



Minutes for August 27, 2024; adopted November 12, 2024

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES Tuesday, August 27, 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 Welch called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:	Motion to approve as drafted (Oliver)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Patten, Camp, MacLeod (Aye)

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

I. DISCUSSION & VOTE

	Value of Written Submission & Submission Deadlines
--	--

II. CONSENT

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Lightus Coop Inc	7 Crooked Ln	New Carriage House	41/80	S Metz VO
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten			
Recused:	-			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Motion:	Motion to approve items on Consent. (Made By: Oliver)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Patten (Aye)			

OLD BUSINESS FROM LAST WEEK 08/20/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Jeff Kaschluk	86A/88 Old South Rd	New Commercial Bldg	68/400&419.1	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Greg Saad			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Applicant addressed all concerns. Oliver			

	- No concerns. Camp - No concerns. MacLeod - Appreciates all the revisions. Nothing to add. Pohl - No concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted (Made by: Oliver)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Thornewill (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. Jeff Kaschluk	86A/88 Old South Rd	Hardscape	68/400&419.1	LFW
Voting:	Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Greg Saad			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	MacLeod - Discussion on landscaping in the median area. - Consideration of plant height and growth potential. - Concerns raised about the effectiveness of proposed plantings (e.g., Juniper) in breaking up views of the bays. - Need for further evaluation of plant types and their suitability for desired visual screening. Oliver - No concerns. Camp - Proposal to plant a tree at location number 7 to soften the front façade of the commercial garage doors. - Preference expressed for a tree rather than alternative landscaping options. Thornewill - Appreciation noted for the current landscaping, but concerns raised about its minimal impact. Strong preference expressed for adding a tree to enhance the aesthetic and functionality.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with the condition that Zone 7 on the site plan will be planted Evergreen species that will grow to a height of six feet. (Made by: MacLeod)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp, Thornewill (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3. Jose Guiterrel	4 Cartwright Pl	Addition	55/220.2	Val Oliver AM
Voting:	Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Patten, Welch			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Val Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	MacLeod - Preference expressed for minimizing dormers on the east elevation. - Concern that adding a third-story dormer above two stories does not align with the architectural style typical for the area. Camp			

	- Suggested having just one window per dormer so it would read not as heavy on the third floor. Patten - No concerns. Welch - Recommendation to reduce the second-floor ceiling height from 8' to 7'6". - Proposal to plant a tree for every front-facing dormer. - Preference for deciduous trees over tall cypress trees for better neighborhood integration. Pohl - Appreciate the idea of the 7'6" ceiling. - Likes the idea of the deciduous trees.
Motion:	Motion to approve with the condition of the reduction of 6" from the second-floor ceiling height and a plan to indicate a couple of columnar deciduous trees. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 3-2 // Patten, Pohl, Welch (Aye) MacLeod, Camp (No)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. 235 Polpis LLC	256 Polpis Rd	GH Add Dormer fen rev	25/25	Botticelli & Pohl JP
Voting:	Oliver (Chair), MacLeod, Camp, Patten, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Pohl			
Representative:	Lisa Botticelli			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - Structure dates back to at least the 1940s. - Western configuration is preferred. - Suggestion to relocate existing two-over-two windows rather than installing new ones. - Appreciation expressed for dormers coming off the ridge and sides. - Emphasis on adhering to "Building with Nantucket in Mind" for appropriate dimensions.			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Approves of the changes. MacLeod - Appreciate the revisions that were made and approves of the changes. Patten - Appreciate the revisions that were made and approves of the changes. Thornewill - Approves of the changes.			
Motion:	Motion to approve with the condition to add a casing in between the windows on the west elevation. (Made by: MacLeod)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0// MacLeod, Camp, Patten, Thornewill, Oliver (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
5. 21 Pilgrim Rd Trust	4 Sophie's Way/21 Pilgrim	New Dwelling	41/213-213.2	S Metz
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Sophie Metz			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	MacLeod - Still concerned about height. The main gable on the west elevation could come down to the			

	story and a half height. Pohl - Agreement with MacLeod on design concerns. - Suggestion to lower the main gable for better alignment with the second-floor windows above the front door. Camp - Agreement on lowering the main gable. - Concerns expressed regarding the placement of the dwelling on the property. Oliver - Nothing to add and no concerns. Welch - Suggestion to reduce the top plate height by 6 inches on the second floor or third-floor rafters. - Recommendation to lower the left dormer of the main mass to conceal the header in the top plate, helping to reduce the overall height appearance.
Motion:	Reduce the ridge and eve of the main gable by 6” and bury the header on all shown dormers (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 3-2// Pohl, Welch, Oliver (Aye) MacLeod, Camp (No)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
6. Cohen Steven L 2 Dukes Rd Tr LLC	2 Dukes Rd	Pool Hardscape	73.3.1/50	Ahern

Voting:	Oliver, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill
Alternates:	Welch
Recused:	-
Representative:	Miroslava Ahern
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.
Staff Comments:	-
Public Comments:	-
Commissioner Comments:	Thornewill - Appreciation expressed for the reduction of the pool size by a couple of feet. - Concerns raised about the rectilinear nature of the wall running straight across the house. - Suggestion to explore more organically shaped walls for enhanced aesthetic appeal. Camp - Observation that the design appears very squared off. - Desire for the pool to better fit into the landscape. - Preference expressed for positioning the pool further back on the site to reduce its prominence. Welch - Agreement on the desire for a more organic shape along the front of the house. - Less concern expressed about rectilinear design in the internal areas, particularly on the left side adjacent to the pool and garage. Oliver - No comment. MacLeod - Suggestion to use natural plantings to soften the eastern corner of the wall. - Recommendation to position the retaining wall behind more organic plantings for better integration with the landscape.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revision. (Made by: MacLeod)
Vote:	Carried 5-0// MacLeod, Camp, Welch, Thornewill, Oliver (Aye)

