



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, Terence Watterson, Jessie Dutra

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, February 11, 2020

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

Called to order at 4:38 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Cathy Flynn, Land Use Specialist; Holly Backus, Preservation Planner
 Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Watterson, Dutra
 Absent Members: None
 Late Arrivals: None
 Early Departures: Oliver, 7:51 p.m.; McLaughlin, 8:18 p.m.; Camp, 8:52 p.m.; Coombs, 9:15 p.m.

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

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. Mark Massey 02-0587	1 Wingspread Lane	Rev. COA 69055: windows	27-17.7	Concept Design
2. Yates, Linda 02-0628	21 Derrymore Road	Rev. 11-0144: Add chimney	41-117	Sophie Metz
3. Hills & Valley LLC 02-0626	14A Greglen Ave	Rev. 72269: 138 sf addition	68-182	Emeritus
4. Twombly, Clayton 02-0634	10 Berkley Street	Shed	76.1.3-38	Structures Ultd
5. Zablou, Bruce 02-0624	69 Tom Nevers Road	Rev. 12-0309: Relocate shed	75-138	Botticelli + Pohl
6. 77 Pocomo LLC 02-0621	77 Pocomo Road	Rev. 01-0507: enclosure	15-6	Emeritus
7. Martin, Kevin 02-0599	15 High Brush Path	252 sf addition	56-374	Charles Lenhart
8. Greg Glowacki 01-0571	2 Beverly Court	Rev. 12-0364:	68-186.2	Linda Williams
9. Cavaler, Mariyana 02-0597	4B Goldfinch Drive	Doors/Window installation	68-598.1	Self
10. Devon Pastor 01-0580	37 Long Pond Drive	Bluestone patio, deck steps	59.4-113	The Garden Group
11. Duane Jones 02-0594	1 Yawkey Way	Rev. 43895:	69-19.1	Val Oliver
12. Nan. Cons. Foundation 02-0595	220 Milestone Road	Windows on "Bog" bldg	51-1	Val Oliver
13. Gahndi, Allsion 02-0593	9 New Jersey Avenue	Patio and deck	60.3.1-408	Val Oliver
14. Hausberg, William 02-0647	105 Eel Point Road	New doors & windows	32-5	Juraj Bencat
15. Stevenson, Woodie 02-0591	75 North Liberty Street	Door	41-140	Val Oliver
16. Spencer, Pauline 01-0562	38 York Street	Shed Addition	55.4.1-50	Ross Goodwin

Voting Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch, Dutra

Alternates None

Recused Pohl, Oliver, Watterson

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns No concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve. (Camp)**

Vote Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain

Certificate #

HDC2020-01- & HDC2020-02-(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. Richard Beaudette Tr. 01-0568 • Due to lack of visibility	8 Masaquet Avenue	Sport Court	80-193	Normand Residential
2. Lauretta Lane Nom Tr 02-0635 • Due to lack of visibility	21 Pocomo Road	Stair railing, lattice MH	14-90	Thirty Acre Wood
3. Lauretta Lane Nom Tr 02-0638 • Due to lack of visibility	21 Pocomo Road	Railing, otdr grill, pavers PH	14-90	M. Avery
4. Trogni, Michael 02-0604 • Ground solar array must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity	4 Drew Lane	Solar ground array	44-23.1	ACK Smart
5. Webster, David 02-0611 • Due to lack of visibility	11 South Shore Road	Shed	67-468.1	CWA
6. 4 MVR, LLC 02-0610 • Due to lack of visibility	4 Middle Valley Road	Addition	43-128	Linda Williams
7. Friend, Scott 02-0601 • Due to lack of visibility	15 Head of Plains Road	Fence	63-55	Linda Williams
8. Pingpack, Chris 02-0631 • Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity	12 Pequot Road	Pool and patio	80-201	Jesse Dutra
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	Dutra			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No additional concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	HDC2020-01- & HDC2020-02-(as noted)	

VI. SIGNS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map-Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Pastoan, Phil 02-0588	63A Old South Road	Sign	68-157.2	Michael Eldridge
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign advisory	Kevin Kuester, Sign Advisory Committee			
Concerns (4:40)	Kuester – Asking this be held for representation			
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
2. US Reif Marine 02-0640	138 Orange Street	Free standing sign	55-283	Paul Wolf
3. US Reif Marine 02-0641	134 Orange Street	Wall sign	55-49	Paul Wolf
4. US Reif Marine 02-0643	134 Orange Street	Wall sign	55-49	Paul Wolf
5. US Reif Marine 02-0646	6 Bayberry Court	Wall sign	55-706	Paul Wolf
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign advisory	Kevin Kuester, Sign Advisory Committee			
Concerns	Kuester – Asking to hold for revisions.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

