



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 28, 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, Oliver, Welch, Watterson
 Absent Members: Camp, Dutra
 Late Arrivals: None
 Early Departures: Watterson, 6:25 p.m.; Coombs, 7:04 p.m.

Agenda adopted as amended by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. CONSENT

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Housing Nantucket – 72483	18 Ticcoma Way	Patio	67-708	Mark Avery
2. Bossi, David -72484	66 Milk Street	Rev. 71334, door, winds	56-9	Ross Goodwin
3. Betsy Dangel Tr. – 72485	3 North Swift Road	Window chng to SDL	40-2.1	Brook Meerbergen
4. Sally A. Cohen Etal – 72486	18 Long Pond	Deck revisions	59-20	Linda Williams
5. Sea & Sky, LLC – 72487	120 Tom Nevers Road	1 st floor deck	91-40	Mark Avery
6. Strazzula, Kathleen – 72488	11 Yompasham Lane	Fence	55-532	Val Oliver Design
7. Cliff Ack Realty Trust - 72489	96 Cliff Road	Rev. 72249, window chng	41-15	Ethan McMorro
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Welch, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No concerns			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	72483 to 72489	

III. SIGNS

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Robert Graham – 72490	5F South Water Street	Flag sign	42.3.1-270	Naomi Holland
2. Robert Graham – Held	5F South Water Street	Flag sign	42.3.1-270	Naomi Holland
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, 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 approval of Item 1 with conditions and hold Item 2.			
Concerns	No additional concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve Item 1 through staff per SAC comments. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72490	
Motion	Motion to Hold Item 2. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

3. Eternal Beauty	33 Main Street	Sign	42.3.1+211	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, 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 approvable as submitted.			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72491	
4. Blue Flag Development	29 Centre Street	Wall sign	42.3.1-122.2	Katharine Requa
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, 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 approvable per SAC comments.			
Concerns	No additional concerns			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per SAC comments. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72492	

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. Crowley, James	8 Wall Street	New dwelling	82-79	V-B Architect
Voting	Pohl, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Paulo Vicente , Vicente-Burin Architect – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:38)	Oliver – Our biggest concern was the bay window; she has no concerns. Watterson – No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Watterson)			
Vote	Carried 3-0	Certificate #	72493	
2. Halik, Robin	46 Surfside Road	Duplex garage/apt	67-120.3	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	Carrie Thornewill , Thornewill Design – She has 3 out 5 members here; asked this be held without opening.			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:42)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold without opening at applicant's request for a full board. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 3-0	Certificate #		
3. North Head Trust LLC	Tuckernuck	Roof solar on shed	96-2.4	John Phinney
4. Taylor, John Etal Tr	Tuckernuck	Roof solar on shed	96-2.2	John Phinney
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Watterson			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:45)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold Items 4 & 5 for representation. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		

5.	Fraker Linda	12 Mount Vernon Street	Addition	55.4.-35	Permits Plus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Mark Poor , Permits Plus – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:46)	(4:37) Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver) Carried unanimously Motion to open. (Oliver) Carried unanimously Coombs – This is much better. Asked that the south elevation “C” windows on the 1 st -floor be separated one foot. Welch – Changes are appropriate. It would be a benefit to have the left and right walls fully to the front. McLaughlin – There is no description for the “A” windows.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the south elevation “C” windows on the 1st-floor to be separated one foot. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72494	
6.	Walters, Charles	50 Orange Street	Fence	42.3.2-35	Katie Hemingway
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Watterson				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:52)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried unanimously		Certificate #		
7.	1620 Capital, LLC	25 Broadway	Hardscaping plan	73.1.3-108	NAG
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	Milena Ieava , Nantucket Architectural Group – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:53)	Pohl – Noted that the small brick terrace sticks up about 2 inches. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72495	

