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 4:42 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl.

Staff in attendance: Cathy Flynn, Land Use Specialist; Holly Backus, Preservation Planner.

Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch.

Absent Members: McLaughlin, Watterson, Dutra.

Early Departures: None.

Late Arrivals: None.

Motion to Approve the Agenda. (Oliver) Carried unanimously//Coombs, Camp, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

II. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chair: Camp nominated Mr. Pohl as chair. Carried 4-0//Pohl-abstain; Coombs, Camp, Oliver, and Welch-aye.

Vice Chair: Camp nominated Ms. Coombs as vice chair. Carried 4-0//Coombs-abstain; Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye.

III. CONSENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 98 Madaket Rd, Inc 06-0602</td>
<td>84 Millbrook Road</td>
<td>Shed move off 84R Millbrook</td>
<td>40-79.4</td>
<td>Thorne will Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 98 Madaket Rd, Inc 06-1249</td>
<td>84R Millbrook Road</td>
<td>Move on from 84 Millbrook</td>
<td>40-79.6</td>
<td>Thorne will Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bruce Zahlow 06-1242</td>
<td>69 Tom Nevers Road</td>
<td>Rev. 66645: Fence change</td>
<td>75-141</td>
<td>Waterscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Liliana Roche 06-1239</td>
<td>14 Gosnold Road</td>
<td>Renew COA 66500</td>
<td>30-83</td>
<td>Alexandre Cashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Suzanne Turner 06-1241</td>
<td>9 Long Pond Road</td>
<td>Demo/move shed</td>
<td>59-33</td>
<td>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Suzanne Turner 06-1225</td>
<td>9 Long Pond Road</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>59-33</td>
<td>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anton Dimov 06-1235</td>
<td>25 Wapposset Circle</td>
<td>Extend fence/step stones</td>
<td>67-578</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Brian Gaudreault 06-1256</td>
<td>19 1/2 Surfside Road</td>
<td>Re-site shed on lot</td>
<td>55-245.5</td>
<td>SMRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gregg Edell 06-1261</td>
<td>25 High Brush Road</td>
<td>Rev. 11-0150: cab clr chg</td>
<td>56-379</td>
<td>Normand Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. John Hedden 06-1250</td>
<td>4 Weatherly Place</td>
<td>Deck/patio</td>
<td>67-951.1</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Martha McGowen 06-1246</td>
<td>37 Meadowview Drive</td>
<td>Rev. 60715: garage door chg</td>
<td>56-132</td>
<td>Val Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Nancy Wilson 06-1245</td>
<td>1 Appleton Road</td>
<td>Rev. 11-0233: xtd adn</td>
<td>66-388</td>
<td>Thorne will Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Donald Dimick 06-1266</td>
<td>59 Bartlett Road</td>
<td>Extending dormer</td>
<td>66-100.1</td>
<td>Linda Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Bazhen Lapenko 06-1268</td>
<td>4 First Way</td>
<td>Rear deck</td>
<td>55-69</td>
<td>Linda Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Dorinda Yates 06-1247</td>
<td>58 Kendrick Street</td>
<td>HVAC condensers</td>
<td>76.4.3-61</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Brian Gaudreault 06-1243</td>
<td>19 1/2 Surfside Road</td>
<td>Rev. 69429: addition</td>
<td>55-245.5</td>
<td>SMRD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch.

Altemates: None.

Recused: Pohl – Recused several; Oliver recused from Item 14.

Documentation: None.

Representing: None.

Public: None.

Concerns: No concerns.

Motion: Motion to Approve Items 1-13 and 15-19. (Camp)

Carried: Carried 4-0//Pohl-recused; Camp, Oliver, Welch, and Coombs-aye.

Motion: Motion to Approve Item 14. (Coombs)

Roll-call Vote: Carried 4-0//Oliver-recused; Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-06-(as noted)
IV. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brian Gaudreault 06-1236</td>
<td>19 ½ Surfside Road</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>55-245.5</td>
<td>SMRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ACS Properties 06-1253</td>
<td>20 North Beach Street</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>42.4.1-10</td>
<td>Structures Unlimited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity
- Due to lack of visibility. The cardinal points to be labeled on the elevations

