



HDC Minutes May 6, 2025; adopted June 3, 2025

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Minutes May 6, 2025

2 Fairgrounds Road

Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Stephen Welch, Chairman called the meeting at 4:00 pm

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

Associate Commissioners: Carrie Thornewill, Constance Patten, Joe Paul

Staff: Cathy Flynn Holly Backus, Fiona Johnson

Meeting called to order at 4:02 PM

Oliver: made the motion to approve the agenda. Approved Stephen Welch, Val Oliver, Ray Pohl, Angus MacLeod and Carrie Thornewill.

Camp arrived at 4:10 pm

In person, Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp and Thornewill

On Zoom, Joe Paul joined at 6:05 pm

Absent- Connie Patten

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- HDC Public Comment email

Welch's comments about the HDC public comment process were procedural. He clarified that all public comments should be sent to hdcpubliccomment@nantucket-ma.gov by 8 a.m. on the Monday before the meeting. These comments will be forwarded to the commissioners that morning, reviewed prior to the meeting, and entered into the public record. He encouraged the use of this process to support transparency and participation.

II. CONSENTS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1. Kaizer, Peter Jr 12489	6 Nobadeer Ave	Color change trim	37/2	Peter Kaizer	VO
2. Mullins, Kevin 12498	11 Plum St	Cottage	80/28	SMRD	VO
3. Mullins, Kevin 12497	11 Plum St	Main house addition	80/28	SMRD	VO
4. Town Of Nantucket 12501	10 Sun Island Rd	Trash enclosure	69/3.1	Gryphon Arch	VO
5. Town Of Nantucket 12500	10 Sun Island Rd	Paving & walkways	69/3.1	Gryphon Arch	VO
6. Nantucket Island Land Bank 12502	125 Somerset	Window replacement	66/69	Gryphon Arch	VO
7. 100 Wauwinet Trust 12484	100 Wauwinet Rd	Garg/ Barn Rev 11811	11/24.1	Botticelli & Pohl	JP
8. Jared and Beth Krumple 12505	5 Davis Ln	Move shed on site	82/72	Val Oliver	JP
9. NSHA 12515	25 Airport Rd	Addition/ fenestration	68/727	Emeritus	JP
10. Chris & Meghan Holding 12509	25A Clifton St	Fenestration revs	73.4.1/3.1	Emeritus	JP
11. NT Property owner 12513	18 Honeysuckle Dr	Rev Garage addition	68/865	Linda Williams	JP
12. 2 Mary Ann Dr LLC 12511	2 Mary Ann Dr	Dormers	68/467	Linda Williams	JP
13. 20 North Pasture 12512	20 N Pasture	Rev studio	44/86	Linda Williams	JP
14. NT Property owner 12520	20 Honeysuckle Dr	New house	68/399	Linda Williams	JP
15. Red Horse LLC 12508	65 Quidnet Rd	Color change	21/115	Botticelli & Pohl	JP
16. Henry Spitzer 12419	1 Sconset Ave	New gates	73.4.1/8	Studio Viburnum	CP
17. Sara Martinian 12517	14 Green Meadow	Outdoor shower	67/384	Caitlin Cooke	RP
18. Linda Saligman Trust 12514	117 Eel Point Rd	Addition	32/1	BPC	RP
19. 40 OSR LLC 12533	2A Forrest	Addition	68/10.1	Linda Williams	RP
20. 41 N Media LLC 12521	1 Old South Rd	Concrete color chg	55/181	Robert Sauer	RP
21. Murphy 12522	8 Golfview	Cottage	66/192	Gryphon Arch	RP
22. 138 Surfside Nom Trust 12544	138 Surfside Rd	Rotate sports court	80/142.1	Val Oliver	RP
23. Elizabeth Bac 12461	123 Eel Point Rd	Window replacement	33/15	Chuck Lenhart	SW
24. Frawley, Kevin 12462	20 Meadowview Dr	New Garage	56/141	Chuck Lenhart	SW