OLD BUSINESS 07/30/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Thomas Ripley	92 Washington St	New Dwelling	42.2.3/22	Marshall Harris
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Leo Wilson			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - The house must comply with Resilient Nantucket Guidelines, requiring elevation of 6'2". - Appreciation expressed for the changes and revisions, including the inboard chimney. - Recommendation for kick panels on the French doors. - Concern noted about shed dormers along the waterfront interfering with the center Gambrel, which is considered atypical. - Suggestion to reduce shingle space on the sides of the single dormer. - Inquiry regarding the differences in glazing on the waterfront between the current and proposed designs.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Proportions of the A windows in the dormer and rear elevation are misaligned; taller windows are needed for better light orientation. - Dormers appear squat; suggestion to steepen the pitch and extend them into the upper roof plane. - Recommendation to use door-window combinations to break up the three sets of French doors facing the harbor; kick panels needed. - Front elevation still feels too tall; proposal to narrow the width of the main gable. - Rake detail is considered too plain; suggestion to incorporate a typical shadow board with a larger sub-rake for improvement. - Front door is perceived as too formal; front porch feels awkwardly asymmetrical. - Roof pitch on the left side of the hip is steep and should be adjusted. - Concern that the middle dormer connecting the two gables does not work well; a smaller isolated dormer in that position is preferred.			
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Agrees with Mickey's comments on the water side and dormer sizes. - Concerns were raised about short windows due to the dormer and the arc's impact. It's suggested that altering the arc's curve could allow for taller windows without changing the roof pitch. - Agreement on the inclusion of kick panels on all French doors for aesthetic consistency. - Recommendation to clearly identify all roof pitches on the elevations, as they are currently missing. Angus - Agree with what's been said, particularly the proportion of the upper panes of the six over ones facing the water. Some areas where the windows could have gotten longer on the south side. - Lowering the windowsills in the dormers closer to the roof could improve proportions, especially with the gable windows. - The aim is to eliminate shingle space below the dormer windows. - For the windows below, they may need to be narrower to ensure the panes are vertical rather than horizontal.			

	- Emphasis on the importance of subtle details for the overall design success, such as the moldings mentioned by Mickey. - Discussion included the addition of rake or crown molding to enhance the architectural detail. Oliver - Nothing else to add. Thornewill - Appreciated the changes thus far. - Appreciation for the simplification in the end elevations, but concern remains about the lack of gambrel roofs in the neighborhood. - Preference for straight lines on all roof bases, as the current flare is considered too fanciful. - The regularity of the fenestration, especially the French doors, feels too static; a suggestion was made to break it up for more visual interest. - Positive feedback on the chimney being brought in. - Opposition to the use of a standing seam roof for this project. Welch - Request for clarity in the image, noting the visibility of the chimney and appreciation for its placement. - The penetration pattern feels overwhelming, not just with the French doors but also with the screen panels. There's a suggestion to modify these elements to create a more balanced pattern. - Regarding the dormer, it's recommended to pull the face of the dormer wall towards the water and incorporate taller windows, as it won't be visible from elsewhere. - Concerns about the dormer between the gambrels being inappropriate. It may need to be separated into a center dormer that is not connected to the gambrels, as the current design lacks height. - The picture frame around the area of the height increase is deemed inappropriate. A suggestion is made for vertical board spacing or lattice instead.
Motion:	Hold for revisions (Made by: MacLeod)
Vote:	Carried 5-0//MacLeod, Oliver, Thornewill, Pohl, Welch (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. Thomas Ripley	92 Washington St	New garage	42.2.3/22	Marshall Harris
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Leo Wilson			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - While the architectural design is appreciated, the gambrel style may be excessive for a garage apartment or studio. - The gambrel matches the main house, but there are concerns about its suitability for this structure. - Emphasis on the importance of consistency in design, suggesting that even if the balcony is not visible from public areas or the water, kick panels should still be included. - A simpler gable structure is suggested as being more appropriate for the garage apartment.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Supported Holly's comments on the gable versus gambrel roof design. - Noted that the building is very tall and visually dominant, especially in perspective views. - Observed that the original building, which had a gable roof, appeared lower and less dominant on the lot. - Felt that a gable roof would be a better choice for this structure. - Mentioned that the "A" windows had similar issues as those on another house.			

