



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, April 16, 2019

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

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

Staff in attendance: John Hedden, HDC Compliance Coordinator
 Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Watterson
 Absent Members: McLaughlin, Dutra
 Late Arrivals: Watterson, 4:38 p.m.
 Early Departures: Watterson, 9:00 p.m.

Agenda approved as amended by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. **Steve Theroux**, Nantucket Architectural Group – Has a client in Sconset but outside the historic area; He wants to use Morel Trim. Wants to know if it is worth his while to make an application. Left information on the material with the Commission.
Pohl – Make the application; we can't deliberate until then.
2. **Pohl** – At the Select Board discussion about the Westerwyck Pool appeal: so far as chair, he has allowed recused members to make citizens comment; though it's legal to do that but something that confuses the issue of appeal. If you are going to recuse from an application, remove yourself from the table and he would prefer you don't speak. Recusing is different from abstaining; if you are going to recuse, you do so at the beginning of the hearing; you can't recuse after several hearings. That also muddied the water.

II. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Pohl – We don't have to do this right away; in fairness to Mr. McLaughlin, this should be held for a full board of regular members.
 Motion to hold for a full board. (Camp) Carried unanimously

III. CONSENT

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Williams, Christine – 72245	2 Red Mill Lane	Rev. 70030: door color	55-919	Linda Williams
2. Byrnes, Randall – 72246	9 Liberty Street	Gate	42.3.1-57	Concept Design
3. Hunter, William – 72247	3 Sleetwing Circle	Rev. 72097: change grade	74-27	NAG
4. Krueger, Charles – 72248	4 Weweeder Avenue	Driveway Apron	80-102	Greyson Keller
5. Cliff ACK Realty Trust – 72249	96 Cliff Road	Rev. 71965: window change	41-15	Ethan McMorrow
6. Jennings, Bill – 72250	2 Marion Avenue	Door color change	84-402	Val Oliver Design
7. Russell, Donald – 72251	14 Brewster Road	Rev. 70769: garage doors	54-236	Self
8. One Sunset Ridge LLC – 72252	1 Sunset Ridge Lane	Move off shed	73.4.2-83.1	Greyson Keller
9. Perry, Mary – 72253	34 Fairgrounds Road	Shed move on	67-292	Greyson Keller
10. Strazzula, Kathy – 72254	11 Yompasham Lane	Move/ demo shed	55-332	Val Oliver Design
11. Bocage, Ronald – 72255	39A Milk Street	Window change to SDL	56-198	Welch & Assocs.
12. Kalman, Rick – 72256	43 Appleton Road	Hoop barn #1	66-66	Linda Williams
13. Kalman, Rick – 72257	43 Appleton Road	Hoop barn #2	66-66	Linda Williams
14. Graves, William – 72258	82 Main Street	Roof chng, roofwlk rebuild	42.3.4-27	Linda Williams
15. Caggiano, Paul – 72259	9 North Point Road	Relocate outdoor shower	38-80	Linda Williams
16. Delay, Michael – 72260	14 Cherry Street	Rev. 71765: door color chng	55-380	Linda Williams

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp
 Alternates: None
 Recused: Oliver, Welch, Watterson
 Documentation: None
 Representing: None
 Public: No concerns.
 Concerns: Motion to Approve. (Coombs)
 Motion: **Motion to Approve. (Coombs)**
 Vote: Carried 3-0

Certificate # 72245 to 72260

IV. 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. BeKind, LLC – 72261	4 Pilgrim Road	AC units	41-217	Matthew Tomaiolo
• AC units to be screened sufficiently not to be visible from Pilgrim Road.				
2. Williams, Christine – 72262	2 Red Mill Lane	Rev. 70533: gate	55-919	Linda Williams
• Gate to be natural to weather and vegetation to be incorporated into the gate.				
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No additional concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72261 & 72262	

V. SIGNS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 17 Main ACK, LLC	17 Main Street	Wall sign	72.3.1-178	Archer Signs
2. 17 Main ACK, LLC	17 Main Street	Projecting sign	72.3.1-178	Archer Signs
3. 17 Main ACK, LLC	17 Main Street	Projecting sign	72.3.1-178	Archer Signs
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend these be held for representation.			
Concerns	No discussion at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

VI. REVIEW OF PLANS AND DISCUSSION OF SIDEWALK WORK ON WASHINGTON STREET.

Pohl – This was discussed at length at the April 10 Select Board meeting. This presentation will reveal how the HDC moves forward with applications from the Department of Public Works (DPW). This is for us to review a proposal between Coffin Street and the Artists Association. We’ve been invited to review and discuss. This is not an application; this is a solicitation of our opinions. Everyone at the table is invited to give their opinion.