V. OLD BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mary Heller Tr 05-0908</td>
<td>37 Ocean Avenue</td>
<td>Roof top solar MH</td>
<td>73.3.2-49</td>
<td>ACK Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, manufacturer spec sheet, perspective rendering, and advisory comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Tim Carruthers, ACK Smart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Concerns (4:54)     | Carruthers – Lowered the panels on the northwest elevation and moved the hedge up to the fence and let grow to 8 or 9 feet. SAB unanimously approved the panels on house and cottage with not moving the hedge.  
Backus – Read SAB comments: not in favor of moving the hedge; appreciate moving center panels on the main house – some not in favor of panels on an historic structure; better placement on the cottage (no concerns).  
Welch – Thinks the panels will be visible on the historic house and the hedge won’t be sufficient mitigation; wants something else planted to encumber the visibility.  
Coombs – She agrees with Mr. Welch on an historic house, especially on the front. It’s inappropriate.  
Pohl – He was surprised SAB was okay with this; he sides with SAB on not moving the hedge. Two members are against panels on the historic house even with vegetation. |
| Motion              | Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch) |
| Roll-call Vote      | Carried 4-0//Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye |
| Certificate #       | HDC2020-06-(as noted) |

2. Mary Heller Tr 06-1136

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Mary Heller Tr 06-1136</td>
<td>37 Ocean Avenue</td>
<td>Roof top solar garage</td>
<td>73.3.2-49</td>
<td>ACK Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, manufacturer spec sheet, and advisory comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Tim Carruthers, ACK Smart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Concerns (4:54)     | Carruthers – Moved panels to the northwest; won’t be visible from Carew Lane  
SAB comments see main house.  
Welch – Appropriate with respect to the guidelines, being on a non-historic and secondary structure, not directly facing a street though there is some visibility on the northeast.  
Coombs – Okay with solar here.  
Pohl – Thinks you can get unanimous vote on this. |
| Motion              | Motion to Approve due to lack of visibility. (Coombs) |
| Roll-call Vote      | Carried 4-0//Oliver, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye |
| Certificate #       | HDC2020-06-1136 |
## VI. NEW BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nantucket 62 Walsh</td>
<td>60 Walsh Street</td>
<td>Hardscaping: parking &amp; gates</td>
<td>29-85.2</td>
<td>Jardins International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voting**  Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch  
**Alternates**  None  
**Recused**  Pohl  
**Documentation**  Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.  
**Representing**  Elizabeth O'Rourke, Jardins International  
**Public**  None  
**Concerns (5:32)**  O'Rourke – Presented project.  
No concerns.  
**Motion**  Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)  
**Roll-call Vote**  Carried 4-0//Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Coombs-aye  
**Certificate #**  HDC2020-06-1097

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property owner name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Map/Parcel</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Edmunds</td>
<td>37 Milk Street</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>41-528</td>
<td>Thornewill Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voting**  Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch  
**Alternates**  Coombs (visual difficulties)  
**Recused**  None  
**Documentation**  Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.  
**Representing**  Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design  
Carrie Thornewill, Thornewill Design  
**Public**  None  
**Concerns (5:13)**  L.Thornewill – Presented project: 24X14 in-ground.  
C.Thornewill – The hedge is existing except for a gap that will require a 4-foot, solid-board gate. Could put a 4-foot fence inside the privet to screen in winter.  
Backus – This is not in HSAB jurisdiction. This is on the edge of ROH, R-1 zone.  
Oliver – If you can’t see it, it’s approvable; but she doesn’t have to like it. Feels this area is getting inundated with pools. It should be screened in perpetuity. We have no information on the equipment.  
Welch – Relying on HDC oversight and control of structures, including as to their appropriateness in context and setting, he can’t support this as close as it is to the old historic district (OHD).  
Camp – She wants to know the topography on the left side to ensure the grade isn’t being manipulated. Privet is deciduous; would prefer something else to ensure it is never visible. Okay if it’s not visible in perpetuity. Appreciates the smaller size.  
Pohl – Even though there’s wire fence, the Milk Street side will have an opaque board fence to run the length of the south side behind the privet.  
**Motion**  Motion to Approve through staff with a solid board fence inside the privet along Milk Street and Saratoga and pool equipment to be screened at time of inspection and in perpetuity. (Oliver)  
**Roll-call Vote**  Carried 3-1//Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye; Welch-nay  
**Certificate #**  HDC2020-061177
3. Elizabeth Pagnum 03-0865 19 Lily Street  Hardscape-driveway  42.4.3-42  David Troast

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Welch
Alternates: None
Recused: Camp, Oliver
Documentation: Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
Representing: David Troast, Ernst Landscaping
Public: Abby Camp, 29 Lily Street

Concerns (5:35)

Troast – Presented project; the Planning Board approved this because it’s across from a no-parking area. His client indicated 37 Lily Street has two curb cuts.