	- Suggested that mismatched dormers at the back of the building should be uniform.
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Dislike for the "bracketed" design element, noting it would not be visible. - Believed the gable could be added with minimal impact on the second-floor interior layout. - Open to exploring the gable option, depending on others' feedback. MacLeod - The member agreed with previous comments about the design. - Felt that the double gambrel roof appears overly busy from the street. - Suggested the structure could serve as a tool to strategically screen the house. - Appreciated efforts to keep architectural styles consistent. - Noted that the double gambrel—having both a main and additional gambrel—makes the design feel too complex. - Recommended simplifying the roof design to achieve a cleaner look. - Agreed with others' comments overall. Oliver - Agree with what's been said; simple is always better. Thornewill - Expressed support for a gable roof and lowering the roof mass, as it currently appears very large. - Acknowledged the goal of creating a cohesive design but noted that this is the only gambrel in the neighborhood, which doesn't align with surrounding structures. - Suggested that a simpler gable style for the garage would better complement the neighborhood. - Felt that avoiding multiple gambrels on one property would create a more harmonious look. Welch - Agreed with the concerns about height. - Suggested reviewing properties on Orange Street (537, 102, and 116 gambrels) as examples where the perception of the lower cord length is significantly less. - Appreciated the low first-floor and fascia heights but felt the second floor needs to be lowered for better overall appeal. - Supported Angus's view that the double gambrel design complicates the appearance, especially from the side view. - Recommended simplifying the street-facing design, as it feels excessive. - Proposed that a perspective view of the main house and garage would be beneficial for evaluation.
Motion:	Hold for revisions (Made by: MacLeod)
Vote:	Carried 5-0//MacLeod, Pohl, Thornewill, Oliver, Welch (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3. Thomas Ripley	92 Washington St	New shed	42.2.3/22	Marshall Harris
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Leo Wilson			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The door does seem a little taller. The header height with the eve seems disproportionate but other than that it's appropriate.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Suggested that elevations should be labeled (e.g., east, west) for clarity. - Noted that the blank elevation faces the street and recommended adding a window to improve its appearance. - Observed that the roof pitch may be steeper than necessary.			

	- Agreed with another member's comment that the steep roof pitch doesn't match the style of surrounding buildings.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Having a steep roof pitch doesn't seem to go with the other buildings. Pohl - Requested clarification on which gable end faces the street. - Suggested that if the blank gable end faces the street, a window should be added. - Agreed with the comment about lowering the roof pitch. Thornewill - Nothing else to add. MacLeod - Agrees with comments about the pitch and window. - The gable design prompted thoughts on achieving consistency among the structures. - Suggested focusing on ways to unify the design with both the site and surrounding structures. Welch - Requested a perspective overview of the structures from a couple of angles for a clearer view. - Noted concern with the roof pitch, suggesting it be addressed. - Proposed using the roof slope as an opportunity to tie this structure to the garage, potentially incorporating a hip or similar element. - Believed carrying over design elements between the structures would create a more cohesive overall concept.
Motion:	Hold for revisions (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 5-0//Pohl, Thornewill, MacLeod, Oliver, Welch (Aye)

13 and 15 Nancy Ann LLC	13-15 Nancy Ann Ln	New Mixed Use Bldg	68/137-138	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matt MacEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Dormers help visually lower the mass, but the structure still feels large. - Improved roof pitch and residential shutters add nice touches, but the design remains too industrial and oversized. - Suggested dividing the building into smaller sections to better fit Nantucket's character. - Felt the pedestrian access doesn't create true separation; it's simply an opening. - Recommended scaling down the building by reducing programmatic elements to align better with the neighborhood's scale and feel. Camp - Val suggested breaking up the structure, potentially dropping the middle section near the pedestrian entrance to a story or story and a half to create a human-scale division between the masses. - Expressed concerns about the material choice, particularly the use of board and batten, and suggested considering shingling or adding more variation to the massing. - Acknowledged improvements since the initial design but noted that the building's large, rectangular form still resembles a "box" or stage-set illusion, with small rebates creating only a superficial sense of separation. - Felt the project is progressing but still requires significant changes to avoid a monolithic appearance. Pohl - Agreed with previous comments and acknowledged that the design has improved since the			

	first iteration. - Criticized the building's shape, describing it as a box, measuring 124 feet by 140 feet. - Noted that small 18-inch rebates create only an illusion of separate buildings, resembling an old frontier stage set with facades that appear close but are actually superficial. - Believes the design is progressing but still needs further work to avoid a monolithic, staged appearance. MacLeod - Appreciated the improvements in the presentation since the previous iteration. - Noted that the structure still reads as a large, two-story building measuring 124 by 140 feet. - Observed that the building's massing resembles the Richmond development, where similar-sized buildings with various gables still appear as one large structure. - Questioned whether simplifying the design to one cohesive building might be better than trying to fit multiple smaller buildings into one. - Felt the design currently gives an industrial feel, raising concerns about how it sets a precedent for the neighborhood's future look and alignment with its character. Welch - Agreed with previous comments but felt the changes were insufficient. - Expressed concern that the building is too large to effectively use residential architectural elements, leading to a muddled design. - Suggested that an 18-inch rebate is inadequate for creating variability in the facade, as it appears repetitively around the structure. - Noted a troubling trend of large structures disguised as residential, referencing a recent project (Sparks) and emphasizing the need for more authentic architectural solutions. - Proposed breaking the structure into multiple buildings or a mix of residential elements in front and larger components in the back, possibly adopting a neo-traditional approach. - Mentioned the importance of maintaining a balance with surrounding residential areas while acknowledging the project's context in an industrial zone. - Appreciated the board's comments and acknowledged the challenges with the previous mid-Island project, highlighting the different context of this location. - Argued that while the program is dense, spreading it out would require more land, making this approach appealing for addressing local needs. - Clarified that the intent is not to make the structure look residential but to reduce its perceived scale.
Motion:	1. Motion to revise the agenda to substitute Camp for Patten (Made by: Welch) 2. Motion to hold for revisions (Mady by: Pohl)
Vote:	1. Carried 5-0// Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp (Aye) 2. Carried 5-0// Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. Wolfram Family Trust	7 Folger Ln	New dwelling lot 3 & 4	42.4.4/33.3	WAPD
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Andrew Kotchen			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The site is located within the Old Historic District (OHD). - The main dwelling is classified as a non-contributing infill structure. - Appreciation expressed for changes to the accessory structure, including adjustments to the roof slope and grade, as well as the installation of a six-panel door. - Noted that the glazing is atypical for accessory buildings within the Historic District. - The "broken back" design was deemed more appropriate. - Mentioned the potential for a taller structure in the future.			

