



## HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road  
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554  
[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://www.nantucket-ma.gov)

**Commissioners:** Raymond Pohl (Chair), Diane Coombs (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, Kristine Glazer, Abigail Camp  
**Associate Commissioners:** Vallorie Oliver, Matt Kuhnert

~~ MINUTES ~~

**Tuesday, November 29, 2016**

Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room – 4:30 p.m.

Called to order at 4:34 p.m.

Staff in attendance: John Hedden, PLUS Administrative Specialist; Catherine Flynn, Administrative Specialist; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker  
 Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp, Oliver  
 Absent Members: Kuhnert  
 Late Arrivals: None  
 Early Departures: None

Agenda adopted as amended by unanimous consent.

### I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

### II. CONSENT

1. Cokarinos, Gregory – <b>66974</b>	7 Towaddy Lane	AC units screened	49.3.2-14.5	Lewis Kelsey Jr.
2. Michel, Betsey – <b>66975</b>	11+15 Sankaty Avenue	Eliminate walkway	73.1.4-36	Sam Hill
3. 6+8 Lovers Lane LLC – <b>66976</b>	6+8 Lovers Lane	Leaders and gutters	68-200,201	Jon Mason
4. Nantucket Public Schools – <b>66977</b>	10 Surfside Road	Revise windows	55-137	SMRT

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp

Alternates Oliver

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, photos, correspondence, and historical documentation as required.

Representing None

Public None

Concerns (4:37) No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve. (Glazer)**

Vote Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain

**Certificate # 66974 to 66977**

### III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Nant. Theatre Proj.	5 North Water Street	Mechanical as-built vents	42.4.2-88	Michael Kopko
------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------	---------------

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver

Alternates None

Recused Glazer

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, photos, correspondence, and historical documentation as required.

Representing None

Public None

Concerns (4:37) **Pohl** – Discussion about policy on vents is scheduled for end of meeting.

**Staff** – The Certificate of Occupancy (CO) is being held up for this; it is a follow-up from its inspection.

Discussion about the reason this is before the board at this time.

**McLaughlin** – Vents are becoming popular; in the old historic district (OHD), they should be wooden. As these are already in, the metal should be painted.

Consensus agrees with Mr. McLaughlin; discussion about the white wood trim to go to natural to weather and grills grey.

**Oliver** – They should pay the as-built fee.

Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with for both vents, the wood trim to be natural to weather and grills painted**

**Nantucket grey and payment of the as-built fee. (Camp)**

Vote Carried unanimously

**Certificate # 66978**

2.	Hellman, Nina	48 Centre Street	Color change deck	42.3.1-1	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp				
Alternates	Oliver				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, photos, correspondence, and historical documentation as required.				
Representing	<b>Ted Lambrecht</b> – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:48)	<b>Staff</b> – The CO is being held up for this. No concerns with going to all natural to weather.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Glazer)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously			<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66979</b>

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

1.	Faros Properties	17 Broad Street	Rev. 66360: add pent roof	42.4.2-74	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Glazer, Camp				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, photos, and historical documentation as required.				
Representing	<b>Matt MacEachern</b> , Emeritus Development – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:50)	No concerns.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Glazer)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously			<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66980</b>

2.	Dunn, Lee	137 Orange Street	Demo dwelling	55-286	Emeritus
3.	Dunn, Lee	137 Orange Street	Demo shed	55-286	Emeritus
4.	Fee, Henry	141 Orange Street	Demo dwelling	55-153	Emeritus

Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp				
Alternates	Oliver				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural conceptual plans, mold reports, and historical documentation.				
Representing	<b>Matt MacEachern</b> , Emeritus Development – Reviewed requested information per previous comments. They can supply as-builts of the structures. Reviewed proposed buildings with underground parking, which is before the Planning Board.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:52)	<p><b>McLaughlin</b> – Should have photos of the exterior elevations of the two main structures. As far as he can see, there is no historical value left of the buildings due to their deterioration. Of 16 structures on that side of the street between Cumberland Farms and the Rotary, only three are 1½ stories.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – She cannot approve the demolition of these two historic buildings, which are two of the oldest on Orange Street, whether or not they are in bad repair; we are fast losing the small historic areas. She hasn’t seen any documentation on their condition. Looking at the conceptual design, she can’t be part of approving 40-foot tall structures in this area. Would like to see more historic information; suggested talking to the former owner’s descendents.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – She is having difficulty supporting the demolition of two historic homes; however the direction of development of that section of Orange Street is going, these small structures will be “crushed.” She’d like to see a survey of the architecture of the surrounding structures to ensure the new buildings will relate architecturally. She does not appreciate a lot-line to lot-line structure with no attention to landscaping; attention needs to be paid to pedestrians walking the street. These structures will set precedent for further development going toward the rotary.</p> <p><b>Glazer</b> – Agrees with Ms Camp; the proposed encroaches on the road and is out of scale with the area.. She’d like to see architecture that relates to the existing buildings. She respects the fact the area was rezoned to allow 40-foot tall buildings; however, this board has the right not to allow the structure to be 40-feet tall and the right to determine how large the structure will be. She is sorry we didn’t meet with Town Counsel in regards to demolition by neglect before this application as that would have been a better route. She could be persuaded to approve the demolitions if she knows what’s going in its place is sensitive. Need dimensions of these structures. She wants to see a 3D scan of the existing structures.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – Agrees with Ms Glazer; these are in bad shape. There was discussion at the last hearing to inventorying the structure with a 3D scanner. He too hopes the replacement buildings would be more respectful of these existing structures and other buildings in the area.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Suggested the building on the corner be smaller scale or move the buildings away from the road so that a 40-foot tall building won’t be right on the road. The only other tall structure is Landmark House, which is set a couple 100 feet from the road; these would loom over the street.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for a 3D scan. (Glazer)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously			<b>Certificate #</b>	

5.	Theodorakos Vaios Trst	79 Pocomo Road	New guest house	15-5	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Glazer, Camp				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans and photos.				
Representing	<b>Chip Webster</b> , Chip Webster Architecture – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns and additional information. The left side faces the water north and the front faces west into the pool.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:15)	<p><b>Glazer</b> – This looks better especially on the east. The French doors look elongated but match the three windows on the north elevation. The “B” windows are big.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – Agrees about the French doors.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – This is 23.9 feet which is almost two feet over the secondary dwelling limit; the height should be reduced. There is no front door that leads into this; the French doors on the west side are not an obvious front entrance.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – If there were to be a proper front door, it should be on the south elevation in place of the “A” window. As far as the height, it is a long way from the road.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with a front door in place of the south elevation “A” window; and height approval is based upon the fact it is not visible. (Coombs)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously		<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66981</b>	
6.	Engle, Kristen Trust	90 Pocomo Road	Rev. 61491 & 63004: GH	15-43	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp				
Alternates	Oliver				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans and photos.				
Representing	<b>Chip Webster</b> , Chip Webster Architecture – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. An approval exists to demolish the existing main house and build a replacement. An approval also exists to demolish the existing guest house and build a new guest house; this is a revised plan for the guest house.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:26)	<p><b>Glazer</b> – This is in fact a revision to an existing COA and we need that information. Need a compass rose on the site plan.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – There is nothing in the drawing depicting what the garage doors will look like. The “C” windows should be hoppers.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Agrees need about knowing what garage doors will look like. This is still tall for a secondary dwelling at 25.9 feet.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Would like to see more differentiation between the house and garage roofs. The garage roof can be taller.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions and more information. (Glazer)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously		<b>Certificate #</b>		
7.	Tack 3 LLC	26 Washington Street	Renovation	42.3.2-23	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp				
Alternates	Oliver				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, photos, correspondence, and historical documentation.				
Representing	<b>Chip Webster</b> , Chip Webster Architecture – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:34)	<p><b>Pohl</b> – Read a letter from Mickey Rowland, Rowland and Associates into the record.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – There is no additive massing; most buildings on this side of the street are lower and have additive massing so don’t they block the view of the harbor from the street. The pillars on the front are much too formal; this used to be an old railroad building and is very simple. The height off the street is greater than any other building in the area. South elevation, the six ganged windows should be separated, as they make that side inappropriately heavy; the 2<sup>nd</sup>-story deck is inappropriate for this area.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – This architecture belongs on Orange Street, not Washington Street.</p> <p><b>Glazer</b> – Greek revival on this side of the street is incongruous. It’s too formal of a design.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – The twelve “D” windows should be fixed or hoppers.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – The formality exacerbates the size.</p>				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Glazer)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously		<b>Certificate #</b>		