Backus – Read HSAB comments: want photos from the street; want to understand the need for the retaining wall height.

Camp – There are two curb cuts making four parking spaces; no houses on Lily Street have this much parking. Not so much concerned about the knee-wall; her concern is the hardscaping for four parking spaces. This isn’t appropriate to Lily Street; there is no precedence along Lily Street. 37 Lily Street has a main house with drive to the left; it’s a large lot with the second structure having its own driveway. Suggested looking at ways to soften the look.

Welch – He was at the Planning Board meeting; in order to have two curb cuts, the Select Board and Department of Public Works (DPW) must approve it, former if a street-side parking space is forfeited, latter regards storm water runoff and other matters; he presumes this matter is under that review process. He is concerned with respect to the overall amount of parking; a mitigating fact is that between curb cut and parking there is landscaping. He would like to view this to get a sense for the area and the new structure.

Coombs – You will not see any houses with parking on both sides of the house particularly with this configuration; we are charged with protecting the streetscape. Doesn’t understand the need for four parking spaces. She would like to view this again with the second parking area indicated with string.

Pohl – There is a rule that a piece of property is only allowed one curb cut; asked if Mr. Troast researched that. Asked that the new parking be staked out clearly and for photos of the precedent.

Motion: Motion to View with the parking area staked and held for revisions. (Welch)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 3-0//Coombs, Welch, and Pohl aye

Certificate #

4. Teal Sziklas 06-1263 44 Fair Street  Hardscape – fence  42.3.2-155  Linda Williams

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternates: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
Representing: Linda Williams
Public: None

Concerns (5:55)

Williams – Presented project; HSAB asked the fence to slope down then the gate to be stepped down. There’s substantial plantings along part of the front.

Backus – Read HSAB comments: want the fence sloping with the gate squared off; have no drawings.

Welch – Post caps are out of place. A consideration is the grade behind the fence; if there’s something at the bottom to retain the grade, the fence could all be 36” over a level-line retaining wall. We need a drawing to indicate fence, retainage, and gate. The 1880 photo shows a small return at the gate area, it gives a sense of entry which is appreciated and preferred.

Coombs – Thinks we should view this. The fencing along the whole front will not be returned; asked why.

Camp – The step effect would be too busy; likes the idea of building the grade so the fence slopes straight and likes Mr. Welch’s idea of breaking the sloping grade.

Oliver – She’s okay with the fence, the question is how it will look with the rising grade.

Pohl – The historic photos showed a fence that was level on the top and bottom; it was effective because of the small amount of retainage. It would be good to have a level line from the highest grade to the fence location.

Motion: Motion to View and hold for further information. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Welch, Camp, and Pohl aye

Certificate #
5. Nant. Historic Assn. 06-1265  15 Broad Street       Hardscape       42.4.2-61       Linda Williams

| Voting       | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch |
| Alternates   | None                               |
| Recused      | None                               |
| Documentation| Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments. |
| Representing | Linda Williams                     |
| Public       | None                               |
| Concerns (6:11) | **Williams** – Presented project; NHA wants it to look like a “dock” about 4” out of the ground  
**Welch** – The main complaint about diagonal lattice is a function of the fact it is usually 1/8” flimsy material, which looks aesthetically unpleasing.  
**Camp** – The deck design feels choppy for kids; everything should be kept at grade or the whole length of the building. Not a big fan of the lighthouse, which has a Disney-world effect; it should go away at the end of the season.  
**Oliver** – We need to know what the plans for the deck are. A patio is a better option.  
**Coombs** – There is no accessibility for children in wheelchairs; agrees with Ms. Camp about it being at ground level. Thinks it should be no wider than to the inside of the windows.  
**Oliver** – Would like something more detailed at least on the site plan since there is no drawing. Agrees a flush deck would be okay. |
| Motion       | **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)** |
| Roll-call Vote | Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye | Certificate # |

