



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, May 14, 2019

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

Called to order at 4:32 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: John Hedden, HDC Compliance Coordinator; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker
 Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Watterson, Dutra
 Absent Members: None
 Late Arrivals: Dutra, 4:36 p.m.
 Early Departures: Watterson, 7:37 p.m.; Camp, 8:08 p.m.; Coombs, 8:24 p.m.

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pohl – He'd like an official designee to go to the Road committee, either from this board or HSAB, to be the point person for that.

II. CONSENT

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Houlihan, Morash – 72415	18 Bishops Rise	Rev. 71251: windows	40-126	Val Oliver
2. Theodorakos, Vaios – 72416	2 Larrabee Lane	Roof change color	55-102.1	Yashagah, Burt
3. Dias, Allan – 72417	4 Nanina Drive	Extend driveway	67-591	Self
4. Coyle, Marcia – 72418	61 Pochick Avenue	Roof change color	79-159	T&T Roofing
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch, Dutra			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	Staff – Reviewed the roof color changes for Items 2 & 4.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	72415 to 72418	

III. SIGNS

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Town of Nantucket	2/4 Fairgrounds Rd	Informational sign	67-40/67-752	Charles Gibson
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend held.			
Concerns	No comments at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
2. Easy Street Ltd Partnership	2 Broad Street	Wall sign	42.4.2-66	Joseph Olson
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend approvable per comments.			
Concerns	No further concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per SAC comments. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72419	

3.	N.I.R. – 72420	5 Old South Wharf	Projecting sign	42.2.4-2	Will Sartorius
4.	N.I.R. – 72421	9A South Beach Street	Wall sign	42.4.2-58	Nathan Skerritt
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend both approvable as submitted.				
Concerns	No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72420 & 72421	
5.	Nant Historical Assoc	2 Union Street	Flag sign	42.3.1-186	Julie Connor

IV. OLD BUSINESS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Union Lodge	30 Main Street	Revisions to entries/chimney	42.3.1-215	McMullen & Assoc
Voting	Camp (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Watterson, Dutra				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Jeffrey Turner , Union Lodge Chaplain – Reviewed the submitted material. The chimneys are leaking and causing serious internal issues. He doesn't know what the Brothers would say about replacing some windows. A total of 7 windows were removed – 2 on the back would remain bricked up. Older Brothers remember the insignia once being on the building.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:41)	<p>Dutra – He's okay with the front. Feels the chimneys are an important part of this historic building; they are over 100 years old. The windows were removed circa 1960s, and today HDC wouldn't allow that to happen.</p> <p>Watterson – He likes the single-pane glass in the sidelights. The chimneys aren't original, and this is a commercial building; he sees no reason to hold up the work.</p> <p>Oliver – The historic packet was very informative. Agrees with Mr. Watterson about the chimneys; this building has changed many times with more egregious changes. The insignia on the side should come off.</p> <p>Welch – This is an iconic building for a variety of reasons. He would ask for a trade-off; missing are windows along Main and Union Streets; replace those in exchange for allowing the chimneys to be removed.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The chimneys should be replaced exactly as you see them. All windows should be true-divided light (TDL), single-pane windows.</p> <p>Majority thinks the replacement of the windows would be great.</p> <p>Hedden – Replacing the windows are not part of the application. The Nr. 3 windows are noted as Andersons.</p> <p>Camp – She'd like the Board to decide on what they want to see and have the revisions come back.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the addition of the previously existing windows per Exhibit A, three bays on the Main Street side and two on the Union Street side; with all doors and windows to be TDL, single pane; and keeping the square and compass shingle pattern on the Union Street side. (Watterson)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72422	
	Motion to hear the Farmhouse before the Barn. (Oliver) Carried unanimously				
2.	Long, Dean	11 Pippens Way	New dwelling/Farmhouse	43-94.2	Gryphon Architect
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	Camp				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Ethan Griffin , Gryphon Architect – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:07)	<p>Oliver – Thinks some height could come out of it but the structure probably won't be visible.</p> <p>Coombs – Southwest elevation, almost all windows are ganged; she'd like the 2nd-floor windows separated.</p> <p>Welch – No additional comments.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments.</p> <p>Pohl – Northeast elevation, there is only 1 foot between the top of the main ridge and the right-wing ridge.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the southwest-elevation, 2nd-floor, double-ganged windows separated. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72423	

