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Monday, July 13, 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 4:30 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
Late Arrivals: Camp, 4:35 p.m.; Welch, 4:35 p.m.
Early Departures: Camp, 8:45 p.m.

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

I. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

II. 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>Lilmoor, LLC 07-1287</td>
<td>1 Maxey Pond Road</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>40-107</td>
<td>Jardins International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Miacomet Road N.T. 07-1276</td>
<td>90 Miacomet Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>81-145.1</td>
<td>NAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Burns 07-1275</td>
<td>23 Longwood Drive</td>
<td>Rev. 73015: entry/balusters</td>
<td>76-76</td>
<td>NAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Sendelbach 07-1290</td>
<td>21 Hummock Pond Road</td>
<td>Add 26 sf wartz addition</td>
<td>56-11</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Palmer, LLC 07-1289</td>
<td>110 Wauwinet Road</td>
<td>Driveway gate</td>
<td>11-29</td>
<td>Normand Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None
Concerns No concerns.

Motion Motion to Approve. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Welch-abstain; Oliver, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-07-(as noted)

III. 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>Christopher Keogan 07-1279</td>
<td>5 Daffodil Lane</td>
<td>Rev. 72435: cond/frnt dr</td>
<td>68-723</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Due to minimal visibility

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation None
Representing None
Public None
Concerns No additional concerns.

Motion Motion to Approve per noted conditions. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver-, Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-07-1279
IV. 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>Tim Quinlisk</td>
<td>88 Quidnet Road</td>
<td>Demo/move on site</td>
<td>21-109</td>
<td>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Welch (acting Chair), Oliver</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>Pohl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli &amp; Pohl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (4:38)</td>
<td>McLaughlin and Dutra not present. Not opened at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Held due to lack of quorum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-call Vote</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Certificate #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. George Spencer 06-1144 5 Sherburne Way Demo/move off 30-38 Botticelli & Pohl

| Voting              | Coombs (acting chair), Oliver, Welch |
| Alternates          | None                                 |
| Recused             | Pohl                                 |
| Documentation       | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation. |
| Representing        | Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl   |
| Public              | Linda Williams, 6 South Pasture Road |
| Concerns (4:39)     | Botticelli – Reviewed the previous hearing; it is on a tiny access road and the house would have to be cut up into pieces and require significant brush cutting along the road. Backus – Beside the information she presented at the previous hearing, she did not receive additional information. Any 1989 survey will indicate “not contributing” for structures built since the 1950s. Everyone acknowledges that our surveys must be updated. The National Historic Landmark (NHL) survey is the one she goes by; it shows every structure up to 50 years old as contributing. Just because it is 50 years old doesn’t mean it’s contributing. Mr. Welch did an excellent job regarding 31 Fairgrounds Road last week. Welch – He had asked that we try to determine who provided the survey; apparently the only contributing factor is it predates 1975, no local, regional or higher-level cultural or historical significance. Moving forward, it would be beneficial to locate whoever did the most recent NHL survey submission, to find out specifically why they included the pre-1975 homes on the list on, regards cultural or historical significance or both, and what else they know. He researched this property and could find no cultural or local significance. He’s comfortable with what’s proposed. Asked if there were extenuating circumstances against a move off; informed there is limited access, feels a demolition is appropriate. Oliver – No concerns. Williams – She knows these properties well and agrees with Ms. Botticelli; you can’t get anything up the driveway. The house is not in good condition. |
| Motion              | Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver) |
| Roll-call Vote      | Carried 3-0//Oliver, Welch, and Coombs-aye | Certificate # HDC2020-06-1144
3. Sheila Wilner Trust 01-0547  
10 Beach Street  
New dwelling  
73.2.4-10  
Emeritus

Voting  
Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates  
None

Recused  
None

Documentation  
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments, and 3D rendering.

Representing  
Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development

Public  
Linda Williams, 6 South Pasture Road

Concerns (4:50)  
Pohl – The demolition of the existing is set for another meeting; if we have a Thursday meeting, both could be on that agenda.

MacEachern – The existing home is not in good shape as testified to by the neighbors at the last hearing; it was sent back to SAB, who met today; he feels it unrealistic to try to work with the existing. Asked that previous letters from neighbors be reread. Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; 24’ tall; feels it is completely contextual with the area; tried to integrate architectural detail from Codfish Park into this design.