6. Waterfall Ent 02-0636	7 Union Street	Projecting sign	42.3.1-146	Ken Withrow
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign advisory	Kevin Kuester, Sign Advisory Committee			
Concerns	Kuester – SAC would like to view this			
Motion	Motion to View. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

7. Thurston, Susan 02-0637	8 Washington St (Rear)	Projecting sign	42.3.1-142.1	Nancy Kakubik
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign advisory	Kevin Kuester, Sign Advisory Committee			
Concerns	Kuester – This is approvable as submitted.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0637	

V. DISCUSSION OF ARTICLE 62 PRESERVATION OF HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT BUILDINGS

Documentation Article 62; Town Counsel opinion on Article 62; *Building with Nantucket in Mind*;
 PLUS Staff Holly Backus, Preservation Planner
 Public Mary Bergman, article proponent
 Linda Williams

Discussion (4:41) **Bergman** – A boiler plate article adopted by other towns; the difference is that this is drafted with the HDC’s authority in mind versus the Historical Commission. Feels a demolition delay would allow time for more substantive discussion and determining if a structure has historical value as well as bring in a Town engineer to evaluate the structure. As a National Historic Landmark, we have a responsibility to be stewards of Nantucket.
Oliver – In the past, there always was concern about having a Town independent engineer to evaluate a structure; that never manifested.
Pohl – Town went to local engineers and they all said no.
Bergman – She wants to ensure that a demolition goes through a proper process and is considered thoughtfully with transparency and clarity. It should be determined a structure is unsafe before a demolition is permitted.
Coombs – A lot of this started with the removal of 78 Union Street; we were told at that time that it had been condemned. At that time, she said we should not demolish something based upon the applicant’s engineer. Cited other examples where the only voice was the applicant’s. If we have to go outside of Town to get a qualified engineer, we should. We also need to find a way to fund it; that was another question we ran into.
Bergman – One thing she learned at the demolition workshop is that the applicant pays for someone to fill out a Massachusetts Survey Form B.
Pohl – At a certain point, someone would make a distinction on a demolition. The question is who the arbiter of that would be.
Bergman – As the article is written, filing for a demolition of a structure more than 50 years old would trigger that this is a potential structure. A quick determination would be made whether or not this is a historically significant structure. Next discussion is if it should be preserved and rises to the level of having a delay. It is possible the Historical Commission could play a supporting role in making that determination; that might be an amendment made on the floor.
Backus – The way this bylaw is written, it’s a general bylaw and can’t be amended.
Welch – He believes Town Counsel’s opinion was that this article could not be amended to be a zoning bylaw; that’s different than amending it so that for instance it is instead the Historical Commission under the general code vs. the HDC; suggests we not delve into that, not being attorneys.
Pohl – Suggested not getting into the discussion since no one here is an attorney.
Welch – Agrees with commissioner concerns about getting surveyed and engineer input from an objective source. Also appreciates Ms. Bergman’s efforts and her not being interested in creating more work for the HDC while at the same time respect an existing process and commission. One of the things that strikes him is that typically this demo delay is administered under the Historical Commission, part of the reason for this is that historical commission are the State designated agency and can receive funding under a Certified Local Government designation, which allows for preservation-related efforts; The reason the Historical Commission administers the demolition delay is it gives the applicant an opportunity to work with a preservation-oriented group well-versed through the state in what types of grants, loans, and resources are available for rebuilding and how they can be used.

Concerned that if the demo delay were to come through the HDC, that part of the process is not activated; HDC does as practical matter a review of the historical record only as provided by the applicant and opponent(s). So Demo delay through Historical Commission is a different process where applicant gets an opportunity to be educated about the process, including historical commission information the types of grants, funding, and techniques are used and why one solution may be more beneficial than rebuilding or why a partial rebuild may be more beneficial. Not resources HDC has, not likely even with a fee charged associated with the application. Whereas the Historical Commission actually can be receiving funds for specifically these types of efforts; in this regard, believes it would be a benefit for the community to have those types of interactions with paths for the HDC to benefit from someone providing that service, to the benefit of all. Spoke with Mary earlier in the day, would like to suggest that HDC meet with members of the historical commission and applicant to determine if there is a way that we can determine which resources work best under our Act and other regulations to work out a way to move forward; if done under the Organization Focus Committee, structure exists to facilitate meeting and discussion, idea is to work out details so that it doesn't become a burden for any one board. He would like to see this article put off for Special Town Meeting in Fall. **Coombs** – Wants to know why there would be the thought this would come under zoning.

