~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, February 04, 2020
Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room – 4:30 p.m.

Called to order at 4:35 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist
Attending Members: Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson
Absent Members: Coombs
Late Arrivals: Dutra at 4:40 pm. Camp at 4:43 pm
Early Departures: None

Agenda adopted as amended by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

II. CONSENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 7 Van Fleet Cir LLC 01-0565</td>
<td>7 Van Fleet Circle</td>
<td>Re-site structure 20'</td>
<td>91-116</td>
<td>Alexander Boyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DiSibio, Amy 01-0569</td>
<td>4 Masaquet Avenue</td>
<td>Window revision</td>
<td>80-194</td>
<td>NAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whippen, Wayne 01-0563</td>
<td>13 Quidnet Road</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>21-117.7</td>
<td>Thornewill Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reid, Robert 01-0575</td>
<td>32 Hooper Farm Road</td>
<td>Garage roof change</td>
<td>67-24</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reed, Victor 01-0576</td>
<td>19 Miacomet Avenue</td>
<td>Roof change</td>
<td>67-211</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Richard Phillips Tr 01-0577</td>
<td>19 East Tristram Avenue</td>
<td>Gate/driveway</td>
<td>31-4.1</td>
<td>Jardins International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nashaquisset Coop 01-0567</td>
<td>8 Yompmash</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>55-540</td>
<td>Cathy Vizzari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hawthorne Park Prr 01-0462</td>
<td>53 Hummock Pond Road</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>56-816</td>
<td>Workshop APD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bank of America 01-0579</td>
<td>15 Sparks Avenue</td>
<td>Pergola change</td>
<td>55-177</td>
<td>Brisbano Architect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting Welch (acting chair), Watterson, McLaughlin
Alternates None
Recused Pohl, Oliver
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None
Concerns No concerns.

Motion Motion to Approve (Watterson)

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Whippen, Wayne 01-0564</td>
<td>13 Quidnet Road</td>
<td>Pool/patio</td>
<td>21-117.7</td>
<td>Thornewill Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peachley, Mega 01-0452</td>
<td>3 Newtown Lane</td>
<td>A/C condensers</td>
<td>55-579.8</td>
<td>Ronan Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Option 1 from plans; A/C Condensers must be screened and not visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Keith, Katie Designs 01-0561</td>
<td>1 Doc Ryder Drive</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>66-209</td>
<td>Permits Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Watterson
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None
Concerns No additional concerns.

Motion Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Welch)

Vote Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain Certificate # HDC2020-01-(as noted)
IV. OLD BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parotto, Linda</td>
<td>01-0535 3 Coon Street</td>
<td>Roof shingles</td>
<td>55.1.4-84.1</td>
<td>George Wing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting: Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch
Alternates: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
Representing: George Wing
Public: None
Concerns (4:40)

- **Pohl** – Read HSAB comments: no concerns if like kind. The issue was the applicant had requested a color not approvable in the old historic district (OHD).
- **Wing** – His client will go with Colonial slate architectural shingles.
- **Welch** – That is on the approvable list.

Motion: Motion to Approve the Colonial slate architectural. (Welch)
Vote: Carried 4-0
Certificate #: HDC2020-01-0535

2. Cederview Point, LLC 01-0529 40 Shawkemo Road Porch/fenestration 27-4 Botticelli & Pohl

Voting: Camp (acting Chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch
Alternates: None
Recused: Pohl
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing: Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl
Public: None
Concerns (4:43)

- **Botticelli** – Presented an alternative at the table.
- **Oliver** – You can’t see the building now; she's assuming the vegetation will remain.
- **McLaughlin** – No comment.

Motion: Motion to Approve per Exhibit A submitted at the table. (Welch)
Vote: Carried 4-0
Certificate #: HDC2020-01-0529

3. Reinemo Family 01-0458 Tuckernuck New dwelling 95-19 Val Oliver

Voting: Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson
Alternates: Camp read back in.
Recused: Oliver
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and correspondence.
Representing: Val Oliver
Public: None
Concerns (4:50)

- **Oliver** – Reviewed precedent photos concerning the roof being 9/12.
- **Camp** – Thinks most houses on Tuckernuck historically have steeper gables.
- **Watterson** – Doesn’t think this is visible except possibly from one of the trails (dirt roads) so he has no concerns.
- **McLaughlin** – Have to approve due to lack of visibility because of the roof pitch.
- **Pohl** – Our charter is visibility from a public way; there are no public ways on Tuckernuck.

