



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

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

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Diane Coombs (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, Abigail Camp, Vallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Stephen Welch, Jessie Dutra, Carrie Thornewill

~~ MINUTES ~~

Monday, February 1, 2021

*This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube,
Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Regarding Open Meeting Law*

Called to order at 4:30p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl.

Staff in attendance: Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist. Holly Backus, Preservation Planner; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker
Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra, Thornewill
Absent Members: None
Late Arrivals: Thornewill; 4:48 p.m.; McLaughlin, 5:00 p.m.
Early Departures: McLaughlin, 8:53 p.m.

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

Motion **Motion to Approve. (Oliver)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0// Dutra, Welch, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Iglesia Faro De Luz 01-2826	90 Skyline Drive	Rev.2497: rmv bsmnt egress	79/54	Rigoberto Lemus
2. David Silva 01-2828	16 Helens Drive	Rev.1316: rmv bsmnt access	66/53	Self
3. Jeffrey Davis 01-2823	205 Madaket Road	1 st floor deck	59/50	Nicholas Gault
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No concerns			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Dutra, Oliver, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2021-01-(as noted)

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. David Bernard 01-2824	70 Hummock Pond Road	Door change	56/73	Self
• Due to lack of visibility				
2. Mike Smith 01-2825	12 Austin Farm Road	Basketball court	56/369	Waterscapes
• Must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
3. Wet Sand, LLC – 01-2827	8 Perry Lane	Fence/brick walkway	67/425.2	Shelter 7
• Lattice must be horizontal and vertical				
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Dutra			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No further concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2021-01-(as noted)

V. NEW BUSINESS CARRIED OVER

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Candice Heydt Trust 12-2626	20 Brant Point Road	Stairs to roof walk	29/153	Val Oliver Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Val Oliver, Val Oliver Design				
Public	Linda Williams				
Concerns (4:35)	<p>Oliver – Presented project; three neighbors have submitted letters of support; natural to weather; HSAB was split on visibility; a view might be warranted.</p> <p>Williams – Did a survey of roof walks in Brant Point; the stairs on Lincoln Circle were approved and are visible.</p> <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments from Jan. 4: biggest concern is visibility; make more discrete; precedence doesn't matter; stairs to roof walks are inappropriate. HSAB did not review the revised plans.</p> <p>Coombs – Stairs are very inappropriate; she can't vote for this. Also, this puts two exterior roof-walk stairs side by side and permitting this will lead to more.</p> <p>Dutra – He's not crazy about this. If the roof walk is removed, there is no access issue. This is all about visibility. From the pictures, you can see the roof walk. He's not okay with this but a view might change his mind.</p> <p>Welch – He'd like to view.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees with a view.</p> <p>Pohl – Suggested brilliant orange string marking the railing coming down. This isn't a code staircase; suggested fewer vertical balusters.</p>				
Motion	Motion to View with orange ribbons marking the staircase coming down from the roof walk. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Welch, Dutra, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
2.	17 Avenue R.T. 01-2776	17 Lincoln Avenue	Rev. 12-2442: ext. revisions	30/118	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Dutra, Thornewill				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:49)	<p>Backus – Read HSAB's extensive comments from Feb. 1.</p> <p>Botticelli – Reviewed changes made per HSAB comments; we can put the railing back over the bay on the east.</p> <p>Thornewill – South elevation, the front door looks short; the top of the door should be level with window headers; that would push the transoms up to be less obtrusive; liked the shed dormer over the door. East elevation, the 2nd-floor deck and bay below is more successful as originally built with the deck extending over the bay. Likes the window and door changes and extending the porch roof at the turret.</p> <p>Camp – East elevation, the pane size is chaotic. Doesn't mind the chimney being white. The front door is very complicated; prefers the original single-window dormer over the front door.</p> <p>Oliver – Agrees with much that's been said, especially the front door. Likes the right side of the south elevation and the alternative gable dormer. Agrees with Ms. Thornewill about the railing tying into the bay on the east. Because of all the angles, the windowpanes look to be different sizes but probably aren't. The web windows are okay in the gables.</p> <p>Dutra – South elevation, he prefers the gable dormer, either large or small; preferred the original front door; the proposed door looks squat and the transoms are too much. East elevation, she likes the version where the railing ties across the bay. West elevation, she prefers the 4-light windows over the spiderweb windows; okay with the web window in the gable; prefers the windows in the turret.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees with what's been said. Front door and prefers the small doghouse dormer over it.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Thornewill, Oliver, Dutra, Camp, and Coombs-aye			Certificate #	