Bergman – She put this forward as a general bylaw; there is a zoning bylaw that requires a 30-day delay for residential structures. There had been thought of amending that zoning bylaw.

Coombs – She has spoken to Michael May who provided great guidance for the historic cores.

Williams – This is inadequately written for numerous reasons. There already is a demolition delay in the HDC guidelines, in the building department, and in the Town Code. If this is modifying the Town Code demolition delay, that needs to be spelled out. She's concerned about the HDC taking a stand on this beyond a philosophical stance. When she was on HDC, Town Counsel said that the HDC can't just take the age of a structure into account when considering a demolition. Feels the sentiment is great, and a homerule petition would give HDC more authority over the issue. The HDC has had an issue with finding an independent engineer for years; HDC does have the power to require the applicant to establish an escrow account so the Town can hire an engineer.

Welch – He has the utmost respect for preservation as well as for commissioners' time. Having said, ill advised or not, Town meeting makes decisions as they do and this is just as likely to pass as not; and, we don't have the capacity to work through these types of issue on the fly if it is passed. Suggests we work together to come up with a solution for the Fall. It's an important discussion. Also, the Historical Commission is brand new but have a State mandate that can help the community in a meaningful way helpful to the community and the HDC without adding to HDC's workload, which benefits everyone. Coming up with a more focused effort might not happen before the April Town meeting. Suggests PLUS, vocabulary, costs, process need to be considered and factored in a focused effort.

Bergman – As to the language of the bylaw, it is recommended by the Massachusetts Historical Commission; they recommend any other way is ineffective; they state the reducing the delay to 6 months is ineffective.

Williams – Waiting to Fall or next Spring will give the HDC to put together a comprehensive change to the State Act.

Welch – There's nothing to suggest this happen all at once; it could be implemented in stages some of which have nothing to do with the HDC. He doesn't want to tie this up with a re-write of the Act.

Backus – There is nothing that precludes the HDC from flexing their muscles. There are things that can be done whether or not this article goes forward.

Welch – Suggested Ms. Bergman look into what modifications and to what extent this can be modified on Town meeting floor. Knowing that, Ms. Bergman can make a determination on how she wants to proceed so we have a better understanding on how we proceed, after which we can reconvene.

Backus – The important thing to know about where this stands is Finance Committee (FinCom) will be taking it up on February 18th. Recommends HDC provide a statement for them regarding this.

Welch – Suggests that if we are going to make a recommendation or comment, it should be based upon what information we have, which is what we provide to the FinCom; if this becomes a Historical Commission effort, he there is no homerule aspect.

Backus – She would advise Town Counsel to look into that more. It is imperative to ensure there are two laws that aren't in conflict.

Welch – We don't have the information to make and endorsement or not; we don't know if what results will require any change to the Act. He recommends asking for more information from Ms. Bergman and meet with her as soon as possible after she has that and put this on the Feb. 18th agenda. In that way, we'll know what to recommend to FinCom. Also gives time for Andrew/PLUS to consider any changes.

McLaughlin – This commission was established in 1955 by a State act as included under Appendix C of the guidelines; over the years, he's always mentioned for a move/demolition request that it is better to move than demolish. Under the Act, only the HDC can make changes to it, not other Town departments.

Pohl – This will come up for further discussion.

VI. APPLICATIONS HELD FOR VIEWS ONLY

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map-Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. ACK Properties, LLC 01-0533	7 & 9 Hussey Street	Pergola/outdoor shower	42.3.4-64	BPC
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Dutra			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Joe Paul, BPC			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:17)	<p>Pohl – Mr. Paul is making the claim that much of this is very low with regards to Hussey Street.</p> <p>Paul – A photo from the summer when the privet is full, shows the top of the shower is perhaps 24 inches above street level. Everything is natural to weather.</p> <p>Oliver – No concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Feels there will be limited visibility of what’s before the board; that depends on the color, grey or natural to weather.</p> <p>Camp – She can’t think of one instant where there’s a board fence enclosed in privet; she doesn’t want to set a precedent of board fences along the older streets. Feels the shower won’t be visible.</p> <p>Dutra – No concerns.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve based upon lack of visibility. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0533	