3.	Long, Dean	11 Pippens Way	New dwelling/Barn	43-94.2	Gryphon Architect
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	Camp				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Ethan Griffin , Gryphon Architect – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:22)	<p>Oliver – We have two buildings that are nearly the same height; as the secondary structure this should be significantly subservient. It also has too many ganged windows; an actual barn has simple fenestration.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; it’s only 2 feet shorter than the main structure and will be visible from South Valley Road. Southeast elevation, the ganged windows should be separated. Needs more additive massing. The C & B windows aren’t the right shape; the panes should be more vertical.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees about the simpler fenestration. He’s not concerned about the height of the structure due to its distance from the main house.</p> <p>McLaughlin – There are 22 windows; 5 are casements and should be double-hung windows or fixed.</p> <p>Pohl – Noted a drafting error that would result in leaky doors.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for minor revisions. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
4.	Motta, Joseph	38 Cliff Road	Partial demo	42.4.4-43	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Joseph Motta , owner – Circa 1923; he wants to withdraw this; asked if he could lift it for a new foundation.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:30)	<p>Pohl – Mr. Motta would lift the house, put a foundation under with a cellar in the rear, and set the house back down. Asked the Commission’s view.</p> <p>Coombs – Doesn’t want it to end up towering out of the ground.</p> <p>Oliver – She’s good with that proposal. We would need a new application.</p> <p>McLaughlin – He would support the new foundation work.</p> <p>Camp – Ditto.</p>				
Motion	WITHDRAWN				
Vote	N/A		Certificate #		
5.	Bradford, Andrea	128 Main Street	Clapboard color change	42.3.3-97	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:41)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
6.	Amari-Faulkner, Francine	82 Centre Street	Remove fence	42.4.3-62	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Giovanna Lucy – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:42)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: needs the fence, which appears in Nantucket Historic Association (NHA) file photos. He’s less vehement about the fence, the existing is different than the one in the NHA photo.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees with HSAB, the fence should remain; it “protects” the house.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees; the fence should remain to define the house.</p> <p>Oliver – No concerns. Suggested it could be kept just in front of the house.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The fence should be replaced; removing it impacts the history of the building.</p> <p>Welch – Asked if this is part of a landscape plan; suggested bringing it back with the complete landscape package.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		

HDC Minutes for May 14, 2019, adopted May 28

7.	Swenson, Bob	130 Somerset Road	Fence	66-532	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Dutra				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Val Oliver – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:50)	Dutra – A 5&1 would be more traditional; but he has no concerns due to its location. Camp – No concerns. Coombs – The existing fence has diagonal lattice, which would have to be changed. She’s okay with the solid board. McLaughlin – It’s an appropriate location; no concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	72424
8.	Houlihan, Morash	18 Bishops Rise	Rev. 68900: chimney & door	40-126	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Val Oliver – Presented project; wants this held so she can get information on the gas vents.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:59)	No concerns with the door. Discussion about how to conceal the metal gas vents on the chimney.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for further information. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	
9.	Houlihan, Morash	18 Bishops Rise	Rev. 68744: eliminate fence	40-126	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Val Oliver – Presented project, autocover pool.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:07)	Staff – From the street the pool isn’t visible because it is at a higher elevation. He cited this because there was no fence, not because he could see the pool. Pohl – Asked if anyone wants to view this. Coombs – She doesn’t think the pool will be visible; natural vegetation will grow and conceal it. McLaughlin – If the pool is visible, it should be screened. Camp – She’d approve this with some vegetative screening.				
Motion	Motion to Approve with the pool not to be visible at the time of the second inspection. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	72425
10.	Brescher, John & Jessie	31 Somerset Lane	Fence	66-134.2	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Carrie Thornewill , Thornewill Design – Presented project.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:17)	Dutra – The privet should be at least four feet to start. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (McLaughlin)				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	72426