3.	11 India Street, LLC 01-2816	11 India Street	Hardscaping	42.3.1/122.2	Ahern
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC				
Public					
Concerns (5:15)	<p>Ahern – Presented project; HSAB’s biggest issue was the granite at the entry to the Roberts House; bike rack to be natural to weather; outdoor carpet is inside the courtyard.</p> <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments: 8-foot-high privet unnecessary; existing ivy will provide adequate screening; question if Goshen stone adequate for ADA access; eliminate outdoor carpeting; want to see outdoor lighting plan; Goshen stone walkway will be parallel with existing public brick sidewalk and is out of character.</p> <p>Oliver – Doesn’t understand the reason for the post. Regarding the courtyard, asked if there will be lighting and at the tap-room area, there seems to be a big fence or wall that wasn’t applied for – her concern is they are permanent. She thinks it would be better all brick.</p> <p>Camp – Highly visible at a very important site. Wants to know the architecture of the new restaurant because this is more formal; would like to see boxwood hedge and a more formal design. Would like to know the lighting plan; it is part of the streetscape. Wants to see the architecture as seen from Centre Street. The outdoor rugs are too trendy. There are granite posts all over the place; wood to her is more rural; it’s not unusual to find a granite post on Centre Street.)</p> <p>Coombs – Along Centre Street, this is a lot of different material and makes the area very busy; should be more peaceful. She’d also like to see an architectural depiction of the streetscape.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Asked if there is more information about the granite posts. There is so much on the drawing, it’s hard to understand it all.</p> <p>Pohl – It would be better to remove the outdoor carpet from the application. HSAB wants the posts to be wood. He likes using the Goshen stone to set the campus apart and it’s historically appropriate. Okay with the second walkway, which also helps distinguish the compound and takes the interior traffic off the sidewalk. Freshly-cut granite would stand out; if it could be done out of old curbing, that would blend in better.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (McLaughlin)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs, Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
4.	ACK Blue Shutters, LLC 01-2801	4 Hulbert Avenue	Hardscape	42.1.4/2	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp,				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Lindsay Congleton, Atlantic Landscaping Inc.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:39)	<p>Congleton – Presented project; we can’t do anything within the wetland no-disturb buffer.</p> <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments: driveway posts should be wood, not granite.</p> <p>Coombs – This is right on the edge of the wetlands and visible; asked if there are any plantings in the rear.</p> <p>Camp – Likes the design; she’s okay with this proposal but agrees with HSAB about posts being wood on Hulbert Avenue.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff without the granite posts. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2021-01-2801
5.	William Reyelt 01-2800	38 Derrymore Road	Pool and hardscape	30/72	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Lindsay Congleton, Atlantic Landscaping Inc.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:04)	<p>(5:46) Held to find correct packet.</p> <p>Congleton – Presented project.</p> <p>Oliver – This will be screened by virtue of being low and behind the house with screening.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees.</p> <p>Coombs – It’s well done; but there isn’t much left for flowers and green.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve with the pool and other hardscape elements are not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-			Certificate #	HDC2021-01-2800