Rob McNeil, Director DPW – Work was proceeding on the section of the sidewalk from Town Parking Lot to Coffin Street. The American Legion asked the sidewalk in front of their building be repaired and correct the ADA ramp into the building. Will replace the precast concrete with brick, reset existing brick, and maintain the existing granite curb from Coffin Street to Salem Street. The driveway apron into the Handlebar will become brick and in front of the American Legion will replace the broken-up concrete. Will replace the precast, concrete curb around Wilkes Square with granite.

Coombs – Asked if there are photos of the replacement granite curbing. One issue in the area is the “knife-edged” curbing, especially in the old historic district (OHD); it doesn’t look historic and cuts tires.

McNeil – This stretch has on-street parking; we are not raising the 6” curb line that currently exists. Mr. Hedden was with us to review the area. We have a large sample of chisel-topped granite to use to supplement. Mr. Pohl has been invited to be part of the review group to provide input through the process.

Coombs – In the OHD, the old curbing should be used. She would like this Board to stand up for the rounded curb. It provides a look that draws tourists.

Pohl – Matt Fee supported the concern about the sharp curbing; it’s practical as well as aesthetic to have rounded curbing.

McNeil – We are trying to address concerns by having the soft or chiseled top. In all projects downtown, we are reusing brick taken up and supplementing it.

Welch – He’d like to suggest looking into running a blinder down the granite curbing to soften the edge. Confirmed that along this stretch, the existing granite curb will be put back in; asked if he has stock to pull from to supplement for broken pieces.

McNeil – It will all be set into concrete.

Welch – He feels the section with pre-cast concrete is a “non-significant/non-contributing” area. Subject to input from historic and preservation experts, we set up “non-significant/non-contributing” areas that would allow use of certain materials. That would also allow HDC to have input so that we don’t lose resources. With that type of process, we could have oversight of work.

Oliver – Nothing to add.

Watterson – He agrees with Mr. Welch.

Camp – She’d like to see all the old granite maintained. She’s pleased to see the concrete curb being replaced. The completed section looks good. Throughout the Town the eased-edge curbing should be used.

Pohl – At the corner of Force 5, the curbing is not old, but the edge is not sharp.

Welch – One of the aesthetics is the irregularity; machining the edge is very regular. Using different-sized segments would alleviate that regularity.

Pohl – Speaking to the regularity, when pulling up existing granite that snaps, there are examples of broken curb that was put back in.

McNeil – Curb edges have been impacted by snow plows.

Coombs – On all streets in the OHD, the curbs should have the consistency of the old curbing, not like what was done along Straight Wharf.

Kevin Kuester, 83 Main Street – On this project, he'd like to see the Wilkes triangle rendered in new stone. He doesn't think the "Lego®" block sections at crosswalks are appropriate in the OHD; those that were used downtown should be replaced.

Discussion about the need versus statutory requirement to have the "Lego®" sections at crosswalks.

McNeil – The "Lego®" sections will go in at Coffin Street and Salem Street. They would also be used at the edge of pavement for the ADA ramp in front of the American Legion.

Pohl – The HDC would prefer not to have them.

Hedden – As far as the granite curbing, there is a difference of contrast from that granite and cobblestone versus that granite and asphalt. The visual contrast of sharp granite and cobblestone is drastic; one is much more modern. Along Easy Street, the granite is already chipping off and getting a patina.

