



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Minutes July 29, 2025
2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554



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 and Aleksander Trifunovic
Holly Backus left the meeting at 5:08pm

Meeting called to order at 4:02 PM by Angus MacLeod

Oliver: made the motion to approve the agenda. Approved by Val Oliver, Angus MacLeod, Connie Patten, Carrie Thornewill
In person, Oliver, MacLeod, Patten, Thornewill
Pohl, Paul via zoom Camp via zoom joining at 4:27 pm
Welch was absent

I. CONSENTS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	Gale Valero- 12876	7 Waydale Road	Addition	55/84	Val Olver Design	AM
2.	Robin S. Wolpow- 12890	5 Arbour Way	Rev 12609; addition	29/159	Botticelli & Pohl	AM
3.	John Manera- 12872	4 Larrabee Lane	Rev 7308; rmve railing/screen ac	55/102.7	Self	VO
4.	Oscar Vasquez 12919	15 Pine Grove Road	Shed	67/423	Self	VO
5.	Jeremy Trotter- 12700	7 Moors End	Cabana	43/218	Self	VO
6.	Larry Tilton-12886- 12886	5 Windy Way	Roof change	67/447	Jim Lydon	VO
7.	Carl Nielsen- 12880	50 Wanoma Drive	Rev 11065; partial demo	92.4/244	Thornewill Design	VO
8.	Lauren Gudonis Tr- 12883	69 Hulbert Avenue	Addition	29/6	Thornewill Design	VO
9.	Thomas Ripley	92 Washington Street	Renew #71948- demo/move MH	42.2.3/22	Hammond Wilson Arch	
10.	Valero-Beta Gama- 12889	60-62 Old South Road	Demo Greenhouse A	68/85.2&85.3	Val Oliver Design	AC
11.	Valero-Beta Gama- 12888	60-62 Old South Road	Demo Greenhouse B	68/85.2&85.3	Val Oliver Design	AC
12.	Peter Kanchev- 12881	9 Honeysuckle Drive	Fence	68/877	Self	CP
13.	Ianetta Fisher Douglas Tr-12901	7 Paul Jones Road	Rev. 10909; fenestration	30/68.1	Emeritus, LTD	CP
14.	Kathy Lasota-12905	8 Maple Lane	Roof top solar- garage	67/303.4	Cotuit Solar	RP
15.	27 OSR, LLC- 12900	27 Old South Road	New dwelling Building 1	68/2	Dreamline/Kris Megan	RP
16.	JDB 34 Liberty St 12928	34 Liberty Street	Renew HDC2021-07-4200	42.3.4/82	Linda Williams	
17.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12923	1 Toombs Court	Move off/demo building	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
18.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12920	1 Toombs Court	Move off/demo garage	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
19.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12922	1 Toombs Court	Move off/demo walk-in cooler	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
20.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12931	1 Toombs Court	Move off/demo shed	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
21.	Cascabelles Dos LLC- 12954	5 Shawkemo Hills Lane	Demo garage	27/40	Smith and Hutton	AM
22.	Gilbert Holdgate- 12966	8 Rose Bud Lane	Move on from 27 Old South Rd	68/779	LINK	AC
23.	JDB 34 Liberty St 12935	34 Liberty Street	Historic Determination	42.3.4/82	Linda Williams	
24.	Denbigh Partners, LLC- 12916	54 Orange Street	Historic Determination	55.4.1/18	Linda Williams	
25.	Thomas Ripley- 12946	92 Washington Street	Move/demo garage	42.2.3/22	Hammond Wilson Arch	
26.	Thomas Ripley- 12947	92 Washington Street	Move/demo shed	42.2.3/22	Hammond Wilson Arch	

- Pohl, Thornewill and Oliver recused
- Patten made the motion to approve Consents
- MacLeod(Acting Chair), Patten Paul voted Motion carries unanimously