25.	The Peterson Trust 12435	8 Jefferson Ave	MH Add/Fen Revs	29/49	Botticelli & Pohl	SW
26.	Lee, John & Kelly 12434	1 Ridge Ln	Color change	38/91	Gryphon Architects	SW
27.	Goldman, Joshua 12432	16 Pollywog Pond Rd	Shed	55/422.7	Atlantic Landscaping	SW
28.	Dunham, Brenda & Dave 12433	16 Deer Run Rd	Shed	57/13.1	Val Oliver	SW
29.	4 Sunset Hill LLC 12451	4 Sunset Hill	Historic Determination	41/502	EMDA	SW
30.	Glowacki, Brian 12446	30B Evergreen Way	Move house on from 4VF	68/711.1	Val Oliver	SW
31.	33 Cliff Rd LLC 12492	33 Cliff Rd	Garage Revs 11949	42.4.4/5	Botticelli & Pohl	SW
32.	33 Cliff Rd LLC 12479	33 Cliff Rd	GH Revs 12000	42.4.4/5	Botticelli & Pohl	SW
33.	Somerset NT- 12392	2 Bittersweet	New Dwelling	56/104.2	George Berg	CT
34.	Somerset NT- 12405	2 Bittersweet	Shed	56/104.2	George Berg	CT
35.	Somerset NT- 12394	2 Bittersweet	Hardscape pool	56/104.2	George Berg	CT
36.	Ackually Ours LLC 12470	13 Mizzenmast	New shed	66/378	Brook Meerbergen	SW
37.	100 Wauwinet Trust 12531	100 Wauwinet Rd	New pool house	11/24.1	Botticelli & Pohl	AM
38.	Suni & William Harford 12527	60 Wanoma	MH 10693	92/13	Emeritus LTD	AM
39.	7 Brewster Nant LLC 12525	7 Brewster Rd	Rev MH basement	54/286	Linda Williams	AM
40.	McDonough, John & Susan 12524	5 Moby Way	Fence	65/159	KMLD	AM
41.	Leon Francis 12425	24 Essex Rd	Renew COA #68059	67/632	Nathalie Kaufman	CT
42.	31 Pequot St Realty 12481	31 Pequot St	Renew COA #6218	80/130	Griffin Law	VO
43.	Geagan, Jesse	40 Fairgrounds Rd	Demo/move off Shed	67/294	Isaiah Stover	AC
44.	Geagan, Jesse	40 Fairgrounds Rd	New Shed	67/294	Isaiah Stover	AC
45.	Barbara Tibbetts	43 Chuck Hollow Rd	Shed	75/112	Structures Unltd	AC
46.	App Ack LLC 12476	30 Appleton Rd	Addition	66/36	Reid Yenor	AC
47.	9 Bartlett LLC 12477	9 Bartlett Rd	Window replacement	67/13.1	Reid Yenor	AC

Board: Welch, Camp, Thornewill and MacLeod

Pohl and Oliver recused

MacLeod made the motion to approve consents.

Motion carries unanimously

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	Fingilly, LLC 12275	2A Longwood Dr	Pool	71/13.3	Self	
	Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing at time of application as evidence by then current Nantucket Map Geo topo.					
2.	Mullins, Kevin 12493	11 Plum St	Pool hardscape	80/28	SMRD	VO
	Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing at time of application as evidence by then current Nantucket Map Geo topo.					
3.	Garfinkel, Steven 12483	13 Starbuck Rd	New Plunge Pool	60/113	Thornewill Design	VO
	Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing at time of application as evidence by then current Nantucket Map Geo topo.					
4.	A Safe Place 12510	19 Amelia Dr	Fence	67/428	Emeritus	JP
	Due to minimal visibility.					
5.	Mullins, Kevin 12499	11 Plum St	Cottage move/demo	80/28	SMRD	VO
	Date of construction c. 1960 noted on COA and a copy of the tax assessor's property card to added to file.					
6.	89 Easton Street Trust 12503	89 Easton St	Rev window change	42.4.4/21	BPC	VO
	Applicant provide confirmation from MHC on revised fenestration changes.					
7.	Happy Horse Ack LLC 12407	7 Yompasham	Ext Stair window well	55/534	Thornewill Design	CP
	Date of construction c. 1994 to be added to the COA.					
8.	Somerack LLC 12413	5 High Brush	Retaining wall	56/388	KMLD	CP
	Retaining wall must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. No grade change from existing at time of application as evidence by then current Nantucket Map Geo topo.					
9.	Jeremy Trotter 12375	7 Moors End Lane	Rev. 11664- red size/add spa	43/218	Borislav Iliev	SW
	Pool/patio/spa as shown, but 5' closer to the house. Spa/pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity (wherever visibility would otherwise occur, in particular along Land Bank-owned travelled way, plant indigenous materials in a naturalized manner); no grade change from existing or as noted on the application.					
10.	Ackually Ours LLC 12469	13 Mizzenmast	Demo/ move off shed	66/378	Brook Meerbergen	SW
	Move-off only					
11.	Mark Howard 12443	13A Willard St	Fence	42.4.1/15.1	Sam Herrick	SW
	Fence along right front to be moved "back" to front right corner, then running parallel to the front façade.					

12.	Gandi, Balaji & Allison 12447	9 New Jersey Ave	Roof Change shed	60.3.1/408	Shelter 7	SW
	• Roof shingle color to be Pewter Gray.					
13.	Gandi, Balaji & Allison 12448	9 New Jersey Ave	Roof Change MH	60.3.1/408	Shelter 7	SW
	• Roof shingle color to be Pewter Gray.					
14.	Aliaksandr Arashonkau 12529	9 Greglen Ave	Solar	68/90	Self	AM
	• Solar panels to be removed from East facing gables on front and rear building sections.					

Board: Welch, Oliver, Pohl, Camp and MacLeod

Thornewill recused

Oliver made the motion to approve consents with conditions

Motion carries unanimously

IV. SIGNS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	10 Straight Wharf, LLC	10 Straight Whf	Freestanding Sign	42.3.1/137	Linda Williams
	• Hold for revisions (Jack + Charlie's)				

(Jack + Charlie's)

Board Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Camp

Linda Williams provided background on the free-standing sign at Jack and Charlie's Ice Cream Shop, explaining that a historical sign had been in place for decades before it was removed by the DPW in 2019 during sidewalk work. Kim Glowacki reconstructed the sign at his own expense. Williams emphasized that most signs along Federal Street have no front yard setback and that restoring the sign would help customers locate the business, which is set back over 20 feet from the street. She urged the commissioners to consider the historical context and visit the location before deciding.