6.	20 Sherburne Turnpike	01-2718	20 Sherburne Turnpike	Garage	30/195	Sophie Metz Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver					
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.					
Representing	Sophie Metz, Sophie Metz Design					
Public	None					
Concerns (5:49)	<p>Metz – Presented project; sits lower than the house; pergola is natural to weather; 22.10 feet front and 19.10 feet rear.</p> <p>Oliver – The structure is fine and scaled well; leaning toward no pergola connector, especially if its white.</p> <p>Coombs – South elevation, the little window in the gable bumpout should be larger.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees with Ms. Coombs. North elevation, the dormer windows should be pushed up into the fascia strip and the roof line continue the across under the dormer; the same with the south elevation dormer.</p> <p>McLaughlin – South elevation, asked about the dotted in items (air conditioner units to be screened).</p> <p>Pohl – It's not clear if the pergola is part of this application so wants to keep it out of this discussion. Agrees with Ms. Camp about the dormers. Raise the north elevation dormer windows to allow a continuous eave and in the south elevation a larger window in the right bumpout, a "C".</p>					
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the north elevation dormer windows raised and eave to continue across and the south elevation right window to be the same as main house west elevation. (Camp)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs, Oliver, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2021-01-2718	
7.	20 Sherburne Turnpike	01-2802	20 Sherburne Turnpike	Cabana	30/195	Sophie Metz Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver					
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.					
Representing	Sophie Metz, Sophie Metz Design					
Public	None					
Concerns (6:01)	<p>Metz – Presented project; wood roof, white trim, cottage corners, max height 18 feet.</p> <p>No concerns due to lack of visibility.</p>					
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted due to lack of visibility. (Oliver)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2021-01-2802	
8.	7 Starbuck Court, LLC	01-2818	7 Starbuck Court	Rev. 1451: raise hse, new fndtn	42.3.3/80,81	MCutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver					
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments					
Representing	Doug Mills, Mark Cutone Architecture					
Public	John Stover, engineer					
Concerns (6:10)	<p>Mills – presented project; circa pre-1809; the exterior photos of the rubble foundation are post excavation; the only material visible above grade is the brick.</p> <p>Stover – The rubble-stone foundation is in failure mode; want a new foundation to support the building.</p> <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments: Starbuck Candle Factory circa 1800; would like alternative engineering solutions rather than rebuilding with brick veneer. This was surveyed by Historic American Buildings; any way to retain the existing rubble foundation would be appreciated with suggestion for a pier foundation.</p> <p>Camp – If you change the foundation it'll come off the historical register. This is a great building that needs to be saved while keeping it as historical as possible while doing what is necessary to preserve it. Suggested keeping a section of the rubble foundation as an artifact of history</p> <p>Coombs – We should try everything to support the existing foundation. The building is worth preserving as is.</p> <p>Oliver – Agrees with Ms. Camp; we need to do what must be done to preserve this. Asked if there is a way to pour an inside wall and keep the rubble as a face to the new foundation.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments on the project.</p> <p>Pohl – Understands the issue. This isn't too far from being a bad example of redoing a rubble foundation, cited the 1800 house foundation work as a bad example. The rubble wall is clearly decaying and needs a poured concrete substrate behind it. It would be better to reuse the rubble and historic-brick type and mortar as a template. He'd like more detail on how this would happen. Would like to see a sample of the brick laid up.</p>					
Motion	Motion to Hold for more information. (Oliver)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #		

9. ACK Blue Shutters, LLC 01-2799	4 Hulbert Avenue	Rev. 02-0633: add roofwalk	42.1.4/2	Sophie Metz Design
-----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------	----------	--------------------

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates Welch, Dutra, Thornewill
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
 Representing Sophie Metz, Sophie Metz Design
 Public None
 Concerns (6:26) **Metz** – Presented project.
Backus – Read HSAB comments: okay with the roof walk but not keen on half a skirt; should either be open or all skirt.
Camp – She’s okay with the roof walk and the skirt.
Oliver – The house would support the roof walk, but it doesn’t go with 2-over-2 window; it’s like two different time periods.
Coombs – She doesn’t think this building architecturally calls for a roof walk; it looks inappropriate.
McLaughlin – No concerns.
Pohl – He agrees the roof walk isn’t a bad element; prefers it without a skirt but could skirt ¼ of it so it doesn’t look incomplete.
 Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with a natural-to-weather, full skirt. (McLaughlin)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 3-2//Camp, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye; Coombs and Oliver-nay Certificate # **HDC2021-01-2799**