8. Quarter Mile Hill, LLC	1 Quarter Mile Hill	Addition	42.3.4-38	CWA
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Chip Webster , Chip Webster Associates – Reviewed the historic documentation; a structure is shown on the 1909 Sanborne map that isn't this building; there was a structure, which might have been a school, on the site that was older and removed.			
Public	None			
Concerns (4:55)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: north elevation, consider traditional, simple additive massing; east elevation visibility from Gardner; 2nd-floor deck and 2¾/12 pitch dormer integrated with roof walk inappropriate; west elevation secondary lower gable competes with front door, balcony over front door and 2nd-floor deck makes it too busy, French doors not appropriate; still no history of structure; 6/1 inconsistent with existing. The approximate date is 1910 to 1923.</p> <p>Welch – The Massachusetts Cultural Resources survey shows a property with no address that shows the footprint for a small structure in the front southwest and a larger structure; this map is an excerpt with no date; but it does reference 1898, 1904, 1923, and 1949 Sanborne maps. He would prefer that we get a copy of the Sanborne maps of the lot, so we can make a determination. If we find a similar footprint, it is incumbent upon Mr. Webster to define the difference between the two; he doesn't question what the family says but doesn't have enough information to tell what is what. Agrees about the roof walk apron and the 2nd-floor west elevation deck. Would like to see a written testimonial on the history from the owner.</p> <p>Oliver – You can see through the hedges from Lowell Place; the west elevation of the roof walk should be open, and the 2nd-floor deck and the French doors and porch give it very contemporary feel. South elevation, the roof walk on the 1-story addition is too much of an anomaly and might be visible.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments; he will abstain.</p> <p>Pohl – Agrees with Ms. Oliver about the west elevation: deck over the front door, French doors over the front door, and wrap-around porch; okay with the roof walk. The secondary roof walk is not appropriate.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and to go back to HSAB with historic documentation. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 3-0//McLaughlin abstain		Certificate #	
9. Houlihan Morash, LLC	18 Bishops Rise	Chimney mods	40-126	Val Oliver Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Welch, Watterson			
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 (5:14)	<p>McLaughlin – Anything shiny like that should be painted black.</p> <p>Watterson – No concerns.</p> <p>Coombs – Doesn't think it will be visible and won't be shiny long.</p> <p>Staff – Talked to the distributor about that cap; they are now aware of using caps or reducing the height of such pipes.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72496
10. Garian, Jennifer	36 Pocomo Road	Addition/windows	14-79	Concept Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	T.J. Watterson , Concept Design – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:19)	<p>Oliver – The changes are appropriate.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees.</p> <p>Welch – The 15-light didn't come through on the door schedule for the double French door.</p> <p>McLaughlin -</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (McLaughlin)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72497

11. Famiglio, Mark	2 Harbor View Way	Driveway/Belgium block	42.4.1-31	Julie Jordin
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:23)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried unanimously		Certificate #	
12. Walker, John	112 Wauwinet Road	Renovation/addition	11-20	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and information packet.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	Linda Williams , for 110 Wauwinet Road – Reviewed information packet, submitted at the table, comparing the existing dimensions to the proposed and versus the vernacular of structures in the area. Read comments from the November meeting minutes; she has the same concerns with this submittal as she had with the November design. The west elevation exceeds the 50% fenestration rule and every window is ganged. Whitney Gifford , Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, & Gifford LLP – Reiterated his points regarding the definition of a renovation versus what is happening here. Would like to see more of the original house incorporated into this design. This is closer to the harbor than any other structure; tripling the massing and doubling the height will have even more of an impact on the harbor viewshed. Reminded the commission that another structure is proposed for this property; asked the commission to keep that in mind as they review this structure.			
Concerns (5:24)	Oliver – She viewed this; she did not get down onto the beach. Looking at the photos of other houses makes her feel better about this overall massing. If the design is appropriate, the increase in footprint isn't an HDC purview. Appreciates removal of the transoms. The east and west elevations are appropriate for the area. The north and south elevations are still a struggle; the massing is falling short. Welch – Thanked applicant and opposition for the work brought forth. Ms. Williams made some valid points about the footprint, so did a little research' on an average, the applicant's request is less than 106, 110 and 100R [Wauwinet Road], those are further towards the water than the applicant's proposed structure; he doesn't have a read on the 2 nd -floor square footage so cannot compare that. His primary concern is the relation of the north-south to the east-west elevations; it is almost two different structures. Some of that is mitigated by limitations of visibility as supplemented with native plants; however, he is not suggesting HDC makes its decision based on landscape material. Appreciates the changes on the east elevation. Looking at the north elevation, it is a one-block façade while the south has a sense of additive massing. Pointed out additional concern about the north elevation and as it translates to the west elevation; another concern is the massing of the primary structure on the north, which is elongated; that elongation carries to the west at the gable addition, on the left side of that elevation, through an atypical roof transition; suggested a way to differentiate and add a sense of more appropriate mass including by transitioning the height of the right side of the north elevation. McLaughlin – The height and length fit into the area. Thinks this is ready to fly. Pohl – Agrees this looks like two different buildings; the east and west elevations are charming, but the north and south aren't working in its favor. The whole notion of saving the existing house and considering this as an addition is disingenuous; we are talking about the 25- to 50-foot no disturb buffers. Suggested giving up and moving this out of the 50-foot buffer and keeping the existing structure as a guest house or garage. About the exterior chimney, he would support making that gable wider and annexing the chimney into the building.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72498

