnecessary clouding and only retaining what is applicable. • Inclusion of the as-built fee.
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	
Motion:	month due to the as-built condition. The requirement to clean up the drawings by removing unnecessary clouding and only retaining what is applicable.
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Vall Oliver, (aye)

42/44 Arb Way LLC **9 Arbour Way** **Rev to 11-9503 infill porch** **29/137** **Botticelli & Pohl AM**

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Carrie Thornewill, Val Oliver
Alternates:	Val Oliver
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	HOLLY – ☐ Concern raised about the French doors, noting that a kick panel is usually desired. ☐ Mention that the 2-over-2 light configurations may not warrant a kick panel, suggesting this is typically not required in such cases. ☐ No other concerns noted. ☐ Confirmation that the existing doors will be reused, which is seen as a positive. MICKEY- ☐ Concern expressed about the French doors facing the street in a prominent location. ☐ Typically, French doors are not approved in such visible positions. ☐ Suggestion that it would be more appropriate to replace the French doors with a single door instead of two. ANGUS- ☐ Agreement with the concern about the French doors. ☐ Appreciation for the reuse of the French doors. ☐ Support for the doors being installed on the side rather than the front, as front-facing doors would contradict the guidelines.

CARRIE-

- ☐ No issue with the French doors being installed as proposed.
- ☐ Belief that there will be some buffer landscaping.
- ☐ Initial confusion about the driveway's location, but clarification was provided.
- ☐ Acknowledgment that the driveway is on the other side and will be vegetated.
- ☐ Overall opinion: the French doors are not seen as prominent and are acceptable.

ABBY-

- ☐ Approval of the proposal, noting that the location is far enough back.
- ☐ Belief that it contributes to additive massing.
- ☐ Overall, the commenter is fine with the proposal.

CONNIE-

- ☐ General agreement with the proposal; multiple members express approval.
- ☐ Motion made to approve the proposal as submitted.
- ☐ Acknowledgment of the motion and call for a vote.

Public Comments:

Commissioner Comments:

Motion:	Motion to submitted
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Carrie Thornewill, Val Oliver ,Connie Patten(aye)

John Roberts

15 Helen dr

Roof change add dormers

66/146

KMLD AM

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Carrie Thornewill,
Alternates:	Carrie Thornewill,
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	ANGUS – ☐ The speaker took the proposal off the consent list and is ready to express concerns. ☐ Acknowledgment of several room dormers in the neighborhood, primarily located at the back of houses. ☐ Appreciation for the photos of neighboring houses with shed dormers but notes that most examples lack front dormers. ☐ Highlights that two of the examples provided are corner houses, with dormers located at the back. ☐ Mentions a smaller dormer example across the street with half-size windows, which contrasts with the proposed front dormer. ☐ No issue with the back dormer, but concern about the front dormer's visibility when approaching from the end of Helen's drive. ☐ Suggestions made for two smaller dormers at the front, which would involve relocating the bathroom and closet, despite potential compromises in headspace. ☐ Clarification given regarding the bathroom's placement due to existing plumbing constraints.

CARRIE-

- ☐ Emphasis on the importance of visibility regarding the proposal.
- ☐ Reference to a neighboring three-story building, noting that it lacks a dormer.
- ☐ Clarification that the discussion is not solely about the dormer but the overall context.
- ☐ The speaker finds that the proposed dormer is similar in scale to the neighboring building.
- ☐ Acknowledgment that the neighborhood has various building configurations, indicating flexibility.
- ☐ Overall, the speaker expresses no significant issue with the proposed dormer.

VAL-

- ☐ Val expresses approval of the proposal, acknowledging the mixed-use nature of the neighborhood.
- ☐ Recognition that the area contains garage apartments and commercial-residential combinations.
- ☐ Val believes the placement of the proposed dormer on the lot is appropriate and notes it is not highly visible.

ABBY-

- ☐ Abby expresses concern about the proposed height reaching almost 30 feet, emphasizing the need for vegetation to remain or be enhanced to limit visibility from the public way.
- ☐ Abby indicates she is willing to make a motion to approve the proposal, contingent on the preservation or addition of vegetation for visibility.
- ☐ Motion made to approve the proposal with the condition regarding vegetation.
- ☐ The vote results in four in favor and one opposed

Motion: Motion made to approve the proposal with the condition regarding vegetation.