8.	Sheppard, Blaise	2 Brinda Lane	House	67-274	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans.				
Representing	<b>Val Oliver</b> – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:46)	No concerns.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Glazer)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously			<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66982</b>
9.	Peterson, Richard	30 Main Street (‘Sconset)	Hardscape: pool	73.3.1-46	Atlantic Landscape
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, photos, correspondence, and historical documentation.				
Representing	<b>Lindsey Congelton</b> , Atlantic Landscaping – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; it is outside the ‘Sconset residential old historic (SROH) zoning district.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:48)	<b>Coombs</b> – The pool is very close to the rear property line and looks cramped in; would like it moved closer to the house. <b>Camp</b> – Got clarification on the landscaping around the pool. From Maury Lane, the picket fence will be visible; agrees about moving the pool away from the rear lot line. <b>McLaughlin</b> – No comments. <b>Oliver</b> – Agrees it should move closer to the house. <b>Pohl</b> – If it moves north, it doesn’t move away from a public way and doesn’t change its visibility; doing that also creates a dead zone. Instructed board members to strike out on the plan that the spa is raised. Discussion about reducing the pool size to 14X40 and/or reducing the patio and moving the pool closer to the house.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (McLaughlin) not carried <b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously			<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66983</b>
10.	Dupont, Wayne	12 Pine Street	Shingle to clapboard front	42.3.2-57	David Wiley
Voting	Coombs (acting), McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, photos, correspondence, and historical documentation.				
Representing	<b>Wayne Dupont</b> – Would accept painting the shingles grey.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:06)	<b>Coombs</b> – Read into the record Dave Wiley’s letter asking for clapboard. There is no historic precedent for clapboard. Discussion about cobblestone grey or platinum grey.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as platinum grey with a color chip submitted to staff. (McLaughlin)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously			<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66984</b>
11.	55 Fair Street LLC	55 Fair Street	Windows, stairs, chimneys	55.4.1-74	Kelly Ennis
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, photos, and historical documentation.				
Representing	<b>Kelly Ennis</b> – Reviewed information requested and changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:12)	<b>McLaughlin</b> – No comments. <b>Coombs</b> – She is against the removal of the historic chimneys in a pre-1847 house. The 1920s “D” windows should be repaired, not replaced; would like to see a historic window survey. Okay with replacing the modern “B” window on the north. <b>Camp</b> – Happy with putting in the new windows. Agrees about the chimneys; those give the structure its historic flavor. <b>Glazer</b> – We need to know exactly which windows are coming out. <b>Ennis</b> – Explained the disposition of the windows: replaced, moved, remain, etc. <b>Pohl</b> – In the 2 <sup>nd</sup> -floor plan, the two chimneys are shown but they don’t show on the 1 <sup>st</sup> -floor plan.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with a more detailed window schedule elevation by elevation and keeping the three chimneys; stairs are approved. (Glazer)</b>				
Vote	Carried unanimously			<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66985</b>

12. Benk, Paul	8 North Gully Road	Rev. 65821: rotate garage	73.1.3-48	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp			
Alternates	Oliver			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, photos, correspondence, and historical documentation.			
Representing	<b>Matt MacEachern</b> , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Paul Benk			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:31)	<b>Pohl</b> – Read into the record an email from Diane Downing, 29 Bank Street. Noted that her concerns are not HDC purview. <b>McLaughlin</b> – East elevation 2 <sup>nd</sup> -floor, the “C” windows should be 4-over-4 double hung. No other concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the east elevation 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor “C” windows to be 4-over-4 double hung. (Glazer)</b>			
Vote	Carried unanimously	<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66986</b>	
13. Nantucket Yacht Club	4 South Beach Street	New dormitory	42.4.2-59	Emeritus
Voting	Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans.			
Representing	<b>Matt MacEachern</b> , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Peter McEachern Vin Raimo			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:39)	<b>Camp</b> – Appreciates the changes. Okay with a 9-light door on the south. <b>McLaughlin</b> – South elevation, the front door should be a six-panel door. <b>Coombs</b> – Agrees with Ms Camp about the door on the south elevation being a 9-light. <b>Pohl</b> – The 42-inch railing required by code for commercial construction is out of for the OHD; suggested a 36” rail with a horizontal rail above it to meet the 42-inch requirement. Consensus thinks that’s a good idea. Discussion about color of the doors: white. Discussion about the flood vents color: natural to weather trim and vents grey.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the south elevation door to be a six-panel and white; vents to be grey with the skirt and vent frames natural to weather. (Camp)</b>			
Vote	Carried unanimously	<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66987</b>	
14. Nantucket Yacht Club	4 South Beach Street	Demo bldg	42.4.2-59	Emeritus
Voting	Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, photos, correspondence, and historical documentation as required.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development Peter McEachern Vin Raimo			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:51)	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Vote	Carried unanimously	<b>Certificate #</b>	<b>66988</b>	