13. Black, Michelle	28 Eel Point Road	Rev. 721363: windows	40-44	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, 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; transoms are remaining in the kitchen.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:56)	<p>Oliver – Her only concern is the east elevation transoms; the east elevation is the most visible and the transoms should be eliminated.</p> <p>Welch – Appreciates the changes. Agrees with Ms. Oliver.</p> <p>McLaughlin – There are multiple awning “G” windows; those should be 3-over-3 double-hung windows.</p> <p>Pohl – There is plenty of room for the “G” windows to be double hung; and agrees about removing the east elevation transoms.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with on the east elevation, the transoms eliminated and the “G” windows to be 3-over-3 double-hung. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72498
14. Kamadif, LLC	32 Dukes Road	Rev. 71605: dormer	56-188	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, 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; agrees the porch is long and presented some alternatives.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:02)	<p>Oliver – The extension of the porch makes it look like a car port, but it might not be visible; preferred the last iteration.</p> <p>Welch – South elevation, the changes to the left dormer addressed concerns of the view from the west. The covered porch is long, but it isn’t visible so isn’t an issue. Glad to see the transoms removed.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No additional comments.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff subject to changes shown on Exhibit A. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72499
15. Center St. ACKquiston	29 Centre Street	Alterations/addition	42.3.1-122.2	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Watterson			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; color pallet is all white.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:10)	<p>Pohl – Read HSAB comments: north not visible; east fire escape removal is an improvement; west elevation porch glass too vertical, six-light option and/or drop headcasing to align with pilasters; chimney demo not visible. If you drop the headcasing, the windows will be less vertical.</p> <p>Discussion about ways to adjust the west elevation head casings.</p> <p>Oliver – Her only concern was the arrangement with the windows; it is almost there.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; need to pay attention to north and south elevation when you change the window details.</p> <p>McLaughlin – North elevation, asked how to reach the 3rd floor.</p> <p>Pohl – Agrees about fixing the headcasing would work.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	

16. Hanabea Six, LLC	6 Hanabea Lane	Revisions; color change	69-255	JB Studio
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Watterson			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Sergey Chumac , JB Studio – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; zoning allows 40 feet in height. John Sullivan , owner – Trim is natural to weather.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:18)	Oliver – The changes are great. Coombs – Appreciates the changes. Watterson – The shed dormers could be reduced in width; suggested bringing the cheek walls in about 1 foot to increase the distance between them. Thinks it is still a little tall.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the west elevation shed dormers to be narrowed one foot pushing the inside cheek walls toward the gable ends. (Watterson)			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	72500	
17. Lhota, Joseph	6 South Miacomet Avenue	Guest house	82-356	BPC
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Joe Paul , BPC – Presented project; technically this is a dwelling but will be used as gym and office space.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:26)	Oliver – That it doesn't have a front door and the north elevation facing the road are confusing. Appreciates the change to the balustrade. South elevation exceeds the 50% fenestration rule. Coombs – All the windows are ganged; would like the east gable windows to be separated. Welch – Asked about the fenestration on the main house: mulled or not. No additional comments. He has no concerns there is no front door; this doesn't address the street or parking area; it is basically a pool house/gym accessible only from the yard. South elevation, changing the 2 nd -floor fenestration will help.			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the east elevation 2nd-floor window separated; and the south elevation to become a pair of French doors and windows. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	72501	
18. Ard, Warren	6 Berkley Street	Pool	76.1.3.-43	Botticelli & Pohl
19. Ard, Warren	6 Berkley Street	Rev. 67902: shed	76.1.3.-43	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:43)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #		