10. William Scannell 01-2760	119R Eel Point Road	New guest house	33/17.1	BPC
------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------	---------	-----

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Thornewill
 Alternates Welch, Dutra
 Recused Oliver stepped off
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and correspondence.
 Representing Joe Paul
 Public None
 Concerns (6:36) **Paul** – Presented project; none is visible from the street; there is no front door; columns are meant to echo the main house but agrees that in a vacuum they look odd.
McLaughlin – South elevation, the door on the side should have less glass.
Thornewill – It’s a simple structure. Thought next door we didn’t allow a cottage on the water side. Columns seem out of character with the house. Agrees with Mr. McLaughlin on the 6-light door.
Coombs – Okay with the south elevation 6-light door and Juliet balcony. Her only concern would be the columns on this structure.
Camp – This takes up a lot of space and is “chunky.” Would prefer it be a little smaller; likes the design.
Pohl – It’s behind the house and it’s set way back with respect to the top of the bluff; that means if there is any visibility, it will be minimal. He has no concerns.
 Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Thornewill, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2021-01-2760**

11. Nant. Isl. Land Bank 01-2732	174 Orange Street	Park	55/64	Normand Residential
----------------------------------	-------------------	------	-------	---------------------

Voting Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver Welch
 Alternates Dutra, Thornewill
 Recused Pohl
 Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments
 Representing Ben Normand, Residential Design
 Kris Horiuchi, Horiuchi & Solien Landscape Architects
 Public None
 Concerns (6:48) **Normand** – Explained how this site ties into other Land Bank properties along the harbor and creeks to create a larger park. The pool and existing structures, except the main house, were already approved for removal.
Horiuchi – Presented project; the pool will be removed; the use of the aggregate concrete is new on the Island.
Backus – Read HSAB comments: would like low vegetative screening between parking and Milestone Road; if there will be any lighting, want to see plan; electric transformers should be screened.
Oliver – They chose their materials well; appreciates the most everything will blend in. Shares HSAB’s concern about lighting. Asked if the aggregate is permeable (no).
Camp – This is in good hands and is tastefully done. She’d be okay with some simple lighting at the parking area.
Welch – Appreciates the choice of materials; the proposed aggregate in concrete is a good choice. On the site plan, asked what the element shown in the center of the lawn area is (an existing garden to be removed). Wants to look at the partial demo before voting on this. Asked what the remaining structure will be used for (no function). As long as the lighting is sensitive to the Dark Skies, he’s okay. Regarding the parking area, it looks to be insufficient for use based upon use of other Land Bank properties; more parking would be part of any approval he considers.
McLaughlin – Asked about the exposed aggregate concrete. Asked where the bike access is.
 Discussion about aesthetics of the aggregate concrete.
 Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted subject to an option to increase the parking by no more than four spots without additional approval. (Welch)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, McLaughlin, Welch, and Coombs-aye Certificate # **HDC2021-01-2732**

