



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 26, 2020

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

Called to order at 4:33 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: Watterson, 6:32 p.m.; Dutra, 6:56 p.m.; McLaughlin, 8:41 p.m.; Camp, 8:52 p.m.

Motion to Approve Agenda, (Oliver)

Carried 5-0//Coombs-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Oliver-aye; Camp-aye; Pohl-aye.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pohl – There are issues at 81 Vestal Street, which backs onto Duke Street. He wants the grading and retainage for 81 Vestal Street placed on next week's agenda.

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Ronald Weinberg 05-0986	4 Quaise Pastures Lane	Renew COA 66481	26-29	Julie Jordin
2. Frank Ryan 05-0977	8 Kings Way	Shed	41-277	Joe Olson
3. Janet Ryder 05-0992	11 Surfside Road	Window changes	55-258	NAG
4. Lindsay Torpey-Cross 05-0984	7 Green Lane	Roof change	42.3.3-86	Nate Barber
5. Norval Ferguson 05-0994	2 Corby Way	Rev. 72047: side entry	67-2	Ethan McMorrow
6. 17 Hinckley NT 05-0995	17 Hinckley Lane	Window/door changes	30-105	Val Oliver
7. Thomas Middleton 05-0987	28 Nonantum Avenue	Roof change - MH	87-21.1	Trevor Smith
8. Thomas Middleton 05-0985	28 Nonantum Avenue	Roof change - Cottage	87-21.1	Trevor Smith
9. Ruth Anne Neville 05-1004	128 ½ Somerset Road	Egress window	66-533	Jason Libby
10. 2 Teasdale, LLC 05-0982	2 Teasdale Circle	Rev. 52260: door/windows	69-77	Emeritus
11. 3 Pleasant St NT 05-0983	3 Pleasant Street	Front step-fence	42.3.3-157	Linda Williams

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Watterson

Alternates Welch, Dutra

Recused Oliver

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns No concerns.

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

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Coombs-aye; Camp-aye; Watterson-aye; McLaughlin-aye;
Pohl-aye

Certificate # **HDC2020-05-(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. Catherine Wailey 05-0980	72 Pocomo Road	Raised platform/pergola	15-37	Tom Hanlon
• Due to lack of visibility				
2. Matt Cassano 05-0993	62 Orange Street	Fence/outdoor shwr	55.4.1-135.1	Ethan McMorrow
• Outdoor shower must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity				
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No additional concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs-aye; Camp-aye; Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye		Certificate #	HDC2020-05-(as noted)
	Pohl-aye			

IV. SIGNS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Toopag RE Trust 05-1021	44 Centre Street	Projecting sign	42.3.1-63.1	Jean Petty
2. N.I.R. 05-1020	9B South Beach Street	Wall sign	42.4.2-58	Jean Petty
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:43)	Flynn – Chris Young reviewed these and said both are approvable with a border around each.			
Motion	Motion to Approve Items 1 & 2 through staff per staff comments. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs-aye; Camp-aye; Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye;		Certificate #	HDC2020-05-(as noted)
	Pohl-aye			

V. OLD BUSINESS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Richard Holt 05-0891	121 Madaket Road	Rev. 72983: roofwalk/wind	40-60.1	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	Welch, Dutra			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law P.C.			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:45)	Botticelli – This was a view and she submitted some alternative plans; reviewed the four options. The structure is 25'8" and the grade was lowered 1 foot. Reviewed other revisions. Likes Mr. Watterson's suggestion. Cohen – Feels the view should have helped the Commission understand the roof walk adds to the horizontal nature of the structure rather than its verticality. From Madaket Road, you can't see this building; it is 150 feet from the road and is tucked in. We're willing to eliminate the chimneys if the Commission feels they are too busy on the roof. This is no larger than other homes in the area. He has not heard an explanation why this roof walk is architecturally inappropriate on this structure. Camp – She disagrees with every point Mr. Cohen made; from Cliff Road it looks very raw and doesn't believe the roof walk gives a horizontal feel but will make the situation worse. This is viewable from Madaket Road. The structure is already out of proportion so doesn't support the roof walk. Looking up from Cliff Road, this is very imposing. North elevation, she doesn't want the basement to be visible; also, there's too much railing. Oliver – Agrees with Ms. Camp; the structure is already an anomaly. This is very complicated and the structures around it are low and nestled in. There is a lot of railing, but since it's grey, it will blend in. Watterson – He asked for the view. While he thinks it is perched high and set back from the road and is visible, he feels the matched roof and skirting down-plays the roof walk. As long as the skirting is cedar shingles to match the roof, that will mitigate the view. No concerns with the other changes. Welch – He's not currently sitting but feels Mr. Watterson's suggestion breaks up the sense of a monolithic massing from left to right; by making some aspect of the roof walk visible helps defray sense of height; as such, roof walk might be helpful.			