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes	May 14, 2019: Motion to Approve. (Coombs) 4-0//Welch abstain
Review Minutes	April 10, and May 21, 2019
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of update on Vineyard Wind project. • Discussion of synthetic materials: Oliver – We are waiting for samples and for the Building Association to put together a presentation for HDC. • Review and possible vote on upcoming HDC schedule: Staff – The big point is HDC doesn't normally meet the week of July 4th or Labor Day. Oliver – She will look at the schedule for a date for an organizational meeting. • Discussion and possible vote on an HDC representative for the Nantucket Sidewalk Work Group: Coombs – Volunteered to be the representative. Welch – There was discussion about how this relates to the HDC process; right now, they are working on materials; it would be beneficial to have our representative discuss and develop that aspect, a process, and related requirements as brought up at the Select Board meeting. Suggested keeping this on the agenda as an open discussion item for regular reports by our HDC representative as needed. McLaughlin – Feels Jesse Dutra is the most qualified person to represent the HDC since it is his profession. Motion to Appoint Ms. Coombs as the HDC representative to the Nantucket Sidewalk Work Group. (Welch) Carried 4-0//Coombs abstain

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification of COA# 71241, garage doors, at 32 India Street: Pohl – Doug Mills came in for a cottage in the back with a double barn-door arrangement; when it was open, the opening was a single pane of glass. Some said that the doors should be closed in perpetuity. Welch – He said that in relation to the window not being visible at the time of inspection and in perpetuity. He believes he said it in jest and it was not meant to be part of the motion as a condition of approval. The link Mr. Hedden sent did not open on the video of that meeting; it's like it was hit by a virus. Oliver – She thought we were serious about keeping the doors closed; the window is a huge anomaly in that area. She couldn't follow the link as well. Hedden – In the video, Mr. Welch said it on top of something else. A neighbor noted the doors were open and informed him; he sent the non-compliance notice. He will resend the link and all pertinent information.
Commission Comments	<p>Coombs – Leslie Johnson called her about 81 (sic meant 86) Main Street on the corner of Pine Street; people working on the house took out the antique slate and put in brand-new slate. There is a photo of a pile of old slate and new slate in place.</p> <p>Oliver – Can't imagine Brian Pfeiffer would do that. Thinks there is miss communication.</p> <p>Hedden – He talked to Mr. Pfeiffer and the Department of Public Works (DPW) and told Mr. Pfeiffer to save the old stone. It's hard to tell which are old and which are new stones; there are some obviously with straight edges. Recommend the commissioners go look at it; it's set in sand. He believes there are a lot of broken pieces; Mr. Pfeiffer has it all documented and will send him photos from before and after and the quarry where the rock came from.</p> <p>Welch – This goes to his point with the process with the Town. He considers this section of sidewalk as significant and warrants a high-level application with drawings, identification of materials to be replaced, sourcing of materials, installation method, etc.; the Town or property owner should have submitted documentation on the situation and reported where the replacement stone was coming from and talked about the edging of the stones, etc. It sounds like there might be some additional information Ms. Coombs didn't have access to; he'd be surprised if Mr. Pfeiffer has not documented the work.</p> <p>Pohl – One of the early presentation about upper Main Street focused on this section of sidewalk; Director DPW Rob McNeil said this would be their test kitchen; this is the test in progress.</p> <p>Hedden – HDC did review and approve work to the front stoop; he had informed Mr. Pfeiffer to coordinate with the DPW was planning sidewalk/road work. He didn't know that it went to full stone work.</p> <p>Welch – We should hold the homeowner to the same standard we've discussed holding the Town and DPW; he thinks it's important to articulate concerns while they are happening; we should send an amicable letter to the owner indicating this should have been applied for and to submit along the lines of a detailed hardscape plan, which should be presented to HDC along with presentation of all relevant information. Suggested that if we are going to suggest holding someone (Town/DPW) to a standard, we should hold everyone (else) to the same standard, thus institutionalizing the process. Someone made changes to the architectural elements under HDC purview, they need to present what was there, changes made, and materials used.</p> <p>Pohl – Asked Mr. Hedden to have Mr. Pfeiffer to explain the process to the HDC.</p>

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

- Proposed HDC schedule

Adjourned at 7:11 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Sconset Advisory Board

Madaket Advisory Board

Sign Advisory Committee