12. Nant. Isl. Land Bank	01-2731	174 Orange Street	Partial demo	55/64	Normand Residential
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver Welch				
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Ben Normand, Residential Design				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:19)	<p>Normand – Presented project; read the history of property, oldest section is circa 1890s.</p> <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments: would prefer the construction dates for the different portions indicating what parts are being proposed for demolition; would like to see an effort to repurpose those sections; there was discussion on sustainability of demolitions. This is circa 1880 barn altered in 1970s. Asked that the extensive history be submitted to the file. Nantucket Preservation Trust provided some additional historic information.</p> <p>Coombs – She is not for</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the Ottison’s history submitted into the file. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Camp, Welch, McLaughlin, and Oliver-aye; Coombs-nay			Certificate #	HDC2021-01-2731
13. Brett Fodiman	01-2765	111 Surfside Road	New dwelling	80/70	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Thornewill				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	Camp stepped out				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:35)	<p>MacEachern – Presented project; 18wX20lX25h; felt eave forward would be more diminutive.</p> <p>Oliver – The hard part about this is the other two structures have not yet been approved; we’ve asked for those to be simplified and modified. This is as tall as the garage. It’s a lot for the property, but if there is a guarantee it won’t be visible, it’s approvable. The west and east elevations should be the gable ends.</p> <p>Coombs – This is a secondary structure and should be no more than 22 feet; it will be visible from Surfside Road.</p> <p>Thornewill – The west elevation feels tall with the expanse of roof; doesn’t think it will be visible. This is cute.</p> <p>McLaughlin – West elevation, the meeting rails don’t align. East elevation, the overhang is more than 12 inches.</p> <p>Pohl – A reduction in the ridge height would reduce the height and the west elevation would appear less vertical.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Thornewill, Coombs, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
14. OHOM, LLC	01-2749	28 Main Street, ‘Sias	Window change to SDL	73.3.1/47	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	Camp still off				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:45)	<p>MacEachern – Presented project; for thermal compliance on the rear.</p> <p>Backus – Read SAB comments: circa 1832; okay for the newer addition but the existing historic windows and doors should not be changed and advise against that; fenestration facing the street should not be changed to simulated-divided lights (SDL). The addition was approved with true-divided lights (TDL).</p> <p>Oliver – She’s okay with the doors and the windows in the new addition going to SDL; the existing windows should remain TDL; most doors are in the rear.</p> <p>Coombs – No windows on the front should be SDL.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No SDLs should be allowed in the old historic district.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. Green Mountain is a nice-looking SDL and the TDL with the exterior storm panel.</p> <p>Pohl – Part of this is to have all windows in the rear of the new addition to be SDL and SAB is okay with that.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff the windows on the new section rear to be SDL and the doors on the old part with traditional grill pattern allowed to be SDL; windows in old section to remain TDL. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye; McLaughlin-nay			Certificate #	HDC2021-01-2749

15. 3 Mary Ann Drive, LLC 01-2772	3 Mary Ann Drive	Rev. 71596: garage door veneer	68/214	Cutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Doug Mills, Mark Cutone Architecture			
Public	Terry Norton, 5B Mary Ann Drive			
Concerns (8:35)	(7:55) Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver) Carried. Mills – Presented project: steel painted; can provide color chips. Discussion about the doors being painted grey rather than a sandtone. Norton – Don't think the steel doors painted grey is a big deal given the mixed-use neighborhood.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for a color sample of the grey. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	

16. Sheila Wilner 01-2750	10 Beach Street 'Sias	Rev. 01-0547: deck/dormer	73.2.4/10	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:56)	Williams – Presented project; there is precedence. Backus – Read SAB comments: this issue was discussed at length with HDC and advisory board and are not inclined to support it; original approval is preferable. SAB did not have the context photos to review. She asked about the language to rebuild and stated that should have been included in red. Camp – This isn't bad, but she's aggrieved by the other things going on in Cod Fish Park; thinks there are going up illegally. The compromise of bringing the shingled corners around a couple of feet and leaving some balustrades would be okay. East elevation, prefers the dormer as previously approved. Oliver – She's okay with the balcony. This is asking to rebuild the east elevation dormer that or else the drawings shoe elements that are not happening. Coombs – Okay with the 2 nd -floor porch. Okay with the dormer on the east elevation becoming one dormer. McLaughlin – East elevation, the roof pitch over the door should be adjusted to meet guidelines. East elevation, single dormer looks better. Pohl – Remove language about rebuilding original piece. The east elevation roof over the door is part of the historic house, which we asked to be preserved. He's okay with the proposal as long as the language about rebuilding and rehabbing be removed from this application. Discussion on motion regarding the east elevation remaining 2 dormers versus becoming a single dormer. Williams – Asked for a consensus on the east elevation dormer			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with no rebuilding of the front elevation and the east elevation deck railing to be shingled. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-2//McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye; Camp and Oliver-nay		Certificate #	HDC2021-01-2750
17. Michael Getter 01-2730	18 Essex Road	New dwelling	67/635	Val Oliver Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Dutra, Thornewill			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	Oliver, McLaughlin			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Val Oliver, Val Oliver Design			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:16)	Oliver – Presented project. No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Dutra, Thornewill, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2021-01-2730