	- Concerns about the lack of proposed vegetation to soften visibility from Coffin Park, a public area. - Appreciation for the supplemental views and the use of turtle glass.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - French doors should have kick panels. - The large picture window resembles a French door; recommended replacing it with double-hung windows. - The design has a very modern feel, which may not suit the historic context.
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Proposed replacing the pergola with a roofed porch to mitigate the impact of the glass. Pohl - Good with this, very limited visibility. MacLeod - Overall proportions of the structure are acceptable. - Satisfied with the window changes and the broken back design. - Concern about the elevation with the French doors: - Suggested adding kick panels to the doors. - Recommended removing the bottom row of lights. - Proposed replacing the picture window with two large six-over-six windows to maintain glass area while separating the panes. - Overall appreciation for the changes made so far. Thornewill - Agreed with Angus on the need for kick panels to mitigate the height of the windows and doors, which are eight feet tall or taller. - Appreciated the simplicity of the design but noted it reads as very contemporary. - Suggested that kick panels would help align the design more closely with the historic district. Welch - Visibility is a critical concern; mitigation of plant materials is important. - Acknowledged the turtle lighting study, noting its atypical nature. - Mentioned that a similar window exists on a nearby white structure on Gay Street. - Suggested there may be similar designs on streets closer to India, possibly on Quince or Hussey Street. - Overall, expressed comfort with the current design, appreciating the efforts made to address visibility concerns.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted, updating the COA application to reflect changes throughout the approval process. (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 5-0//Pohl, Thornewill, MacLeod, Oliver, Welch (Aye)

OLD BUSINESS 08/13/2024 - VIEW

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Center of Town LLC	35 Center St	Solar Rooftop	42.3.1/3	AckSmart
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Tobias Glidden			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - The structure within the OHD dates back to circa 1850, built after the Great Fire of 1846. - Appreciated the mockup provided for its insights. - Noted potential visibility from the south street and sidewalk. - Suggested that, if feasible, the structure should be pushed back as much as possible, although			

	the roof configuration and overhead hood may limit this.
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Agreed with Holly that the structure will be visible from the street on both sides. - Suggested eliminating any panels within 10 to 12 feet of the front to reduce visibility.
Commissioner Comments:	Pohl - Acknowledged that the structure will be visible from both the north and south. - Noted that visibility from the south will be more scrutinized due to a lack of trees in that area. - Suggested that pushing the structure back further from the street would help make it less conspicuous. - Drawings can be more accurate. Oliver - If the elevations are similar to the proposed design, recommend setting back one row to minimize proximity to the street. Camp - Expressed concern about the south elevation, which is often seen while walking. - Suggested moving the structure back a panel or 8 to 10 feet to improve visibility. MacLeod - Agreed with Mickey's suggestion of moving the structure back 10 to 12 feet. - Proposed using a mockup with red and yellow stripes to visualize the changes, if possible. Welch - Suggested that panels should be positioned no closer than the halfway point of the roof's length to simplify dimensional accuracy. - Emphasized that this would allow for adequate solar exposure on both sides of the structure. - Expressed concern about visibility in the historic district. - Recommended that any approval be on a test-case basis to evaluate the visual impact over 12 months, considering seasonal changes and varying downtown activity. - Stressed the importance of real-life assessment rather than just mockups before making decisions on future approvals.
Motion:	Motion to hold for a modified mockup to show where the lines are of the panels and to view. (Made by: Camp)
Vote:	Carried 5-0// Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp (Aye)

OLD BUSINESS 08/13/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. FP Martin House LLC	61 Center St	Rev Stair? Accessible lift	42.4.3/67	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matt MacEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Noted that the property is the circa 1803 Martin House, a 5-bay, 2.5-story structure with a central ridge chimney. - Acknowledged that it was originally a 3-bay house and underwent changes as early as the 1890s, supported by photographic evidence. - Appreciated the proposed changes to the central access and friendship stair, which, while not traditional, retain the character-defining feature of the central portico entry. - Emphasized the importance of maintaining the central access, as it has been part of the structure since the 1890s. - Expressed concerns about the current proposal, indicating uncertainty that it adequately meets the structure's needs.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - Expressed approval of the friendship stair, noting that it works well for the current condition			