VII. NEW BUSINESS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map-Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Saligman, Linda 02-0615	117 Eel Point Road	Addition: shed dormer	32-1	Charles Crovo
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Charles Crovo			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:30)	<p>Crovo – Presented project.</p> <p>McLaughlin – This is 950 feet from the water and 450 feet from the road.</p> <p>Camp – Looks like it will be minimally visible from the road. No concerns.</p> <p>Coombs – We don’t normally allow empty space under a deck.</p> <p>Oliver – No concerns due to lack of visibility; we should have the 1st-floor plans for the file.</p> <p>Pohl – Confirmed that most windows are casement with no muntins and this proposal fits that. This won’t be visible from the road.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0615	
2. 3 Pleasant Street NT 02-0648	3 Pleasant Street	Change fene/expand deck	42.3.3-155	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:36)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments (no quorum): deck too large; grill shouldn’t be on deck. Read Holly Backus comments: 1804 building; French doors should be true-divided lights (TDL); okay with French doors not visible. Total deck is 13.5 feet; new deck projects out an additional 3 feet. Simulated divided-light (SDL) muntins are wider than on TDL</p> <p>Williams – Presented project; contends low to no visibility of the deck.</p> <p>Oliver – Okay with expanding the deck; but request the application be corrected to SDL and specify on the plans what the doors are.</p> <p>Camp – Wants the screening maintained and the Yewwood tree maintained.</p> <p>Pohl – The French door lights will be SDL but with 7/8th inch muntins</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with information on size and manufacturer information on doors; 7/8th inch muntin, door and windows schedule; and screening to be maintained. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-020648	

3. Richmond Meadows Two	02-0614	4 Iris Place	Aluminum handrails	68-336	KOH Architecture
4. Richmond Meadows Two	02-0623	2 Orchid Place	Aluminum handrails	68-337	KOH Architecture

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates Welch, Watterson
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Nicole Fazio, Richmond Development for KOH Architecture
 Public None
 Concerns (5:46) **Fazio** – Presented project; black is on the application but open to other colors. Thinks they won't be visible with cars and landscaping.
Oliver – It's hard to understand how the rails related to the buildings. They should be wood. Asked if they've ever applied for hardscaping; doesn't think we've approved the trash bins. With the building in, provide photos.
Coombs – We've spent two years to make these buildings look more Nantucket and now asking for aluminum handrails. Feels they should be wood.
McLaughlin – Agrees with Ms. Coombs. These rails will be visible.
Camp – To here this has become a commercial area and she's concerned natural to weather wood leading to dormitory like buildings won't blend in as it ages; thinks metal might work better.
Pohl – He'd be amazed if these aren't visible. All they need is a simple rail and posts on one side. Ms. Klamert needs to know that the hardscaping must be applied for.
 Motion **Motion to View and hold for more information and photos. (McLaughlin)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate #

5. Paton, Scott	02-0585	33 Orange Street	Hardscaping: fnc,retain,ptio	42.3.2-199	The Garden Group
-----------------	----------------	------------------	------------------------------	------------	------------------

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch
 Alternates Watterson, Dutra
 Recused Oliver
 Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
 Representing Jacob Williams, The Garden Group
 Public None
 Concerns (5:57) **Pohl** – Read HSAB comments: no photos; too much landscaping; bluestone between cobble not appropriate, should be cobble with grass; not enough information; want back. Read Holly Backus comments: circa 1750, photos would be helpful; too much impervious surface proposed; bluestone between cobble not appropriate.
Williams – Presented project.
Coombs – The site plan doesn't indicate any change in grade that would justify a retaining wall. Would prefer more greenspace; except for a tiny bit, this is surrounded by paving or building. The fence going up to the front should be picket.
Welch – Drafting scales out to be about 2-foot wide bluestone. The level of sophistication of fence is insufficient for that area; fence typically more sophisticated and level of detail worked out in application. If you're using bluestone inlay, one line of it would be appropriate with soft edges; however, the drafting imagery makes it look less organic; suggested providing photos of what it will look like. Agrees there's too much bluestone patio, but it if isn't visible, suggests it isn't our purview.
McLaughlin – The fence per the scale is 15 feet; it should be a regular 5&1 fence.
Camp – Agrees with Ms. Coombs about more greenery. Also, agrees with Mr. Welch. The bluestone should be irregular shape. She'd be okay with Type II picket with privet behind it.
Pohl – The fence is definitely not drawn in 1/4 scale. Agrees something needs to be done with the fence; natural to weather fence and the moon gate aren't appropriate. There's way too much bluestone, and it is formal cut; bluestone in the parking should be irregular shaped.
 Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate #

6.23 Commercial Whf, LLC 01-0581					
23 Commercial Wharf		Granite raised bed	42.2.4-5	The Garden Group	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Dutra				
Alternates	Watterson				
Recused	Oliver & Welch left the room.				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Jacob Williams, The Garden Group				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:13)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: not in keeping with Wharf area, need different design; want back. Read Holly Backus comments: only concern will granite be flush cut or uneven like historic granite; proposed bed must be within property line.</p> <p>Dutra – He’s okay with it but the granite should be first generation. The bed could be 2 inches shorter.</p> <p>Camp – Asked about the height of the timber retaining wall.</p> <p>Coombs – The front wall of the bed is 18 inches. She’d like it to be shorter. Everything is hard, she’d prefer things to be softer.</p> <p>McLaughlin -</p> <p>Pohl – The CAD program is making the timber wall taller than 18 inches.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with use of antique granite stone with old edges and old cut and height reduced to 14 inches visible. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0581		
7. White Elephant Hotel LLC 02-0582					
4 Willard Street		Shed	42.4.1-57	Mike Duffy	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Mike Duffy, NIR				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:23)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: should not be on Easton Street corner; no plans show siting. Read Holly Backus comments: no photos from street; not clear where going; windows should be TDL; might need special permit.</p> <p>Duffy – Presented project.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Louvers should be wood.</p> <p>No others have concerns.</p> <p>Staff – We need ¼-inch scale drawings for the file.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0582		
8. Carolyn Barg Trust 01-0574					
19½ West Chester Street		Hardscape: spa, otdr shower	42.4.3-7.1	Ahern LLC	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:30)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: would like back with proposed fencing for screen. Read Holly Backus comments: lots of impervious surfaces proposed.</p> <p>Ahern – Presented project; on the back lot elevated above West Chester Street; she would enhance the screening.</p> <p>Coombs – This is visible from Kite Hill. This part of West Chester is more natural and flowing; more should be less visible.</p> <p>Camp – So many hardscape plans come in with sharp edges; she’d like to see something softer. There is a property that is visible with sharp-edged bluestone, and it is unattractive and not Nantucket. Not in favor of a water feature in this area. She’d prefer it all be Goshen stone, no bluestone.</p> <p>Oliver – What we can see resembles stone that we have. The biggest visibility is the brick driveway. A fence on the wall would alleviate visibility. Clarified the look and material of the middle patio: irregular Goshen stone.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Nothing to add.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with existing stone wall to be copied; bluestone to be Goshen stone; decrease visibility of the spa from Kite Hill; and fence on the south side to screen from West Chester Street, per Exhibit A. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-01-0574		

9. Mills, Edward	02-0584	4 Traders Lane	Drwy mat + extend fence	42.3.3-22	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:41)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
10. Massey, Mark	02-0586	1 Wingspread Lane	Rev. 68448: wire mesh, gate	27-17.7	Concept Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	TJ Watterson, Concept Design				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:41)	<p>Watterson – Presented project; will increase screening to hide the wire mesh on the fence.</p> <p>Coombs – No concerns because it’s not visible.</p> <p>Oliver – If the mesh is screened with other than the gate, she has no concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – They built this without permit and they should be fined. The wire on the gate and picture shows wire on the fence. Wants this to be found as a violation.</p> <p>Staff – This failed inspection for the Certificate of Occupancy (CO), it’s not a violation.</p> <p>Camp – She doesn’t find this that egregious.</p> <p>Backus – This wasn’t an as-built violation because they don’t have a CO yet; it’s still an open application.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the two lengths of fencing either side of the gate to be screened with vegetation to hide the wire mesh. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin opposed		Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0586	
11. Piece of the Pie, LLC	02-0583	14 Spearhead Drive	Driveway apron	69-336	Nantucket Eng.
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:58)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		