18. Shriberg Trust	01-2796	60 West Chester Street	Guest house	41/374	CWA
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:20)	<p>Webster – Presented project.</p> <p>Camp – The “B” windows look too long and skinny; should be wider.</p> <p>Oliver – It doesn’t relate to the main house. Windows are vertical and tall; the dormers eave lines need to drop to be on top of the window and meeting should rails align. The rear “C” window is skinny and vertical. Grill patterns are inconsistent. Not concerned about the round windows.</p> <p>McLaughlin – This fenestration is very chaotic. The west, north, and east elevations will be visible and need revisions. Windows are too narrow. The round windows are inappropriate.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with Mr. McLaughlin.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Camp, Oliver, Welch, and Coombs-aye; McLaughlin-nay			Certificate #	
19. Peter Barrett	01-2734	40 Mary Ann Drive	New dwelling	68/965	Topham Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Joe Topham, Topham Design				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:34)	<p>Topham – Presented project; modular construction.</p> <p>Pohl – It seems tall. There are no casings shown on the windows or doors. The distance between the head of the 2nd-floor windows and the eave is excessive. Reducing the pitch would make it more boxy than it is.</p> <p>Oliver – The fenestration is chaotic; it lacks an inviting front door.</p> <p>Camp – It’s very tall.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
20. Phillip Marks	01-2706	33 Beach Grass Road	Duplex	68/371	SMRD
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Steve Roethke, Steve M. Roethke Design				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:45)	<p>Roethke – Presented project, modular and natural to weather.</p> <p>Camp – The windows aren’t lined up vertically and the grill patterns are not consistent.</p> <p>Oliver – Okay with the front elevation as drawn. Northeast and southwest elevations, the windows could be larger and/or more consistent in size. Rear elevation 1st floor window should be wider. The massing is fine.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees the windows need to be larger to fill the wall space. Doors could be larger as well.</p> <p>McLaughlin – All the windows should be the same size except the bathroom windows.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

21. 59 South Shore Road NT **01-2754** 59 South Shore Road Pool and hardscape 80/308 Linda Williams
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Thornewill
 Alternates Dutra
 Recused Oliver sitting out.
 Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Linda Williams
 Public Sharron Chalke
 Concerns (8:53) **Williams** – Presented project, not visible; we’re repurposing stone from the foundations at Cliff Road. There are issues with Mr. Chalke’s lawn encroaching onto this property, so the owner wants to leave the fence where it is.
Chalke – The 6-foot fence will be located right on the property line; he’ll have to plant to screen it.
Welch – Confirmed the large granite block will be in the area which is labeled 12-24 inches and there will be no granite posts near the road. Asked the size of the pool area relative to the neighbors.
Camp – Not so concerned with what’s going on inside the lot. Her concern is the 250-foot length of the board fence; asked for intermediate plantings to mitigate the length and wants to ensure the finished side faces the neighbor.
Coombs – Asked what the “game field” is (yard behind screening). Asked where the drive with the label “granite block wall foundation” goes (to a future horse barn).
Thornewill – No concerns.
Pohl – No concerns. We can’t take the view from the neighbors into account. The fence could be moved in to allow plantings on the outside.

Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-1//Thornewill, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye; Camp-nay Certificate # **HDC2021-01-2754**

22. 59 South Shore Road NT **01-2774** 59 South Shore Road Rev. 12-2431: red barn add’n 80/308 Linda Williams

23. 59 South Shore Road NT **01-2773** 59 South Shore Road Rev.12-2430: green barn add’n 80/308 Linda Williams

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Thornewill

Alternates Dutra

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and correspondence.

Representing Linda Williams

Public None

Concerns (9:11) **Williams** – Presented project, attaches the two barns with a 1-story element; not visible.

Backus – There were letters of concerns from two neighbors.

Welch – He reviewed the letters and there wasn’t much in the way of HDC related issues. He has no concerns since it is appropriate and won’t be visible.

Coombs – This will make a very large building.