Chris Young, chair of the Sign Advisory Council, provided historical context regarding free-standing signs. He explained that a moratorium on such signs was imposed in 1986, with the option to register pre-existing signs until May 1991. Young pointed out that several previous applications for this sign location had been denied: Atlantic in May 2010, Town Pool in May/June 2016, and Jack and Charlie's in May 2017. The main reason for these denials was the long-standing abandonment of the sign armature. He emphasized that the council had consistently informed applicants that the sign was not approvable due to this abandonment and argued that changing their stance now would undermine past decisions.

The Board discussed the sign application and ultimately decided to refer it back to the Sign Advisory Committee for further review and modifications. During the discussion, one board member pointed out that approving the sign would be inconsistent with the history of multiple previous denials. The board was reminded of the 1986 moratorium on free-standing signs and the requirement to register pre-existing signs by 1991. They acknowledged the historical context provided by Linda Williams and Chris Young but decided against conducting an immediate site visit.

Oliver made the motion to refer the application back to the Sign Committee.

Vote passes unanimously

2.	NIR Retail, LLC	34 Main St	Wall Sign	42.3.1/218	LINK 02554
	• Hold for revisions (Ellsworth + Ivey)				

(Ellsworth + Ivey)

Board Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, and Thornewill

MacLeod made a motion to hold for review next meeting 5/13/2025

Motion carries unanimously

3.	16 Federal, LLC	16 Federal St	Wall Sign (16 Federal)	42.3.1/71	Edwind Claflin
----	-----------------	---------------	----------------------------------	-----------	----------------

(16 Federal)

• Approve subject to the stipulation that the lighting will comply with the guidelines

4.	Klaudius & Leipa, LLC	5 Chestnut St	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/5	Cara Marquis
----	-----------------------	---------------	-----------------	----------	--------------

• Hold for revisions

(The Vault Nantucket)

5.	NHA	15 Broad St	Temporary Sign	42.3.1/70	Ashley Santos
----	-----	-------------	----------------	-----------	---------------

• Hold for revisions

(Left Side)

6.	NHA	15 Broad St	Temporary Sign	42.3.1/70	Ashley Santos
----	-----	-------------	----------------	-----------	---------------

• Hold for revisions

(Right Side)

7.	NHA	15 Broad St	Post Sign	Multiple locations	Ashley Santos
----	-----	-------------	-----------	--------------------	---------------

(Nantucket Historical Association)

• Hold for a view and removal of the existing signs by the NHA until application is approved.

8.	NIR Retail, LLC	40 Straight Whf	Projecting Sign	42.2.4/15	James Decatur
----	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------	---------------

• Motion to approve

(The Black Dog)

9.	CLACK, LLC	33 Main St	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/211	LINK 02554
----	------------	------------	-----------------	------------	------------

(BEACHKREW)

• Approve subject to the sign being reduced 5 square feet and installed at the existing bracket location.

10.	Tracy & Susan Root	20 Broad St	Projecting Sign	42.4.2/33	LINK 02554
-----	--------------------	-------------	-----------------	-----------	------------

(Billie's Established 2025)

- Approve through staff with the addition of a gold leaf border and the logo not to exceed 15% of the total sign area.
- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---|--------------|-------------------|
| 11. Zero India Street, LLC | 1 Cambridge St | Projecting Sign | 42.3.1/130.2 | LINK 02554 |
| | | (Marissa Collections) | | |
| 12. NIR Retail II, LLC | 22 Center St | Projecting Sign | 42.3.1/165 | LINK 02554 |
| | | (Door 26) | | |
| 13. Community Found for Nant | 9B Bayberry Ct | Wall Sign | 55/709.2 | LINK 02554 |
| | | (Community Foundation for Nantucket w/logo) | | |
| 14. Ken Withrow | 7 Union St | Projecting Sign | 42.3.1/146 | Plymouth Sign Co. |
| | | (Union Street Inn) | | |
| | | • Approve subject to the bottom of the sign to be lowered to 7' 6" above the landing of the door and the sign dimensions be limited to 17" x 40". | | |
| 15. Ken Withrow | 7 Union St | Fence Sign | 42.3.1/146 | Plymouth Sign Co. |
| | | (Union Street Inn) | | |
| 16. Charles & Cynthia Lenhart | 137A Orange St | Wall Sign | 55/665 | Plymouth Sign Co. |
| | | (The Baldwin Group) | | |
| 17. Charles & Cynthia Lenhart | 137A Orange St | Projecting Sign | 55/665 | Plymouth Sign Co. |
| | | (The Baldwin Group) | | |

Board Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod, and Thornewill

Pohl made the motion to approve sign applications 3 thru 17 per recommendation from the Sign Committee.