12. Art State Properties 02-0589		92 Washington Street	New Dwelling	42.2.3-22	Smith-Hutton Arch
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	No name given.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:59)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: north clarify intent; windows too small for wall area; north too much glazing and too close; single door on balcony with flanking windows more appropriate; A/C location; not enough east elevation fenestration. Read Holly Backus comments: omitted information on previous COA approvals; plans don't show relocated garage; proposed elevation for FEMA without HDC approval.</p> <p>Rep. – Presented project; leaving garage in existing location. Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Chapter 91 has put a height limit on the structure from the finished floor to ridge.</p> <p>Discussion about FEMA requirements for raising above flood level and having an engineer verify that height.</p> <p>Backus – This is an example of the why behind Article 62.</p> <p>Oliver – She'd love to see some of the grade level retained. The brick piers are a concern. She did view this without have the house drawings. This will set a precedent for that area. She'd prefer a steeper pitch on the dormers and other roofs; the dormer windows seem small and float in the wall. The east elevation 2nd floor should have another window. Some reduction in glass facing the water. It would be helpful to have the previous approval. The outside chimney feels massive. She'd like to see the DEP height restriction.</p> <p>Coombs – Need to get specific FEMA requirements for the area. East elevation, agrees about the 2nd-floor window, especially if keeping the smaller windows; prefers larger windows on the 1st floor. Would like to see it brought down in height a little.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The 2nd-floor deck should be no more than 8 feet deep; it's 9 feet deep.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees the chimney is too massive and over fenestration of the north and south. Gable dormers would be quieter with more bungalow details. Okay with the brick if it's old struck brick.</p> <p>Pohl – The brick piers with break-away panels is busy; suggested framing them out as vertical board with no frame and painted grey with no picture frame with a shingled water table above it; that would minimize the trim at the bottom of the building.</p> <p>Welch – If he were to vote on this, he'd want certification from the surveyor on the height and if it can come down a foot, that would give latitude for the pitch to change.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and more information. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
Break 7:20 to 7:26 p.m.					
13. CRB, LLC 01-0578		74 Old South Road	Solar Panels	68-405	Rhett Dupont
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	Welch stepped out.				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.				
Representing	Rhett Dupont				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:26)	<p>Dupont – Presented project.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate # HDC2020-01-0578		
14. Neel Carlton et al. 02-0596		84 Pocomo Road	Guest House	15-40	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:29)	<p>Webster – Presented project; details will match main house and not visible.</p> <p>McLaughlin – South elevation, the window to wall ratio should be no more than 50%.</p> <p>No others have concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin opposed		Certificate # HDC2020-02-0596		

15. Soros, Jeffrey 02-0630					
	45 Baxter Road	Replace bay windows	49-13	CWA	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:34)	<p>Pohl – Read letter from Mary Wilkes: asked if like-kind replacement. Read Holly Backus comments: does not materially change structure.</p> <p>Webster – Presented project.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0630		
16. K4, LLC 02-0600					
	48 Orange Street	As-built roof stairs	42.3.2-97	Chris Skehel	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Victoria Ewing, LINK				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:37)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: stairs on roof not appropriate. Read Holly Backus comments: stairs should be screened but roof walk not historic.</p> <p>Ewing – Presented project.</p> <p>Coombs – For years she had tried to get the previous owner to remove the stairs; he took them off when the house was for sale. Now the stairs are back. This is visible but not easy to see.</p> <p>Staff – There is an open building permit on this, but these stairs aren't part of that.</p> <p>Oliver – Suggested natural to weather vertical board around the middle section and leave the rest of the skirt open.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Board it in and paint it white.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with natural to weather shaft around the little stair part and shuttle and leave the rest open. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 4-1//McLaughlin opposed	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0600		
17. Glowacki, Greg 02-0592					
	15 Millers Lane	Tertiary cottage	68-124	Val Oliver	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Val Oliver, Val Oliver Design				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:45)	<p>Oliver – Presented project.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0592		
18. Greg Glowacki 02-0598					
	15 Millers Lane	New Dwelling	68-124	Val Oliver	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Val Oliver, Val Oliver Design				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:48)	<p>Oliver – Presented project.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0598		

19. Paton, Kristen 02-0602	33 Orange Street	Roof walk alterations	42.3.2-199	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Val Oliver, Val Oliver Design			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:51)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments (no quorum): enlarge roof walk not in keeping with house. Read Holly Backus comments: Lancaster page 212 indicates roofwalk modern to 1930s.</p> <p>Oliver – Presented project, two options: 1 shift at the same size, 2 enlarge.</p> <p>No concerns with Option 1.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve Option 1 as submitted. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0602	
20. Douglas Bennett 02-0603	8 Pine Grove Road	Solar rooftop array	67-241	ACK Smart
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Dutra			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.			
Representing	Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:54)	<p>Glidden – Presented project.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Dutra)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0603	
21. Champoux/Durand 02-0605	8 Upper Tawpawshaw	Roof top solar - MH	53-56	Cotuit Solar
22. Champoux/Durand 02-0608	8 Upper Tawpawshaw	Roof top solar - shed	53-56	Cotuit Solar
23. Champoux/Durand 02-0607	6 Upper Tawpawshaw	Roof top solar - MH	53-55	Cotuit Solar
24. Champoux/Durand 02-0606	6 Upper Tawpawshaw	Roof top solar - shed	53-55	Cotuit Solar
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.			
Representing	Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:58)	<p>Alence – Presented project, cedar roofs.</p> <p>Camp – She would like to view this.</p> <p>Watterson – On the 8 Upper Tawpawshaw main house, he believes most sections are okay but skeptical about the front dormer being visible from the road.</p> <p>McLaughlin – We don't have drawings of the panels.</p> <p>Coombs – Wants the drawing to be large to provide more definition.</p> <p>Pohl – Suggested viewing both properties as a group.</p>			
Motion	Motion to View and hold all four for 1/4-scale drawings of the panels on the roof. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
25. 40 Polpis Road, LLC 02-0609	44 Polpis Road	Solar rooftop array	54-26	Cotuit Solar
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.			
Representing	Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:07)	<p>Alence – Presented project.</p> <p>Camp – She would like to view this.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The photos show silver panels, not black.</p> <p>Welch – It's on the primary mass though far back from the road. Agrees about viewing and a picture of one of the panels.</p>			
Motion	Motion to View and hold for pictures. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

