



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION₂

Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Stephen Welch (Chair), Ray Pohl (Vice-Chair), Abby Camp, Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod
Associate Commissioners: Carrie Thornewill, Constance Patten, Joe Paul

~~ MINUTES~~

October 15, 2024

This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Welch called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

Staff in Attendance:	Holly Backus, Preservation Planner, Fiona Johnson, Administrative Specialist, Sara Johnson, Administrative Specialist
Attending Members:	Pohl, Welch, MacLeod, Oliver, Paul, Patten
Remote Participants:	Thornewill
Absent Members:	Camp
Late Arrivals:	Welch @4:02pm
Early Departures:	None

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

I. CONSENTS

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent	
1. Brian Rice & Rob Goldrich	41 Crooked Ln	Renew COA 2021-02-2964	41/202	Self	RP
2. Rebecca Paglia	19 Ridge Ln	New Doors & color change	38/77	Self	RP
3. Lia Humphrey	124 Surfside Rd	New Shed	80/298.1	Michael Humphrey	RP
4. Cohen Stephen Trust	2 Wannacommet Rd	Window replacement	41/573	NAG	RP
5. Min Day	76A Old South Rd	Remove cupola off barn	68/408	Val Oliver	RP
6. Collet, Colby & Caskie	5 Maxey Pond Rd	Addition	40/105	MCA+	JP
7. Auburn Cottage LLC	46 Easton St	Fenestration revs 6857	42.4.1/22	Botticelli & Pohl	JP
8. Susan B McCollum Trust	35 Eel Point Rd	Fenestration revs 10370	32/63	Botticelli & Pohl	JP
9. Hodges, Keegan	35 India St	Window color reno roof	42.3.4/129	Thornewill	JP
10. Dunphy, Maureen	7 I Street	New Fence	59.4/74	Thornewill	JP
11. Dunphy, Maureen	7 I Street	Fenestration revs 9248	59.4/74	Thornewill	JP
12. Kelly Brandon	4 Kendrick St	Cabana	71.3.2/168	NAG	JP
13. Daniel Omstead	50 Wauwinet Rd	Reissue COA 3045 garage	14/68.2	LFW	VO
14. John Barry	22 Eel Point	Window rev 3838	40/45	Emeritus LTD	VO
15. Quidnet LLC	26 Quidnet Path	GH rev 9671	21/150	Emeritus LTD	AM
16. Ack Koda LLC	42 Shimmo Pond Rd	Move Off / Demo studio	43/126	Botticelli & Pohl	AM
17. Ack Koda LLC	42 Shimmo Pond Rd	Move Off / Demo shed	43/126	Botticelli & Pohl	AM
18. 24 Walsh LLC	24 Walsh St	New fence arbors	29/82	LINK	CT

Motion to approve Consent agenda:

All in favor: Welch, Macleod, Patten and Paul (Sitting off Pohl, Oliver and Thornewill)

II. CONSENTS WITH CONDITIONS

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent	
1. ●Carl & Sharon Nelson	2 Cabot Ln	Revisions 2023-08-8902	30/254	EMDA	RP
● French doors to have kick panels					
2. Olivia Akin	60 Kendrick St	Shed	76.4.3/57	Structures Untld	JP
● Make the roof pitch minimum of 8/12					
3. Nob Ack LLC	2 Nobadeer Wy	Rev 9413 Fens	68/113	Reid Yenor	JP

- Add date of construction to the COA (NHL Data = 1960)
- | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------|-----|----|
| 4. | Kelly Brandon | 4 Kendrick St | Pool hardscape | 71.3.2/168 | NAG | JP |
|----|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------|-----|----|
- Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.
- | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------|-----|----|
| 5. | Paul Karger | 6 Phippen Wy MH | Trim color change | 43/94.5 | LFW | VO |
|----|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------|-----|----|
- Add date of construction to the COA (NHL Data = 2017)
- | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------|-----|----|
| 6. | Paul Karger | 6 Phippen Wy Garage | Trim color change | 43/94.5 | LFW | VO |
|----|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------|-----|----|
- Add date of construction to the COA (NHL Data = 2018)
- | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------|----|
| 7. | Brandon Eldridge | 26 Arlington St | Move off / Demo shed | 76.1.3/281 | Self | VO |
|----|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------|----|
- Fix COA to reflect approval is just for the move off or demo of shed. (Other items require separate COA.)
- | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------|-----|----|
| 8. | Garren Peter | 36 Pocomo Rd | Window revs | 14/79 | NAG | VO |
|----|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------|-----|----|
- Shed roof over first floor doors – raise pitch up to take up excess space under windows on second floor
- | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|----------|----|
| 9. | ACK 33.5 Vesper Ln LLC | 33.5 Vesper Ln | Pool hardscape | 55/908 | Atlantic | AM |
|----|------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|----------|----|
- Pool, fire pit & outdoor grill not to be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.
- | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|--------------|----------------|---------|----------|----|
| 10. | 15 Lyford Rd LLC | 15 Lyford Rd | Pool hardscape | 92.4/86 | Atlantic | AM |
|-----|------------------|--------------|----------------|---------|----------|----|
- Pool not to be visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application. A separate COA is needed to “relocate existing shed upon the lot.”
- The commission discussed the need for recusals regarding the consent agenda with conditions. It was confirmed that no one had conflicts. Stephen Welch decided to step off for the next item. A motion to approve the consent agenda with conditions was made by Val Oliver and all present voted in favor.**
- Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten and Thornewill approved Consents with Conditions**