11. Halik, Robin	46 Surfside Road	Duplex garage/apartments	67-120.3	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Carrie Thornewill , Thornewill Design – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; contends this is shorter than the existing structure on the lot and The Muse next door.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:21)	<p>Camp – West elevation, the pent roof is a little large; reduce it about 1 foot in length.</p> <p>Dutra – Agrees about the pent roof; it’s a little long. Mr. Welch made some valid points.</p> <p>Coombs – West elevation, bring the 1st-floor windows in a bit and move the 2nd-floor windows out to align. For the location, this is too long at 70 feet and will be visible from all four sides; it should be reduced. It’s not in keeping with the area.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with Ms. Coombs about the length; it dwarfs the structures around it; there is no real sense of additive massing. Utilizing 8/12 pitch and the dormers doesn’t create a sense of additive massing. The “A” windows dwarf the front door. Given the scale of structures around it, this is inappropriate; this is a near maximum size for the lot. What will be visible is the 2nd-story from three sides. The overall width of this structure adjacent to other structures are his concern. The mass closer to the street should be smaller in scale to be a transition to the larger structure in the rear. This building will set a precedent for this area.</p> <p>Pohl – The use of the building is a separate issue from massing. Likes this much more than the initial submittal. Two separate structures might have to be the way to go. Having a face to Surfside Road is positive.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
12. Eighty-Six Main N.T.	86 Main Street	Gate & fencing	42.3.3-66	Brian Pfeiffer
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.			
Representing	Brian Pfeiffer – Reviewed submitted additional material; explained the limitations of swinging the gate which dictate its placement.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:47)	<p>Welch – He has no concerns with the arbor cap moldings. The concern was that the gate flush to the front arbor post would be an extension of the fence as a wall; having the gate inset 1.5 feet creates a sense of entry. It would make sense to his eye that the treatment of the fence would continue around the returns to where the gate is mounted. Our purview is only what will be visible from the public way.</p> <p>Coombs – She finds the history of fences interesting. She’s okay with the height. The gate should be inset.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Asked for clarification on the two driveway gates.</p> <p>Camp – Right now the drawing shows the driveway opening at 13 feet; Mr. Pfeiffer is indicating it won’t be that wide. This is a very long stretch of white fence at 5’7”; the 13-foot wide sliding gates need to reflect back to the gate with columns and detailing to break up the monotony of the fence.</p> <p>Pohl – If the gate is inset 1.5 feet, we need to know what we will see on the side of the arbor. The sliding gate aperture is being reduced but we don’t know what the width will be. Agrees with carrying the fence around to meet the arbor gate.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
13. Reitermann, Michael	4 Angola Street	Shed	55.4.1-22.2	Structures Ultd.
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Nancy Drazhal , Structure Unlimited – There is an existing retaining wall behind this.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:17)	<p>Oliver – She viewed this and understands the terrain issue; asked if this would back onto retaining. This is not a highly travelled area. She has no concerns.</p> <p>Coombs – No concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – If this were to be moved back, there is a lot of material that would have to come out; it could go on the other side of the house.</p> <p>Camp – It should be pushed back into the yard farther from the road.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the front face of the shed flush with the front of the house and to be shingled. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 4-0//Camp abstain		Certificate #	72427

14. Ard III, Warren and Lauren	6 Berkley Street	Rev. 67902: shed	76.1.3-43	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	McLaughlin, stepped out			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli , Botticelli & Pohl – Thought this was held for visibility of the roof.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:28)	Camp – If it is visible from the road, she doesn't support the solar panels; thinks it will be visible. The cedar roof with black panels add to her concerns. Oliver – Given the gable faces the road and the panels are on the side, this is a good application for the panels. Watterson – Okay with the shed but feels the panels will be visible.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted given the size of the shed; it's at the back of the property; it's a 1-story structure; and there will be pool screening. (Oliver) Not carried. Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	
15. Ard III, Warren and Lauren	6 Berkley Street	Pool	76.1.3-43	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli , Botticelli & Pohl – Reviewed the project and landscaping plan.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:35)	Oliver – Based on the proposed hedging, this won't be adequately screened; it needs a fence or more substantive vegetation.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
16. High Garden Holdings, LLC	40 Jefferson Avenue	New dwelling	30-119	Emeritus
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:37)	Camp – No concerns. Oliver – No comments. Welch – No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72428
17. Laundro ACK, LLC	4 Hanabea Lane	New commercial structure	69-15	Emeritus
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:41)	Oliver – Still thinks the cupola should be eliminated; it exacerbates the height of the building. Camp – No concerns. Welch – This will be a huge building; but feels the fenestration will mask that. The cupola breaks up the roof. Coombs – The roof should be as dark a grey as possible.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 3-1//Oliver opposed.		Certificate #	72429