McLaughlin – This structure for the area is the second largest and doesn't fit the area. The roof walk will stand out and is not appropriate on this style roof.

Coombs – She viewed this and looked at an old application showing the topography; this is on the highest point of the property and is huge compared to others in the area. The roof walk will add more height to it. The buildings in this area of Madaket Road and Cliff Road are small and low. She can't support the roof walk.

Discussion about the dimensions of the structure.

Motion Motion to Approve through staff without the roof walk. (McLaughlin) did not pass

Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver-aye; Camp-aye; Watterson-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Certificate #
Coombs-aye

2. Seaver Fam Trust	05-0937	51 Ocean Avenue	Beach Stairs	73.3.2-53	Botticelli & Pohl
---------------------	---------	-----------------	--------------	-----------	-------------------

Voting Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates Watterson

Recused Pohl

Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl

Public None

Concerns (5:24) **Botticelli** – This was held for a view; given the vegetation, contends the platform is not visible from a public way. From her description, she believes Ms. Camp was not viewing the correct set of beach stairs.

Camp – There are a lot of black pines; making the platform larger will take away natural vegetation; wants the platform to remain the size it is now. She viewed this from Ocean Avenue, and it is visible from the road.

Oliver – She walked the area and feels this will not be visible.

Welch – Asked that any images submitted for an application be dragged into the PDF; not doing that makes it very difficult for the Staff to handle during the meeting. Agrees with various comments; suggested the landing be located slightly farther down the hill, maybe 6 steps or another section of stairs, to be less visible from the street and be smaller, perhaps 10X15 noting that where it is proposed some current vegetation will be removed increasing visibility whereas moving it down the hill and making it smaller might help.

McLaughlin – From Maury Lane to the bridge, there are 3 sets of stairs that have been there for years. This should be a standard beach stair, natural to weather.

Coombs – Would prefer the new deck to be a little smaller; it's proposed at 10X20. Likes Mr. Welch's idea.

Motion **Motion to Hold for more information. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Camp-aye; Oliver-aye; Welch-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Certificate #
Coombs-aye

3. Chip Webster	05-0943	11 South Shore Road	Dr/wind chgs/small solar	67-468.1	Self
-----------------	---------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	------

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Welch, Watterson

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates

Public None

Concerns (5:49) **Webster** – This was held for a view concerning visibility of the stove pipe and panels; provided a photo of the panels; reviewed context photos. Visibility of this roofline from Wherowhero would be seasonal.

Oliver – She walked the area; the vegetative buffer in place, she no longer has concerns.

Camp – She has no concerns.

McLaughlin – This is not in the old historic district; he has no concerns. Asked if the status of the pipes Mr. Webster cited as examples were approved or not – unknown.

Coombs – No concerns. Wherowhero is wild enough to carry this. Asked that any steel chimneys be considered on an individual basis, not because others have them.

Pohl – This property has an easement buffer that must be maintained.

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

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Camp-aye; Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Coombs-aye; Certificate # **HDC2020-05-0943**
Pohl-aye

4.	Richmond Great Pt 05-0909	63 Old South Road	Kitchen hood fan	68-157.2	Mayra Escobar
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Mayra Escobar, Richmond Great Point Properties				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:26)	<p>Escobar – Reviewed changes made and additional information.</p> <p>Camp – This is fine; this seems proportionally correct for this building.</p> <p>Coombs – Confirmed that the fan would develop a patina over time. No concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – No concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments.</p> <p>Pohl – No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp-aye; Coombs-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Oliver-aye; Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-05-0909
5.	Jonathan Klatt 03-0821	7A Hussey Farm Road	Retaining wall - pargetted	56-94.3	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:04)	<p>Williams – The rear wall and concrete apron were approved in 2017; that approval required berming along the side of the driveway. The retaining walls and fence appeared because of the 30” berm. Some of the concrete walls near the road were removed. We can cut off 8.5 feet of the fence on the north side and 6 feet of the fence on the south side. The wall hasn’t been pargetted yet. Could run a split rail across the front of the property to the wall; feels picket would be too formal.</p> <p>Camp – Now that a lot of the cement is gone and the fence is being pulled back, a couple of bushes at the street end would soften it; landscaping could do a lot for this without huge cost. Railroad ties might soften the rear wall.</p> <p>Oliver – Would like to see an updated photo showing the pieces of wall gone. She thinks vine plants above the rear wall, which would trail down, would mitigate the wall.</p> <p>Coombs – Asked why the fence is necessary along the sloping wall – code requires fences for drop-offs over 30”. Noted that after 9 months, the fence hasn’t greyed in at all; wants to know why. Suggested painting the pargetted wall dark green or grey.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Agrees that screening might help cover the cement walls.</p> <p>Pohl – We will approve removal of two lengths of front fence and plants at the leading edges of the wall and some plant to trail down over the rear pargetted wall.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the parget to be dark grey; vine plants on the rear wall; plants at the end of the small cement walls on the street end; and removal of the last section of fence on the north and south sides. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Coombs-aye; Camp-aye; Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-30-0821