Pohl – Restated that the sharp granite is an aesthetic and practical concern; easing the edge will advance the process. Sense of the Board would like to see reclaimed granite around Wilkes Square.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Margaret Marshall Trust	17 Sherburne Turnpike	New dwelling	30-172.1	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Victoria Ewing , LINK – Presented project; she will get the finished-floor height.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:31)	<p>Welch – Asked the finished-floor height. Wants to be clear on the grading.</p> <p>Coombs – East elevation, the two mullied windows over the front door are in a dormer and the windows underneath should be separated. She's concerned about the vegetation being cut back and opening up the property.</p> <p>Oliver – The house is appropriate but shares Mr. Welch's concerns about the grade. Asked for a height pole.</p> <p>Camp – Nothing to add.</p> <p>Pohl – We rarely review the application, which is a problem; there is a category on grade change, which isn't filled out. We need existing and proposed topo of the site; and the information detailed on the application. Suggested putting in stakes to mark the edge of the property.</p>			
Motion	Motion to View with height poles at both ends of the main ridge. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
2. Margaret Marshall Trust	17 Sherburne Turnpike	Cabana	30-172.1	LINK
3. Margaret Marshall Trust	17 Sherburne Turnpike	Pool	30-172.1	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:43)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold to track. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
4. Davis, Bruce	11 Baxter Road	Roof change	73.1.4-8	Will Stephens
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Will Stephens – He's waiting for a sample of green 3-tab; asked this be held for that.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:44)	<p>Pohl – He and Ms. Camp have no concerns about using green architectural. We could approve architectural to move this along; if Mr. Stephens gets the 3-tab, he can use it instead.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for more information. (Camp) No vote taken			
	Motion to Approve with green architectural or 3-tab shingles for final review by the Chair. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 3-0	Certificate #	72263	

5. Collins, Wylie	4 North Water Street	Partial demo chimney	42.4.2-90	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Victoria Ewing , LINK – Reviewed additional photos submitted per HDC request.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:52)	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Watterson)			
Vote	Carried 3-0	Certificate #	72264	
6. Carter, Jeff	10½ Cherry Street	New main dwelling	55-383.2	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Val Oliver , Val Oliver Design – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; this is at the back of a lot against another 2-story house; the 2 nd -floor plate dropped 1 foot.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:55)	Camp – She wished the dormer windows were one size smaller. South elevation, asked if the ridge could come down further; the ratio of gable to broken back is off. Coombs – Doesn't think the south elevation will be visible. No concerns. Welch – Lowering the rear ridge, the primary façade relates less to the structure at the front. Front north elevation on the previous submission is more appropriate; with a higher ridge, the rafter tails could go on a small plain; the dormers would be less prominent. Much of this will not be directly visible so has no concerns about the size and rear; his concern is how this relates to the structure in front and two the left. Pohl – There is space between the 1 st -floor window headers and the eave. No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	72265	
7. Carter, Jeff	10½ Cherry Street	New studio	55-383.2	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Val Oliver , Val Oliver Design – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:07)	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	72266	
8. Anguelov, Martin	19B Waydale Road	New dwelling	67-29	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver, Welch			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Val Oliver , Val Oliver Design – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	Stephen Welch , 13 Waydale Road – The changes are appropriate.			
Concerns (6:09)	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	72267	
9. Crowley, James	8 Wall Street	New dwelling	82-79	Vincente-Burin Arch.
Voting	Pohl, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Paulo Vincente , Vincente-Burin Architects – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:10)	Oliver – Her concern is the cantilevered, 2 nd -floor bay on the west and north elevations; suggested a porch under it. Watterson – The south elevation negative-mass porch would fit in if it's a shingled rail. He's okay with the bay. Pohl – Agrees with what's been said.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Watterson)			
Vote	Carried 3-0	Certificate #		

10. Laundro ACK, LLC 4 Hanabea Lane New commercial bldg. 69-15 Emeritus

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates None

Recused Watterson

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing **Matt MacEachern**, Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; tallest ridge is 35 feet.

Public None

Concerns (6:25) **Welch** – The change to the front by lowering the mass is helpful. He’d like to get a better idea of what’s out there since there is much to be developed. He has no concerns.
Coombs – The height is concerning; it’s huge with a cupola, which makes it feel taller. Zoning might allow 40 feet but HDC doesn’t have to approve 40 feet. Hanabea Lane has some small houses on it.
Oliver – Recently approved a commercial building which dropped the front substantially and did not exceed 30 feet. It might help if this moved to the back of the lot; or put the 2nd- and 3rd-floor program on an ell.
Camp – This is huge; the “B” windows swim in the wall. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about moving it back.
Pohl – Shares the concern about the size. Dislikes the monitor on a building this size.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)**

Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate #

11. High Garden Holding, LLC 40 Jefferson Avenue New dwelling 30-119 Emeritus

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates None

Recused Watterson

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing **Matt MacEachern**, Emeritus Development – Presented project.