18. 77 Pocomo, LLC	77 Pocomo Road	New dwelling	15-16	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:45)	<p>Camp – Confirmed this is comparable to existing structures. The connector is odd. The top of the chimney is a little skinny and too modern for this house design.</p> <p>Coombs – The connector gives lightness to the structure.</p> <p>Oliver – There are some anomalies in the deck but thinks it won't be visible. There shouldn't be a connector; it makes the building feel too long.</p> <p>Pohl – Suggested enclosing the chimney on the water side to hide the metal gas pipes. It would be safer not to have the pergola.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the chimney to be larger and the cap enclosed on the water side and no pergola. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72430
19. 77 Pocomo, LLC	77 Pocomo Road	New shed	15-16	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:57)	Oliver – The overhang is too much. We had asked Chip Webster to turn the roof.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes	April 16, 23, & 30, 2019: Motion to Approve. (Oliver) Carried 5-0//Welch abstain
Review Minutes	April 10, and May 7, 2019
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of mail units on Pilgrim Road. Pohl – In the past, we've put shingle enclosures around these. Kristine Glazer – There is no delivery on West Chester Street beyond Pilgrim Road or on Pilgrim Road. This grouping of boxes apparently services the rest of West Chester Street, Pilgrim Road, and Priscilla Lane. Believes someone complained to the Post Office and the new post mistress erected these structures not knowing they had to be approved by the HDC. She doesn't know who these boxes belong to. This is an inappropriate structure for the environment. Coombs – These boxes are not required by the USPS. They tried to put these on Hulbert Avenue and Easton Street years ago, but the main Post Office said mailboxes could not be changed without the residents' permission. The Post Mistress knows she should have come to us. Explained why postal delivery here is sometimes very difficult. Welch – His experience with the Post Office is different than Ms. Coombs; they required we purchase these to their spec or they would provide them at cost because they have a particular locking mechanism. It might be whomever these are for were required to purchase them. An inquiry should be made to the Post Mistress about who the owners are; it could be someone installed them without approval. These are 12 boxes; presumably they belong to 12 people. Pohl – We need to send a letter to the Post Mistress asking about why these were put in. Motion to Send a letter to the Post Mistress for a history of why the boxes were put in and the HDC not informed. (Coombs) Carried unanimously • Discussion of update on Vineyard Wind project. Welch – Asked if there were any questions. There are 826,000 square acres overall set aside for the wind farms. • Discussion of synthetic materials. Oliver – Asked to put this at the beginning of the next meeting for a discussion with the full board. We need to have a policy. Island Lumber, which don't sell synthetic materials, is losing business to those vendors who do. Pohl – If you can't tell when it's painted that it's synthetic, the real issue is how it will look after long-term wear. There are examples where synthetic materials were approved and used, Shepley for one. Welch – This is pressing for a variety of reasons and is hard to address; perhaps starting the discussion is overdue. He doesn't think the issue can be resolved in one sitting. If we are going to review these, we need to index synthetic materials available through local vendors and then get samples of each. Dutra – Suggested someone go to the vendors and get samples of the various materials to look at it.

	<p>Hedden – Lifespan is a pine and Bodyguard is an Australian wood; they are treated wood. Azac is PVC. The others are composites.</p> <p>Pohl – Get samples to include cedar then prime & paint them all the same color for members to review.</p> <p>Welch – There are other synthetics that are not trim: shingles and clapboards. He suggests we make determinations on trim-type woods and deal with the rest as they come up. It is incumbent upon the applicant to list the material to be used on the application; if they want something other than cedar, they need to provide us a sample. In his mind, this doesn't require a policy like roof shingles because you have to have a roof. No synthetic material can be used unless the HDC approves it for that application.</p> <p>Pohl – Noted that the use of fiberglass on the First Congregational Church is obvious; it is shinier than the wood.</p> <p>Oliver – This is a line that isn't clear, even to us. Suggested a presentation by HDC for the Builders Association.</p>
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Photo of postal box bank on Pilgrim Road

Adjourned at 8:38 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Sign Advisory Committee