Motion carries unanimously

V. COMMISSIONER Q & A WITH PRESERVATION PLANNER

Holly Backus I would like to re-emphasize a few points. 5 California in Madaket is something worth paying close attention to, as it's a bit atypical. As mentioned in her staff comments, they are important to consider. Holly highly recommends referring to a Building with Nantucket in mind.

No other major concerns.

Welch I just wanted to let you know, Holly, that I think the historic determination form was well done. However, I wanted to consider whether we need additional language with respect to the stretch. What we'll do is come up with a passage to include in each letter so that if we make a historic determination, it won't be rejected by DOER. To clarify, we've already worked on this between yourself and my team for a previous application. The goal now is to formalize it in the operating manual for the office. As for the draft, we haven't used it yet, as it's still under consideration. I asked that it be held for review by the entire membership to see if anyone has additional comments for Holly. I've resolved my own comments and mentioned them, so she's aware. We haven't had a chance to discuss it with everyone yet, but now that it's been available for a week, I wanted to check if anyone else has feedback. If there are no further comments, we'll add it as an action item for a vote next week.

VI. HELD OVER PER COMMISSIONERS REQUEST FROM 4/29/2025

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1. Abigail Reardon- 12416	31 Shimmo Pond Rd	Deer fence	43/170	Jacob Svirsky	VO

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Camp; Alternates: Thornewill

Pohl expressed concerns about the visibility of the proposed deer fence, noting that there is not enough scrub vegetation to conceal it and believing it would be highly visible. He was also worried about the fence running around the entire property perimeter, suggesting that the current vegetation would not be sufficient to hide it. Ray was clearly skeptical about the proposed fence, primarily due to its potential visual impact and lack of adequate screening vegetation.

MacLeod: noting that there are no 8-foot deer fences along Shimmo Pond and no cattle guard deer grates in the neighborhood. He emphasized that the proposed fencing would be inappropriate for the area, suggesting that its design was not consistent with existing neighborhood practices and would not be suitable for the location.

Camp expressed concern that the proposed deer grates could harm the deer, worrying that they might become corralled and then spooked. She felt the fencing was inappropriate for the area and acknowledged not having a clear solution to the issue. Even if the fence were pulled back 5-10 feet, she believed it would still be highly visible. Her comments mainly focused on the potential negative impact on wildlife and the visual intrusiveness of the proposed fencing.

Oliver discussed the long-term visibility of the pressure-treated posts and suggested potential solutions for mitigating the fence's appearance. She proposed staining the posts with either an oil-based or non-VOC water-based stain to create a gray appearance. However, she noted that even with gray staining, the vegetation was too thin, and the fence would still be noticeable. Val also mentioned her involvement in helping Caitlin (the applicant) with the application and recommended pushing the fence further into the property while adding more vegetation to help conceal it. Her comments are centered on reducing the visual impact of the proposed deer fence through material treatment and landscaping adjustments.

Welch comments focused on potential modifications and specific details. He suggested reducing the fence area by starting near the edge or back corner of the house, moving it off Shimmo Pond Road and Middle Valley, and containing it to just the backyard instead of the entire property. Regarding the gate design, Stephen recommended a more traditional approach with a gate featuring wire mesh above it, opposing the current three-material gate design. He also asked technical questions, such as the on-center spacing of the wire mesh and whether the wire orientation would be horizontal or vertical. Overall, his comments were aimed at helping the applicant create a more fitting and less visually intrusive fencing solution that better aligns with the neighborhood context.

MacLeod made the motion to hold for revisions

Motion carries unanimously

VII. NEW BUSINESS 02/04/2025

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	Georgi Dimov- 11906	3 Miles Court	Solar Roof	68/187.2	Georgi Dimov	RP

Hold for representation

VIII. NEW BUSINESS 03/18/2025

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	5 Weetamo Rd LLC 12192	5 Weetamo Rd	New Man House	15/50	WAPD	AC

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Camp; Alternates: Thornewill

MacLeod: had two main comments. He appreciated the simple volumes and the proposed gray paint color, noting that white trim on houses in the area often stand out. However, he expressed concerns about the design, specifically the free-standing two-story volumes, glass railings exposing full-length windows, French doors that resemble long windows, and night shots highlighting these glass elements. Angus felt that these design features, particularly the glass railings and exposed windows, were problematic and drew unnecessary attention to the house.

Pohl: had minimal comments on the 5 Weetamo project. His main points included asking about the homeowner's association review, to which Andrew confirmed it had expired and that they had contacted all homeowners directly. Ray expressed general comfort with the project as proposed, especially considering its location. He suggested that if there were concerns about the glass railings, the applicant could create a mock-up with plywood to visualize an alternative. Overall, Ray seemed satisfied with the project, believing the presented imagery accurately reflected what would be built, and he was fine with the design as it stood.

Oliver: had two primary comments on the 5 Weetamo project. First, she expressed concerns about certain design elements, particularly the glass connectors with the green roof and the glass railings that expose full-length windows and French doors. When discussing potential modifications, Val was open to the turtle glass option previously approved on another project and noted that she was more concerned about the glass connectors than the railings. She suggested possibly scaling back the glass elements. Ultimately, Val seemed willing to consider the project with some modifications, especially to the glass connectors and railings, and was interested in seeing how the design could be adjusted to reduce its visual impact.