VI. NEW BUSINESS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Whitney Matthews 05-0968	43 Union Street	Rev. 70375: reduce size	43.3.2-29	Ethan McMorrow
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	Coombs				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt Matthews, owner Ethan McMorrow				
Public	Diane Coombs, 44 Union Street				
Concerns (6:32)	<p>Matthews – Presented project.</p> <p>McMorrow – The structure is on piers to protect the Town tree.</p> <p>Backus – Subdividing the lot resulted in this smaller lot; appreciates that the elms were accommodated.</p> <p>Coombs (speaking as an abutter) – The existing elm is a Town tree and must be saved. There is one window on the south elevation; that elevation should have another window. North elevation, the 2nd-floor windows are very small.</p> <p>Camp – East elevation, the 2nd-floor windows should move apart. Suggested no shutters on the 2nd-floor north elevation windows.</p> <p>Oliver – Agrees with Ms. Camp about no shutters on the north elevation 2nd floor. On the south, the 2nd-floor should have two windows of the same size as the first floor. North elevation, suggested lattice with roses to mitigate the blank wall.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Nothing to add.</p> <p>Welch – This is generally appropriate and likes the reduction in scale; it’s tall. The north elevation shutters aren’t an issue due to the tree somewhat blocking the visibility. Agrees with Ms. Oliver about the south elevation and suggested adding shutters. All that is subject to the elm tree remaining in place.</p> <p>Pohl – Agrees. East elevation, it’s okay for the door to be out of alignment but would prefer the 1st-floor window move in rather than moving the 2nd-floor windows.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for minor revisions. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Welch-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Camp-aye; Oliver-aye; Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
2.	Daniel Lawson 05-0966	11 Sesapana Road	Front deck/entrance	68-26	Ethan McMorrow
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Ethan McMorrow				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:51)	<p>McMorrow – Presented project.</p> <p>Camp – No concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments.</p> <p>Oliver – Suggested a pergola over the deck to tie into the section of remaining roof.</p> <p>Coombs – No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs-aye; Camp-aye; Oliver-ay; McLaughlin-aye; Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-05-0966