Motion: Motion to Approve due to lack of visibility from a publicly travelled way. (McLaughlin)
Vote: Carried 3-0 //Camp abstain
Certificate #: HDC2020-01-0458

4. Be Kind Devel 01-0420 154 Cliff Road New dwelling 41-73 Sophie Metz

Voting: Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson
Alternates: Welch, Dutra
Recused: None
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing: Sophie Metz
Public: None
Concerns (4:53)

- **Metz** – Presented project.
- **Oliver** – This is visible from Hickory Meadows; but it is beautiful and appropriate.
- **Watterson** – It’s a bit tall at 29’10” but it’s pretty tucked away.
- **McLaughlin** – Confirmed the 4-light windows are fixed.

Motion: Motion to Approve. (Camp)
Vote: Carried 5-0
Certificate #: HDC2020-01-0420
5. Be Kind Devel 01-0421 154 Cliff Road Garage 41-73 Sophie Metz
Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson
Alternates Welch, Dutra
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Sophie Metz
Public None
Concerns (4:58) Metz – Presented project. No concerns.
Motion Motion to Approve. (Watterson)
Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # HDC2020-01-0421

6. Be Kind Devel 01-0422 154 Cliff Road Guesthouse 41-73 Sophie Metz
Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson
Alternates Welch, Dutra
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Sophie Metz
Public None
Concerns (5:00) Metz – Presented project.
Motion Motion to Approve through staff with the northern-most wing to be changed to a pergola and no brackets. (Oliver)
Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # HDC2020-01-0422

7. Iliev, Borislav 12-0380 9 Maclean Lane Roof & basement access 55-485 JB Studio
Voting Camp (acting Chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Juraj Benca, JB Studio
Public None
Concerns (5:08) Benca – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; moved the basement access to the rear. No concerns.
Motion Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)
Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # HDC2019-12-0380

8. Lyubomir, Lyobenov 01-0527 7 Toombs Court New dwelling 68-153.1 JB Studio
Voting Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Dutra
Alternates Welch, Watterson
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing John Hodgkiss
Public None
Concerns (5:12) Hodgkiss – Presented the project; contends there is no visibility.
Motion Motion to approve through staff aligning the left 2nd-floor window with the 1st-floor window on the right elevations per Exhibit A. (Dutra)
Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # HDC2020-01-0527
9. 12 Lincoln Avenue N.T. 12 Lincoln Avenue  New second dwelling  30-183  Emeritus

Voting
Alternates
Recused
Documentation
Representing
Public
Concerns (5:21) MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; offered to remove the connector.
Oliver – She would approve this without the connector.
Camp – No concerns.
McLaughlin – No comments.
Welch – No comments.

Motion
Vote

Carried 5-0  Certificate #  73371

10. Wilner, Sheila Trust 01-0548 10 Beach Street  Move off/demo dwelling  73.2.4-10  Emeritus

Voting
Alternates
Recused
Documentation
Representing
Public
Concerns (5:30) Pohl – Read SAB comments: not appropriate; this is contributing. Read Holly Backus comments: 1940s bungalow, contributing; shouldn’t be demolished; consider appropriate addition.
MacEachern – Presented project; feels a house of this age is on the cusp and others of this age have been moved or demolished. Most correspondence commented about construction parking; there was no opposition to a move or demolition. Doesn’t think old Codfish looked like this; it looks like a trailer.
Oliver – She’s beginning to question what is contributing and what that is based upon; asked for input from a historical expert. Doesn’t think this is contributing.
Camp – Thinks this is contributing because of its size, windows, and harkens to old Codfish Park; the lot is large enough for this to become a nice cottage. Now everything is being gentrified, and we’re losing a part of history. The large 2-over-2 windows are very appropriate to Codfish Park.
Welch – This looks like mid-20th-century ranch. He’d like to see photos of what was there mid-century.
McLaughlin – This was there in the late 1940s; he doesn’t think it warrants contributing status.
Pohl – The appropriate location for this to be moved is within Codfish Park. He’d like to see more photos of Codfish Park from before the storm that took out three streets.