6. NIR, LLC 06-1267  29 Broad Street       Railing change       42.4.2-38       Linda Williams

| Voting       | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch |
| Alternates   | None                               |
| Recused      | None                               |
| Documentation| Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments. |
| Representing | Linda Williams                     |
| Public       | None                               |
| Concerns (6:24) | **Williams** – Presented project; the 2nd-floor railing is metal covered with vinyl. HSAB suggested along Centre Street to duplicate the rear fire escape railing and to be painted brick red; the white railing replaced a previous white railing.  
**Oliver** – Doesn’t see why it can’t just be a fire escape. They didn’t apply for the 100 feet of vinyl covered metal railing.  
**Coombs** – It won’t take long for people to figure out it is vinyl which was applied to the back of the historic building. The black fire escape melds in; HDC is not concerned with what it will cost to replace that rear railing. The rear will be visible from Centre Street.  
**Welch** – He’d like to view as to visibility, including with the color change in mind.  
**Camp** – The real problem is visibility of the white railing from Ash Street. She too would like to view.  
**Pohl** – He’d like to view it with a portion spray-painted rust red like on Centre Street. |
| Motion       | **Motion to View with a portion painted grey and brick red matching the metal fire escape and revisions. (Coombs)** |
| Roll-call Vote | Carried 5-0//Welch, Camp, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye | Certificate # |

7. Vanessa Robinson 06-1230  58 Pleasant Street       Deck, pergola, & shower       55.4.1-45       Nathan Waig

| Voting       | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch |
| Alternates   | None                               |
| Recused      | None                               |
| Documentation| Architectural elevation plans, site plan, historic documentation, and advisory comments. |
| Representing | Linda Williams                     |
| Public       | None                               |
| Concerns (6:38) | **Williams** – Presented project; will put the shower back; the shed was the basement walkdown; circa 1930s.  
**Backus** – This came in before COVID as a like-kind; she noticed it was not like kind. There were photos indicating where the pergola was that were not included in this package.  
**Welch** – Okay with the work itself; he’s concerned about the as-built nature. This is for elements that should be considered separately, and we should review this with individual as-built fees. The application says, “replace shed.”  
**Flynn** – The as-built fee was paid.  
**Camp** – She has no concerns.  
**Oliver** – Looking at photos from the Link site, the shower was much larger.  
**Coombs** – There is a large portion of the side that is bubbled; asked what that is for.  
**Pohl** – This is the removal of stuff with the outdoor shower to be smaller and at grade. |
| Motion       | **Motion to Approve. (Coombs)** |
| Roll-call Vote | Carried //Camp, Oliver, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye | Certificate # | HDC2020-06-1230 |
8. Sheila Giardini 06-1257 7 Clifford Street  
Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch  
Alternates: None  
Recused: None  
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, AND photos.  
Representing: Nathan McMullen, McMullen & Associates  
Karen McMullen, McMullen & Associates  
Public: None  
Concerns: (8:57) Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp) Carried unanimously//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye  
N. McMullen – This was originally approved 5 years ago but couldn’t build due to zoning issues.  
K. McMullen – Down-sizing and minimizing the cabana.  
Oliver – Asked about the material for the fireplace.  
Welch – Asked the height of the undersized fascia – 8 feet; appears too tall, might benefit from lowering that 6”.  
Camp – No concerns.  
Motion: Motion to Approve through staff with the fascia beam at 7.5 feet. (Camp)  
Roll-call Vote: Carried //Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye  
Certificate #: HDC2020-06-1275

9. Nant. Isl Land Bank 06-1258 73 Washington Street  
Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch  
Alternates: None  
Recused: None  
Documentation: Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.  
Representing: Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC  
Public: None  
Concerns: (6:52) Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp) Carried unanimously//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye  
Backus – Read HSAB comments: the proposed water fountain should be charcoal grey and concerned with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance of the fountain. This is on the old Artist Association land.  
Ahern – Presented project; they are trying to keep this feeling like a friendly neighborhood; she doesn’t want to agree to the fence going back to 5 feet without her client’s consent.  
Oliver – She thought the road was going to be wider. There is no secure way to cross the street in that location; realizes that isn’t HDC purview.  
Coombs – She would prefer the water fountain be less modern. From what she knows, Nantucket Island School of Design and Arts has no plans to change the buildings.  
Camp – No concerns; that intersection will be more open.  
Welch – Agrees except that there used to be a 5-foot fence with a Type II cap along the private yard areas of the cottages; application removes some of the caps and lowers the fence to 4 feet. Adjacent to the buildings, asked that the fence go back to a 5-foot fence with a Type II cap; it remains a separation between public and private space, but he won’t hold this up for that. In the future, if the buildings are lifted, the fence should be increased to 5 feet to hide the foundations—understands PIN is working on a proposal for raising those cottages.  
Pohl – If the Artist buildings start popping out of the ground, the 5-foot fence would be better. The proposed fountain should be grey.  
Motion: Motion to Approve through staff with the fountain grey and any accessibility stone work should be ADA accessible. (Welch)  
Roll-call Vote: Carried //Coombs, Oliver, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye  
Certificate #: HDC2020-06-1258