15. Evans, Bill 25 Westerwyck Way Hardscape: pool 82-120 D. Gardenier  
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp  
 Alternates None  
 Recused Oliver  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, photos, correspondence.  
 Representing **Sean O’Callaghan** – Noted that the structure is very formal; explained the reason for this location of the pool. The mesh fence would be sandwiched between double rows of privet.  
 Public **Glazer** – As a non-voting member, feels a pool on this property is completely inappropriate; to put in a pool, the land has to be drastically altered.  
 Concerns (6:53) **Camp** – This house is on a corner and is very exposed on open terrain; to camouflage the pool means to introduce too much landscaping.  
**Coombs** – Looking at Image 7, it shows a mesh fence in an open area; that is very hard to camouflage and is inappropriate. A pool can’t be hidden here and would be visible from every road. The amount of screening necessary is inappropriate.  
**McLaughlin** – The only way this might be screened is to put the shed on the other side; would like to see an alternative to this proposal.  
**Pohl** – There are two major issues; this pool, unlike the neighbor’s, is situated so close to the road it would require a very tall and opaque screening in an area that is otherwise flat and open. A double row of privet is too formal and can still be seen through when the leaves fall. The majority of the board is against the pool because of where it is located and it will be visible and the required screening would drastically change the landscape; that isn’t a viable alternative.  
 Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)**  
 Vote Carried unanimously **Certificate #**

Break: 7:08 to 7:15 p.m.

16. Beardsley, Scott 138 Main Street Outdoor shower 41-521 Joel Walbridge  
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp  
 Alternates Oliver  
 Recused None  
 Documentation None  
 Representing None  
 Public None  
 Concerns (7:15) No comments at this time.  
 Motion **Motion to Hold for representation. (Glazer)**  
 Vote Carried unanimously **Certificate #**

17. Taurus Trust 181 Eel Point Road Spa, walls, firepit 33-21 Ben Champoux  
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp  
 Alternates Oliver  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans and photos.  
 Representing Ben Champoux  
 Public None  
 Concerns (7:16) Glazer & Camp said they visited the site and are convinced it will be “largely” invisible.  
 Review of the project plans.  
 No concerns.  
 Motion **Motion to Approve. (Camp)**  
 Vote Carried unanimously **Certificate # 66989**

18. 5 Hollister Rd. Trust                      5 Hollister Road                      Deck, door, windows                      92.4-263                      Thornewill Design  
 Voting                      Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp  
 Alternates                      Oliver  
 Recused                      None  
 Documentation                      Architectural elevation plans and photos.  
 Representing                      **Luke Thornewill**, Thornewill Design – The new deck would raise the ceiling of the living space below.  
 Public                      None  
 Concerns (7:21)                      **Camp** – South elevation, the deck and stairs make it wide but that’s not visible.  
    **Coombs** – West elevation, the stairs look excessive.  
    **Glazer** – West elevation, the stairs are exacerbated by the deck; would like to see the decking scaled back.  
    **Oliver** – The stairs aren’t visible. Suggested the west elevation deck rail be shingled. The flat-roof deck won’t be visible.  
    **McLaughlin** – The new deck needs to be pulled back to 8 feet deep. Also the amount of decking should be reduced 4 feet  
 Discussion about whether or not there is a need to reduce the deck be reduced to 8 feet due to lack of visibility.  
    **Pohl** – West elevation, the stairs exist; the change to them is to install proper stair rails. Suggested the new deck be cut back  
 in the corner to a small connector between the two decks.

Motion                      **Motion to Approve through staff per Exhibit A due to lack of visibility and given existing conditions. (Camp)**  
 Vote                      Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain                      **Certificate #                      66990**

**19. Cooley, Mary                      5 Cherry Street                      Addition                      55-375                      Thornewill Design**

Voting                      Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp  
 Alternates                      Oliver  
 Recused                      None  
 Documentation                      Architectural elevation plans and historical documentation.  
 Representing                      **Luke Thornewill**, Thornewill Design – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.  
 Public                      None  
 Concerns (7:40)                      No concerns.  
 Motion                      **Motion to Approve. (Camp)**  
 Vote                      Carried unanimously                      **Certificate #                      66991**

**V. HDC BUSINESS**

Approve Minutes	None
Review Minutes	None
Other Business	1. Discussion and vote on Madaket Advisory Board meeting day and time and new member.