III. SIGNS

- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------------|------------------|--------|--------------|
| 1. | CC5 Savings | 112 Pleasant St | WALLSIGN (HOURS) | 55/149 | POYANT SIGNS |
|----|-------------|-----------------|------------------|--------|--------------|
- SAC recommends hold for revisions**
- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|--------------|
| 2. | CC5 Savings | 112 Pleasant St | PROJECTING SIGN (ATM) | 55/149 | POYANT SIGNS |
|----|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|--------------|
- SAC recommends approval through staff subject to sign being made of wood**
- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------|--------------|
| 3. | CC5 Savings | 112 Pleasant St | WALL SIGN (CLERANCE) | 55/149 | POYANT SIGNS |
|----|-------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------|--------------|
- SAC recommends approval through staff subject to sign being made of wood (lettering can be carved or painted)**
- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------|--------------|
| 4. | CC5 Savings | 112 Pleasant St | WINDOW SIGN (DRIVE UP) | 55/149 | POYANT SIGNS |
|----|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------|--------------|
- SAC recommends hold for revisions**
- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|--------------|
| 5. | CC5 Savings | 112 Pleasant St | WALL SIGN (SIDE VIEW) | 55/149 | POYANT SIGNS |
|----|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|--------------|
- SAC recommends approval through staff subject to sign being made of wood**
- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------|--------------|
| 6. | CC5 Savings | 112 Pleasant St | WALL SIGN (FRONT VIEW) | 55/149 | POYANT SIGNS |
|----|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------|--------------|
- SAC recommends approval through staff subject to sign being made of wood**
- | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------|--------------|
| 7. | NIR Retail LLC | Zero Main St | PROJECTING SIGN (ATM) | 42.3.1/481 | POYANT SIGNS |
|----|----------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------|--------------|
- SAC recommends approval through staff subject to sign being made of wood**
- | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|
| 8. | NIR Retail LLC | Zero Main St | WALL SIGN (HOURS) | 42.3.1/481 | POYANT SIGNS |
|----|----------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|
- HSAC recommends hold for revisions**

Val Oliver made a motion for a blanket vote to approve the signs according to the committee's recommendations.

The motion was passed unanimously by MacLeod, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill and Pohl, officially approving the sign applications.

IV. OLD BUSINESS 10/08/2024 HEARD LAST WEEK

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------|
| <u>LM Kelly</u> | <u>81 Cliff Rd</u> | <u>Hardscape arbor</u> | <u>30/165</u> | <u>R. Newman</u> | <u>JP</u> |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------|
- Commissioners: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Thornewill; Alt: Patten, Paul -- Last heard October 08, 2024
 - Rob Newman presented details about the hardscape portion of the applications for 81 Cliff. He submitted photographs of the existing stone wall and neighboring walls for clarity. The intention is to replicate the existing wall around the new garage's driveway and parking area. He also discussed relocating an outdoor shower to increase privacy and adding railings to the front porch. Newman highlighted examples of nearby retaining walls for reference.
 - A commissioner noted that while the wall design is suitable for internal areas, its visibility from a public way raises concerns about its appropriateness. The discussion emphasized ensuring that the design aligns with the historic character of the area.
 - Holly Backus noted that the house associated with the application was built in 1950 and mentioned previous approved additions. They appreciated the detail in the submitted photographs but expressed concern about the visibility of the proposed curved wall

from Sherburn Turnpike. Holly emphasized that while such walls are suitable for internal areas, their visibility from a public way could be problematic. The discussion was acknowledged, and the chair thanked them for their input.

- Carrie Thornewill asked about the height of the walls around the driveway, noting they would not exceed 22 inches. She suggested softening the appearance by adding grasses between the driveway surface and the walls. Rob Newman responded positively, agreeing that adding grass would enhance the design. He clarified that they aimed for continuity with the wall but were open to adjusting the slope if the board found the design inappropriate.
- Ray Pohl expressed concerns about the proximity of the stone wall to the road, describing it as too hard and overly architectural for that location. While he appreciated the stone's use in other Nantucket projects, he preferred not to have the wall close to the road, suggesting it would be more appropriate further back near the pool area. He shared this as his opinion, emphasizing the need for a softer appearance in that public-facing space.
- Val Oliver likes the idea of the berm
- Angus MacLeod agrees with everyone as does Stephen Welch

Val made a motion to approve the application with an amendment (referred to as Exhibit A) to eliminate the retaining wall near the driveway and instead use a berm. The motion was clearly stated for the minutes, confirming the removal of the wall. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Thornewill, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Welch all supporting the motion

V. NEW BUSINESS 09/03/2024

1.	<u>E Foley</u>	<u>76 Orange St</u>	<u>Relocate parking</u>	<u>55.1.4/25</u>	<u>R. Newman</u>	<u>JP</u>
Rob Newman explained the application for relocating parking at a property on the corner of York and Orange Streets. The owner, Ms. Foley, recently renovated her home and wishes to move parking from the backyard off York Street to a new spot between 76 and 78 Orange Street. This change will increase green space in her backyard.						

She plans to repurpose existing bricks for the new parking pad and will reduce the number of parking spaces from two to one. Robbie noted that there wouldn't be a need for changes to the curbing, as the asphalt height is compatible with the curb, allowing for easy access without a formal curb cut. He emphasized that backing out onto Orange Street will be safer due to its four-way stop, compared to backing onto York Street.

- Holly Backus provided additional context regarding the application, noting that the house dates back to circa 1850 and is a contributing structure within the old historic district. Holly expressed concern that the proposed 12 by 22-foot brick-paved area might be excessive. She recommended reducing the size and scale of the parking area, despite acknowledging that there are precedents in the neighborhood. She supported retaining the existing historic materials and suggested extending the running bond of the sidewalk into the new parking area, potentially incorporating thin brick strips similar to those at a nearby property. Overall, her recommendation was to reduce the size of the proposed parking area for better alignment with the historic context.
- Mickey Roland, representing the Historic Structures Advisory Group, expressed agreement with Holly's comments. He suggested that the width of the proposed parking area could be narrower, particularly on York Street, while noting that the width on Orange Street was acceptable. He also clarified that the direction of the brick should run parallel to the street rather than perpendicular to the sidewalk.
- Val Oliver expressed his support for the proposal, noting that the new parking area appears smaller than the existing one on York Street. She acknowledged that the plan reuses existing brick, which is a positive aspect.
- Ray Pohl concurred with Val, stating that the existing parking space is wider but not as deep. He preferred the proposed narrower and deeper parking layout off Orange Street. Ray also supported Mickey's suggestion to run the brick in a running bond parallel to the road.
- Angus MacLeod shared his thoughts on the proposal, appreciating the plan to reuse the brick and the intention to create a smaller parking space. However, he expressed concern about having parking close to the sidewalk on Orange Street, suggesting that it detracts from the façade of the historic structure. Angus supported the idea of incorporating brick strips and emphasized that the further back the parking is positioned, the less prominent it will be next to the historic home.
- Connie Patten expressed her approval of the proposal but raised a question about the fence in front of the property, asking if it would be trimmed to run parallel with the house, as it appears to extend into the area where parking would be. Robbie explained that the fence had been damaged in a car accident and would be repaired to allow for proper access to the parking area. He confirmed that the fence would be straightened out, aligning it properly with the house.
- Stephen Welch shared his perspective, noting that he typically supports proposals that convert street parking into on-lot parking, as it can enhance the view of the structure. However, in this case, he pointed out that parking is located on the opposite side of the street, meaning there wouldn't be a net visual benefit from the proposed change. He expressed his preference for keeping the parking in the existing location on York Street, suggesting it would better preserve the visual appeal of the home.