II. 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.	39 Milk Street, LLC- 12871	39 Milk Street	Roof change	54/461	Carey Company	AM
	• Provide photos of the body of the existing roof, not rakes & eaves.					
2.	Josh Leffleur- 12877	22 Pleasant Street	Driveway	42.3.2/50	Val Oliver Design	AM
	• Provide approved COA to confirm same design and details					
3.	Lasota Family- 12878	8 Maple Lane	Hip to gable roof	67/303.4	Val Oliver Design	AM
	• Not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity					
4.	Mike Raso- 12879	82 Centre Street	Brick walkway	42.4.3/62	Self	AM
	• provide scale drawing of path centered on door and running parallel with house. Note running bond perpendicular to sidewalk and detailed as seen in examples provided for 60 and 62 Centre Street.					
5.	Jeremy Trottier- 12891-	7 Moors End	Rev 12375; red pool/add fence	43/218	Self	VO
	• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. Indigenous vegetation along Land Bank property to remain. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.					
6.	Andrew Kozer- 12921	14 Mizzenmast Road	Fence	66/372	Self	CT
	• Planting material every third panel to soften board fence on neighbor's side.					
7.	Mark Silver- 12868	9 Lyons Lane	Pool-hardscaping	76/25	NAG	CP
	• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. Indigenous vegetation along Land Bank property to remain. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.					
8.	8 Heath Lane, LLC- 12907	8 Heath Lane	Pool	72/46	Paul Martin	RP
	• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. Indigenous vegetation along Land Bank property to remain. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.					
9.	Cascabelles Dos LLC- 12953	5 Shawkemo Hills Lane	New garage	27/40	Smith and Hutton	AM
	• Due to lack of visibility					
10.	CNV Surf, LLC 12938	68 Shawkemo	Cabana	44/5	Emeritus, LTD	AM
	• Replace South doors with 2 (A) windows or 3 (B) windows and step East dormer back 3' minimum from South gable					
11.	CNV Surf, LLC- 12952	68 Shawkemo	Pool	44/5	Jardins International	AM
	• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. Indigenous vegetation along Land Bank property to remain. No grade change from existing or as noted on the application.					
12.	Joshua Morash 12924	35 Meadow View Drive	Demo/move off garage	56/131	LDA Architecture	AM
	• Removal should not affect the pool visibility from Meadow View Road					
	• Oliver is recused					
	• Thornewill made a motion to approve consents with conditions					
	• MacLeod(acting Chair), Pohl, Thornewill Patten and Pul vote to approve unanimously					

III. SIGNS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	Kenneth Valero	66 Old South Rd	Wall Sign	68/854	Cara Marquis	
	• Recommends approval as submitted					
2.	Community Found of Nan	9B Bayberry Ct	Rev. 12553- Wall Sign	55/709.2	Botticelli & Pohl	
	Community Foundation of Nantucket					
	• Recommends approval subject to the sign being installed below the triple windows as illustrated on Exhibit 2A.					
3.	Zero India, LLC- 12903	1 Cambridge St	OB- Rev- Projecting Sign	42.3.1/130	The Sign Lady	
	Marissa Collections					
	• Recommends approval with the white background and pink lettering. The proposed projecting sign on Cambridge Street must comply with the guideline minimum height clearance of 7 feet 6 inches, hang vertically as proposed to the right side of the building and all current unapproved signage removed.					
4.	CLACK LLC	33 Main St	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/211	LINK	
	Beachkrew					
	• Recommends approval as submitted with the traditional bracket used and any unapproved signage removed.					
5.	NIR Retail, LLC 12917	34 Main St	Projecting Sign	42.3.1/218	LINK	
	Ellsworth + Ivey					
	• Recommends approval with the sign scaled to 18 by 18 inches.					
6.	NIR Retail, LLC- 12691	Straight Wharf	OB- Rev. Wall Sign	42.2.4/15	LINK	
	Bagel Bar					
	• Recommends approval subject to the sign being reduced to 7 feet by 2 feet.					
7.	NIR Retail, LLC	Straight Wharf	Wall Sign	42.2.4/15	LINK	

- Held for revisions
8. NIR Retail, LLC Straight Wharf Bagel Bar
 Temporary Sign 42.2.4/15 LINK
- Held for revisions.
 - Pohl recused
 - Oliver made the motion to approve the signs per recommendation of the sign committee
 - Motion carries MacLeod (Acting Chair), Thornewill, Oliver, Patten and Paul