10. Oliver Katnawala 06-1229 19 Roberts Lane  
Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch  
Alternates: None  
Recused: None  
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.  
Representing: Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar  
Public: None  
Concerns: (7:45) Motion to Approve for representation (Oliver) Carried unanimously//Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye  
Alence – Presented project; panels in the back on a shallow dormer.  
Welch – He’s familiar with this area and doesn’t believe panels on the back will be visible.  
Coombs – No concerns if they aren’t visible.  
Oliver – Agrees.  
Camp – Agrees.  
Motion: Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)  
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye  
Certificate #: HDC2020-06-1229
HDC Minutes for July 6, 2020, adopted Aug.3

11. Oliver Katnawala 06-1228
   19 Roberts Lane
   Roof top solar - Cottage
   56-100
   Karen Alence

   Voting
   Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

   Alternates
   None

   Recused
   None

   Documentation
   Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.

   Representing
   Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar

   Public
   None

   Concerns (7:46)
   Motion to Approve for representation (Oliver) Carried unanimously//Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl- aye
   Alence – Presented project; panels on shallow east-west dormers with only the gable end visible from the road.
   Oliver – She thinks the panels will be visible; based upon minimal visibility, they are approvable.
   Camp – No concerns.
   Welch – From the west, they will be obliquely visible; notes tall and growing vegetation along the street and that the proposed is on a dormer on a secondary mass.
   Coombs – If it can't be seen on the dormers, she’s okay with it. Thinks with solar applications we should require surveyor confirmation that a side won’t be visible.
   Pohl – We would never get confirmation of lack of visibility from a surveyor.

   Motion
   Motion to Approve as submitted subject to minimal visibility.

   Roll-call Vote
   Carried 5-0//Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye

   Certificate # HDC2020-06-1228

12. Karen Moss 06-1227
   17 Meadow lane
   Roof top solar
   41-406.1
   ACK Smart

   Voting
   Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

   Alternates
   None

   Recused
   None

   Documentation
   Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and manufacturer spec sheet.

   Representing
   Tim Carruthers, ACK Smart

   Public
   None

   Concerns (7:09)
   Carruthers – Presented project; summarized letter from owners at 18 Meadow Lane; circa 1982; black on black. There is a code that requires the array must be set back from the edge of the roof twice its height off the roof; that has to do with heavy winds. The shed is too small and there is no room for a ground array; there is a precedent for arrays on the front.
   Camp – It's on a cul de sac but the array on the front and would be right in your face; she didn't view this.
   Oliver – Agrees with Ms. Camp. It would help if it covered the whole roof. Would prefer it not be on the front; would like some mitigation efforts. It could go on the shed.
   Coombs – Agrees with concerns about it being on the front; doesn’t know how busy the cul de sac is.
   Welch – Agrees. A view is in order. Appreciates the inclusion of the photos. For this to be successful, there would have to be some screening, but not right on the street. A ground array is an option. He would like to view this.
   Pohl – Scrub Juniper planted randomly would mitigate the visibility. Appreciates the black roof and being a 1-story house.

   Motion
   Motion to View and Hold for revisions. (Welch)

   Roll-call Vote
   Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye

   Certificate #

13. Patrick Gately 06-1231
   15A Gray Avenue
   Roof top solar
   67-683
   ACK Smart

   Voting
   Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

   Alternates
   None

   Recused
   None

   Documentation
   Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.