	and feels appropriate. - Suggested that the center post on the landing may be unnecessary and could be removed for simplicity. - Recommended pushing the landing back from the sidewalk by one or two treads to allow for planting in front of the friendship stair, which would soften the edge along the sidewalk.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Expressed growing support for Mickey's proposal regarding the front entrance, acknowledging initial reservations. - Agreed that the entrance is a prominent feature of the antique house. - Suggested adding a planting bed to soften the area around the friendship stair, which would enhance the overall appearance. - Emphasized the importance of maintaining a historic look in the design. MacLeod - Raised concerns about removing a tread, noting that it could increase the height of the landing. - Preferred keeping the landing as diminutive as possible to maintain emphasis on the original entry and the perpendicular stair. - Indicated a lean towards accepting the proposal as submitted without further modifications Oliver - Expressed support for Mickey's idea of adding planting in front of the friendship stair. - Suggested potentially cutting into the top step to integrate it with the deck and pushing it back for a better visual transition. Welch - Agreed with Angus and Val, suggesting that combining their concepts would successfully create desired green space without raising the landing height. - Recommended raising the railing height significantly, possibly twice the current height. - Suggested placing the handrail on the interior of the posts and using bulkier balusters (around 2.5 to 3 inches) to match existing features. - Advocated for omitting the center post to enhance the design. Pohl - Noted that a standard railing height of 36 inches looks more appropriate than a taller 42-inch railing, which can appear gangly. - Mentioned a successful design solution from the Via Mare involving a supplemental rail on top, suggesting it could work well in this case as well. - Emphasized the importance of maintaining a historic look in the design.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. Inset a step on the existing landing move the entirety of the new proposed assembly towards the house the depth of a tread, eliminate the center post, redraw the railing ballister system, and run the post through the plasters in the deck. (Mady by: MacLeod)
Vote:	Carried 5-0// Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp (Aye)

OLD BUSINESS 08/27/2024 - VIEW

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Catherine Kinsella	19B Hummock Pond Rd	New Barn	56/468	Self
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Camp, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Catherine Kinsella			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver			

	- Has concerns with the dark green given its location. Pohl - No concerns with the color. Welch - No concerns with the color. Camp - No concerns with the color. Paul - No concerns with the color.
Motion:	Motion to approve as submitted. (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 4-1// Welch, Pohl, Camp, Paul (Aye) Oliver (No)

OLD BUSINESS 08/27/2024

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Olsen Family	28 Prospect St	Hardscape Revs	55.4.4/77.1	Val Oliver
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	Oliver			
Representative:	Val Oliver			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The site is an infill within the Old Historic District (OHD), with existing hardscape, including a wall and outdoor shower, in poor condition. - Concern raised regarding the outdoor shower, which is atypically located on the deck; it should be relocated to ground level. - Requested clarification on whether landscaping plans had been previously approved; if so, this should be noted on the current plans.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - The driveway is currently shown at 19 feet wide, which seems excessive for a single-car width; suggested narrowing it. - The outdoor shower is being lowered but remains awkwardly shaped, extending from the building; recommended reducing its depth. - Inquired about the low plantings shown on the site plan along Prospect Street: - Asked if these are new plantings and whether they are located in the street right-of-way or on the property. - Suggested the idea of a brick sidewalk connecting the crosswalk to the existing sidewalk for better accessibility. Joan Taylor - While the plan to lower the outdoor shower to grade is an improvement, the shower remains large compared to examples from 16 M Street and 26 M Street. - The shower's placement is considered obvious and awkward, visible not only from the M Street view corridor but also from the nearby Land Bank land, which has frequently used paths about 20 feet from the patio. - Expressed concern that the design originally proposed by Commissioner Val was ideal for the landscape, and that lowering the deck to accommodate the shower disrupts the simplicity and character of the design. - Suggested exploring several alternative locations for the shower: - The 5-foot alleyway created. - The other end of the porch. - Noted existing plumbing stacks on both sides, which could facilitate relocation. Anne Davis - Considered the side with the outdoor shower as the front facade of the house due to its visibility from public land on Mill Street.			

	- Noted that this side is the most forward-facing and visible, making the shower's placement critical. - Expressed concern that the shower blocks the main architectural features, affecting the building's character, simplicity, and symmetry. - Observed that the shower currently obstructs views of some windows and doors from various angles. - Suggested relocating the shower to one of the sides of the house to allow for an unobstructed view of the main façade.
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Suggested making the outdoor shower smaller and lowering it to grade to reduce its visual impact. - Expressed concern about the visibility of the retaining wall, which is quite prominent. - Recommended grading the retaining wall down to create a more natural slope with the landscape to minimize visibility from the road. - Reviewed the site plan and noted that there appears to be ample room to relocate the outdoor shower to grade, which would make it less visible. Pohl - Agreed with Mickey on two points: - Suggested narrowing the width of the curb cut on Prospect Street. - Noted the outdoor shower's peculiar dimensions, as it typically has the long side against the building rather than projecting out. - Acknowledged that the current dimensions may be due to reusing existing structures rather than replacing them. - Mentioned that planting in front of the shower and lowering it may mitigate concerns, expressing overall acceptance despite its dimensions. Paul - No concerns MacLeod - Agreed with previous comments about the outdoor shower's typical placement at the back of the house but noted that the back is highly visible from below. - Suggested that a narrower shower design facing away from the house would minimize visual impact. - Supported lowering the shower to grade, whether using stone or a deck, with a preferred finished height of no more than 5.5 to 6 feet. - Expressed primary concern about the retaining wall, which extends beyond the front of the house and is awkwardly high. - Raised questions about the placement of a 4-ft board fence in relation to the retaining wall. Welch - Recommended the driveway apron should be no wider than 12 feet with a 1-foot flare and 10 feet deep. - Expressed support for dropping the outdoor shower to a lower platform, contingent on eliminating the step area. - Suggested that if public visibility from the Land Bank is a concern, the step should be removed and replaced with privet for privacy. - Proposed moving the shower door to the deck side to enhance usability and reduce visibility. - Recommended keeping the shower as-is while ensuring it is obscured by privet at least at the height of the shower. - Suggested additional visual mitigation with indigenous plants further out, creating a natural appearance. - Agreed that the retaining wall visibility can be managed with proper landscaping on the property side, without requiring significant structural changes. - Reinforced the need for careful placement of plant materials to mitigate visibility of the retaining wall, potentially along the right side of the house. - Concluded that these adjustments would address concerns regarding the retaining wall, shower