IV. COMMISSIONER Q & A WITH PRESERVATION PLANNER

- N/A

V. 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.	Kim Glowacki- 12388	5 Meader St.	New secondary dwelling	42.2.3/40	LFW	JP
• Oliver Recused • Board: Pohl, Patten, Paul, Thornewill and MacLeod; Alternates: none • Holly Backus comments discussed the proposed dwelling, noting it must comply with the <i>Resilient Nantucket: Flood Adaptation & Building Design Guidelines</i> (Chapter 11) and that an elevation certificate is required due to the property's flood zone designation. Although the current design is slightly smaller than the previous version, members felt it remains boxy and inappropriate in scale. Concerns were raised regarding insufficient separation between the main dwelling and the proposed secondary structure. Commissioners recommended the applicant provide a streetscape view from Meader and Washington Streets to better evaluate contextual fit. The front stairs were noted to protrude in an atypical manner that does not align with building design guidelines. Additionally, concern was expressed over the use of a proposed double swing door, with a recommendation that it is not used for parking access beneath the building. It was advised that the Commission obtain both the elevation certificate and the FEMA map prior to considering approval. • Thornewill expresses concern that the scale of the proposed structure was out of context with the surrounding neighborhood and that the building appeared "jammed in" to the lot. The structure was not seen as reading clearly as a secondary dwelling, and the presence of two gables—one on each side—was noted as contributing to an overall sense of excessive massing. It was also observed that the design included too many windows and that the second-floor decks were not appropriate for this type of structure, even if the main house includes similar features. It was noted that the decks on the main house may have been a byproduct of the building being turned around during a previous move. Overall, the assessment concluded that the proposed design lacked the appropriate scale and character for a secondary dwelling and appeared too visually dominant for the lot. • Patten expressed agreement with prior comments regarding the proposed secondary dwelling at 5 Meader Street. She noted that the overall scale of the building was inappropriate, the window design did not fit the context, and the structure appeared crammed into the lot. She further stated that the design did not read as a true secondary dwelling. Her remarks supported the view that the project required substantial revisions to align with neighborhood character and the standards expected for secondary structures. • Paul: It was noted that the window trim appeared as wide or wider than the corner boards, and it was suggested that the trim be scaled back. Dormers were critiqued for sitting too far above the windows, with a recommendation that they align directly atop the windows for better proportion. Regarding the second-floor decks, it was recommended that the designs be better integrated, with visible railings, and that a visually awkward shingled wall be eliminated. Concern was also expressed about the proposed color palette; it was advised that the structure should not match the color of the main house, as doing so would intensify its visual impact. A contrasting color scheme was proposed to help mitigate the perceived scale of the building. Overall, the comments reflected a call for significant design revisions to address concerns about scale, massing, and the visual dominance of the structure within the neighborhood context. • MacLeod expressed concern that the North elevation, which faces the street, reads as the back of the house and lacks appropriate entry treatment. He recommended enhancing the street-facing facade, potentially by adding a porch or other architectural features to improve its presentation. He stated that the overall scale of the structure appeared to be nearly double what would be appropriate for a secondary dwelling and found the massing to be excessive. His overall assessment was that the design requires substantial reworking, as it does not effectively represent a secondary dwelling and fails to respect the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood. His comments aligned with the broader consensus of the board, calling for significant design modifications. • Pohl offered a strongly critical assessment of the proposed secondary dwelling at 5 Meader Street, stating that he found virtually nothing about the current design to be appropriate. He emphasized that the project requires complete redesign, citing major concerns with the building's scale, massing, and porch configuration. Notably, he used the term "redesign" explicitly—acknowledging that the board typically avoids such direct language—underscoring the extent to which the proposal falls short of the Commission's expectations. He concluded that the applicant should fundamentally rethink the proposal, as the current design does not meet the standards for a secondary dwelling or the architectural context of the neighborhood. • Boards comments: Although the current design is slightly reduced from a previous version, it remains boxy, out of scale, and does not convey the appearance of a secondary dwelling. Board member Carrie noted the scale is out of context for the site, the building feels "jammed in," has too many windows and includes inappropriate second-floor decks. Connie agreed with scale concerns, stating the structure appears crammed onto the lot and fails to read as a secondary dwelling. Joe commented that the design is over-scaled and lacks sufficient yard space and offered specific design recommendations: using narrower window trim, placing dormers directly over windows, modifying the second-floor decks, and considering a lighter color palette to reduce visual density. Angus criticized the north (street-facing) elevation for appearing like the back of a house, noted the lack of a defined entry treatment, and said the overall scale felt roughly twice as large as appropriate. Chair Ray Pohl found nearly nothing about the proposal to be appropriate and recommended a complete redesign addressing scale, massing, and porch configuration.						