26. 11 India St. LLC 02-0618					
	11 India Street	Deck railing replacement	42.3.1-122.1	Emeritus	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:14)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments (no quorum): no date, no photos, should not be changed except to match existing; wants back. Read Holly Backus comments: need photos of existing; should match existing and be like kind; should go back to HSAB.</p> <p>MacEachern – Presented project.</p> <p>Pohl – The railing will have to be raised to 42” to meet the commercial code; he shares HSAB and Ms. Backus concerns about keeping the newel post. The way to keep the post the same is to put a block under it to lift it; also keep one rail where it is and add a second narrower one above it.</p> <p>Welch – He supports Mr. Pohl’s solution.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the existing handrail to remain the same height and details; a second horizontal handrail added to meet commercial code; and the newel post blocked up on a plinth. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0618		
27. Century House R.E. Tr 02-0617					
	10B Cliff Road	Color change	42.4.4-61	Emeritus	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:18)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: completely not acceptable, black trim and shutters not appropriate. Read Holly Backus comments: colors too dark; why change?</p> <p>MacEachern – Presented project.</p> <p>Welch – This is a non-starter.</p> <p>Pohl – Black sash is more Greek revival but not the trim and shutters.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions to the color. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #			
28. Lieber, Jonathan 02-0616					
	6 Stone Post Way	Garage fene. + pergola	74-38.1	Emeritus	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	None				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:22)	<p>MacEachern – Asked this be held for the next meeting.</p> <p>Not opened at this time.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for Feb. 18 meeting. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #			
29. 12 Lincoln Nom Trust 02-0622					
	12 Lincoln Avenue	Addition revisions	30-183	Emeritus	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Watterson				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:22)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: no date or photos; should not have shed bump off staircase. Read Holly Backus comments: 118-year-old structure.</p> <p>MacEachern – Presented project.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0622		

30. Ash, Diane 02-0645	23 Pine Street	Move/demo shed	42.3.2-113	Emeritus
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl, Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:25)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: please reuse. Read Holly Backus comments: asked it be relocated and repurposed.</p> <p>MacEachern – Presented project; a new carriage-house structure has been approved.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0645	

31. SW Assoc Realty Tr 02-0629	5 South Water Street	2nd/3rd Floor Addition	42.3.1-270	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:28)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: completely inappropriate; will change character of building; no date. Read Holly Backus comments: Old Hardies building circa 1940; elevation too large, great use for housing but out of scale; refer to historic structures with 3 floors.</p> <p>MacEachern – Presented project; adding 2-stories of apartments above the retail section.</p> <p>Coombs – It’s important to keep the center of this Island viable; we’ve had committees working to keep the Downtown open in the winter. Nantucket shouldn’t look like Hyannis; people come here because Main Street still looks the way it did years ago while other towns screw up their main street. Hardies was a simple building; the little green door was Andy’s Diner with one counter and four stools; it is part of our history and needs to be preserved. We are losing so much of that history. It’s too heavy and too big; it should stay simple.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with Ms. Coombs comments about the importance of this. This has gone through a metamorphosis to become a block building with a warehouse look mingled with a country store with porch. What’s been proposed is colossal, especially looking at the south elevation comparison. He’d like to see it more compartmentalized versus more uniform to create a sense of separate structures. Suggested providing a 3D model of the existing and the proposed. The structure is significant enough in its location and relation to the area that we would want to see the full representation. The perspective drawings don’t capture it enough. There are redeeming details and with respect to the 2nd floor of the original warehouse and the idea of the old, separate, Firestone store; some elements okay but not as a block. The 2nd-floor decks for apartments in town are very extensive and represent a difference in not only architecture but also culture.</p> <p>Dutra – Agrees with what’s been said, simpler would be better. This is a great opportunity to do something good there. Agrees with removing balconies and roof walks. Suggested 1.5 stories versus 3 stories.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees with what’s been said. Keeping the first floor is a good gesture to the past. Likes the way architectures are combined but it does appear massive. Agrees about the decks; maybe one.</p> <p>Pohl – Everyone agrees with the idea of simplicity. One historic photo shows the old Dreamland, which was large but very simple; the photos show a lot of simple, unadorned buildings. He likes the idea of breaking up the massing to feel like a group of buildings stuck together.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