Motion
Motion to Hold for additional information and alternative locations where it might go. (Camp)

Vote
Carried 5-0

11. Wilner, Sheila Trust 01-0547 10 Beach Street  New dwelling  73.2.4-10  Emeritus

Voting
Alternates
Recused
Documentation
Representing
Public
Concerns (5:48) Pohl – Read SAB comments: north elevation looks like back entry but faces street; east elevation too many French doors; south elevation 2nd-floor deck weighs down; 12/12 out of scale. Read Holly Backus comments: proposed dwelling is a lot larger in footprint and scale and out of character with Codfish Park; requested Nantucket Preservation Trust to provide historic photos of existing; those should have been filed into the first application. Should have a shallower pitch.
No name given – No neighbors have concerns with removing the existing structure; our main concern is construction timing.
Camp – The west elevation is simple and good; fenestration is chaotic. East and north elevations have too many French doors; should have more windows on the 2nd-floor. Agrees the balcony overwhelms the south elevation. West elevation, the gable isn’t Codfish Park.
Welch – With respect to scale, this should come down to 1.5 stories. He’s looking at this through the lens of what’s there now; he might make more restrictive comments once he sees the historic photos requested for the previous application.
Oliver – Agrees about this being 1.5 stories. Doesn’t recall any houses in Codfish Park with 12/12 pitch. Suggested dropping the ceiling height of the 1st floor or bring it down with a mudblock. Porch across the front shouldn’t have gables. Agrees with Ms. Camp about the 2nd-floor decks and windows. Would like the awnings.
McLaughlin – West elevation, must change dormer to align meeting rail. East elevation, too much glass.

Motion
Motion to Hold for revisions. (McLaughlin)

Vote
Carried 5-0  Certificate #
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12. Ash, Diane 01-0546 23 Pine Street Rev. 11-0244: fenestration 42.3.2-113 Emeritus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Camp (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Dutra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>Pohl, Watterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (6:00)</td>
<td>Camp – Read HSAB comments: north elevation chimney should stay if historic; French doors facing Pine Street not appropriate and too much glass; which is the front door; stubby pergola; prefer 6-over-6; is hardscaping part of this. Read Holly Backus comments: windows to stay as original approved; no concerns with pergola addition; chimney gives it character. MacEachern – Presented project. Hardscaping will be under a separate application. Oliver – Appreciates effort; thinks this should stay at least 6-over-1 but 2-over-2 changes the whole character; don’t need shutters on the 2nd floor; should stay simple. The pergola will be visible. Doesn’t think they need double doors for the living room. Likes the idea of the chimney but isn’t bound to it. Minimize the amount of 1st-floor glass. Suggested the pergola be natural to weather if they have to keep it. Welch – Agrees with much Ms. Oliver said. Going back to 6-over-6 will open up solutions on fenestration and options for doors. He’d prefer the chimney stay but losing it doesn’t diminish the final product. Dutra – Okay with 2-over-2. Understands concerns with pergola and French doors and would like to see appropriate changes. McLaughlin – East elevation, pergola facing the road isn’t appropriate to the neighborhood. The ratio of windows to wall is excessive; proposed windows too tall. Camp – Okay with 2-over-2 and shutters and elimination of chimney. French doors on the street are inappropriate. The 2-over-2 windows look a little tall and perhaps just one French door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Hold for Revisions. (Oliver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Carried 5-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certificate #

13. MacKenzie, Ian 01-0541 2/4 Howard Court Rev. 11-0163: wndw/chmny 42.3.4-36 Emeritus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Dutra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>Watterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (6:16)</td>
<td>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: incomplete application; pitch might be as-built in progress; existing chimney brick should not disappear; windows on porch should be double-hung; refer to previous HDC approval. Read Holly Backus comments: why increase ridge height; Boston sash true-divided light (TDL) on both south and east elevations which face Howard Court. HDC can exempt the use of simulated-divided light (SDL) windows for reasons of maintaining historic fabric. MacEachern – Presented project; SDL are due to wind-rating but requested the historic exemption letter Camp – Okay with raising 6 inches. Previous windows more appropriate; the proposed windows are too elongated. Chimney seems too stout and could be fixed by adding an owl. Oliver – Existing structures are exempt from the wind-rating requirements. Agrees with Ms. Camp. The 16-light windows should not be casements; she’d prefer they be sliding. Larger windows don’t correlate with the door. Welch – Agrees with Ms. Camp. Would like to see the chimney about 5 feet above the roof. The proposed window openings are 4’9”; the old ones were 3’9”. McLaughlin – Asked about the 16-light windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Carried 5-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certificate #
14. Everts, Hale 12-0300 46 Monomoy Road  Deck addition/alterations  54-71  Ethan McMorrow
Voting: Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
Alternates: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing: Ethan McMorrow
Public: None
Concerns (6:31)
McMorrow – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.
Oliver – It looks like an entire section is being removed and rebuilt out of proportion. She’d like to see a demolition plan and what’s being rebuilt with floor plans.
Welch – He’d like to see a perspective of the existing and proposed from the east up to the eastern corner of the garage. This is an iconic structure and we need to clearly understand it.
Camp – Agrees.
Dutra – Agrees.
McLaughlin – No comments at this time.
Pohl – East elevation shows the gable facing the street with a lower gable behind, which in the proposed is taller and longer; that is a demolition. Essentially everything but the garage is being demolished.