The Commission also raised concerns about the atypically projecting front stairs, the use of a double swing door under the building, and the lack of contextual streetscape visuals.

- Public Comment: Mickey Rowland, et al; echoed these concerns, objecting to the front porch detail, the excessive height (31 feet), and the symmetrical layout, and urged that the design better reflect a “cottagey” style suitable for the Meader Street neighborhood.
- MacLeod made the motion to hold for significant revisions, including scale, massing, fenestration changes
- Motion carries unanimously

VI. NEW BUSINESS 07/29/2025

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>	
1.	Lasota Family-12892	8 Maple Lane	Front door change	67/303.4	Val Oliver Design	AM
	• MacLeod (Acting Chair), Pohl, Patten, Thornewill and Paul; Alternates: none: Agent: Oliver • Pohl made a motion to approve as submitted • Motion carries unanimously					
2.	Beach Bucket, LLC- 12893	14 Silver Street	Rev 1178; windows	55.41/182	Emeritus, LTD	
	• MacLeod (Acting Chair), Pohl, Camp, Thornewill and Oliver Alt: Paul • Holly Backus provided detailed comments regarding the proposed window change for 14 Silver Street, a circa 1830 historic structure known as the George Merrick House, built by Josiah Gorham. She noted that the Commission had previously approved the addition with the specific condition that <i>Boston Sash</i> windows be used and emphasized that only two manufacturers—<i>Boston Sash</i> and <i>Green Mountain</i>—are approved for producing historically appropriate Nantucket-style muntin windows. Holly underscored that approval of an alternative window type in one application should not establish a precedent for others, particularly in cases involving contributing historic structures. She stressed that <i>Simulated Divided Lite (SDL)</i> windows, such as those proposed by Marvin, can significantly alter the character of a historic building and may not meet the required preservation standards. Additionally, she reminded the Commission that the Historic District Commission (HDC) has jurisdiction over all exterior architectural features, including windows. Her recommendation was to uphold the previous condition and ensure that any new or replacement windows in the addition use either Boston Sash or Green Mountain SDL windows to maintain the building's historic appearance. • The Commission reviewed a proposed change in window type for 14 Silver Street, contributing circa 1830 structure. It was noted that the previously approved addition required the use of Boston Sash windows, and that only Boston Sash and Green Mountain are generally accepted for producing appropriate Nantucket-style muntin profiles. Concerns were raised about setting a precedent by approving Marvin Simulated Divided Lite (SDL) windows, which could alter the character of the historic building. Some members acknowledged that Marvin windows had been approved elsewhere in the Old Historic District and observed that the house's setback from the street reduced visibility of window details. There was general support for the absence of storm windows and acknowledgment that the proposed windows are not clad. Caution remained regarding the accuracy of the exterior profile and the historic significance and visibility of the structure, particularly given its location near a public parking lot. • Pohl made the motion to hold for samples of windows • Motion carries unanimously					
3.	Mary McAuliffe- 12904	72 Baxter Road	Addition	49/44	Botticelli & Pohl	AC
	• MacLeod (Acting Chair), Oliver, Paul, Patten and Paul Alt: Thornewill; Agent: Pohl • Holly Backus Comments were provided regarding the proposed alterations to 72 Baxter Road, a circa 1940s contributing ranch-style structure characterized by its low profile and flanking hipped roofs. While acknowledging the need to add a second floor, concern was expressed that the proposed second-story addition over the left side of the house introduces a gable end that disrupts the structure's defining hipped roof form. It was also noted that the proposed front door design is atypical for this architectural style. A recommendation was made to explore relocating the program to the center of the structure, if feasible, to retain the character-defining single-story hipped roof profile and better preserve the original ranch-style design of the dwelling. • Oliver made the motion to approve as submitted • Oliver, Patten, Camp and Paul Yay and MacLeod Nay • Motion carries 4-1					
4.	3 Pops Ln Holding Tr- 12894	3 Pops Lane	Rev 11086; MH addition/reno	60.2.4/64.1	MCA+	
	• Pohl, Camp, MacLeod Patten and Oliver Alt: Thornewill and Paul • Holly Backus Comments were provided regarding the George Elmore Taylor House at 3 Pops Lane, a contributing 1940s structure with 1990s additions. Appreciation was expressed for retaining the existing historic dwelling. It was recommended that any additions follow the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards</i>, remaining subordinate in scale and massing, compatible in materials, and appropriate to the Nantucket vernacular. Concerns included unclear square footage of the proposed addition and a front-facing addition that does not meet preservation standards. The use of horizontal boards on the north (Heather Creek) elevation was also deemed incompatible. Suggestions included relocating additions to the rear in smaller volumes and referencing historic precedents such as 341 Madaket Road. Photos of the existing structure were requested. Overall, the guidance emphasized designing an addition that complements and preserves the historic character. • The Board conducted a brief review of the proposed revisions for 3 Pops Lane and expressed general appreciation for the applicant's new design approach, particularly the decision to retain the existing structure and maintain a low profile. Several members supported the changes overall, though there were recurring concerns about the proposed use of horizontal siding, with some preferring shingles to better align with traditional Nantucket design. The chimney design was also criticized as appearing overly modern, with suggestions to redesign it in a more traditional form. Additional comments included interest in the proposed Marvin window profiles and the suggestion to use a continuous sill along the screen porch to provide visual cohesion. The applicant expressed openness to making modifications, including adding continuous sill and adjusting the					