Backus – Read SAB comments: new design, service part of Sconset, not sympathetic to the past, new design should not be larger, have only one set of French doors on the east; superficial changes, no respect to design of original structure, would prefer smaller with nod to original. Read into the record letter of concerns.

Oliver – She doesn’t feel comfortable approving something without the demolition. She’d prefer to discuss the demolition before this structure. Some of the changes are positive; the height is fine. East elevation is over fenestrated; double French doors on the 2nd-floor should be single; the 2-light “B” windows are an anomaly when 6-over-1 would tie in better.

Camp – The old photos showed the character of Old Codfish Park; we’ve made mistakes and lost some of that older vernacular. Feels the 2-over-2 windows harken back to when this was all shanties. Would prefer simpler gables with single windows, a simpler building that reflects Old Codfish Park.

Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver that we should look at this alongside the demolition. We’re here to defend the history and character of structures and areas where appropriate including their context and setting. Asked for the images of the existing structure and that the proposed reflect that historical nature. Proposed is as he’d previously stated, too large and overpowers the site; 1½-story structure of proposed height and configuration is inappropriate. Believes other valid points have been made. Notes that the motion for demolition was to track with the new dwelling; requests that occur; he’s concerned we are talking about these separately when the intent was they would be discussed simultaneously.

Pohl – We don’t need to reread the letters from the last hearing. Understands Ms. Oliver’s concern about approving this without the demolition. Agrees with what’s been said. Double doors to the deck are not traditional to Codfish Park; this need simplification. This building is very homogenous to the point it won’t fit in; Codfish Park was little buildings added onto over the years; he would like to see those elements in this design.

Williams – Believes the existing structure might have been connected with the old railroad; it dates to the 1930s and is similar to The Club Car; this might be one of the earliest intact structures in Codfish Park.

Motion  
Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)

Roll-call Vote  
Carried 4-0//Oliver, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye

Certificate #
4. 78 Wauwinet Road, LLC 06-1065 78 Wauwinet Road New dwelling 14-18 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 (5:22)

**MacEachern** – Changed the roof walk per previous concerns; provided topographical information; the roof walk railing is 38”; the roof walk is 11X10.

**Oliver** – Other 2-story structures in this area don’t have 3rd-floor dormers; asked they be eliminated from the front elevation; it’s the 3rd-floor that will be visible. Could agree to leave the roof walk off until the house is framed up.

**Camp** – This is an overwhelming design. Because of the vegetation, the 3rd-floor dormers will be visible; the wood roofing shingles will help tone the whole thing down. It’s the roof that will be within our jurisdiction; vegetation will cover much of the rest. She loves the owl lots; but they don’t read to match the scale of the house; they look “dinky.” They need to be proportional to the scale of the house and make the silhouette look random as well.

**Coombs** – The 3 dormers on the 3rd-floor front are too much and will be visible along with the roof walk. The roof walk should be closer to the chimney; with the dormers it makes the center mass heavy in a country area. Remove the dormers and move the roof walk closer to the chimney; make the front façade simpler.

**Welch** – Setting and context are important; with this application that is important. White trim is a concern; cedar-shingled roof will help; cottage corners on the 3rd-floor dormers might be more in keeping with the country-style setting along with a natural-to-weather roof walk. With respect to the effect of cut and fill; he’s okay as long as there is no further grading, cut and fill is as presented on Page G-1.2 of the submission for this meeting, and no removal of vegetation along the north side of the lot.

**Pohl** – A scale reference would be helpful; looks like the roof walk railing is more than 3-feet high from the deck. He has similar concerns about the 2nd-floor on up - the dormers on the front and back, particularly if they are white. The roof walk is as wide as it is long; it’s absolutely huge and will be a very large presence on the skyline. His concern is the 2nd-floor up: frieze board, white trim, roof walk. Seeing a 3rd-floor dormer, particular if it’s white, in the rural part of this Island is a bad thing.

**Motion**

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

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

Certification #

5. 78 Wauwinet Road, LLC 06-1065 78 Wauwinet Road Garage 14-18 Emeritus

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates None

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development

Public None

Concerns (5:44)

**MacEachern** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; this is 24’6” tall.

**Coombs** – This is a big square building with no additive massing; it does not give the impression of a barn or a garage. It should fit into the countryside better due to its proximity to the street. It should be no more than 24-feet tall. It should be simpler and reduced in size. She wants to see revisions made addressing her concerns.