Public None

Concerns (7:05) **Pohl** – Read HSAB comments: no concerns, except black and white color pallet.
Oliver – The masses are all even across the front; the garage should be pushed back. This goes from lot line to lot line, which is atypical massing in this area.
Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; it’s almost 80 feet long. East elevation, the “funny-window” doghouse dormer looks tiny on the roof plain; it’s visible from the west too.
Welch – Confirmed the size and design of structures around this and the grade related to the street. The perspective of this will be no different than those around it. He’d like to see the perspective from the northeast. He’d like to see the brackets angled; those on the garage should relate to those on the porch.
Camp – The 3 French doors are too prominent over the front door, should be shingle-style windows; front door should be shingle-style; agrees about pushing the garage back; the garage doors and windows draw attention to it and make it less than the main mass; the far left should be a shed dormer.
Pohl – His biggest concern is the garage: it comes forward and is too vertical; agrees about pushing it back. He’s not loving the little dormers shoe-horned between roof plains on the east and west elevations.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)**

Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate #

12. High Garden Holding, LLC 40 Jefferson Avenue New cabana 30-119 Emeritus

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates None

Recused Watterson

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing **Matt MacEachern**, Emeritus Development – Presented project.

Public None

Concerns (6:54) **Pohl** – Read HSAB comments: will be visible; prefer 4-light doors; nano-wall too modern for context; no black and white.
Oliver – Agrees tying into the main house 2-over-2 and 4-light doors would help. Eliminate gable dormers on the south and north.
Coombs – Agrees about the dormers.
Welch – Agrees with what’s been said. Suggested coming up with a way to attenuate the dormers presentation to the east and west.
Camp – Likes the west elevation profile without the dormers. Agrees with what’s been said.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)**

Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate #

13. High Garden Holding, LLC	40 Jefferson Avenue	New gym	30-119	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:59)	Pohl – Read HSAB comments: nano-wall, 4-light doors, trim color. Oliver – Her concerns are the same as for the cabana.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
14. High Garden Holding, LLC	40 Jefferson Avenue	Pool	30-119	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Elizabeth O'Rourke , Jardins International – Presented project. Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:00)	Pohl – Read HSAB comments: no concerns. The more pools we approve, adding the language about not being visible at time of inspection and thereafter is very important.			
Motion	Motion to Approve with caveat that the pool is not visible at the time of inspection and thereafter. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72268
15. Hills & Valleys, LLC	14A Greglen Avenue	New dwelling	68-182	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Asked this be held for further revisions.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:05)	Oliver – We have no idea what's going in front of this; we must review this as this will be visible. This is too tall and too skinny. The front needs to be softened. Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; had asked for a streetscape of what's there and possibly proposed. Welch – Looking at the context, what will be visible before the other structures are built is the left; this is a deep lot. It would help to see where other structures will be placed on the lot. Pohl – You can tell if a building is tall and skinny by looking at the eave end roof proportions.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
16. Hills & Valleys, LLC	14A Greglen Avenue	Shed	68-182	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed the project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:11)	Welch – The area that would normally be to the cheek, asked if that is meant to be open; should be filled in. Coombs – North elevation, there are no windows, would like a couple of windows similar to the garage-door side. Oliver – Okay with the blank walls; this is an industrial area. Agrees the cheeks should be filled in. Camp – Nothing to add. Pohl – Agrees about the cheek walls.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the cheeks tightened up. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72269