	visibility, and driveway width.
Motion:	Motion to reduce the width of the drive in to 12' wide with a 1' flare on either side on the curb cut. The shower will be screened from the Land Bank property with a row of privet, supplemented by a lower vegetation. Shower will step down to grade and will be surrounded on the two Land Bank property-facing sides. Retaining wall not to be visible. (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 4-1// Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Paul (Aye) Welch (No)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
2. Off Shore Development	6 Tautemo Way	Main house revs	83/19	S.Boukus
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	TJ Watterson			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Expressed concern about the four windows in the south elevation dormer, noting they appear modern and overly prominent for the area. - Suggested that the design would be more successful with just three windows, creating a subtler appearance. - Indicated that the window arrangement on the east elevation is acceptable but found the south elevation to be excessively fenestrated. - Appreciated the reduction in size of the gables and the overall massing. Pohl - Expressed ongoing concerns about the second-floor decks, noting that the columns on the first floor appear tall and slender. - Criticized the opaque shingled walls with interspersed railings, particularly on the south end of the west elevation, describing it as resembling crenellation on a medieval tower. - Observed that the north elevations also exhibit a similar crenellated appearance, which is not characteristic of the area. - Agreed with Abby regarding visibility issues from various vantage points, including Osprey Way. Paul - Raised concerns about the treatment of the half walls on the decks and the slenderness of the columns, which may be due to maintaining ceiling height. - Noted the absence of a step down to the second-floor deck on the far right of the west elevation as a concern. - Appreciated the reduction in massing facing Osprey, which enhanced both elevations. - Mentioned curiosity about the visibility of the four windows on the interior elevation, agreeing with Abby's comments. - Suggested exploring a more traditional open railing design and the possibility of adjusting the deck levels. MacLeod - Noted that the south elevation has excessive shingle area and suggested adding a window to reduce wall space. - Recommended bringing the cheek walls in closer to the three windows to improve the design. - Expressed ongoing concerns about the layering of gables and dormers, hoping for resolution. - Appreciated the rhythmic transition to a one-story section on the right but felt the left side detracts from the central focus. - Suggested stepping the dormer back a couple of feet and incorporating lights or low eave windows to create a less facade-like appearance.			

	Welch - Second Floor Decks: Suggested either downsizing or replacing with shingle walls, and expressed interest in seeing both options presented. - South Elevation: Highlighted concerns about the layered gables and dormers on the west side, noting Angus's comments about successful downsizing on the opposite side. - Acknowledged that visibility will primarily be from an oblique angle on Osprey, reducing initial concerns about the design. - Emphasized the need for railings and deciduous plant materials to block views from Osprey. - Expressed intent to review the hardscape plan to ensure adequate screening.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revision (Made by: Pohl)
Vote:	Carried 5-0// Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
3. Off Shore Development	6 Tautemo Way	New cabana	83/19	S Boukus
Discussion:	Watterson agreed to track with Main House.			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
4. Off Shore Development	6 Tautemo Way	New pool	83/19	S Boukus
Discussion:	Watterson agreed to track with Main House.			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
5. Forest Ave LLC	6 Forest Ave	New Garage studio	68/12/1	LINK
Voting:	Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Tori Ewing			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	-			
Commissioner Comments:	Paul - Appreciation for the relocation of the stair, creating more space between buildings. - Suggestion to integrate the pent roof over the door into the mass of the building. - Proposal for the first floor to step forward by three feet to extend the pent roof across the entire section, enhancing integration. - Belief that this adjustment would soften the verticality of the structure and reduce competition with the main house. - Reference to a photograph of the existing house showing a more cohesive roof design that could serve as a model. - No concerns expressed regarding other elevations, focusing mainly on the East Elevation's pent roof and band board. Pohl - Agreement with Joe's comments on the design. - Concern expressed about the fenestration on the East Elevation, noting a disproportionate small window amidst a large area of shingles. - Suggestion to replace the small window with two ideally placed windows, rather than a ganged option. Camp - Agrees with Paul's and Pohl's comments. Oliver - Agrees with other Commissioner's comments. Welch			