- Ray Pohl proposed a motion to approve the parking plan with a revision regarding the direction of the running bond, specifying that it should run parallel to Orange Street instead of perpendicular.

The motion was put to a vote, resulting in three votes in favor (from Patton, Oliver, and Pohl) and two against (from Welch and MacLeod). The approval moved forward with the specified revision.

2. Laura Lorio 12 New St New Fence 55/340 Self VO

Laura Lorio said she would like to install a small fence at the back of her property. She is open to any suggestions from the board.

Holly concern with board fence at

Although there are other fences in the neighborhood.

No concerns from board members

Ray: **Approve as submitted with a simpler Board fence with no cap**

All in favor: Stephen Welch, Ray Pohl, Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod and Joe Paul

3. Robert Jepson 32 Hinsdale Rd As-Built Shed 68/19.2 Ryan Jepson VO

HELD FOR REPRESENTATION

4. Krupp Est Trust 134 Miacomet Rd New Cabana 81/6.4 Jeff Morash AM

Monica Architect: A 377-square-foot pool cabana is being proposed, with dimensions of 14 feet 6 inches by 26 feet. The design will match the existing house in detailing. Two windows of the same size as the main house. A small trellis with two round posts (10 inches in diameter) that match the main house. A small dormer with a 4/12 roof slope, which aligns with the main house's roof pitch (approximately 10/12). cabana's height will be under 17 feet.

Ray Pohl No concerns

Joe Paul no concerns

Angus MacLeod no concerns

Val Oliver ditto

Stephen Welch agrees Motion to approve as submitted. Motion carries unanimously

5. 7 Brewster Rd LLC 7 Brewster Rd New Dwelling 54/286 LFW AC

- Linda Williams: A new dwelling that's situated off Brewster, up a hill behind other properties, with an easement for access. From the pictures, you can see the layout and how the house compares in size to others in the area, noting that it's actually a bit smaller than some nearby homes. The house features a Gambrell style, which is common in that region, especially around Monomoy. It's a relatively simple design, with a wood roof and subdued colors, without any elaborate details.
- Val Oliver: Something off, roof pitch or roof walk. Aside from those details, Val feels that the overall massing (the size and shape of the house) is in line with what's typical for the area, with only the roof pitch potentially needing a slight adjustment.
- Angus MacLeod: Concern for Gambrell roof and its proportions. Angus mentioned that something feels "off" about the roof lines, especially with the upper pitch being too short and the lower pitch perhaps being too long. The roofwalk also seems disproportionate. He also pointed out that the dimensions of the sections of the roofwalk might be too small. Another concern is the mixture of the glazed sidelights and the door design.
- Ray Pohl: It sounds like the main issue with the Gambrell roof, as you've clarified, is that the roof's proportions feel off because the eave is too high. Specifically, the 10-foot-high columns are likely about 2 feet too tall for the roof design. The roof's top chord, which is at a 5/12 pitch, needs to be steeper, and the second floor needs to be lowered to bring the eave down. This adjustment would reduce the space (about 2 feet) between the top of the windows and doors on the first floor and the eave, making the proportions more balanced. By lowering the eave and adjusting the roof's pitch, the columns would also appear more reasonable in length, resolving many of the issues with the roof design. The roofwalk is still a separate issue, but Ray feels that fixing the Gambrell roof's proportions would address the primary concern.
- Connie Patten: in agreement with the points about the roofwalk being too small for such a large roof. You also had a quick question about the double-sided fireplace, asking for clarification, and it turns out it's located on the second floor, behind the house.
- Stephen Welch: The ceiling height of the first floor is too high, causing the gambrel roof cords to be squished. This needs to be fixed. A suggestion to have the roof plane (possibly referring to the walk or pitch) at a size of around 16, with flexibility to adjust the size once reviewed. The gambrel roof cords should ideally align with or be below the main ridge. This will require some technical adjustments to the roof design. There's a suggestion to add a chimney to the design, as it's currently not included in the elevations. The designer will decide on the exact placement.

- Motion to Hold for revisions, motion carries unanimously**

VI. NEW BUSINESS 09/17/2024

1. Carl & Sharon Nielson 50 Wanoma Way New Dwelling 92.4/244 Thornewill RP

- Carrie Thornewill provided an overview of the proposed project, which involves constructing a new home with enhanced street presence. The new design aims to create a more prominent street presence with two gables facing the road and a porch roof that incorporates the second-floor deck. To soften the appearance at the corners, a shingled wall is proposed. The dimensions of the main

mass are 26 feet 8 inches, while the secondary mass measures 24 feet 4 inches. The new construction will have two-over-two windows and a footprint slightly altered from the existing structure, with the proposed building moved closer to Wanoma Way, as shown in the site plan. Carrie mentioned that from the street, visibility will mainly consist of second-floor windows and some railing, with landscaping partially obstructing the view. The design features white trim and a gray architectural roof. She also referenced photographs in the file to provide context for the existing.

- Joe Paul expressed support for the proposed design, acknowledging that the absence of shed dormers on the flanking masses aligns with the overall aesthetic. He inquired about the shingled wall detail, specifically asking about the lack of a cap shown in the drawings. Carrie confirmed that there would be a cap included in the final drawings. Joe noted that the exterior stairs would likely not be visible from the street and remarked on the limited presence of gang windows, indicating that he finds the design appropriate for the area. Overall, he expressed a positive sentiment toward the proposal.
- Ray Pohl reiterated his support for the proposal, agreeing that it is appropriate for the area due to its location. He mentioned that viewing the photos of the existing building alongside the proposed design shows minimal visibility issues from public spaces. He concluded by expressing that he has no concerns about the proposal and fully supports it.
- Val Oliver echoed this sentiment, confirming their agreement.
- Angus MacLeod raised a question about the existing vegetation surrounding the driveway, noting that it currently obstructs the view of the deck. He asked if the landscaping would be maintained to minimize visibility of the deck from the street. Carrie responded that the design intends to embed the deck within a porch roof to enhance its visual appeal, suggesting that while some of the deck may still be visible, it wouldn't be unusual for the area. Angus concluded that he agrees with the other commissioners regarding the proposal.
- Stephen Welch stated that he had nothing further to add, emphasizing that the key aspect of the proposal is the lack of visibility from the street.
- Val made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. The motion was put to a vote, and all present commissioners voted in favor, resulting in unanimous approval. Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Paul