Camp: comments on the 5 Weetamo project were like Angus's. She expressed concerns about the glass elements, particularly the glass connectors, glass railings, and the six long French doors that are exposed. Abby suggested scaling back these glass features, indicating that she was not comfortable with the current design as presented. She agreed with Angus's assessment of the problematic glass elements and supported exploring an alternative design that would reduce their visual impact.

Welch: as the chair, appeared generally supportive of the project. His key comments included feeling comfortable with the project's location and limited visibility, suggesting that the design would not be highly noticeable. He supported approving the green roof (sedum tray) as a test case, highlighting its environmental benefits in slowing water runoff. Stephen was also open to the turtle glass solution for the railings and connectors. He seemed less concerned about the visual impact, particularly given the significant distance from which the house would be viewed, emphasizing that most views would be from a quarter mile away. Overall, Stephen appeared willing to approve the project with minor modifications, especially concerning the glass elements.

Pohl made the motion approve the project with the following conditions: That Turtle glass must be used on both the connectors and railings. And the project will serve as a test case for visibility and impact as seen from the harbor.

Motion to Approve made by Pohl; 4-1 (Camp opposed)

Motion carries

2.	5 Weetamo Rd LLC 12190	5 Weetamo Rd	Shed	15/50	WAPD AC	
----	------------------------	--------------	------	-------	------------	--

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod Camp and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill

Pohl made the motion to approve as submitted

Motion passes unanimously

IX. NEW BUSINESS 04/01/2025- VIEW

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	1 Caroline Way LLC- 12273	1 Caroline Wy	Fence gate	82/59	Ahern LLC	SW

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod Camp and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill

The Board had no major concerns with this application

Pohl made the motion to the fence application with the condition that grass or plantings be added in front of the horizontal fence to soften its appearance.

X. NEW BUSINESS 04/01/2025

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	Moesinger Rebecca- 12219 No representation	45 Surfside Rd	As-Built Fence	67/14	Self	AC
2.	Quidnest LLC- 12227	26 Quidnet Path	Rev 9671 remove chimney	21/150	Emeritus LTD AC	

Board: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Thornewill; Stepped away- Camp

No concerns

Oliver: Motion to approve as submitted

Vote carries unanimously

3.	Zepf, Chris & Wendy- 12236	5 Baxter Rd	Demo chimney	73.1.4/11.1	Aiden Bourke	AM
----	----------------------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	--------------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver and Camp; Alternates: Thornewill

No concerns

Oliver made the motion to approve as submitted. 4-1

Welch, Pohl, Oliver and Camp in favor **MacLeod** is a No

4.	Tejada Elmer- 12234 • Hold per applicant	26 Honeysuckle Dr	Hardscape	68/386	E Churchill	AM
----	---	-------------------	-----------	--------	-------------	----

5.	Wolfram Family Tr- 12246	7 Folgers Ln	Pergola	42.4.4/33.3	WAPD	AM
----	--------------------------	--------------	---------	-------------	------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Oliver, MacLeod and Camp; Alternates: Thornewill

Mickey Rowland, et al raised two main concerns about the 7 Folgers project. He questioned the visibility of the proposed structure, particularly from the footbridge in Coffin Park, as it was unclear how visible it would be. He also criticized the design, describing it as "untraditional" and "modern," suggesting it looked more suited for the California desert than the historic Cliff Road area. Rowland emphasized that visibility was the key issue and expressed skepticism about the structure's appropriateness for the historic setting.

The Board expressed strong opposition to the 7 Folgers project, citing concerns about its modern design and appropriateness for the historic setting. Ray was against the project, feeling the structure resembled something that had been "relocated from the California desert to Cliff Road" and was uncomfortable with the design. Val, who had recently been in the backyard of the neighboring property, could clearly see the structure from there, though she was unsure about visibility from the road. She also thought the design was too modern and suggested the chimney could be more rudimentary. Angus shared concerns about the contemporary design, noting the project's proximity to the oldest house, and felt the modern style was inappropriate for the location, leading him to oppose the project as well. Abby thought the design was "too much" and suggested changes to the proportions, particularly with the column, fascia, and pergola height. She also felt the field stone chimney was not appropriate and wanted the dimensional measurements adjusted. Overall, the board was largely united in opposing the project, emphasizing its modern design, visibility issues, and inappropriateness for the historic context.

Camp made the motion to hold for revisions and a view.

Vote carries unanimously

6.	Ack 11 Pleasant St LLC- 12251	11 Pleasant St	New garage	42.3./121	Studio Ppark	VO
----	-------------------------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill

Mickey Rowland, et al: expressed significant concerns about the proposed garage, describing it as very tall and narrow, and suggesting it would be more appropriate as a one-and-a-half-story structure. He felt the garage competes with the main house in both size and proportion and criticized the deck connecting it to the main house as inappropriate. He also noted that the French doors on the upper right side would be visible from the street and described the overall layout as complicated. His comments reflected broader concerns about the design, scale, and integration of the garage with the existing property.