32. Pug Cottage Nom Trust 02-0625					
	13A Lincoln Avenue	Addition	30-135.1	Botticelli + Pohl	
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Pohl				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl				
Public	None				
Concerns (8:52)	<p>Coombs – Read HSAB comments (no quorum): incomplete application, need historical information and photos and dates; early common house and garage; addition is the tail wagging the dog; would like back. Read Holly Backus comments: no concerns.</p> <p>Botticelli – Presented project.</p> <p>Watterson – He viewed this; feels this is appropriate and will fit in.</p> <p>Dutra – No concerns.</p> <p>Welch – The design is nice and appropriate.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Dutra)				
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0625		
33. Fish, Kevin 02-0627					
	36 York Street	Porch	55.4.1-103	EMDA	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (9:00)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried unanimously	Certificate #			
34. Walker, Jon 02-0642					
	112 Wauwinet Road	Hardscaping: retain/paving	11-20	Self	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Mark Poor, Permits Plus				
Public	None				
Concerns (9:01)	<p>Poor – Presented project.</p> <p>No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0642		
35. Shneider, Karl 02-0612					
	84 Main Street	Addition and alteration	42.3.3-20	Thornewill Design	
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (9:03)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for Feb. 13. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #			

36. Hulbert ACK II, LLC 02-0633 4 Hulbert Avenue MH lift, reno, addition 42.1.4/2 Sophie Metz

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Welch, Watterson, Dutra
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
 Representing Sophie Metz
 Public None
 Concerns (9:04) **Pohl** – Read HSAB comments (no quorum): need date circa 1930s; roof walk not appropriate; rear elevation visible; east front door no sidelights; “A” windows should be “B”; triple-ganged windows to be “C”. Read Holly Backus comments: 1893; elevating 4 feet; go back to HSAB; premature for guidelines.
Metz – Presented project; core is very old, circa 1892, but has been consumed by additions.
Welch – The skirting seems appropriate but general vocabulary is square edge. Would like to see some echo of the shutters. We need clarification on the age; there’s a big difference between 1930s and 1890s; doesn’t see dramatic change to the floor plan so not sure the date would make a difference. The roof walk should be open; skirts make them large architectural elements. Asked for certification on the minimum-flood level.
Coombs – The house is not a style for a roof walk. East elevation 2nd-floor windows are all ganged; if it’s being renovated, the windows should be broken up. The original central mass should be restored to what it would have looked like in the 1890s. The existing has no particular age. West elevation 2nd-floor windows are too small and mostly ganged. (left at 9:15)
Dutra – The proposed represents the existing well. North elevation, suggested reducing the vertical shingle line to match the water table on the deck. Agrees with Mr. Welch about a throw-back to the shutters.
Watterson – Agrees with much that’s been said. Would like the skirting to be less “punctuated.” The roof walk might be okay though this isn’t a proper 2-story house.
Pohl – The roof walk should be much lighter without the skirt; the posts shouldn’t be 6X6. The roof walk contradicts a lightness this house has. The window over the front door should be centered over it. Agrees about the ganged windows especially on the east elevation; would like to see more single windows. There are a lot of different sized windows; suggested coalescing them more.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)**
 Vote Carried 4-0 Certificate #

37. Zarcone, Michael 02-0632 16 Cherry Street Pool and patio 55-379 Jesse Dutra

38. Noyes, Terrence 02-0620 19 Hooper Farm Road Plastic shed 55-220 Self

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes	None
Review Minutes	None
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission Statement for Town Website vote • Discussion of Article 58: Zoning Bylaw Amendment: Commercial Mid-Island Height Restriction • Historic Preservation Guideline/Nantucket Resiliency update • Time management • 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	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:
 1. None

Adjourned at 9:23 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:
 Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board Sconset Advisory Board Madaket Advisory Board Sign Advisory Committee