3.	33 Coffin St, LLC	33 Coffin Street	Decks/add balcony	73.4.1-26.1	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Camp – Stepped out				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:56)	<p>Webster – Presented project; no change to the existing footprint.</p> <p>Backus – Circa 1994; concerned with the amount of fenestration on the west elevation.</p> <p>Welch – Asked if there is a sheet showing what is being removed and what is staying. The proposed site plan has some landscaping, but it is difficult to discern what is existing mass and proposed additive mass. He'd like to see the floor-plan marked up to show existing and proposed, to facilitate imagining this in 3D. He's a little concerned about the south elevation porch depth relative to the chimney and house; same on the north. Concerned about the balance of fenestration regarding visibility. South elevation, asked if the part of the gable above the three 2nd-floor windows will be proud of the rest of the gable; would like a perspective shot of this elevation. There needs to be more discussion about the relation of windows to doors; they seem disjointed and proportions are incongruent.</p> <p>Oliver – Likes a lot of the changes. She wants to see the cantilevered gable peak. The porches are very deep indicating a shallow-pitched roof. The north 2nd-floor additions will make the ridge line over 50 feet; should try to keep the ends as they are now to provide additive massing. All the 2nd-floor windows are casement or awnings; should work to get more double-hung windows and make them less horizontal.</p> <p>McLaughlin – You can't read anything on the plans; the print should be larger. North elevation, there should be one skylight per roof plain.</p> <p>Coombs – North elevation, agrees about the skylights; there are six sets of French doors and thinks that is not in keeping with that street corner; 2nd-floor gable has 4 ganged windows, which should be broken up. East elevation corner is very visible. Not sure about the 2-over-2 windows.</p> <p>Pohl – Agrees with what's been said. The porches are very deep and face Burnell with a very shallow roof pitch. Right now, the lot is wooded, and they seem to want more developed landscaping.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Welch-aye; Coombs-aye; Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
4.	Michelle Black 05-0953	28 Eel Point Road	Sports Court	40-49	Ahern LLC
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Camp – still out				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:17)	<p>Ahern – Presented project.</p> <p>Welch – Asked if the grade change was previously approved or if those are part of this application – grading for the court is part of this application. The biggest imperative related to grading as shown is that it should be fully legible on the plans, so we can offer more adequate review. His understanding, when we viewed this for the main structure, was that there would be substantial natural landscape in front of the house to screen it; he's not seeing any of that on this plan. He'd like to see a site plan with more landscaping information along with the site plans approved for the main structure.</p> <p>Coombs – There are some apparently superfluous lines on the plan – 50-foot wetlands buffer. No concerns as long as the vegetation is as thick as proposed. Asked about the topographical elevations – court 32, house 43 and road 26.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Nothing to add.</p> <p>Oliver – She struggles with on-the-hill things.</p> <p>Pohl – It's cut into the side of the hill, working with grade, and heavily planted. He has no concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for additional information on landscape/hardscape materials in front of the home and approved site plan for the house application. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Welch-aye; Coombs-aye; Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

5.	Frank Ryan	05-0989	8 Kings Way	Pool	41-277	Ahern, LLC
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch					
Alternates	None					
Recused	Oliver – stepped out					
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.					
Representing	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC					
Public	None					
Concerns (7:34)	<p>Ahern – Presented project.</p> <p>Camp – She’d like to view this; she’s not sure where it is and if the pool will be visible.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees a view would be helpful.</p> <p>Welch – He’d support a view. If the green granite is visible, it’s a little too formal.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The horizontal-rail fence is atypical for this area.</p> <p>Pohl – Thinks the retaining wall will be visible from John Paul Road.</p>					
Motion	Motion to View. (Camp)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//McLaughlin-aye; Welch-aye; Camp-aye; Coombs-aye;				Certificate #	
	Pohl-aye					
6.	Frank Ryan	05-0975	8 Kings Way	Screened in Porch, spa, steps	41-277	Joe Olson
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver					
Alternates	Welch					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.					
Representing	Joe Olson					
Public	None					
Concerns (7:47)	<p>Olson – Presented project; existing privet screens the whole area.</p> <p>No concerns due to screening.</p>					
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp-aye; Oliver-aye; Coombs-aye; McLaughlin-aye;				Certificate #	HDC2020-05-0975
	Pohl-aye					
7.	Mark Dowley	05-0976	31 North Pasture Lane	Solar on pergola	49-78	ACK Smart
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver					
Alternates	Welch					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer’s spec sheet.					
Representing	Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart					
Public	None					
Concerns (7:47)	<p>Glidden – Presented project; similarly done as to the Scallop Shed.</p> <p>Camp – She supports this; the pergola is on the interior side of the property with a very shallow pitch.</p> <p>Coombs – No concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – No concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Feels this will be visible from Town-owned property to the south.</p> <p>Pohl – He supports this.</p>					
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs-aye; Oliver-aye; Camp-aye; McLaughlin-aye;				Certificate #	HDC2020-05-0976
	Pohl-aye					
8.	Eric Rosenfeld	05-0974	57 Quidnet Road	Roof top solar	21-89	ACK Smart
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver					
Alternates	Welch					
Recused	None					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer’s spec sheet.					
Representing	Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart					
Public	None					
Concerns (8:03)	<p>Glidden – Presented project; black on wood; the road east of the structure is a driveway, not a public way.</p> <p>Oliver – This wasn’t on the view list; she would like to view this. Suggested doing a pergola “thing” on the east elevation.</p> <p>Camp – Wants to view this as well.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Maybe we should view this.</p> <p>Coombs – Wants to view as well.</p>					
Motion	Motion to View. (Camp)					
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp-aye; Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Coombs-aye;				Certificate #	
	Pohl-aye					