	- Agrees with other Commissioner's comments. - Drawings need to be revised, application needs to be updated and revised, confirmed that a red cedar roof is being used.
Motion:	Motion to approve through an Exhibit A to add another window in the east gable (not mulled) extend the roof across the east, remove solar panels from this application, clean up the drawings, site the materials on the elevations, recite on the plan to remove it from the setback, confirm the roof is cedar shingle. (Made by: Oliver)
Vote:	Carried 5-0// Welch, Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Paul (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
6. Katie H / Adam Kates	12 Pilgrim Rd	New Dwelling	41/476	Emeritus LTD
Voting:	Pohl (Chair), Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Matt MacEachern			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	-			
Public Comments:	Patience Killen - Concern expressed regarding the height of the building. - Comparison with neighboring properties: one at 22 feet and another at 19 feet 6 inches. - Strong preference stated for keeping the building height under 26 feet to maintain neighborhood consistency. Kristin Graham - Expressed concern about the height of the house and the precedent it would set for the neighborhood.			
Commissioner Comments:	Camp - Appreciation expressed for neighbors' input and reminding the commission of previous discussions. - Acknowledgment that Pilgrim Road features smaller structures compared to larger, more grandiose buildings found further down. - Preference stated for reducing the scale of the proposed design to be more appropriate for the site and neighborhood context. MacLeod - Concerns about garages and driveways detracting from the facade and streetscape on Pilgrim Road. - Existing garages are often tucked away to maintain visual cohesion. - Proposed height and open design disrupt landscaping potential in the area. - Emphasis on the need for a buffer to better integrate the design within the neighborhood. Thornewill - Appreciates the reduced height but suggests it should be lowered further for better contextual alignment. - Concerns about the garage's prominent placement next to the main structure. - The outdoor shower's location at the front is problematic; it could be relocated behind the garage. - Recommends lowering the ridge height further and potentially increasing ground-floor space to accommodate program needs. Patten - Agrees with fellow Commissioners on the need to lower the building's height for better neighborhood integration.			
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions (Made by: Patten)			
Vote:	Carried 5-0// Pohl, Camp, MacLeod, Thornewill, Patten (Aye)			

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
----------------	----------------	---------------	------------	-------

7. More than Enough LLC 30 Russells Way New Dwelling 77/8.1 CWA

Application not heard due to lack of representation.

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
8. Doherty ACK LLC	2 Mariner Way	Pool Revision	55.1.4/72.4	NSLLC
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Patten			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Paul Santos			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus , Preservation Planner - Applicant presented an infill subdivision; pool approval previously granted. - Current discussion focused on changes due to ConCom approval. - Key considerations: appropriateness within the Old Historic District (OHD) and visibility from site photos. - Landscaping plan includes Holly trees, noted for resilience; recommended plantings at highest height if approved. - Clarification requested on any changes to the deck railing system due to elevation; clear communication needed if no changes are made.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland , Historic Structures Advisory Group - A landscaping hedge can serve as an effective screening tool, but poorly chosen plantings may look out of place, undermining their purpose. - Example cited: the large Leyland Cypress hedge on Jefferson Street, noted for being obtrusive. - Non-traditional or overly prominent landscaping screens would be inappropriate. Amy Cohain - Proposed American Holly plantings to shield the pools are unsuitable for the neighborhood, as they typically grow in wooded areas, not wetlands. - A pool sitting over two feet above the deck is viewed as inappropriate. The developer has not clarified the facade, and this bunker-like structure lacks precedent in the Old Historic District, setting a concerning standard. - Proposed American Holly plantings may not effectively shield the pools, which would still be visible from Union Street. - There is no guarantee that the plantings will thrive or be maintained by future owners, raising concerns about long-term visibility of the pools.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Perfectly lined cedar trees, are unappealing and create an unnatural look. - Rapidly growing evergreens that form dense walls to screen properties are common on the island but lack aesthetic value. - With new developments, there is a tendency to use these fast-growing plants as a solution, which feels artificial. - A desire for landscaping that aligns more closely with the natural character of the area is expressed. - While pools can be allowed, they should not be enclosed with privacy fences. - Emphasis on maintaining a more naturalistic screening to preserve the character of the area. Camp - The project is located in the historic district and is perceived as reading more like a development than a compatible addition. - Concerns that this proposal undermines the character and setting of the neighborhood. - Overall, the project is viewed as inappropriate for the historic district. Welch - The plant material proposed for visual screening raises concerns due to the pool's elevated height, which necessitates a more effective barrier. - A visual plant barrier is deemed inappropriate; other materials, like fences, may also be			

	unsuitable. - The appropriateness of fence height and design should be considered, especially in relation to the historic district's setting. - While this application is assessed individually, comparisons to other subdivisions and their common elements are relevant. - Fences are typically not used between homes in the historic district, although they may be appropriate on the backside of properties. - The decision is focused not just on the presence of water in the pool, but on whether it can be adequately visually screened and if that screening is architecturally appropriate. Patten - Agreement on the need for vegetation that looks more natural to conceal the pool. - Concerns about using a row of cedar trees. Pohl - Related to projects on Easton Street, where every house has a generator similar in size to the proposed pool, which are elevated and screened with vegetation or fencing. - Emphasis on the visibility of people using the pool rather than the pool itself.
Motion:	Motion to deny the modification based on the fact that raising the pool height to nearly the line of sight requires a visual barrier that given flooding cannot be made permanent, a permanent visual plant material barrier is deemed inappropriate, other materials, such as a fence along the driveway, are considered inappropriate for the character and setting of the home. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 3-2// Camp, Oliver, Welch (Aye) Patten, Pohl (No)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
9. Doherty ACK LLC	4 Mariner Way	Pool Revision	55.1.4/72	NSLLC
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Paul Santos			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - The proposal involves changing the pool from being flush to elevated. - Appreciation for the organic nature of the proposed landscaping, which avoids a monoculture of plants. - Encouragement to include more Bayberry in the landscaping plan. - Noted that the vegetation is recommended by ConCom, highlighting its regulatory support. - Emphasis on the importance of achieving a more natural feel with the vegetation. - Additional screening is provided by another structure in front, but more vegetation would enhance the natural appearance.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Same comments as previously made regarding the proposal. - Concern expressed about the potential visibility of the pool from Washington Street Extension. - Uncertainty about whether adequate screening exists in that direction. Amy Cohain - Support expressed for Mickey's comments. - Reference to concerns raised by Holly in the last meeting regarding the visibility of the pool. - The vegetation is seen as a crucial element for providing necessary screening and shielding.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Agreement on the need for varied vegetation rather than a uniform line. - Suggestion for the vegetation to be positioned closer to the pool instead of being lined up. - Acknowledgment that if the pool is visible, adequate screening is necessary.			