2. Tic T'ACK Toe 2 Fawn Ln Rev To Chimney 68/972 Shouldice SW
- William: The home will now include a hearth and fireplace, but the decision has been made to **delete the gas fireplace and remove the chimney** from the right side of the house (as viewed from the front elevation).
- Angus MacLeod: more appropriate with a faux chimney
- Carrie Thornewill: Agrees
- Val Oliver: no concerns with chimney removal
- Ray Pohl Agrees with Val
- Stephen Welch: more appropriate with a faux chimney
- Val Oliver: Motion to approve as submitted: Angus MacLeod added subject to the as-built fee.**
- Motion carries unanimously.**

3. 3 Pops Lane Trust 3 Pops Ln Demo garage 60.2.4/64.1 MCA+ JP
- Mark Cutone: The existing garage, built in 1995, is located on the property and currently serves as a studio. It is scheduled for either demolition or relocation.
- Holly Backus: concur with the age.
- Linda Williams: not much to say about Garage
- Angus MacLeod: As with most demolition projects, I'd prefer to see the structure moved rather than demolished. I'm okay with the demo proceeding, if all reasonable attempts to relocate the garage are explored first.
- Val Oliver Agrees with Angus MacLeod
- Ray Pohl: no issue with the Move Demo
- Joe Paul: The garage, being built in 1995, falls outside the usual policy which typically focuses on structures built before 1975. Given its age, size, and function, it's expected that there will be little opposition to its demolition or relocation. There's a consensus that this structure won't generate much debate, especially considering it was built in the '90s.
- Stephen Welch Agrees with Joe Paul
- Joe Paul makes the motion: Motion to approve as submitted confirming it is a move demo on the application.**
- The motion to proceed with the demolition or relocation of the garage has passed unanimously, with no opposition.**

4. 3 Pops Lane Trust 3 Pops Ln Demo MH 60.2.4/64.1 MCA+ JP
- Mark Cutone: This is also an application for the demolition or relocation of the existing dwelling on the property, which was constructed in 1994.
 - Holly Backus: The tax assessor's records list the existing dwelling as being built in 1994, but there's concern that this might not reflect the actual construction date. The tax assessor's date may only indicate when significant work or revisions were last done, rather than when the structure was originally built. Both Linda Williams and I have found that the tax assessor's information can sometimes be inaccurate, especially for older buildings, and that's why they'd prefer to clarify the actual construction date. There's

no historic district survey available for this property, so it would be helpful to have any additional information to confirm the structure's true age and history.

- Linda Williams: The dwelling was moved to the current site in 1994 or 1995, originally coming from Milly Taylor's cottages. These cottages were part of a group, likely four in total, which were all relocated separately. The cottages predated 1972, meaning the structure itself is much older than the 1994/95 date recorded by the tax assessor. The 1994/95 date likely refers to when the structure was relocated, not when it was originally built. Linda suggests she can consult their records to provide more specific information about the true age of the structure, as it appears to be much older than what's currently reflected.
- Mark Cutone: At this time, there is no concrete evidence to contradict the information being presented verbally about the dwelling's history. However, it's worth noting that there has been some interest in the house since it was advertised, and there is an expectation that it may be relocated and repurposed elsewhere on the island, potentially finding a new life in another location.
- Val Oliver: There's some concern about the age of the structure, and to decide, more concrete evidence is needed. The current verbal claims alone aren't sufficient, and the committee is requesting hard evidence to confirm the structure's actual age before moving forward with any decisions.
- Joe Paul: initially, he had no concerns about the structure, assuming it was built in 1994. However, after hearing the concerns raised by the abutters, he now believes more information is needed before deciding. He's open to the idea of the structure being moved off the property. Joe doesn't have an issue with demolishing or moving the structure if there's no evidence it's older than 1994, but he feels uncomfortable making a decision tonight due to the lack of sufficient information.
- Ray Pohl: Agrees with Joe's perspective, emphasizing the need for more information before moving forward. They feel comfortable with the idea of relocating the structure ("move off") but prefer not to proceed with demolition until the true age (vintage) of the building is confirmed.
- Angus MacLeod: Angus agrees with Joe and Ray, essentially echoing their points.
- **Stephen Welch: It sounds like the request is for Mark to gather additional information, including any relevant imagery or records from the building department file, and submit it by noon this Thursday 10/17/2024 so that the issue can be heard again next Tuesday. No further action or information is expected from the abutters at this point—just whatever documentation the applicant can provide.**

5.	3 Pops Lane Trust	3 Pops Ln	New Dwelling MH	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+	JP
----	-------------------	-----------	-----------------	-------------	------	----