17. Heller, Heff	7 East Lincoln Avenue	New dwelling	42.4.1-8	Robert Newman
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch (read back in)			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Robert Newman , Sandcastle Construction Inc. – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:17)	<p>Oliver – The roofwalk should be eliminated. Likes the horizontal rails; would like them carried around the house. East elevation, eliminate the roof over the door; that would simplify the front elevation.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees no roofwalk. She thinks the horizontal railing is okay for this house; they bring the height down.</p> <p>Welch – It’s a concern that the south elevation is taller than previously submitted; the front door needs a solution for the number of lights to relate to the 12-over-12 windows. Agrees no roofwalk. This is different than 5 or 6 horizontal rails; his concern is the 7 horizontal rails, which feels contemporary.</p> <p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: west no sliders, maybe single French; very busy; roofwalk too much; missing simple 1920 design; railing should remain vertical. Suggested a more plank-style railing. Agrees with what’s been said. East elevation, the broken back segways into a shed; it won’t work that way.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
18. Lhota, Joe	6 South Miacomet	Move on site & window chgs	82-356	BPC
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Joe Paul , BPC – Reviewed the project; held for a view; pool and walls and fencing are existing; the pool is set low.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:34)	<p>Welch – His concern is the changes to the hardscape; what’s represented is the driveway within the public way. No concerns about the changes.</p> <p>Coombs – The 2nd-floor railing is heavy. Would prefer the vegetation be indigenous to the area, no privet. Okay with the windows. The porch railing should not be shingled.</p> <p>Oliver – The 2nd-floor railing is too complicated; part-shingled and part-baluster rails would be better.</p> <p>Pohl – There are three curb cuts for this property.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the porch railing changed to vertical baluster versus the Chippendale. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72270
19. Lhota, Joe	6 South Miacomet	New secondary dwelling	82-356	BPC
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Joe Paul , BPC – He did not address the fenestration issues and the railing was changed.			
Public	None.			
Concerns (7:48)	Oliver – Reviewed some of the other concerns from the previous hearing.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
20. Sullivan-Krueger	6 New Lane	New dwelling	41-294	BPC
Voting	Pohl, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Joe Paul , BPC – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; there was conflicting information on the date.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:50)	<p>Oliver – East elevation, needs a door to address New Lane, which is more typical in this area; the other changes work well. The design of this house is more appropriate for Tom Nevers. The west elevation mass is too close to the same height and eave line as the north elevation mass. The house addresses New Lane more than any other street.</p> <p>Watterson – He’s okay with no door on New Lane. Likes the changes to the east elevation. The north elevation is atypical in that it is the same box with a bumped-up roof line.</p> <p>Pohl – The east elevation is the most successful and is scaled properly; suggested adding the door and using this elevation as the core for the rest: scale down the north; the 2-foot gable topping toward the south is atypical; additive massing.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 3-0		Certificate #	