9. Noreen Salvitz **05-0972** 34 Meadow View Drive Roof top solar 56-136 ACK Smart
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates Welch
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer’s spec sheet.
 Representing Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart
 Public None
 Concerns (8:10) **Glidden** – Presented project; will reroof in black to match the 24 panels
Camp – If it were on the back she’d have no concerns.
Oliver – Agrees, plus this is a 2-story structure.
Coombs – This is visible from every corner.
McLaughlin – It’s fine.
Pohl – Agrees with Ms. Camp and Ms. Oliver; wishes there was more vegetation and the panels fit exactly.
 Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Coombs-aye; Camp-aye; Certificate #
 Pohl-aye

10. Richard Travaglione **05-0971** 27 Tomahawk Road Roof top solar 69-321 ACK Smart
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates Welch
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer’s spec sheet.
 Representing Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart
 Public None
 Concerns (8:16) **Glidden** – Presented project.
Oliver – Suggested moving it all the way to the back, away from Tomahawk.
Camp – Suggested more panels.
McLaughlin – No concerns.
 Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with the panels moved to the east away from the road. (McLaughlin)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver-aye; Camp-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Coombs-aye; Certificate # **HDC2020-05-0971**
 Pohl-aye

11. Michael Young Tr **05-0990** 220 Eel Point Road Hardscape 38-36 Julie Jordin
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates Welch
 Recused None
 Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Julie Jordin, Garden Design Co.
 Public None
 Concerns (8:19) **Jordin** – Presented project; elevation at the road is 18, at the house is about 21; she forgot photos.
Pohl – We should view but we also need photos; asked for a cross section east to west for the front terrace and wall.
Oliver – Based on the distance from the road, she has no concerns.
Camp – No real concerns with the proposal but would also like to view.
Coombs – No problems but could agree to more information.
McLaughlin – No comments.
 Motion **Motion to View and hold for additional information. (Camp)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Coombs-aye; Camp-aye; Certificate #
 Pohl-aye

12. Nantucket Island Land Bank 7 Nobadeer Farm Road New field house 69-1 Mark Voigt
 Voting Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch
 Alternates None
 Recused Pohl
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Mark Voigt, Department of Public Works, Facilities Manager
 Public None
 Concerns (8:27) **Voigt** – Presented project; the Town maintains and improves the property. This could potentially be a spot for solar so was designed to accommodate that.
Oliver – This design is nice; it looks like a barn. She supports this. Would prefer grey for the standing seam roof. Likes the doors as they are.
Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; the height is 20’7”. It will be a nice addition to the field. Given the overall size of the doors, the batten shapes on the outside break up the wall planes on the northwest and northeast; he’d prefer to see them as they are. All doors should be the same color.
McLaughlin – The crossbucks should be on the inside.
Camp – It’s great. If they want solar, the roof should be dark. No concerns with the doors as is.
 Motion Motion to Approve through staff with the battens to be on the interior and the roof to be gun-metal grey. (McLaughlin)
 Motion to Amend the motion to approve as submitted with gun-metal grey roof. (Welch) (carried unanimously by roll-call vote)
Motion to Approve through staff with the roof to be gun-metal grey. (McLaughlin)
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Camp-aye; Welch-aye; Oliver-aye; McLaughlin-aye; Certificate # **HDC2020-05-1005**
 Pohl-aye

VII. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approve Minutes	May 11, 2020: Motion to Hold. (Welch)
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs-aye; Camp-aye; Oliver-aye; Welch-aye; Pohl-aye
Review Minutes	May 19, 2020
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next HDC Meeting Monday June 01, 2020 at 4:30pm Staff Update on 41 81Ls recently endorsed <p>Backus – She will provide information to HDC on upcoming 41 81L subdivisions going to the Planning Board. Pohl – This would give the HDC a chance to opine on a subdivision; however, from what he understands, if there are two buildings which predate 1985, you have a matter of right to subdivide the property as long as the lots meet certain rules. Our rights as the HDC, to review the external architectural features, are not infringed upon. Coombs – These subdivisions often result in undersized lots upon which an inappropriate structure is being proposed. Welch – 41 81 doesn’t change the HDC review process for a structure on the new lot. Backus – 43 Union Street was a 41 81L subdivision. The purview of the Planning Board is that the burden of proof is on the owner to prove that there were two structures on the lot. There is the Preservation Restriction; there are a few placed lots with more than one structure prior to 1985. She hopes to find more stewards of those types of historic properties who will ask for Preservation Restrictions to protect the site.</p>
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

- None

Motion to Adjourn at 9:00 p.m. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Coombs-aye; Welch-aye; Oliver-aye; Pohl-aye

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Sconset Advisory Board

Madaket Advisory Board

Sign Advisory Committee