- Mark Cutone: Mark introduces a proposal for a new dwelling that will be built over the footprint of the original structure, though oriented differently on the property. The design consists of a series of single-story volumes, with the tallest ridge reaching a height of 19'6". The materials proposed for the exterior include black sash windows and wood for the roof.
- Holly Backus: Expresses some concerns about the design of the proposed dwelling, despite appreciating its low stature and single-story volumes. They feel the design doesn't quite capture the vernacular, noting that the six-light wall-height windows and one-light doors are atypical for the area. The exterior chimney is also criticized for not aligning with the building's style and being too large. The speaker suggests reducing the chimney's size and adding imagery showing the view from Hither Creek, as it's a public traveled way. Additionally, they recommend adjusting the fenestration to better reflect the traditional style of the area, though they acknowledge that some quirky windows were present in 1950s to 1970s vernacular in the region. The speaker concludes by suggesting the design feels too contemporary for the location.
- Linda Williams: Expresses significant concern about the scale and design of the proposed dwelling, particularly its width and modern aesthetic. They note that the building's size, with multiple volumes, is atypical for the area. Overall, they describe the design as overdone and too modern for the historic and traditional fabric of the Creeks area.
- Paul Moran: an abutter from Washington Avenue, speaks up to express his strong objections to the proposed dwelling. He feels that the design is completely out of character with the traditional "old Madaket." He emphasizes that there is nothing like this proposed structure on the creek and feels it is simply too large and
- incompatible with the surrounding area. Paul is particularly concerned about how the building would look from the water, describing it as standing out in an inappropriate way on the horizon. He reiterates that the design is too big and not suitable for the location.
- Sarah Hendrickson: along with her husband John, speaks as an abutter from 341 Madaket Road, which is located across from Pops Lane. She expresses that the scale, look, and feel of the proposed dwelling do not align with Madaket. Sarah conveys their dismay about the proposed project, feeling it is out of place with the character of the community.
- Ray Pohl: Begins by noting that the drawings presented for the project are at a 1/16 scale, which makes the building appear more compact than it is. They clarify that this wasn't an intentional misrepresentation, but it does affect the perception of the building's scale. The speaker then acknowledges that the proposal is a single-story design, which they appreciate. However, they express strong concerns about the modernist elements of the design, particularly in relation to the local context in Madaket. Ray feels that the design is too removed from the existing character of the area, which has a more rambling, additive massing style. They suggest that the design could better reflect the traditional character of the neighborhood by incorporating more references to older, vernacular features, such as double-hung windows, rather than the tall, vertical modern doors. The speaker advocates for a design that fits more naturally within the historic feel of the area, without needing to go into specific details.
- Angus MacLeod: Expresses appreciation for the single-story scale and the massing of the individual parts of the proposal. His main concern lies in the series of structures and their proximity to one another, which they feel creates an issue with the overall scale of the project. They suggest that the dwelling would be better suited in a less visible location, as they don't believe the proposed site is

appropriate for such a large structure. Angus also notes that the fenestration is atypical and contributes to the overall concern about the scale of the project.

- Joe Paul: Expresses a nuanced perspective, acknowledging both the positive and negative aspects of the proposal. He agrees with many of the previous comments, particularly appreciating the single-story scale of the house and the concept of a series of connected pavilions. Joe sees promise in the concept but believes it needs refinement to achieve a better balance with the surrounding environment. He prefers this proposal over a larger, more complicated two-story design but is hesitant to approve it without further revisions.
- Stephen Welch: agrees with the overall concept of the project, noting that it is much more appropriate than a two-story dwelling. They understand the design's approach with the series of pavilions but suggest that for it to be successful, the focus should be on minimizing less essential spaces, particularly the connectors between the pavilions. They also recommend downsizing some of the other elements to make the design more fitting for the location. Regarding the fenestration Stephen feels that the current design takes too contemporary a spin on traditional elements. Instead, they suggest the design should embrace more of a "funky" traditional approach, referencing the quirky, eclectic style typical of the area. He feels the concept is close to approval but needs adjustments, particularly in terms of space reduction and window design, to better fit the local vernacular and character of the area.
- Val Oliver: Agrees with the previous comments and offers a few additional suggestions. She expresses significant concern about the glass connectors between the pavilions, noting that the project is highly visible from the bridge and suggesting that these connectors should be toned down to lessen their impact. While they appreciate the single-story scale and stature of the structures, they wonder if the design could be adjusted to better mitigate its presence on the water, possibly by changing the shape or orientation of the elements.
- Mary Jane: an abutter, speaks up to echo her brother Paul's earlier comments. She expresses concern about the size of the proposed project, particularly its horizontal scale. Mary Jane hopes the design is downsized, as she feels it is too large in that direction. She concludes by thanking everyone for their time and the opportunity to voice their concerns.
- **Ray made a motion: motions to "hold for revisions," The motion includes the request to track the progress of the new garage, guest house, and pool as well.**
The motion is then put to a vote: motion passed unanimously, with no opposition.

6.	3 Pops Lane Trust	3 Pops Ln	New Garage	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+	JP
7.	3 Pops Lane Trust	3 Pops Ln	New Guest House	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+	JP
8.	3 Pops Lane Trust	3 Pops Ln	Pool	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+	JP

TRACK WITH MAIN HOUSE

9.	<u>Dave & Avery Keller</u>	<u>6 Plainfield Rd</u>	<u>Pool Spa Pergola</u>	<u>49/173</u>	<u>Ben Champoux</u>	<u>VO</u>
----	--------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	---------------	---------------------	-----------

Ben Champoux: providing details about a property renovation project, specifically the work on the southwest side of the property. They explain that an existing small one-bay garage will be shortened and transformed into a structure roughly the size of a shed. Pergola will extend from this garage, leading to a Blue Mist granite terrace or patio that will surround a 20x40 pool. There will also be a spa positioned off to the side of the pool, and a wood deck that will be flush with the ground, positioned between the pool and the house. Rob Benchley: representing the Sconset Advisory Group, he informs the board that the group does not have any concerns with the application.

Holly Backus: noting that the 20x40 pool and 8x8 spa, along with the surrounding decks, create a significant amount of impervious surfaces. While the pool is located behind the house, Holly expresses concern that the overall design feels a bit harsh due to the extensive use of these surfaces. She suggests incorporating more natural elements into the design to soften the impact and balance the overall aesthetic.

Val Oliver: reiterates that they don't have any concerns with the proposal but would have appreciated seeing pictures or visual references to help reaffirm that the design won't negatively impact the surroundings or views.

Ray Pohl: Is fine with application

Angus MacLeod: agrees with Val more documentation in application.

Connie Patten: No Concerns.

Stephen Welch: No concerns motion should include the pool caveat.

Ray Pohl: Motion to approve as submitted; pool not visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.

Motion passed unanimously, with no opposition.

10.	<u>Pixie Hollow LLC</u>	<u>109 Tom Nevers Rd</u>	<u>Alterations</u>	<u>91/27</u>	<u>MCA+</u>	<u>VO</u>
-----	-------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	--------------	-------------	-----------

- Mark Cutone: provides an update on a project that was previously presented to the board a few months ago. The development is for an additional dwelling for the property owner, who also owns the primary residence on the site. Initially, the structure was designed to have a low profile to minimize its impact on the views from the primary dwelling, which sits behind the new building. However, after construction began, the property owner expressed concern and asked for the design to be revisited to further reduce its impact on the horizon. The ridge height has been reduced by about six feet, from just under 21 feet to approximately 15 feet.