No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve the joining of the two structures. (Welch)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Thornewill, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2021-01-2774**

HDC2021-01-2773

Rest held for Thursday, February 4, 2021

24. Edward Ahneman 01-2811	26 Sespana Road	Solar rooftop	68/98	Cotuit Solar
25. Caroline Baltzer 01-2775	66 Hulbert Avenue	Add window	29/55	Sconset Gardener
26. Linda Del Vecchio 01-2766	11 Beach Street Sias	As built wndw + door change	73.1.3/25	Self
27. 36 Washing Pond, LLC 01-2813	36 Washing Pond Road	New dwelling	31/13.3	Workshop APD
28. 36 Washing Pond, LLC 01-2808	36 Washing Pond Road	New guest house	31/13.3	Workshop APD
29. 36 Washing Pond, LLC 01-1814	36 Washing Pond Road	Garage	31/13.3	Workshop APD
30. 36 Washing Pond, LLC 01-2807	36 Washing Pond Road	Gym	31/13.3	Workshop APD
31. 36 Washing Pond, LLC 01-2810	36 Washing Pond Road	Shed	31/13.3	Workshop APD
32. 36 Washing Pond, LLC 01-2809	36 Washing Pond Road	Pool- hardscape	31/13.3	Jardins Itrntl.
33. Melanie Gowen 12-2621	5 Boyers Alley	Shed	55.4.1/96	Self

V. OLD BUSINESS CARRIED OVER

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	30 Meadow View, LLC 11-2328	30 Meadow View Drive	Pool – hardscaping	56/138	Gryphon Architects
2.	14 Lowell Place, LLC 10-2188	14 Lowell Place	New dwelling	41/164	Emeritus
3.	Frederick Hahn 12-2618	50 Eel Point Road	New dwelling	32/25.1	EMDA
4.	Grey Lady Capital 12-2381	33 Pilgrim Road	Cabana addition	41/834	JB Studio
5.	Andrew Reger 12-2469	7 East Lincoln Avenue	New dwelling	42.4.1/8	Emeritus
6.	103 Main Street 12-2577	103 Main Street	Spa + hardscape	42.3.3/153	Atlantic Lndscpg
7.	William Scannell 12-2446	119R Eel Point Road	New dwelling	33/17.1	BPC
8.	William Scannell 12-2444	119R Eel Point Road	Pool	33/17.1	BPC
9.	Lynne Bolton 11-2230	4 Shell Street	Addition	73.1.3/32	Nant. Carpentry
10.	Holly Coburn 01-2789	20 Bishops Rise – Lot A	New dwelling	40/127	Normand Resid.
11.	Holly Coburn 01-2791	20 Bishops Rise – Lot A	Pool and hardscape	40/127	Normand Resis.
12.	Brett Fodiman 11-2217	111 Surfside Road	New dwelling	80/70	Emeritus
13.	Brett Fodiman 11-2210	111 Surfside Road	New garage/studio	80/70	Emeritus

Proposed HDC Minutes for February 1, 2021

14. 218 Cliff Road Assoc. 12-2461	218 Cliff Road	Main house	40/61.1	Workshop/APD
15. 218 Cliff Road Assoc. 12-2459	218 Cliff Road	New 2 nd DU/garage studio	40/61.1	Workshop/APD
16. 218 Cliff Road Assoc. 12-2400	218 Cliff Road	Pool and hardscape	40/61.1	Ahern, LLC
17. Paul Piccirillo 10-2053	6 Baltimore Road	New dwelling	60/106	Val Oliver Design

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Approved Minutes	January 4, 7, 8, 14, 15 & 19, 2021: no action at this time.
Review Minutes	January 21, 26, & 28, 2021
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next HDC Meeting- Old Business Thursday 2/04/21 at 01:00pm • HDC review of revisions to HDC Background Summary to finalize for web page including vote • Discussion of additions and new dwellings added to the consent agenda • Discussion of 6 Fair Street Minimum Maintenance • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 9:15 p.m. (Camp)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Thornewill-aye

Submitted by:
 Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Sconset Advisory Board

Madaket Advisory Board