Voting                      Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp  
 Alternates                      Oliver  
 Concerns (4:34)                      Brad **Flemming**, Chair MAB – Joe Lipuma has applied to fill a vacancy; asked for his approval and to change the meetings  
 to Tuesday mornings.  
 Action                      **Motion to Approve the Mr. Lipuma as a member of the MAB. (McLaughlin)**  
 Vote                      Carried unanimously                      **Certificate #**  
 Action                      **Motion to Approve the change of meetings to Tuesday 9:30 a.m. (Coombs)**  
 Vote                      Carried unanimously

2. Discussion of preparation and timeline for HDC meeting minutes.  
 Voting                      Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp, Oliver  
 Concerns (7:43)                      **McLaughlin** – It’s nice to have the minutes available when reviewing the agenda of the next meeting. He would like to have  
 them by noon on Monday following the meeting.  
    **Hedden** – The goal in the office is to have the minutes done in a timely manner.  
    **Pohl** – Noted there had been problems with a backlog of minutes; they are currently being produced in a timely.  
    **Glazer** – With the alternation of new and old business, some new business is being heard the following week under old  
 business. Town Counsel said minutes have to be done in a timely manner.  
 Discussion about getting minutes out for use in a timely manner and what “timely” is; in regards to approval of minutes,  
 Attorney General says minutes should be approved at “the next meeting.”  
 Action                      General consensus of the board is to have a weekly turnaround of minutes until such time as a dedicated minutes taker is  
 hired.

3. Discussion and possibly policy on 5' and 1' fences.

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp, Oliver  
Documentation HDC rules and regs.  
Concerns (7:53) **Pohl** – Over the years, 5&1 has come to mean 5-foot of board with 1-foot of lattice. This board has started asking for square lattice, but that has to be custom made. The stock fence has solid diagonal lattice; asked the board to change its stance. He wants to avoid the board making a demand for something that isn't available or is "fine print."  
**Camp** – She prefers the square lattice and doesn't see why the vendors don't stock it. Asked Mr. Pohl to look into whether or not square lattice fences are made.  
**McLaughlin** – Read from the regulations about the fences and stated that is what should be considered when approving fences.

Action **Pohl will look into the availability of square-lattice 5&1 fences.**  
4. Request for Town Counsel regarding: demolition by neglect, applications for non-applicability, and legality of holding applications for information outside the scope of the application.

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp, Oliver  
Concerns (7:59) **Pohl** – The board is looking for opinions from Town Counsel on the above listed items. Town Counsel will answer only specific questions.  
**Glazer** – Town Counsel said they would come to a meeting if we provide a date.  
Discussion about when to have a meeting with Town Counsel. Town Counsel is here on Wednesdays for BOS meetings.

5. Discussion and policy on vents

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp, Oliver  
Documentation Photos of PVC coming out of structures.  
Concerns (8:05) **Pohl** – We are having problems with vents being called out in inspections and need a policy on the size and configuration of vents that need to be applied for. Vents and pipes coming out of a house should be copper, not PVC pipes.  
**Camp** – Suggested sending a general note to contractors to be mindful of using copper rather than PVC and noting the location of pipes and vents on plans.  
**Glazer** – Suggested a little HDC policy letter of bullet points.

Action  
6. Discussion of letter of support to Board of Selectmen (BOS) Home Rule Petition to change current HDC appeal process from BOS to Superior Court.

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Glazer, Camp, Oliver  
Concerns (8:12) **Pohl** – Said that he has learned that no other municipal board has another municipal board as its appellate board. Town Counsel suggested he sponsor a home rule petition that bypasses BOS and goes to the Superior Court. The BOS members he has talked to support the plan. He believes the number of appeals will drastically drop if people have to appeal to the Superior Court. Asked for a vote from the board to write a letter to the BOS requesting they sponsor an article for the home rule petition.

Action **Motion to have the Chair write a letter to the BOS asking them to sponsor an article for a home rule petition to change the appeal process to Superior Court. (Coombs)**

Vote Carried unanimously

Commission Comments	<b>Oliver</b> – Would like an Organizational Meeting to discuss sign-off policies.
---------------------	--

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. None

Motion to Adjourn: 8:18 p.m.

Submitted by:  
Terry L. Norton

Nantucket Old Historic District

Sconset Advisory Board District

Madaket Advisory Board District

Sign Advisory Committee