Motion: Motion to Hold for existing plans, floor plans, demo plan and two perspectives. (Oliver)
Vote: Carried 5-0

15. Heyworth, Benton 01-0425 8 Pond Road  Guest house  56-156  CWA
Voting: Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson, Dutra
Alternates: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing: Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates.
Public: None
Concerns (6:39)
Webster – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.
Oliver – We have no previous submittal. Dormers need to come in 3 feet off the edge, especially facing the street. The people door looks taller than the garage door.
Watterson – Asked for beefed up trim around all doors. Agrees with the setback of the dormers.
Dutra – Agrees with what’s been said.
McLaughlin – No comments.
Pohl – Asked that there be no shingle course between window head and fascia on the dormer. There’s a heavy line on the barn door that shouldn’t be there.

Motion: Motion to Approve through staff moving dormers in the required 3 feet from the building edge; dormers lowered so fascia is on the window headcasing; and more trim on the east elevation doors; per Exhibit A. (Oliver)
Vote: Carried 5-0

16. Mueller, Nantucket Assoc. 34 Prospect Street  Garage  55.4.4-77  CWA
Voting: Camp (acting chair), Oliver, Welch, Dutra
Alternates: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing: Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates.
Public: None
Concerns (6:45)
Webster – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.
Oliver – We need previous submittal. We discussed oversized French doors; those are 8 feet over 7-foot garage doors. Northwest elevation, the door is too much of an anomaly in this area; should be plain French door. Questions overall height of the northeast elevation regardless of the drop off; it’ll consume the house; suggested retainage to mitigate.
Dutra – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. The northeast elevation perceived height is exacerbated by the rails and French doors; suggested removing the rails or a hipped roof to hide them.
Discussion on how to mitigate the height of the northeast elevation.
Welch – You’re 20 feet off Prospect Street while the house is 50 feet off Prospect and the size is way out of proportion; it’s too wide and too tall. The streetscape is part of the historical setting; this structure 20 feet from the street is too much. Feels the bigger picture concern is the overall siting and size of the structure. This is almost as wide as the main house is deep and as along as the house and connector; this is a huge structure in the front yard of an iconic structure.

Motion: Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)
Vote: Carried 4-0
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.</th>
<th>Spencer, Steven 01-0471</th>
<th>6 Magnolia Avenue</th>
<th>Demo existing structure</th>
<th>73.3.1-57</th>
<th>Thornewill Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson, Dutra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Welch &amp; Camp read back in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and historic documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (6:56)</td>
<td>Spencer – Based upon previous comments, we’ve come up with a new proposal; explained their evaluation of the property indicated the existing structure had been significantly altered.</td>
<td>Williams – Reviewed the history of the structure as detailed in the historic packet. There was a gambrel structure on this lot in the 1920s which did not have the existing roof line; believes all sides and the roof have been moved or replaced since the mid-1960s. This has been moved at least once.</td>
<td>Thornewill – Believes a lot of original sheathing was rotten; even covered sheathing is not original. Feels that the groundcover isn’t any greater than for any other lot.</td>
<td>Pohl – Read into the record letters of concerns from Rob Benchley and Angus MacLeod.</td>
<td>Dutra – Confirmed that the structure didn’t move after 1923. Not in favor of a demolition of the gambrel. Mr. MacLeod’s points are valid that something nice can be done with this to carry the character of the 1916 structure even without the historic fabric; it is not structurally unstable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Hold until after review of the new addition. (Dutra)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Carried 5-0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. | Spencer, Steven 01-0470 | 6 Magnolia Avenue | New dwelling | 73.3.1-57 | Thornewill Design |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson, Dutra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Welch &amp; Camp read back in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (7:20)</td>
<td>Thornewill – Presented the revised project.</td>
<td>Pohl – Read into the record letters of concerns from Rob Benchley, Rita Carr, and Mary Wilkes.</td>
<td>Dutra – Huge improvement from first submittal; happy how the gambrel forward is more complementary. The rear addition is still much larger and should be minimized in any way such as reduce the height. In the previous submittal the east and west gambrel addition looked better but with the gambrel forward would be better on the dormers.</td>
<td>Oliver – Thinks Mr. Dutra’s suggestion would make it look wider. Appreciates the changes. Changing to 2-over-2 is a concern; there’s something about the scale of having smaller panes especially facing the street.</td>
<td>Watterson – In general the redesign “nails it.” The original mass might be subordinate but maintains the history and streetscape. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about the windows especially facing the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion about saving the front gambrel.</td>
<td>Pohl – In every other historic district, if you have an old building, the new part shouldn’t look like the existing. What will really help is a perspective view. We’re all favorably inclined to what is proposed and looking for minor tweaks to fenestration. We need more information on the front part of the building in order to rule on saving versus dismantling versus razing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Hold for revisions. (McLaughlin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Carried 5-0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Silva, David 01-0536 11 Upper Tawpawshaw Window/deck changes 53-45 Self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>Dutra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>John Newman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (7:52)</td>
<td><strong>Newman</strong> – Presented project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oliver</strong> – All that will be visible is the front, which only has one window move down low.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motion**  
Motion to Approve without the pergola. (Oliver)