chimney cap to reflect a more historically appropriate design.

- Oliver made the motion to approve through Exhibit A
- MacLeod will be writing up Exhibit A
- Motion carries unanimously

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----|
| 5. | 3 Pops Ln Holding Tr- 12895 | 3 Pops Lane | Garage | 60.2.4/64.1 | MCA+ | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pohl, Camp, MacLeod Patten and Oliver Alternates: Thornewill and Paul • The Board offered a minimal commentary on the proposed garage at 3 Pops Lane, with no significant concerns raised by members. One board member briefly considered the possibility of flipping the garage and guest house locations, but overall, the structure was viewed as typical and appropriate. There was a consensus to move quickly through the garage discussion and focus attention on the guest house portion of the application. A representative of the abutters noted the garage design was acceptable but recommended relocating it closer to Pops Lane. The board did not express objections to the garage design and appeared comfortable proceeding to the next component of the project. • Track with guest house and pool | | | | | |
| 6. | 3 Pops Ln Holding Tr-12896 | 3 Pops Lane | Rev 11088; re-site/reno | 60.2.4/64.1 | MCA+ | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pohl, Camp, MacLeod Patten and Oliver Alt: Thornewill and Paul • The guest house should be more balanced with Main House; reduce in height. MacLeod suggested to move east and flip with Garage. Oliver suggested height poles to view proposed location. Patten and Pohl were concerned about demolishing portions of the existing structure. • MacLeod made the motion hold the application for revisions and to request the installation of a <i>height pole</i> at the proposed guest house location to better assess its scale and impact. The board also requested that the applicant submit an <i>alternative site plan</i> showing the guest house relocated closer to its existing position near the garage. The motion further suggested that, if needed, the proposed garage could be repositioned to the guest house location to accommodate the revised plan. • Motion carries unanimously | | | | | |
| 7. | 3 Pops Ln Holding Tr-12897 | 3 Pops Lane | Pool | 60.2.4/64.1 | MCA+ | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pohl, Camp, MacLeod Patten and Oliver Alt: Thornewill and Paul • Oliver made to motion to hold this application for more information and to track | | | | | |
| 8. | Kathy Lasota- 12906 | 8 Maple Lane | Roof top solar- MH | 67/303.4 | Cotuit Solar | RP |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MacLeod (Acting Chair), Camp, Paul, Pohl and Thornewill Alternates: Patten; Recused: Oliver • The Commission reviewed the proposed solar panel installation at 8 Maple Lane. There was general support for most of the panel placements, particularly those located on dormers and behind existing tree cover, which were considered minimally visible from the public way. However, concerns were raised about a thin row of six panels proposed along the ridge line, which was believed to be visible from the road. It was noted that the existing roof is wood rather than black asphalt, which may reduce compatibility with the solar panels. The board indicated that the project would be more acceptable if the ridge line panels were removed. Overall, the sentiment was mixed but leaned toward approval, contingent on the removal of the ridge-mounted array. • Thornewill made the motion to approve the solar panel installation at 8 Maple Lane with the following conditions: (1) removal of the ridge line panels, and (2) installation of a small plant or tree to help screen the visibility of panels on the secondary one-story rear mass of the structure. • Motion carries unanimously | | | | | |
| 9. | Hooper Farm LLC- 12927 | 1 Hooper Farm Road | New roof | 55/228 | Linda Williams | RP |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MacLeod (Acting Chair), Oliver, Camp Pohl and Patten; Alternates: Thornewill, Paul • The Boards discussed the proposal to use red shingles for roofing, with one member supporting the approach and referring to historical precedents on Martin's Lane and Orange Street. It was noted that three non-architectural tab styles of red shingles are available. However, concerns were raised about the compatibility of red roofing with white trim, with one member suggesting the color combination appeared inconsistent and another citing the Coast Guard station as a rare and intentional exception. The roof's visibility from the rotary and its old-fashioned aesthetic were also discussed. While some members acknowledged existing, red-roofed examples, it was suggested that introducing red roofing on a structure without historical precedent may not be appropriate. • Pohl made the motion to approve as submitted • Oliver, Camp, MacLeod with Nay Patten and Pohl with Yay • Motion does not carry • Pohl made a new motion to hold for revisions • MacLeod, Oliver, Pohl and MacLeod Yay and Patten Nay | | | | | |
| 10. | Cliff Dwelling, LLC- 12918 | 4 John Adams Lane | As-Built Deer grate VIEW | 30/628 | Linda Williams | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pohl, MacLeod, Oliver, Camp and Paul; Alternates: Thornewill, Patten • Would like to see a removal of cattle grate and/or add a gate to mitigate view. • Camp made the motion to hold for revisions • Carries unanimously | | | | | |