**Camp** – She’s not so concerned about the garage; likes the simpler version of the west elevation, which will be visible. Okay with the cupola.

**Oliver** – Appreciates the changes; she also like the simplicity of the prior west elevation, but the dormer exceeded our guidelines by being too large for the window. Agrees the only thing visible will be the cupola; suggested reconsidering the cupola once the house is framed up.

**Pohl** – The ridge height on the application should still be accurate. He’s against the cupola for the same reason he’s against everything above the 2nd-floor of the main house.

**Motion**

**Motion to Approve through staff without the cupola at this time; it can be applied for at a later date. (Oliver)**

**Roll-call Vote** Carried 3-1//Coombs-nay; Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

Certificate # HDC2020-06-1065
6. Noreen Slavitz 05-0972  
34 Meadowview Drive  
Roof top solar  
56-136  
ACK Smart

Motion Concerns
Public
Representing
Documentation
Recused
Alternates
Voting

Roll
Motion
Concerns
Public
Representing
Documentation
Recused
Voting

7. Karen Moss 06-1227  
17 Meadow Lane  
Roof top solar  
41-406.1  
ACK Smart

Motion
Roll-call Vote
Motion to Deny due to the high, unobscured visibility of the solar panels from a publicly travelled way. (Coombs)
Carried //Camp, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye. Certificate # HDC2020-05-0972

Motion
Roll-call Vote
Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)
Carried 4-0//Camp, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2019-12-0300
9. Daniel DeCamora 06-1183  1 Swayze Drive  Roof top solar – garage  66-152  Karen Alence
Voting  Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
Alternates  None
Recused  None
Documentation  Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, manufacturer spec sheet, and landscape plan.
Representing  Karen Alence, Conuit Solar
Concerns (6:44)  Alence – Reviewed the landscape plan; on a secondary structure, will be blocked from view, and covers the roof. There has been talk at the State level of the setback but no ruling has yet been made.
Camp – Could be approved with the caveat that it is obscured from instruction at the time of inspection. The evergreens should be planted to look natural – not in a straight line.
Oliver – Mostly okay; wonders who will determine the scope of the screening.
Coombs – If they are willing to screen as much as possible, she can support this.
Pohl – Ms. Flynn does the site inspections; she will make the final determination about the screening.
Motion  Motion to Approve based upon minimal visibility through staff with naturalized vegetation to screen the view from the public way. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote  Carried 4-0//Coombs, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye
Certificate #  HDC2020-06-1183

10. Elizabeth Pagnam 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, correspondence, and advisory comments.
Representing  David Troast, Ernst Landscaping
Concerns (6:57)  Backus – Read HSAB comments from June 29 and July 13 and neighbors’ letters of concerns into the record. The Planning Board approved the second curb cut. Paul Santos, Nantucket Surveyors application to the Planning Board indicates there is sufficient room for two 17X17 parking spaces but they would go out to the edge of the road.
Flynn – Read a letter of concerns from Charles Harkness, owner of 8 & 21 Lily Street, into the record.
Troast – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Were told they needed HDC approval before going to the Department of Public Works (DPW).
Coombs – Regardless of what any other board says, if HDC feels it is not in keeping with Lily Street, we don’t have to approve this. The other houses along Lily Street have adhered to having one parking space. Regardless that they are adding onto the building, she doesn’t find it attractive or appropriate to allow the second curb cut and spaces for parking two more cars. This second driveway does not fit into the area.
Welch – Agrees with much of what Ms. Coombs said. The new addition has a very strong presence; if this is to move forward, the parking needs be pared down to one space with vegetative screening to mask the height and overall presence of the addition. A big portion of this being successful is the 15 Lily Street parking area material example.
Pohl – HSAB suggested making the parking deeper, but it would run into the building. Asked if the parking spaces are a legal depth from the property line to the house; it looks like the vehicles will hang into Town property. They still need approval from the DPW. We three are all on the same page regarding this application; if it goes down to one space, it would leave more lawn allowing more mitigation of the view of the structure.
Camp – This is inappropriate since they have 2 spaces already; the proposed parking is tight to the neighbor and insensitive to the street. Extending the brick foundation would have to be addressed. Discussion about the height of the foundation on the new addition.
Motion  Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)
Roll-call Vote  Carried 3-0//Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye
Certificate #