- | <u>12. Brendan Swords</u> | <u>10 Marion Ave</u> | <u>Deck Alterations</u> | <u>82/409</u> | <u>Val Oliver</u> | <u>AM</u> |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Val Oliver: explains that the proposed change involves extending the existing deck and wrapping it around the corner of the house to improve the view. The new deck will be minimal and shallow. The speaker notes that the direct neighbor already has a similar wraparound deck, so the homeowners wanted to do something similar. Angus MacLeod: expresses concern about the proposed wraparound deck, particularly because it draws attention to the issues typically associated with second-floor decks. They note that while there are many decks in the area, the wraparound design accentuates these concerns. Angus clarifies that they don't have a problem with a deck on one side of the house, but the wraparound element is what they find problematic, as it doesn't help the overall building's design. Ray Pohl: Is fine with application Joe Paul: believes Val is cleaning up an odd detail and is ok with application Connie Patten: is ok with application Stephen Welch: not feeling it, no detail Ray Pohl: motion to approve as submitted: Connie, Joe and Ray approve Stephen and Angus oppose. 3-2 passes | | | | | |

- 8

- Ray Pohl: motion to hold for revisions. Approved by all

14.	<u>The Whole Spread LLC</u>	<u>332 Madaket Rd</u>	<u>New 2nd Dwelling</u>	<u>60/100</u>	<u>Emeritus LTD</u>	<u>CT</u>
	• Matt MacEachern : describes a small, one-story addition that will serve as a freestanding second dwelling on the property. Although it's technically a second dwelling, the speaker emphasizes that it will be very simple in design, likely to fit in seamlessly with the existing structure and surroundings. • Holly Backus: no concerns • Angus MacLeod: lower the eave line so that it aligns with the top of the windows. • Val Oliver: She's proposing that the door should match the door on the main house, which is a half-glass door, to make the new addition feel more integrated with the overall aesthetic of the property. • Carrie Thornewill: is expressing a concern about the amount of glass on the structure, especially given its visibility from the parking lot. She suggests that it might be more appropriate to simplify the fenestration perhaps by using one set of French doors and a couple of windows that are separate • Ray Pohl: commented seems to agree with the suggestion of lowering the eve to match the top of the windows, which would help reduce the height and create a more balanced look for the structure. • Angus MacLeod: added a comment is about the two four-light windows that are grouped together. He feels that the lack of separation between them makes the treatment of those windows look a bit too flat or basic. Ideally, he would like to see some space between the windows or possibly a more elaborate trim—like a 30s-style double molding—to add more depth and character to the design. • Stephen Welch: Stick with the four-pane door (French door) approach, as previously discussed. This will keep the design simple and consistent with the overall aesthetic. The length of the pergola in elevation is a concern, and a suggestion to reduce its width from 12 feet to 10 feet seems to agree. This would help adjust the proportion and make it feel more balanced with the rest of the structure. • Val Oliver: Motion to approve with an Exhibit A, the front door shall match the house's existing door with a half-glass design (instead of the current full-glass version). Change the four doors on the west elevation to two doors and two windows. The two windows that are currently close together should have a small separation between them (to allow for better proportioning and design). Lower the eave height to align with the head casing of the windows and reduce the top plate to minimize the perceived height of the structure. All in favor, motion passes.					
15.	<u>Herlihy</u>	<u>3 Rudder Ln</u>	<u>Color Change</u>	<u>66/361</u>	<u>LINK</u>	<u>CT</u>
	• Tori Ewing: This application seeks approval for revisions to a previously approved project that was not fully executed as planned. The front porch was retained as is, rather than being extended as originally approved. Color changes to the previously approved design are included in this revision. The fireplace, which was part of earlier plans, will be retained. • Joe Paul: asked for clarification of application. Based on what you've shared, it seems like the application is indeed asking to keep the chimney and retain the existing front porch as it is, rather than extending the porch or removing the chimney as was originally planned. The color change is an additional part of the request. No concerns • No concerns from the board but they are asking for additional information. If it is in by Thursday at noon it will be put on next weeks agenda: Motion: To hold the application for additional information, specifically the as-built drawings reflecting the current state of the project, including the front porch, chimney, and any other structural changes, to ensure alignment with prior approvals. Caries unanimously Joe Paul, Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod Ray Pohl and Stephen Welch					
16.	<u>Nantucket Development</u>	<u>8 Sconset Ave</u>	<u>MH Rev's</u>	<u>49.3.2/28</u>	<u>LINK</u>	<u>CT</u>
	• Tori Ewing: presented revisions to a previously approved design. Instead of a large secondary mass addition at the rear of the existing building, the applicant now proposes a rear dormer on the second floor. Other changes include the relocation of the outdoor shower, modification of the front door to a six-light, two-panel design (instead of the originally approved four-light, two-panel door), and the retention of the existing three windows on the front elevation (instead of adding a new window as originally planned). No further comments or concerns were raised. • Holly Backus: No concerns on removal of rear addition • Ray Pohl, Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod Joe Paul and Stephen Welch are all fine with the submission. • Angus MacLeod: Motion to approve as submitted. All in favor and the motion carries.					
17.	<u>Nantucket Development</u>	<u>8 Sconset Ave</u>	<u>Pool</u>	<u>49.3.2/28</u>	<u>LINK</u>	<u>CT</u>
	• Tori Ewing: clarifies that the pool is proposed to be at grade (level with the existing ground) and will have a small round of coping around it, indicating no significant grade change. • Holly Backus: main concern is how the pool or structure will be screened from view, particularly from the street. It appears that the current photos provided might show the location from the side, not directly from the street. The speaker suggests that adding					

vegetation (such as landscaping or plantings) could help to screen the pool and improve its integration into the surroundings. This would likely be part of mitigating the visual impact from the street.