11.	K225, LLC- 12925	126 Main Street	Rev parking	42.3.3/98	Linda Williams	
	• No action made held for a view and will be revisited at the next meeting August 5, 2025					
12.	Cyril Ross- 12929	12 Oak Hollow Rd	Move off/demo MH	56/128	Linda Williams	RP
	• MacLeod (Acting Chair), Pohl, Oliver, Camp and Thornewill; Alternates: Patten, Paul • The Commission discussed the potential move or demolition of a 1970 structure at 12 Oak Hollow Road. It was explained that the site presents significant challenges for relocation due to the narrow roadway, overhanging trees, and prior assessment by Trevor Barrett indicating that moving the structure would require substantial destruction. While one member expressed openness to a move-off, there was general hesitation around a full demolition. Several board members encouraged exploring alternatives, such as reusing or repurposing the building on the site or salvaging materials. It was acknowledged that the structure is from a period not noted for architectural significance and presents limited historic value. However, due to its size and the lot's scale, members saw potential for integration or adaptive reuse. The discussion remained open-ended, with the board indicating a desire to further explore alternatives to demolition before reaching a final decision. • Camp made the motion to hold for revisions • Motion carries unanimously					
13.	John Myers- 12797	14 Sleepy Hollow	Addition	66/449.2	LINK	RP
	• MacLeod (Acting Chair), Pohl, Camp, Oliver and Patten Alt: Paul, Thornewill • No concerns • Camp made the motion to approve as submitted • Motion carries unanimously					
14.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12913	1 Toombs Court	Duplex- Lot A, building 1	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
	• Pohl, Camp, Macleod Paul and Thornewill Alt: Patten; Recused: Oliver • The Board reviewed a proposed building within a larger development and expressed general support for its design, while raising broader concerns about repetition and lack of variation across the overall site plan. One member suggested narrowing and repositioning the four front windows for better alignment with the gable. Another proposed incorporating a clipped gable to lower the roofline and introduce variation. It was noted that the buildings across the development appeared dense and uniform in height, and suggestions were made to revise future submissions to introduce more architectural diversity. While one member found this building appropriate for its location, others emphasized that future structures would require greater differentiation in scale and form. Concerns were raised about the building's proximity to the street, though it was clarified that nearby properties are situated even closer with less screening. The board indicated they were generally favorable toward approving the current building, with minor adjustments, while holding future buildings for revisions to encourage varied and context-sensitive design across the development. • MacLeod motion was made to hold Lot A, Building One (the duplex) for revisions, specifically requesting: (1) modified fenestration to improve window placement, (2) greater spacing of windows on the east elevation, (3) installation of poles along the street to assess the building's proximity to Old South Road, and (4) submission of a site plan showing existing building footprints and overall context. The motion included the understanding that revised designs would be reviewed collectively across all proposed buildings in the development to ensure appropriate variation in massing, height, and architectural detailing. • The board agreed unanimously.					
15.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12912	1 Toombs Court	Mixed use- Lot A, building 2	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
	• Pohl, Camp, Macleod Paul and Thornewill Alt: Patten; Recused: Oliver • The board raised several concerns related to design and context. On the north elevation, it was noted that the main entry door appeared too low and lacked prominence, with a suggestion to increase its height and consider adding a porch to soften its street-facing appearance. Comments were made regarding door and window placement, including the awkward termination of the dormer into the gable on the east elevation and windows that appeared too close to the dormer. One suggestion was to eliminate the north-facing door entirely and replace it with a window. Broader design concerns were raised about the door on the north elevation lacking architectural clarity, with caution against creating excessive symmetry with adjacent buildings if a porch were added. From a development-wide perspective, members reiterated concerns about uniform height, massing, and density across all proposed structures. While no formal motion was made, the board appeared inclined to hold this building for revisions, consistent with their approach to other buildings in the development, to encourage greater variation in architectural details and site-specific design. • MacLeod made motion was made to hold Lot A, Building Two (mixed-use building) for revisions, with the following conditions: (1) installation of height poles at the front ends of both buildings facing Old South Road to assess visual impact, and (2) a request for the applicant to revise the design to address board concerns related to height variation, roof plane differentiation, and overall uniformity across the development. The motion was seconded and approved by the board, aligning with its broader intent to ensure architectural variety and contextual sensitivity throughout the project.					
16.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12934	1 Toombs Court	Hardscape – Lot A	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
	• To Track					
17.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12909	1 Toombs Court	Duplex- Lot B, building 1	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
	• To Track					
18.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC 12915	1 Toombs Court	Mixed use- Lot B, building 2	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
	• To Track					
19.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12932	1 Toombs Court	Hardscape – Lot B	68/9	Linda Williams	JP