	- Preference expressed to review the elevations before making a final decision on approval. Welch - A fence in the rear yard is deemed appropriate within the context of the subdivision. - It is suggested that the fence be vegetated according to guidelines, using vining material and eight-foot panels. Thornewill - Agreement that a fence could be utilized. - Concern raised about potential visibility from Washington Street Extension. - Observations that the existing vegetation is low, affected by sea spray, and lacks structure. - Suggestion for serious clusters and naturalized compositions of plantings to be essential for effective screening. - Noted that the pool's projection from the house makes natural screening particularly important. Camp - The proposal is viewed as more egregious than the previous one on Marin Way. - Concerns about the project being in the Old Historic District and resembling a clustered development rather than a historic building. - The project is perceived as degrading to the area's character. - Fencing and screening are seen as artificial solutions that do not fit with the organic landscape. - Overall impression is that the proposal feels out of place. Pohl - A large wetland exists adjacent to the property, with a 25-foot no-disturb line that cannot be touched. - This wetland likely contains high-quality vegetation that is protected. - Concerns about visibility from Mariner Way are mitigated by another building between the pool and Mariner Way.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Camp, Oliver, Thornwill, Welch, Pohl (Aye)

Property Owner	Street Address	Scope of Work	Map/Parcel	Agent
10. Doherty ACK LLC	6 Mariner Way Pool	Revision	55.1.4/72.2	NSLLC
Voting:	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates:	-			
Recused:	-			
Representative:	Paul Santos			
Documentation:	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Staff Comments:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner - This proposal is perceived to have the least visibility. - The elevated design from previous approvals is acknowledged. - Proposed vegetation is helpful, but additional plantings are recommended. - Emphasis on avoiding a uniform arrangement and creating a more natural landscape. - Plantings should align with ConCom recommendations due to the proximity to the wetland. - Acknowledgment of a consistent stance on the importance of a vegetation plan during the review of pool proposals. - Emphasis that this recommendation has been documented in the record for clarity.			
Public Comments:	Mickey Rowland, Historic Structures Advisory Group - Nothing else to add. Amy Cohain - Ongoing concerns about the appropriateness of American Holly for the neighborhood. - No further elaboration on the issue.			
Commissioner Comments:	Oliver - Concerns about cedar trees being lined up in a row. - Suggestion to position vegetation closer to the pool.			

	- Emphasis on the need for a mix of plants for a more naturalized appearance. Paul - The speaker designed the houses across the street and is familiar with the lot's context. - The area of the lot serves as a drainage swale for the neighborhood and is unlikely to be altered. - A natural landscape buffer near the house, resembling wetland plants, is considered critical. - The triangular lawn area should feel like an extension of the wetland if the proposal is approved. - Concerns about this lot being the most visible among the three. - Emphasis that fencing is not a viable option due to the proximity to the wetland; screening must rely solely on vegetation. - A request for a visual representation of varying plant heights to aid in understanding the proposal. Camp - This proposal is closer to the Do Not Disturb Zone, raising concerns about its artificiality. - The project feels increasingly out of place, especially given its proximity to wetlands and the harbor. - The historic district context adds to the concern about placing a pool in this location. - Strong opposition to the proposal, feeling it goes against the speaker's principles. Welch - A combination of fencing and plant materials is suggested as an appropriate solution. - A lattice or fence perpendicular to Mariner Way could be effective, especially if designed to withstand flooding. - Plant materials could be incorporated in raised beds to enhance the visual barrier. - A trellis with plants next to the patio is considered appropriate for this location. - This approach may be more suitable than requiring extensive fencing around other lots. Pohl - The comments remain consistent with previous discussions regarding the other proposals. - Acknowledgment of Joe's insights about clearing for runoff as an interesting point.
Motion:	Motion to hold for revisions so applicant can provide a full packet and the Board can view. (Made by: Welch)
Vote:	Carried 5-0// Camp, Oliver, Paul, Welch, Pohl (Aye)

MINUTES

Voting:	Patten, Camp, Pohl, Oliver, Welch
Documentation:	Draft Minutes.
Motion:	Motion to approve minutes of the CLG on June 28 and the minutes of April 23 (Made by: Camp)
Vote:	Carried 3-1-1 // Patten, Camp, Pohl (Aye) Oliver (No), Welch (Abstain)

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 8:41 pm
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-0 // Welch, Pohl, Oliver, Thornewill, Camp (Aye)

YouTube: [Nantucket Historic District Commission - August 27, 2024](#)