- **Angus MacLeod: motion includes an Exhibit A, which is likely a drawing or site plan showing the proposed location for the pool or structure. The screening proposal is clarified with gates and a solid board fence with a cap.**
Motion carries unanimously

18.	<u>Gerwitz</u>	<u>4 Starbuck Rd</u>	<u>Replace garage roof</u>	<u>59.3/66</u>	<u>LINK</u>	<u>AC</u>
	• Tori Ewing: was on consent two weeks ago. • Stephen Welch: The motion to reconsider relates to a previously approved item just the roof. This is required because the matter is not on the agenda for the current meeting, and reconsidering it requires a two-thirds majority vote. • Connie Patten, Ray Pohl, Val Oliver Angus MacLeod and Stephen Welch approve this motion.					
19.	<u>Wallace</u>	<u>65 Polpis Rd</u>	<u>Move on</u>	<u>43/13</u>	<u>LINK</u>	<u>AC</u>
	• Issues with no abutters notices were not submitted • Motion to Hold for complete application. So moved, Stephen Welch, Ray Pohl, Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod and Connie Patten					
20.	<u>Tracy Root</u>	<u>20 Broad St</u>	<u>Fenestration Add Lift</u>	<u>42.4.2/33</u>	<u>Emeritus LTD</u>	<u>AC</u>
	Matt MacEachern: The plan is to integrate an exterior vertical lift into the existing access stoop area, so that it blends in with the current structure. The lift will be designed to look like a traditional stair but will allow for better accessibility. The chimney, which is not visible from Broad Street and is centered in the building, would be rebuilt to match its existing appearance. The original fireplace is non-functional and has been for many years, and ideally, the team would prefer to remove the chimney altogether. However, due to the board's likely attachment to the chimney, the proposal is to rebuild it to match the current design Holly Backus: expressed support for rebuilding the chimney using the same materials (brick and mortar) as the existing structure but opposes the removal of the chimney. She emphasized that the chimney is a character-defining feature of the building, citing an 1890s photo in the packet as evidence of its historical importance. While Holly understands the need for ADA accessibility, she recommended a focus on retaining character-defining features. She suggested reversing the location of the accessible lift and the stairs, if possible, to make the access more in line with the historical street context and avoid disrupting the appearance of the structure. Micky Rolands and the Historic structures advisory group. Agrees with Holly's concerns regarding the stairway but would prefer that the stairway itself face Broad Street (rather than just the landing) in order to better align with the street's historic context and street-facing design. Angus MacLeod: agrees with what has been said, Switch the stair Connie Patten: agrees Stephen Welch: Agrees with the flip Joe Paul: agrees with everyone Ray Pohl: Agrees Joe Pul Makes a motion through Exhibit A, vertical lift and stairway will be reversed, so the stair will face Broad Street, aligning better with the historic context of the structure. The chimney will be rebuilt as proposed, with the same brick and mortar to match the existing design, preserving the character of the building. motion carries all in favor.					
21.	<u>Stephen Frohwein</u>	<u>32 N Liberty St</u>	<u>Rev 6873</u>	<u>41/159</u>	<u>Emeritus LTD</u>	<u>CP</u>
	Matt MacEachern: Screening of exterior condensers (likely for aesthetics or noise reduction). Omission of Gable and Louvers vents (possibly to maintain the clean, simple lines of the design or for functional reasons). Holly Backus: Circa 1840s, one and a half story, three-bay Greek Revival structure. No concerns were raised regarding the screening for condensers, as it was deemed appropriate. Type two picket fence that was historically appropriate was noted as missing in recent photos, likely due to newly planted vegetation, which may have obscured its reinstallation. Holly felt the fence was historically appropriate and in keeping with the site's character. Micky Rolands Has no concerns Stephen Welch: No concerns after clarifying materials Angus MacLeod: asked the question if a vine to grow on lattice. Angus made the motion: To approve the submitted design as presented, with the condition that evergreen planting be added in front of the AC condenser screening to allow airflow while blocking the view. Additional Condition: Matt will address the corner board detail to ensure it aligns with the design standards. Approved with Ray Pohl, Angus MacLeod, Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten and Stephen Welch all in favor of the motion.					
22.	<u>Clay Street Dev</u>	<u>44 Skyline Dr</u>	<u>Move on dwelling</u>	<u>79/990</u>	<u>LFW</u>	<u>CP</u>

Connie Patten: There was some uncertainty or concern about the site plan, which was discussed earlier, and Connie is clarifying if that concern has been resolved.

Linda Williams: The building is currently located in a different area and needs to be relocated to a new site at 44 Skyline Drive. The original building used to be Shepley and was being used for boat storage. It's a single-family dwelling with an attached garage. The building is currently on a property that has been sold, so the structure needs to be moved.

Stephen Welch: does anyone have any concern with the house being moved to the exact location

Angus MacLeod: motion to approve submitted with a hard line where the dwelling is going, thru staff
Stephen Welch, Angus MacLeod, Ray Pohl and Carrie Thornewill approve Val Oliver Abstain

23. Kim Glowacki 20 Greglen Ave Move off dwelling 68/141 LFW CP
- No concerns with the board
 - **Moton to approve as submitted all in favor. Ray Pohl, Stephen Welch, Angus MacLeod, Val Oliver and Carrie Thornwill**

VII. NEW BUSINESS 10/01/2024

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. <u>Nancy Waterhouse Tr</u>	<u>15 Liberty St</u>	<u>Access Ramp</u>	<u>42.3.4/67</u>	<u>Brook Meerbergen RP</u>

Brook Meerbergen: A simple wooden ramp will be constructed out the front door of the building. The ramp will be placed **over the** existing brick surface, so there will be no removal or damage to the current brickwork. The ramp will be made of **cedar**, left in its natural finish, contributing to a more rustic and temporary appearance.

Holly Backus: The proposal involves a temporary ADA ramp for the Starbuck House, a circa 1740 Federal-style building. The house was originally built for Thomas and William Starbuck, and it has been HABS documented. The ramp is considered temporary and removable, as is typical for ADA ramps on historic structures. The ramp is designed to be reversible to avoid any permanent alterations to the building.

Micky Roland: no concerns riling to be natural to weather

No Concerns from Val, Ray, Connie. Angus asked for Clarification concerning the how this will go back to the way it was.

Stephen Welch: South Elevation Observations: The back of the ramp's balusters were noted to resemble more of a dock railing rather than a historically typical detail for the house. It was suggested that the railing should be oriented parallel to the street rather than against the house, in keeping with the more traditional design. was also recommended that a skirt be added underneath the ramp to conceal the brick structure beneath, improving the overall appearance. This would make the ramp appear more refined and integrate better with the architecture. It was emphasized that the iron railings could be removed when the ramp is no longer needed, returning the structure to its original state, which is important for maintaining the historic integrity of the building.

Angus MacLeod: A motion was made to approve the ADA ramp as submitted, with the condition that a skirt be added underneath the ramp. The skirt should be made of materials that are natural to weather, consistent with the natural finish of the ramp itself. Val Oliver, Ray Pohl, Connie Patten and Angus MacLeod Approved. Stephen Welch is a no

2. McAuley, Kenneth 24 Derrymore Rd Dormer 41/610 NAG/WMM SW

Linda Williams speaking on NAGS behalf. She explained the dormer addition.