	To Track					
20.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12909	1 Toombs Court	Duplex- Lot C, building 1	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
	To Track					
21.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12910	1 Toombs Court	Mixed use- Lot C, building 2	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
	To Track					
22.	1 Toombs Ct, LLC- 12936	1 Toombs Court	Hardscape – Lot C	68/9	Linda Williams	JP
	To Track					
23.	CNV Surf, LLC- 12951	68 Shawkemo Road	Hardscape	44/5	Jardins International AM	
	No representative Hold					
24.	Barbara Tibbetts- 12908	43 Chuck Hollow Road	As-Built move on struct VIEW	75/12	Structures Unltd/LFW	
	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, MacLeod and Patten Alt: Paul and Thornewill MacLeod made the motion to approve as submitted due to lack of visibility. With the stipulation that it will never be visible. And the as built fee be paid MacLeod, Oliver, Patten and Pohl Yay and Camp with a nay					
25.	Stephen Burbage 12939	47 Quidnet Road	Pool/spa	21/143	Ahern, LLC	CT
	MacLeod (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver Pohl and Paul Alt: Thornewill and Patten Camp made the motion to approve and the pool/spa not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. Motion carries unanimously					
26.	Branden Scimone- 12944	4 Wood Hollow Road	Move off/demo dwelling	72/16	Robbie Newman	CT
	Held for representation					
27.	Branden Scimone- 12945	4 Wood Hollow Road	New dwelling	72/16	Robbie Newman	CT
	Held for representation					
28.	Branden Scimone- 12943	4 Wood Hollow Road	Cabana	72/16	Robbie Newman	CT
	Held for representation					
29.	Branden Scimone- 12942	4 Wood Hollow Road	Pool	72/16	Robbie Newman	CT
	Held for representation					
30.	Surfside Realty Tr- 12949	16 Walsh Street	Relocate/partial demo/reno	42.4.1/50	Robbie Newman	CT
	Held for representation					
31.	West Ashored LLC 12950	62 Wanoma Way	Rev 12278; veg to hide fence	92/16	Ana Maria Riberio	CT
	MacLeod (Acting Chair), Oliver, Camp, Thornewill and Patten Alt: Paul; Stepped away: Pohl The Commission discussed concerns related to proposed fence screening and vegetation placement. Questions were raised about the feasibility of planting vegetation between fences, as the available space appeared too limited for meaningful growth. It was noted that existing trees are located on the opposite side of the fence, prompting a suggestion to relocate the fence to the far side of the tree line. The site’s proximity to a public path heightened visibility concerns, and the board expressed skepticism about the effectiveness and natural appearance of any proposed plantings within the narrow buffer. Overall, members felt the current screening approach would not provide an adequate or authentic solution. Camp made the motion to hold for revisions and requested a more explicit definition of what the applicant wants to do. Motion passes unanimously					
32.	Marshall Taylor- 12969	6 Starbuck Road	Driveway material change VIEW	59.3/64	Self	CT
	Held for representation					
33.	Osprey Way RT- 12948	1 Osprey Way	Rev 11019; dormer/fenestration	65/19	Botticelli & Pohl	VO
	MacLeod (Acting Chair), Oliver, Camp, Paul and Thornewill Alt: Patten; Agent: Pohl Oliver made the motion to approve as submitted Motion carries unanimously					
34.	FP N. Water, LLC 12941	4 N. Water Street	Rev. 1131; add 26sf bump out	42.4.2/90	Emeritus, LTD	SW
	MacLeod (Acting Chair), Camp, Oliver, Pohl and Paul Alt: Patten and Thornewill Pohl made the motion to approve as submitted Motion passes unanimously					
35.	Scrambled, LLC 12926	47 Hulbert Avenue	Rev. 12516; omit chim, fenest	28/15	BPC	SW
	MacLeod (Acting Chair), Pohl, Oliver, Camp and Thornewill Alt: Patten; Agent: Paul The Boards concern was raised about preserving the original feature, with a preference to retain it. Objections were expressed to shortening the front windows, incorporating large, fixed glass panes on the water side, and removing divided lights from first-floor doors. It was suggested that the large glass elements were out of scale with the historic structure and appeared driven by interior views rather than architectural context. Some members, however, supported the use of picture windows, citing historical precedent in 1930s beach houses. Recommendations included restoring the original front window heights, using a smaller but appropriately styled chimney, reverting to four-light doors on the first floor, and reducing the scale and number of large glass elements on the north elevation. Overall, the board encouraged revisions that balance modernization with greater preservation of the building’s original architectural character.					