21. Hohlt, Richard	121 Madaket Road	New dwelling	40-60.1	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli , Botticelli & Pohl – There is a lot of vegetation along Madaket Road.			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:08)	<p>Oliver – She took photos from Cliff Road; there are no roof walks on Madaket Road in this area.</p> <p>Camp – She has no concerns about the size of the structure; there are other large structures in the area.</p> <p>Welch – His concern is the grade elevation; it's a 28-foot house placed on a high point and the roof walk adds to that; the previous house was not as tall. The grade needs to come down closer to 50 feet; that would bring it down three feet.</p> <p>Coombs – Suggested this be held so they can figure out what to do about the height.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	
22. Ericksen, Ana	22 Orange Street	Restoration/addition	42.3.2-225	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, window survey, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<p>Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl – Reviewed the project and windows that can be reused; held for a view so no revisions made. Lancaster photos indicate the front door was not original.</p> <p>Ana Ericksen, co-owner – Reviewed the history of the house and its influence on these renovations.</p> <p>Mike Ericksen, co-owner – The second floor is not visible; the view is the neighbor's shed. Reviewed the history of the "ice cream" door.</p>			
Public	Sarah Alger , Sarah F. Alger P.C., for 20 Orange Street – Her clients are concerned because this is contributing and should pay attention to the HSAB comments.			
Concerns (8:17)	<p>Coombs – Read HSAB comments: contributing; east inset dormer visible; 2nd-floor master-study wart and glass; west elevation asymmetry speaks to the history of the house; proposed architecture will sterilize presentation to the street; south main mass windows to remain as is; volume of enclosing master study and impact on existing fabric; reuse old brick.</p> <p>Camp – She supports this design. The east elevation ganged windows should be separated and the 2-over-2s on the 3rd floor don't throw back to any existing windows; it's over fenestrated. Should document the anomaly of the "ice cream" door.</p> <p>Oliver – She likes the changes on the street. Her concern is the visibility of 2nd- & 3rd-floor windows; the 2nd-floor is visible from Wilkes Square.</p> <p>Welch – His primary concern is the front, which has the most historical significance and agrees the asymmetry presentation is important to retain.</p> <p>Coombs – East elevation, the ganged windows should be separated on the 2nd and 3rd floors and it's over fenestrated; doesn't like replacing the window with a door. Consensus is okay with the front; main concerns are the east elevation.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and to go back to HSAB. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	
23. 450 Green Park, LLC	2 Stone Alley	Revisions	42.3.1-102	Chris Skehel
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Chris Skehel – Asked this be held for a full board; McLaughlin and Dutra are missing.			
Public	<p>Sarah Alger, Sarah F. Alger P.C. – This has been going on since December 2017. Asked the HDC to deny it. It is unconscionable this has been going on so long.</p> <p>Arthur Reade, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, & Gifford LLP – Agrees.</p> <p>Linda Williams, for Virginia Andrews – The Board is in its right to deny this based upon lack of response to any concerns.</p>			
Concerns (8:48)	<p>Staff – It is up to the applicant to hold without opening. Ms. Williams is making comments when this hasn't been opened by the commission; the Board can accept the comments. Extensions have been signed; June 4th is the next deadline; this has been going on for two years now and the Commission can say this is the last extension.</p> <p>Oliver – Thinks HDC needs to address in the future how many times an applicant can extend.</p> <p>Welch – Abutters are calling for a denial with prejudice; he feels the full board should be present for that. Given the circumstances, the applicant understands what it is at risk and have an opportunity to submit revisions based upon requests. A denial needs to be written up and defensible; part of that defensibility is the vote of the full board. He does not feel we should be taken comments.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for a full board. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 3-0		Certificate #	

24. K225, LLC	65 Center Street	New dwelling	42.4.3-16	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Linda Williams – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (9:02)	<p>Camp – She’d prefer traditional sliders; as a 2-story structure it will read as a negative mass.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Camp. When you see it from the west and south, wants to know what’s in the wall behind the sliders and windows.</p> <p>Welch – Some kind of fenestration is required to be typical and balanced. He believes the west elevation on the north end should not change; this is contributing and shouldn’t be altered. He has less concern about the addition. Asked if the larger sized windows on the first floor could be left as is; the proposed are wider and that is atypical. He wants to see the drawings of what would be approved.</p> <p>Pohl – Explained traditional sliders versus modern sliders. In the drawing he saw, the sliders had three panels and were very tall. He agrees the 1st-floor windows should remain the same width, they could be taller. Consensus is to have sliders on three sides of the porch.</p> <p>Discussion about the 1st-floor windows - keeping the rough opening and maintaining the historical aspect – and the relation to the 2nd-floor windows.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and to be heard Tuesday, April 23. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	

25. Rothbard, Robert	3 Brooks Farm Road	Rev. 67898: house	41-222.7	CWA
26. Breen, Alleen	7 West Chester Street	Driveway	42.4.3-13	Mark Lombardi
27. Willse, David	1 Sunset Ridge Lane	Pergola/trellis/patio	73.4.2-83.1	Greyson Keller
28. Maraganore	41 Ocean Avenue	Expand deck	73.3.2-50	Mark Avery
29. Norris, Mark	31 Pilgrim Road	Rev. 69408: outdoor shower	41-97	Self
30. Kilmartin, John	11 New Mill Street	Addition	55.4.4-87	Topham Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (9:01)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approve Minutes	None
Review Minutes	March 28, and April 4, 2019
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of update on Vineyard Wind project. Held • Discussion and possible vote to expand Historic Structures Advisory Board map for review of applications. Held • Discussion of synthetic materials. Held
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Manufacturer’s information on Morel
2. DPW plans for Washington Street sidewalk repair

Adjourned at 9:20 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Sconset Advisory Board

Madaket Advisory Board

Sign Advisory Committee