   Representing
   Tim Carruthers, ACK Smart

   Public
   None

   Concerns (7:23)
   Carruthers – Presented project; circa 2011.
   Oliver – She viewed this and concurs it won’t be visible and is up high.
   Camp – No concerns.
   Coombs – No concerns.
   Welch – Being high on the dormers and upper third of the roof makes it highly less visible

   Motion
   Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)

   Roll-call Vote
   Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

   Certificate # HDC2020-06-1231
14. Martha Morris 06-1233 9 Dennis Drive  
Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch  
Alternates: None  
Recused: None  
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and manufacturer spec sheet.  
Representing: Tim Carruthers, ACK Smart  
Public: None  
Concerns: Carruthers – Presented project; read letter from the owner also signed by a neighbor; circa 1981.  
Oliver – She’s concerned about the visibility from the cul de sac despite the mitigating circumstances. West elevation has a shed roof; asked if that might provide sufficient power for the structure.  
Camp – This is the same situation as Meadow Lane and it doesn’t enhance the neighborhood.  
Coombs – This flies in the face of our guidelines; there’s no way it can be disguised. We approved a land array at 300 Polpis Road that works very well; you need to use some imagination.  
Welch – Agrees with what’s been said. This doesn’t meet the guidelines - primary mass, visibility, etc.; depending on conditions, where we can disguise with screening we do, we try to make exceptions on a case-by-case basis; this would be hard.  
Pohl – It appears from the photos there is sufficient vegetation to screen the house from most angles except the front. Asked about the east-facing roof.  
Motion: Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)  
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Welch, Camp, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye  
Certificate #:  

15. Danielle DeBenedictus 06-1237 1 Magnolia Avenue  
Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch  
Alternates: None  
Recused: Oliver  
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.  
Representing: Val Oliver, V. Oliver design  
Public: None  
Concerns: Oliver – Presented project; the Summer House; could drop the dormers.  
Backus – Read SAB comments: circa 1916; first ‘Sconset Inn then The Moby Dick Inn; concern about what’s happening at this time, if the dormers are going up; move the gable dormers off the ridge more and eaves to be even with windows lower; the proposed looks top heavy so could be shed. She doesn’t agree with the idea of being shed dormers.  
Camp – Her first impression is the windows are swimming in the dormers; they should fill the dormers more. The middle dormer should be special.  
Coombs – She’d like to see the dormers come down; that would break up the length of the top ridge.  
Welch – Could lower the flanking dormers. The 1910 photo, the primary dormers is higher than the ridge. The 1920 photo shows the dormer with a decorative feature; would like that decorative element be added back in.  
Pohl – Agrees with SAB: if they are dropped the eaves will align and the structure will be less top heavy.  
Motion: Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)  
Roll-call Vote: Carried 4-0//Welch, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye  
Certificate #:  