Pohl: agreed with Mickey's assessment regarding the height of the proposed garage, believing it to be much too vertical. He criticized the arrangement of the garage doors and felt that the pent roof above them was "too tricked out" for the area. He also noted that the east side of the structure was over-fenestrated. Overall, Ray was clearly not supportive of the current design, particularly due to its vertical proportions and excessive architectural detailing.

Oliver: initially thought the design was "pretty good" and suggested simplifying the front of the structure. She proposed two possible approaches: either finding a way to make the garage look more connected to the house or completely separating it with a fence. While she acknowledged the structure was tall and skinny, she didn't believe it was entirely out of proportion compared to the main house. Her comments were less critical than those of other board members, indicating some openness to the design if modified appropriately.

MacLeod: shared concerns about the connection to the main house, specifically criticizing the attached deck and stair, which he felt contributed to the overall "busyness" of the design. He also took issue with the height of the structure and suggested that a one-story design with fewer attachments and

reduced fenestration would be more appropriate. He emphasized that the current design does not respect the historic character of the main house. His comments aligned with other board members advocating for a simpler, more modest design that better complements the existing historic structure.

Camp: supported the idea of reducing the height of the structure and suggested decreasing the garage's size from front to back. She felt the current design appeared "shoe-horned" into the location and believed it detracted from the historic house. She expressed a desire to see revisions, favoring a more modest, simplified design. Her comments aligned with other board members advocating for changes that would better respect the historic character of the main house.

Welch: agreed that the structure was too tall, estimating it to be 4–5 feet too high, and criticized the large windows, noting they were nearly the same size as the garage doors. He felt the overall design looked like a "caricature" and suggested specific revisions: simplifying the garage doors, addressing the pent roof—possibly by widening it or changing its pitch—and reducing the structure's height by at least 4 feet. He concluded by making a motion to hold the application for revisions. His comments were the most technically detailed, offering clear guidance on how the design could be improved to better align with the historic context of the property.

Camp made the motion to hold for revisions with bubbled plans.

Motion carries unanimously

7.	Ack 11 Pleasant St LLC- 12257	11 Pleasant St	Addition	42.3./121	Studio Ppark	VO
----	-------------------------------	----------------	----------	-----------	--------------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill

Mickey Rowland et al comments aligned with Holly's notes and centered on two main concerns. He stated that removing the existing bay window was inappropriate and took issue with the proposed flat-roofed addition and the creation of a second-floor balcony—both of which he felt were unsuitable for the old historic district. When James Krapp presented an alternative option, Mickey remained unconvinced, asserting that the changes did not address the fundamental issues. He emphasized that the proposed additions failed to respect the historic character of the property and would be out of place in the district.

The Board unanimously agreed that the current design for 11 Pleasant Street was inappropriate for the historic district, with particular concern about the removal of the bay window and the addition of a second-floor balcony. They recommended that the applicant return with significant revisions that better reflect and respect the historic character of the property. They agree with Holly and Mickey's comments.

Camp made the motion to hold for revisions with bubbled plans

Motion carries unanimously

8.	Tigerlily Nominee Tr- 12250	7 Barnabus	Rev MH chimney	41/563	Studio Ppark	VO
----	-----------------------------	------------	----------------	--------	--------------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill

Mickey Rowland commented that the detailing was too stark, and the design overall was "too slick." He noted that even chimneys with caps, like the one proposed, typically feature some core building to maintain traditional character. He also suggested that the chimney should not be painted white. His comments indicated that the design appeared too modern and lacked the traditional architectural details appropriate for the setting.

The Board The board unanimously agreed that the proposed chimney was too contemporary and did not align with the historic character of the neighborhood, recommending significant revisions for a more traditional approach in both style and detailing. They also felt the overall design was too modern and needed more traditional elements. Suggestions included incorporating a more traditional core building, avoiding white paint, and returning to a classic style. A hip-style roof with additional detailing was recommended, along with lowering the roof and adjusting the eave and brackets. While supporting the simplicity of the original design, the board called for minor revisions, including lowering the pitch and revising the chimney to its original design. Ultimately, the board favored more traditional detailing, a simplified design, and revisions to the pent roof and chimney to better align with historic architectural styles.

MacLeod made a motion to hold for revisions Motion carries unanimously

9.	Tigerlily Nominee Tr-12249	7 Barnabus	Rev Garage roof	41/563	Studio Ppark	VO
----	----------------------------	------------	-----------------	--------	--------------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill

Mickey Rowland raised concerns about two main aspects. First, he reiterated the same issues with the chimney as he had for the main house, including the stark detailing and the lack of a traditional core building. Regarding the pent roof, he questioned its appropriateness and criticized the detailing as incorrect, suggesting it might even be unnecessary. Specific critiques included the roof being too short, positioned too high above the door, lacking side cheeks, and having questionable brackets. Mickey suggested that if the pent roof was to be included, the detailing would need significant improvement to align better with traditional design principles.