Holly Backus: A 2011 contemporary infill structure within the Derrymore neighborhood. Although it features a small dormer, it does not comply with building guidelines, particularly regarding its alignment with the gable. It was suggested that reducing the length of the dormer from the gable would be necessary to meet the requirements.

Ray, Val and Connie are ok with it.

Angus had questions for Linda.

Stephen is ok with a bit of variety

Motion to approve as submitted, unanimous vote Stephen, Ray, Val, Connie and Angus

3. 88 Pocomo Trust 88 Pocomo Rd Demo 15/42 Emeritus LTD SW

The application was discussed, with clarification that it is not yet a dwelling. There was a suggestion to add a demo move-off option, although it is not necessary at this point. The Public Works notice was mentioned, and it was noted that it only applies to housing structures, which created some confusion due to unclear terminology that needs to be addressed.

The demo delay bylaw and technical language were also discussed. The board is familiar with the project, and no major additions were made to the discussion other than the request to clarify technical language. It was highlighted that the structure is not complete, with open studs inside and finished shingles on the exterior.

Ray expressed no objections to the demolition itself, except for concerns about the potential waste of materials, though they acknowledged that others have already raised this issue.

Ray moved to approve the demolition adding the possibility to include a request to Matt for as much of the material as possible to be parceled out to interested parties.

On that Motion: Val Oliver a firm NO, Angus MacLeod No, Carrie Thornewill No, Ray Pohl Yes, Stephen Welch Yes

Motion failed

Motion to hold approved unanimously same board

4. VBDC, LLC 116 Polpis Rd Pickleball Court 44/4 Ahern LLC SW

Mirka explains the location of Pickleball Court, can not see, 450ft from property line.

Holly recommended adding a caveat that the structure should not be visible in perpetuity. They emphasized that native vegetation should be maintained to ensure privacy and prevent visibility.

Ray, Joe fine with that recommendation.

Angus to mark it up as an Exhibit A : it is pointed out existing vegetation will provide sufficient screening but will be maintained in perpetuity, resolving the issue without further action needed.

Board: Stephen, Ray, Angus, Valorie and Joe.

Unanimously on the Exhibit A

5. Hanson, Peter 27 Osprey Wy Replace deck 83/9 Self SW
Peter explained the condition of his deck and the material he would like to use to replace the deck. Also explain the deck visibility which is nearly no visibility.

Ray expressed no concerns, Stephen brought up PFAS near Coastal water. But made the point not HDC's Purview.

Valorie made the motion to approve as submitted

Ray, Val, Carrie and Angus approve and Stephen with a No

6. NT Property Owner 1 Beach Grass Rd Hardscape 68/885 LFW JP
Linda Williams thought she had included in the packet.

Joe: had previously driven through the neighborhood and noticed that most driveways had cobblestone aprons, but not the ones in this project. He suggested that the driveway aprons should match the existing ones in the area, which he approved for other landscapes under similar conditions. Joe also raised a point about a 5-in-1 fence being placed right up to the street corner, which differs from other fences in the neighborhood that are set back. This one seems unusual, and the board is considering how to handle it.

Val: agrees with Joe concerning fence.

Val proposed Exhibit A. The proposal is to set the 5-in-1 fence back 8 feet from the corner of the street. To fill the space left by this adjustment, a Type 2 picket fence would be extended. A motion was made to ensure that all aprons are consistent with the existing ones in the neighborhood. Cobblestone

Stephen, Ray, Angus, Val and Joe Vote Unanimously to approve.

7. NT Property Owner 5 Beach Grass Rd Hardscape 68/883 LFW VO
Linda Williams: Presenting

Val Oliver: Val Oliver: she reviewed the applications and felt the only thing missing is a photo of the building for each one.

Val Motion to approve changing from brick to cobblestone. Written in by Val

Stephen, Ray, Val, Angus and Connie. Approved

8. NT Property Owner 17 Honeysuckle Dr Hardscape 68/398 LFW VO
9. NT Property Owner 19 Honeysuckle Dr Hardscape 68/397 LFW VO
10. NT Property Owner 21 Honeysuckle Dr Hardscape 68/396 LFW VO

Val: Motioned to approve 17,19 and 21 Honeysuckle Dr together with the same changes. changing from brick to cobblestone.

Board: Stephen, Ray, Angus Val and Connie. Motion carries unanimously

11. Flaster, Michele 7 N Pasture Ln Move house on-site 44/67 LFW VO
Linda Williams: Not visible, rotating on site nothing happening towards the road.

Stephen concerned with grade change, not clear.

George Berg spoke about the concerns: Putting a full basement under the Cottage, with a Walkout.

Angus made the motion: inclusion of topographical information and a site plan. However, it seems that the site plan alone may be sufficient for the purposes of the review.

If there are any issues with retainage (likely referring to retaining walls or areas with elevation changes), those details will need to be shown as well. The board is requesting that the necessary information be provided to assess any potential changes.

Angus would like more info on the impact to the neighbors

Stephen suggested to extend the topographical information beyond the property line, as this will provide a clearer understanding of the site, especially in relation to cross-section lines, which may not offer enough detail. Angus agrees

Angus Motion: is to include topographical information for both existing and proposed conditions, with the topographical details extending over the property lines in both directions. And for the next application to Track.

Stephen, Ray, Angus Val and Carrie approve motion.

12. Flaster, Michele 7 N Pasture Ln Patio/ walls 44/67 LFW VO

13. 5 Surfside Rd LLC 5 Surfside Rd Rev Doors/ ac 55/253 LFW VO

Linda Williams: Just changing door and window which are on the inside of property.

Holly Backus: spoke on property. Concern with clarity for the record. Including the previous COA numbers to be include, no concern with application itself.

Joe: Approve as submitted: including Hollys Technical request.

Stephen, Ray, Val, Angus and Joe approved unanimously

Minutes:

Ray Pohl made the motion to approve minutes from April 30, 2024.

Board Stephen Welch, Ray Pohl, Angus MacLeod, Joe Paul and Val Oliver; Val and Stephen abstained

Stephen: Motion to adjourn at 8:37p. All in favor.

DRAFT