**Vote**  
Carried 5-0  
Certificate # HDC2020-01-0536

20. ACK Properties, LLC 01-0533 7 & 9 Hussey Street Pergola/outdoor shower 42.3.4-64 BPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Dutra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Welch, Watterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Landscape design plans, site plan, and advisory comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Joe Paul, BPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (7:57)</td>
<td><strong>(6:38) Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver) Carried unanimously.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pohl</strong> – Read HSAB comments: shower should be on Quince Street side; pergola profile helpful; approvable due to existing deck. Read Holly Backus comments: pergola not an appropriate feature; however, proposed is over existing deck; outdoor shower proposed location odd toward the front of the structure.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Paul</strong> – Presented project. This might be worth a visit; due to screening the shower will be minimally visible since it starts 4 feet below street level with a 5-foot fence.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oliver</strong> – Wants to view. Pictures would have been helpful.**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motion**  
Motion to View. (Oliver)

**Vote**  
Carried 5-0  
Certificate #

### V. OTHER BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approve Minutes</th>
<th>January 7, 14 &amp; 21, 2020: Motion to Approve. (Dutra) carried unanimously</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Minutes</td>
<td>January 28, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Business**

- Article 62 Preservation of Historically Significant Buildings
  - Pohl – This is to go at the beginning of the Feb. 11 agenda for public participation. Andrew Vorce, PLUS Director, wants to present this due to possible logistical issues.
  - Welch – There is a letter from Town Counsel indicates that the Historical Commission is the body that usually deals with this sort of thing; encouraged members to read that. There’s a political aspect to this; it might make sense to provide an alternative when we don’t have the resource to hold permits for 12 months. His concern is that we come out as not for it as written but if it’s voted in as is, we are in a worse position than previously.

**Motion to go at beginning of February 11, 2020 agenda.** (Welch) carried unanimously

- Mission Statement for Town Website vote
- Vote for two HDC representatives for the MVP-Resilient Nantucket 2/14/20
- McCarthy – Ms. Backus wants the HDC to vote on representatives.
- Welch – Asked for clarification about this as he’s been involved with this already. He’s happy to be involved. The historic preservation guidelines are part of this.
- Oliver – She is also already involved and happy to continue with this.

**Motion to Approve Ms. Oliver and Mr. Welch as HDC representatives to the MVP-Resilient Nantucket.**
  - (Camp) Carried unanimously
  - Historic Preservation Guideline efforts
  - Organizational Focus Committee
  - Application pictures
  - Roof plans: threshold
  - Plans: Scale of Elevations, Floor & Roof Plans
  - Application checklist: Differentiation between complex/simple; minimum standards
  - Application as Master Sheet
  - Discussion of Net Zero Stretch Code and impacts to HDC
  - Discussion and update on Nantucket Sidewalk Work Group

**Commission Comments**  
Oliver – She put in a warrant article to lower the height, which she presented to FinCom and was asked to get HDC support for that article. Pohl – Asked this be added to the Other Business.
List of additional documents used at the meeting:

Adjourned at 8:15 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board  Sconset Advisory Board