- Pohl made the motion to Hold for revisions
- Motion passes unanimously

36.	Robert L. Roy Trust 12911	25 Hussey Street	Addition	42.3.4/54	BPC	SW
-----	---------------------------	------------------	----------	-----------	-----	----

- MacLeod (Acting Chair), Pohl, Oliver, Camp and Patten Alt: Thornewill; Agent: Paul
- The Boards discussion which included changing an existing gable to a shed roof, extending the roof line by approximately four feet, removing a non-functional (fake) chimney, and adding a glass conservatory to the rear L. Concerns were raised about visibility of the rear addition from the Academy Hill parking lot, with a recommendation to consider a more traditional sunroom design in place of the proposed contemporary glass conservatory. Initial plans called for a glass roof, but members suggested using copper instead, citing concerns about nighttime visibility. The board also discussed the appropriateness of using *LePage* or *Green Mountain* windows in a structure nearly 300 years old and recommended that any new windows match the historic character. While generally supportive of the proposal due to limited visibility, board members emphasized the use of traditional materials and historically sensitive design details.
- Oliver made the motion to Hold for a View
- Motion carries unanimously

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

- Camp made the motion to approve minutes for July 22, 2025
- MacLeod, Pohl, Patten, Camp, Paul and Thornewill approved, and Oliver abstained
- Camp made the motion to adjourn at 8:07 pm
- MacLeod, Camp, Oliver, Pohl, Patten, Paul and Thornewill
- Motion carries unanimously