16. Josh LaPleine 06-1264 8 Essex Road  
Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch  
Alternates: None  
Recused: Oliver  
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.  
Representing: Val Oliver, V. Oliver design  
Public: None  
Concerns: Oliver – Presented project.  
Welch – It’s appropriate; no concerns.  
Coombs – No concerns.  
Camp – No concerns.  
Motion: Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)  
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Welch, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye  
Certificate #: HDC2020-06-1264
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Certificate #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Ben Normand</td>
<td>11½ Gray Avenue</td>
<td>Roof top solar</td>
<td>67-910</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Ben Normand, owner, Residential Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    | Concerns (8:12)       | Normand – Presented project; circa 1968 on corner of Derrymore and Liberty; moved here in 2013; visibility is inconspicuous.  
Coombs – This is appropriate and doesn’t think it will be visible due to the Wild Cherry.  
Camp – If you put a conifer on the corner of the driveway, you’d get my vote plus-plus.  
Oliver – She drove by here; she thinks this is an appropriate location not on the main portion and not facing the street.  
Welch – Meets guidelines – It’s not on a primary mass, not facing the street, is on a shallow-pitch roof, and well vegetated.  
Pohl – If we ever start seeing the panels, plant a tree on the corner. |
|    | Motion                | Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs) |
|    | Roll-call Vote        | Carried 5-0/ Welch, Oliver, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye |
|    | Certificate #         | HDC2020-06-1238    |
| 18. | Whitney Gifford       | 32 Pocomo Road     | New dwelling   | 14-77        | Emeritus      |
|    | Voting                | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch |
|    | Alternates            | None               |
|    | Recused               | None               |
|    | Documentation         | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos. |
|    | Representing          | Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development |
|    | Public                | None               |
|    | Concerns (8:20)       | MacEachern – Presented project; emulating a barn structure; height 24’2”; main house is 30-feet tall.  
Camp – This is a skinny gambrel; if it’s going to have a cupola, it needs to widen. This is very ornate; don’t think all of it is necessary and should be toned down some.  
Oliver – Agrees with Ms. Camp. It might be better without the cupola. The wings are wide with a 3/12 pitch; that might be adding to the “wing” effect; suggested closing one of them in. Make it look more like a barn, especially facing the driveway and road.  
Coombs – She would like to see the 2nd-floor west elevation windows be unganged. The cupola adds to the perception of being tall; it should be shorter and wider.  
Welch – Agrees with separating the west elevation windows. Lowering the porch facias and creating a 4/12 pitch would also help the perception of height. The barnboard on the gable end accentuates the vertical nature. This is 35 feet from the right of way in an area with 25-foot tall junipers; he doesn’t think much will be visible.  
Pohl – In the drawing, this looks very tall, very vertical. Confirmed that the gambrel/barn was something the client wanted; this could easily be a gable with dormers and not change the interior program. A gable is a simpler form. |
|    | Motion                | Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver) |
|    | Roll-call Vote        | Carried 4-0/ Coombs, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye. Camp-abstain |
|    | Certificate #         | HDC2020-06-1234    |
| 19. | Paul Zevnik           | 24 West Chester Street | Rev. 06-1071: outdoor shower | 42.4.3-57 | Emeritus |
|    | Voting                | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch |
|    | Alternates            | None               |
|    | Recused               | None               |
|    | Documentation         | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments. |
|    | Representing          | Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development |
|    | Public                | None               |
|    | Concerns (8:36)       | MacEachern – Presented project.  
Backus – Read HSAB comments: no concerns.  
No concerns. |
|    | Motion                | Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs) |
|    | Roll-call Vote        | Carried 5-0/ Oliver, Coombs, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye |
|    | Certificate #         | HDC2020-06-1234    |
20. 12 Lincoln Av NT 06-1248  12 Lincoln Avenue  Rev.02-0692: MH wnd/clr chg  30-183  Emeritus
Voting  Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
Public None
Concerns (8:40) MacEachern – Presented project; we are matching the original conditions on the rear elevation with the lack of trim. Backus – Read HSAB comments: no concerns Camp – No concerns. Oliver – The rear elevation has 5 or 6 different types of windows and virtually no trim on the windows and doors. Welch – He believes the trim was approved as shown; the rear dormer creates visual interest. Coombs – West elevation, all the 2nd-floor windows are ganged; we can’t do anything if it’s existing. Pohl – With the trim being white, the lack of trim might look weird, but it was approved. Everything looks fine to him.

Motion Motion to Approve. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote Carried ///Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-06-1248

21. 12 Lincoln Av NT 06-1244  12 Lincoln Avenue  Rev.73371: GH trim&chimney  30-183  Emeritus
Voting  Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
Public None
Concerns (8:53) MacEachern - Presented project. Backus – Read HSAB comments: the front door should be a traditional craftsman style with 2 panels and vertical 6-lights. Oliver – No concerns; likes the HSAB door suggestion. Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; would like a simple 2-panel door no lights. Camp – No concerns. Coombs – No concerns. Pohl – This is a concept meeting and shouldn’t last long.

Motion Motion to Approve through staff with a 2-panel craftsman-style front door. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-06-1244

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes None
Review Minutes None
Other Business
• Special Meeting for 31 Fairgrounds Road Friday July 10, 2020 at 10:00am
  Pohl – This is a concept meeting and shouldn’t last long.
  Backus – This came from the meeting with the Historical Commission. A group of citizens have hired Mr. Bronski. He is scheduled for a walk around Town on July 14th; the time has yet to be confirmed. HDC is invited but recommends no more than 2 members to avoid a quorum and the need to post as a meeting. Mr. Pohl and Mr. Welch volunteered.
  Motion that Mr. Pohl and Mr. Welch represent the HDC. (Coombs)
Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Welch-abstain.
  Discussion of Certified Local Government (CLG) and possible vote: held.
  HDC review of revisions to HDC Background Summary to finalize for web page
Welch – He reformatted the information to highlight information.
Welch – Mr. McLaughlin took a fall today; please send him thoughts and prayers.

Welch – Vineyard Wind Section 106 hearing commences July 8th; he has some trepidation on their proposed changes and will make a recommendation once he has the information on those proposed changes. Asked this be put on the following full meeting July 13th.

List of additional documents used at the meeting:
1. HDC Background Summary for website.
2. Vineyard Wind, Section 106 proposed changes

Motion Adjourned at 9:14 p.m. (Oliver)
Carried unanimously//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton
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