The Board discussed the design and suggested several revisions to achieve a more traditional and simplified appearance. One member recommended using a hip-style roof with additional detailing and lowering the roof, while also proposing brackets like existing architectural elements. Another member appreciated the simplicity of the original design, suggesting adjustments like lowering the eave to align with the door casing and revising the brackets. A third member liked the original shed design but suggested only minor revisions, jokingly proposing relocating the structure to another project. The chair advised lowering the roof pitch and returning the chimney design to a more traditional style. Overall, the board agreed on the need for simplification, traditional detailing, and revisions to both the pent roof and chimney.

MacLeod made the motion to hold for revisions with a slightly deeper pitch, chimney not changing; brackets to be shingled cheeks; send to MacLeod for review. He may determine consent.

Motion carries unanimously

10. Milton Rowland- 12255	18 Mt Vernon	New garage studio	57/13.2	Normand Residential	VO
---------------------------	--------------	-------------------	---------	---------------------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill, Paul

The Board suggested replacing one nine-light door on the West Elevation with a batten door to match the garage doors. They liked the design's "quirkiness" but recommended simplifying the stoop railing to maintain a barn-like aesthetic. The historic color scheme, SDL windows, and the door change were all supported. While there were minor concerns about the garage apartment's scale, the board generally viewed the design positively, focusing on refining details to preserve the neighborhood's character.

Pohl made the motion to replace the nine-light door next to the garage on the West elevation with a batten door.

Motion carries unanimously

11. Milton Rowland- 12254	18 Mt Vernon	hardscape	57/13.2	Normand Residential	VO
---------------------------	--------------	-----------	---------	---------------------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill, Paul

No concerns

Camp made the motion to approve as submitted

Motion carries unanimously

12. Dyson Patrick- 12256	49 Meadowview Dr	New Gate	56/390	Nate Barber	VO
--------------------------	------------------	----------	--------	-------------	----

No representation.

13. Leiss Mark & Jamie- 12268	5 Coffin Rd	Fence cattle grate	91/9.2	KMLD	SW
-------------------------------	-------------	--------------------	--------	------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill

The Board reviewed a proposed deer fence and raised several concerns. While the fence placement—set back from the road and bordered by thick vegetation—was generally acceptable, the board was critical of the proposed cattle grate. Members felt it was visually and functionally inappropriate, with concerns about deer learning to bypass it and its long-term impact on the landscape. A motion was proposed to approve the fence but replace the cattle grate with a gate, reflecting the board's preference for a more traditional and less intrusive solution.

MacLeod made the motion to approve the fence as submitted BUT to eliminate the cattle grate and have the applicant return with a revised plan showing a traditional gate in its place. 4-1

Welch, MacLeod, Pohl Camp in favor Oliver is a no

14. Kaye Jabren- 12180	5 California Ave	Add 2 nd floor deck stairs	60.3.1/448	Self	RP
------------------------	------------------	---------------------------------------	------------	------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Thornewill and Oliver

Option A

Oliver made the motion to approve through Exhibit A with Oliver to review.

Motion carries unanimously

15. West Ashored LLC- 12278	62 Wanoma Way	Fence	92/16	Ana Ribeiro	RP
-----------------------------	---------------	-------	-------	-------------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul and Thornewill; Stepped away- Oliver, Camp

The Board mentioned Conservation Commission changes. Most of the fence is embedded in vegetation. Since they have to remove quite a bit, they should remove and do something different. Bracken has already staked the lines with marking tape. The suggestion was made to install alternating wire and wood posts.

MacLeod made the motion to hold for a view and will be discussed 5/13/25.

Motion carries unanimously

16. 5 Weetamo Rd LLC- 12308	5 Weetamo Rd	Cabana	15/50	WAPD	RP
-----------------------------	--------------	--------	-------	------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill

MacLeod made the motion to approve as submitted providing, if visible, add additional screening.

Welch, Pohl, Camp MacLeod, Oliver

17. Mark Deck- 12304	33 Union St	Roof solar	42.3.2/146	ACK Smart	RP
----------------------	-------------	------------	------------	-----------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul and Oliver; Alternates: Thornewill; sat off: Camp

Mickey Rowland did not have significant concerns about the proposed solar panel placement on the roof. Asked for black roof.

The Board recommended moving solar panels to the north side to reduce visibility from Union Street and suggested using black roof shingles to maintain the historic aesthetic. They were supportive of the changes but emphasized minimizing the visual impact on the streetscape.

motion was made to approve the application with the condition that the visible portion of the back roof be changed to black shingles. This was to help the solar panels blend in and reduce visibility from the street. The board agreed that with this change, the solar panel installation would be acceptable.

Pohl made the motion was made to approve the application with the condition that the visible portion of the back roof was changed to black shingles. This was to help the solar panels blend in and reduce visibility from the street. The board agreed that with this change.

4-1 (Oliver opposed)

18. Zarcone, Mike- 12302	16 Cherry St	Roof solar	55/379	ACK Smart	RP
--------------------------	--------------	------------	--------	-----------	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Paul and Thornewill; alternates: none; Recused: Oliver; sat off: Camp

No concerns

Motion to approve as submitted

19. Matt Carrie Powers- 12023	36 Bassett Road	Raise bldg. walk out deck	26/50	CWA	RP
-------------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-------	-----	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver

Pohl noted that the site plan indicates different elevations, with the parking area at elevation 36 and the garage floor at elevation 37.5. However, the elevations suggest a flat site, while there is likely a 4-foot grade change across the site. It was suggested that the topographical information on the elevations should be updated to more accurately reflect the proposed site conditions. The focus of the comments was on the discrepancies between the proposed site plan and the actual topography, emphasizing the need for a more accurate representation of the site's grade changes.