Vote: Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Carrie Thornewill, (aye)

. Suzanne & Thomas Albani

39 Wanoma Way

Replace beach stairs

92.4/318 EMDA AM

Voting: Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul

Alternates:

Recused:

Representative:

Documentation:

Staff Comments:

Public Comments:

Commissioner Comments:

Motion: skip over

Vote: Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul (aye)

Elizabeth Churchill

3 Emily St

Move build and addition

49.2.3/53

self

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Val Oliver, Connie Patten
Alternates:	Joe Paul
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	ABBY- ☐ Acknowledgment of visibility from Backx Road. ☐ Concern was expressed about the east elevation and its heavy fenestration. ☐ Suggestion to replace the triple windows with two windows that are spread apart to reduce visual density on the right side. HOLLY - Holly expresses the intention to defer to Rob for further input or discussion. VAL- ☐ Expression of approval for the proposal, stating it seems appropriate and looks like it has always been there. ☐ Indicates readiness to move on to the next application. ☐ Val is confirmed as supportive of the proposal. JOE- ☐ Question about the studio's east elevation, noting it is mostly glass, like a garage door. ☐ Clarification that the structure is sliding forward, and an addition is being made to the back. ☐ Acknowledgment that the proposed changes seem appropriate. ☐ Notable reduction in glazing: from 117 square feet on the east and south to 31 square feet, providing context for the changes. ANGUS- ☐ Angus expresses that he has no concerns about the proposal.
Motion:	Motion made to approve the proposal as submitted.
Vote:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul Val Oliver, (aye)

Elizabeth Churchill 3 Emily St Patio deck 49.2.3/53 self

Voting:	Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Val Oliver, Connie Patten
Alternates:	
Recused:	
Representative:	
Documentation:	
Staff Comments:	
Public Comments:	
Commissioner Comments:	HOLLY – Holly indicates she has no concerns about the proposal. ROB- Rob also states he has no concerns.

VAL-
Val is confirmed as the one who made the motion.

Motion: **A motion is made to approve the proposal as submitted.**

Vote: **Ray Pohl, Abby Camp, Joe Paul Val Oliver, (aye)**

Jose Guiterrel

4 Cartwright Pl

Addition

55/220.2

Val Oliver AM

Voting: **Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul**

Alternates: Connie , Joe

Recused:

Representative:

Documentation:

Staff Comments:

Public Comments:

Commissioner Comments:

ANGUS-

- ☐ Angus expresses concern about the proposal, particularly regarding the front elevation.
- ☐ Notes that the front door seems to have been lost in the current proposal.
- ☐ The main issue is with the third-floor dormer, highlighting that the streetscape shown indicates mostly two-story buildings without dormers.
- ☐ Angus concludes his comments.

ABBY –

- ☐ The speaker expresses that this proposal represents an even greater departure from the previous one.
- ☐ Concerns are raised about the height increasing to 30 feet, which is considered out of scale for the area.
- ☐ The speaker expresses discomfort with the direction of the proposal, indicating significant reservations.

JOE –

- ☐ Joe notes concern about the absence of a clearly defined front door.
- ☐ Suggests repositioning the front door and creating a more welcoming front porch appearance.
- ☐ Acknowledges potential limitations in setback space for adding a landing and stairs.
- ☐ Proposes that a forward-facing door and possibly a porch roof could help mitigate the perception of increased height.
- ☐ Joe clarifies that the side door access could work well if there were a covered porch or landing leading up to it.
- ☐ He appreciates the charm of having the door on the side rather than facing forward.
- ☐ Emphasizes that the design does not have to be rigid, but the entrance should be well-covered.

CONNIE –

- ☐ Connie agrees with Joe regarding confusion about the location of the front door.
- ☐ Suggests that repositioning the front door could enhance the design.
- ☐ Notes a concern about the two doors on the rear, questioning the purpose of the door next to them that has a small, shed roof over it.
- ☐ Thanks, the group for their attention.

RAY-

- ☐ The speaker suggests splitting the dormers for a more balanced appearance.
- ☐ The best case would be to avoid having a dormer facing the road entirely.

- ☐ Acknowledges other board members' comments regarding the front door and potential porch modifications as a way to improve the proposal.
- ☐ Concludes with these considerations.

Motion: **Motion to hold for revision**

Vote: **Ray Pohl, Angus Macleod, Abby Camp, Joe Paul, Connie Patten(aye)**