11. Teal Sziklus 06-1263  44 Fair Street  Hardscape  42.3.2-55  Linda Williams
Voting  Pohl, Coombs, Welch, Camp, Oliver
Alternates  None
Recused  None
Documentation  Landscape design plans, site plan, and advisory comments.
Representing  Linda Williams
Concerns (7:21)  Williams – Reviewed additional information and changes made per previous concerns. Will have a flagstone between the wall and the patio at the gate.
Backus – Read HSAB comments: would like a stepping stone inside the gate to differentiate.
Welch – South elevation showed 2 posts with caps flanking the gate; do we want those caps eliminated since there are none on the fence. South elevation says 18 inches but, on the right, it is closer to a foot; that needs to be corrected. No further concerns.
Motion  Motion to Approve through staff with no post caps and with a flush stone set into the grass inside the gate and the 18-inch wall to be level to left at zero. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote  Carried 5-0//Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye
Certificate #  HDC2020-06-1263

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHA</th>
<th>06-1265</th>
<th>15 Broad Street</th>
<th>Hardscape</th>
<th>42.4.2-61</th>
<th>Linda Williams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Landscape design plans, site plan, and advisory comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Linda Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concerns (7:30)**

- **NHA**
  - **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, and advisory comments.

**Representing**

- Linda Williams

**Public**

- None

**Concerns (7:30)**

- **NHA**
  - **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, and advisory comments.

**Representing**

- Linda Williams

**Public**

- None

**Concerns (7:30)**

- **Williams** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. She will probably have to come back for path of travel.
- **Welch** – The 26X12 at-grade deck with ramp, asked which side is at grade (the outside).
- **Coombs** – It says the three trees will remain, confirmed the chestnut tree will remain.
- No further concerns.

**Motion**

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

**Roll-call Vote**

- Carried //Oliver, Welch, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

**Certificate #**

- HDC2020-06-1265

13. **Charles Lenhart 06-1161**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25 Dukes Road</th>
<th>New dwelling with solar</th>
<th>41-530.2/530.1</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Charles Lenhart, owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concerns (7:35)**

- **Lenhart** – Sent to the commissioners a packet regarding R324.3 Massachusetts amendment to the international building code regarding the setback of a solar array from the edge of the roof. Reviewed changes made to the array per previous concerns; at the closest, he’s 110 feet from Dukes Road and only a bit of the array will be visible; this is designed to be a Net-Zero structure; reviewed context photos regarding ganged windows. He could remove the 2nd-floor panels.
- **Camp** – She has no concerns with the house or the solar.
- **Oliver** – No concerns. Asked how much power would be lost if the 2nd-floor panels were removed.
- **Welch** – Okay with the house; can’t support the solar array due to inconsistency with the guidelines.
- **Coombs** – Okay with the house and doesn’t think the solar will be that visible.
- **Pohl** – Has no concerns.

**Motion**

- **Motion to Approve through staff with the panels on the top gable removed. (Camp)**

**Roll-call Vote**

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

**Certificate #**

- HDC2020-06-1161

14. **Danielle Debenedictus 06-1237**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Magnolia Avenue</th>
<th>Add dormers</th>
<th>73.3.1-123</th>
<th>Val Oliver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, documentation, and advisory comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Val Oliver, V. Oliver Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concerns (7:47)**

- **Backus** – Read SAB comments: looks great.
- **Oliver** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.
- **Camp** – She’s very excited about this; loves the addition bringing back the Tudor style; doesn’t think the dormers need the rake overhang.
- **Welch** – No concerns; appreciates the changes.
- **Coombs** – No concerns.