Oliver: A question was raised regarding the retaining wall details on the east side, specifically seeking to understand the extent of the retaining structure.

MacLeod: It was strongly recommended that existing and proposed grade details be provided, as the current elevations did not accurately represent the site conditions. There were concerns about the placement of porches and decks, referencing guidelines that suggest the sunken area should ideally be at the back of the property. The proposed location on the corner was seen as inconsistent with typical guidelines. These comments indicated that the proposed design did not meet the board's usual standards for placement and topographical representation, and more detailed information was requested before approval could be considered.

Camp: Initially, there were no issues with the project, but after hearing Angus's comments, concerns were raised about its visibility. Specifically, it was noted that the project is on a corner lot in a highly visible location. Questions were raised about the appearance of the retaining wall and how the structure would look when viewed from different angles. These comments reflected skepticism about the proposed design's suitability for such a prominent corner location.

Welch: It was stated that the proposal was not deemed appropriate in any way. While there was some openness to discussion regarding the retaining wall, potential view, and staking, he explicitly stated that he does not support raising the house or the current proposed design. He recommended holding the application for further review. His comments were brief but clearly conveyed that he was not supportive of the current proposal and wanted to see significant modifications or additional information before considering approval.

Camp made the motion to hold for a view and the hardscape application to track.

Motion carries unanimously

20. Never Blue LLC- 12306	4 Van Fleet Cir	New garage	91/111	CWA	RP
---------------------------	-----------------	------------	--------	-----	----

Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Paul; Alternates: Patten; Recused: Oliver

The Board The board raised significant topographical concerns, noting discrepancies between the site plan and elevations. It was observed that there is a 1.5-foot difference between the parking area and the garage floor, while the site plan depicts a flat grade despite an estimated 4-foot actual change. The need for elevation lines that accurately reflect proposed topography, a site plan showing retainage, and a comprehensive hardscape plan was emphasized.

Camp made the motion to hold for changes on the grade lines on the elevations and a site plan showing retainage and hardscape plan.

Motion carries unanimously

21. CNY Surf LLC- 12295	68 Shawkemo Rd	Move off/ Demo Shed	44/5	Emeritus LTD	JP
-------------------------	----------------	---------------------	------	--------------	----

HOLD

22. CNY Surf LLC- 12293	68 Shawkemo Rd	Move off /Demo Garage	44/5	Emeritus LTD	JP
-------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	------	--------------	----

HOLD

XI. NEW BUSINESS 04/15/25- VIEW

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1. Ack Storage Units Trust- 12370	5 Sun Island Rd	Bldg. A (resurface)	69/29.1	Val Oliver	SW

Board: Welch, Pohl, MacLeod, Camp and Thornewill

No concerns.

Camp: Motion to approve as submitted

Motion carries unanimously

2. Matt & Carrie Dewers- 12383	36 Bassett Rd	Hardscape	26/50	CWA	SW
--------------------------------	---------------	-----------	-------	-----	----

Application to TRACK with Main House application.

XII. NEW BUSINESS 04/15/2025

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1. Curlee, Burfield-12311	121 Wauwinet Rd	Repair/replace roofwalk; access stair	12/10	R Newman	CP
No representation					
2. Penant Realty LLC-12323	5 Coskata Course Wy	New dwelling	14/14.1	Botticelli & Pohl	CP
Board: Welch, Oliver, MacLeod, Camp and Thornewill					
No concerns					
Oliver: motion to approve as submitted					
Motion carries unanimously					
3. Nant Boys & Girls Club- 12318	73 Sparks Ave	Rooftop solar	55/193.3	Sunwind, LLC	AC
Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver					
No concerns.					
Oliver motion to approve as submitted					
Motion carries unanimously					
4. Alfred Sanford LLC- 12319	35 Vesper Ln	Demo/move off house	55/125	Richard Craddock	AC
Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Paul					
No concerns.					
Camp motion to approve as submitted					
Motion carries unanimously					
5. Alfred Sanford LLC- 12320	35 Vesper Ln	Demo/move off garage	55/125	Richard Craddock	AC
Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Paul					
No concerns.					
Camp motion to approve as submitted					
Motion carries unanimously					
6. Gottwald, Mark Trust- 12324	4R Jefferson Ave	Garage door revs	29/48.1	Topham Design	AM
Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver					
No concerns					
Oliver motion to approve with Option 1- 8 light.					
Motion carries unanimously					

The Board discussed the amended minutes from March 11, board will review and put on for approval at the next meeting May 13, 2025
 MacLeod made the motion to approve the minutes from January 21, 2025
 Pohl, Camp and MacLeod in favor Oliver abstained and Welch is a No

Camp made the motion to adjourn at 7:31 pm
 Board: Welch, Pohl, Camp, MacLeod and Oliver
 Motion carries unanimously.