**Motion**

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

**Roll-call Vote**

- Carried 4-0//Coombs, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye

**Certificate #**

- HDC2020-06-1237
HDC Minutes for July 13, 2020, adopted Aug. 3

15. Will Forbeth 06-1121 58 Walsh Street New dwelling 29-97 Sanne Payne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Sanne Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (7:50)</td>
<td>Backus – Read HSAB comments: awkward design; should be 1 ½ story, which would bring the eaves down; would like photos of the historic neighborhood. The lot is about 5227 square feet. Payne – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; a 6-foot hedge might help alleviate the vertical-board skirt. Camp – The reduced roof walk now looks too small; suggested enlarging 6 inches on each side. The north elevation is over fenestrated. Oliver – Reviewed her photos of the area. There are sizeable houses in the area, but they aren’t symmetrical; this feels like two little rocket ships connected in the middle and doesn’t feel like an In-Town design. The amount of railing exacerbates the vertical board skirt; suggested some railings be shingled. Appreciates the reduced roof walk. The footprint is only 1519; it feels like a lot. This design lacks a hierarchy of massing. Coombs – Most houses in this area have a lot of open space around them; this house has too many fences and hedging. Other houses have more 1-story additions. This is a lot of house on a minimum-sized lot. Agrees with Ms. Camp about the size of the roof walk; suggested removing the skirt. Pohl – There are houses in this area that are 1 ½ stories and asymmetrical. He noticed the footprint of the house is shoe horned into the buildable area. Doesn’t think all the 1st-floor decking helps due to the required railing. A substantive issue is the highly symmetrical and highly vertical massing; essentially, it’s all 2 stories. Suggested lowering the eaves and bringing it down 1 ½ story.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion: **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Olive, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

16. NBGC 06-1145 69 Sparks Ave New dwelling 55-139.2 Emeritus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Pohl, Coombs, Oliver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Camp had stepped out for the prior hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (8:10)</td>
<td>MacEachern – Asked this be held for additional changes. Not opened at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion: **Motion to Hold at applicant’s request. (Camp)**

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

17. Bartlett Farm Housing LLC, 05-1032 24 Bartlett Farm Road New dwelling 65-86 Emeritus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recused</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns (8:11)</td>
<td>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. There are other lots likely to be developed. A landscape plan will be submitted tomorrow to go with the pool. Trim and sash are grey. Oliver – Shared her photos of the height poles. I still want it to be turned so the proposed south elevation faces Bartlett Farm Road; the current elevation has a lot of windows and, with the dormer, looks very large on the street. If the current vegetation were to remain, she would have less concern but feels this will stand out when someone turns the corner. The pool and privet hedge will be more open. There will be other houses but this is the first one and right on the street. Coombs – Knowing this area, she thinks this is too large for the area, which is farmland; this needs to carry forward the farm vernacular. She was taken aback by the fact they are putting in a pool. Camp – She likes this house; it might be tall, but she likes every elevation. She would prefer the proposed south elevation face Bartlett Farm Road but thinks it will be fine. Pohl – Appreciates the grey trim and sash; he agrees with Ms. Camp. Pushing the north elevation dormer back and dropping the eave works; it was overwhelming. Likes the change of the west-elevation pent roof to a shed roof; likes the idea of the two lights and bring the roof down closer to the door.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion: **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote: Carried 4-0//Coombs, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye Certificate #
V. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes

None

Review Minutes

June 1, 4, 8, 16 & 30 and July 2 & 6

Other Business

- Next HDC Meeting Old Business Thursday 7/16/20 at 1:00-3:00 pm:
  
  Welch – Vineyard Wind Section 106 hearing is on Thursday 7/16/20; asked HDC meeting time be held open
  in the event HDC needs an executive session to discuss possible litigation.

  Vineyard Wind Section 106 hearing (July 8, 2020) report from Commissioner Welch and Commission discussion
  Welch – Provided an update on Section 106: larger turbines with an adverse impact on the National Historic
  Landmark resulting in possible litigation. Asked for Thursday’s agenda to include an executive session to discuss
  strategy with respect to possible litigation as an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the bargaining
  or litigating position of HDC attempts to provide protections to the National Historic Landmark. A vote may
  be taken.

  Motion to Hold Executive Session for purposes Mr. Pohl stated on Thursday. (Welch)
  Carried 3-0//Oliver-recused; Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye

  Next HDC New Business meeting Tuesday 7/21/20 at 4:30 pm

  Discussion of Certified Local Government (CLG) and possible vote

  HDC review of revisions to HDC Background Summary to finalize for web page including vote

  Discussion of adding Quidnet applications to the Sconset Advisory Board review process

Commission Comments

None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Vineyard Wind Section 106

Motion to Adjourn at 9:04 p.m. (Coombs) Carried 4-0//Oliver, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board  Sconset Advisory Board