



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 ~~

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

| <u>Property owner name</u> | <u>Street Address</u> | <u>Scope of work</u> | <u>Map/Parcel</u> | <u>Agent</u> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Lilmoor, LLC 07-1287 | 1 Maxey Pond Road | Fence | 40-107 | Jardins International |
| 2. 90 Miacomet Road N.T. 07-1276 | 90 Miacomet Road | Addition | 81-145.1 | NAG |
| 3. Todd Burns 07-1275 | 23 Longwood Drive | Rev. 73015: entry/balusters | 76-76 | NAG |
| 4. Devin Remick 07-1274 | 27 Allens Way | Rev. 04-0881: windows | 67-267 | NAG |
| 5. Peter Sendelbach 07-1290 | 21 Hummock Pond Road | Add 26 sf wart addition | 56-11 | Self |
| 6. Lydia Palmer, LLC 07-1289 | 110 Wauwinet Road | Driveway gate | 11-29 | Normand Residential |
| 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

| <u>Property owner name</u> | <u>Street Address</u> | <u>Scope of work</u> | <u>Map/Parcel</u> | <u>Agent</u> |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Christopher Keogan 07-1279 | 5 Daffodil Lane | Rev. 72435: cond/frnt dr | 68-723 | Self |
| • 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

| | <u>Property owner name</u> | <u>Street Address</u> | <u>Scope of work</u> | <u>Map/Parcel</u> | <u>Agent</u> |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1. | Tim Quinlisk 03-0793 | 88 Quidnet Road | Demo/move on site | 21-109 | Botticelli & Pohl |
| Voting | Welch (acting Chair), Oliver | | | | |
| Alternates | None | | | | |
| Recused | Pohl | | | | |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation. | | | | |
| Representing | Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl | | | | |
| Public | None | | | | |
| Concerns (4:38) | McLaughlin and Dutra not present. Not opened at this time. | | | | |
| Motion | Held due to lack of quorum. | | | | |
| Roll-call Vote | N/A | | | Certificate # | |
| 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) | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Oliver – No concerns.</p> <p>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.</p> | | | | |
| 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) | <p>Pohl – The demolition of the existing is set for another meeting; if we have a Thursday meeting, both could be on that agenda</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 over-powers the site; 1¾-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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | | | |
| 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 Certificate #

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 |
| Voting | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver | | | | | |
| Alternates | None | | | | | |
| Recused | None | | | | | |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet. | | | | | |
| Representing | Tim Carruthers, ACK Smart | | | | | |
| Public | None | | | | | |
| Concerns (5:55) | <p>Carruthers – Reviewed the changes made per previous concerns; the homeowner is putting on a new black roof; circa 1983; the array not visible approaching Meadowview from the southeast; it is visible from the west. Asked the board to make a motion to deny and take a vote; doesn't think there are further revisions that can be made.</p> <p>Oliver – This is better; would like some screening of visibility from the west; this is 2 stories high. The Cape shown for context is 1 story with screening and the other two structures shown are in commercial areas. The last photo shows why we prefer matching colors.</p> <p>Camp – The main structure is too “in your face” for these to be on the front of the building. It would be okay on the lower roof.</p> <p>Coombs – Unfortunately, this is exactly why we put together guidelines on solar. Any vegetation would take 5 to 10 years before it screened this. It's on a curve across from the pond and very visible; something else has to be considered.</p> <p>Pohl – Asked the commission if they are looking for screening on the road. The only possible chance this has of being approved is if there is ample screening in the area given currently over to lawn on the western view.</p> | | | | | |
| Motion | Motion to Deny due to the high, unobscured visibility of the solar panels from a publicly travelled way. (Coombs) | | | | | |
| Roll-call Vote | Carried //Camp, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye. | | | Certificate # | HDC2020-05-0972 | |
| 7. | 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, and manufacturer spec sheet. | | | | | |
| Representing | Tim Carruthers, ACK Smart | | | | | |
| Public | None | | | | | |
| Concerns (6:05) | <p>Carruthers – Reviewed screening per previous requests; showing the driveway on the site plan; this is the last house on a dead-end road on the front of a 1-story house; the homeowner is putting up a black roof. Setback rules for arrays require twice the distance of the height of the array from the roof. The grid pattern is two rows of 10 panels in portrait mode.</p> <p>Coombs – The area around the panels makes it look like a patch; asked if it could all be moved right with one more panel added to cover the roof. Wants to see a revised layout.</p> <p>Camp – This area is very open from the bottom of the lane; she doesn't want to depend on screening. If we are going to pass this, they have to plant big fir rootballs, so we can approve due to minimal visibility.</p> <p>Welch – From what we've been told, jury's still out on the fire-related setback requirements; - code pertains to commercial as he understands it. He hasn't found anything specific to residential for Massachusetts. His concern is this proposal is not in keeping with the guidelines; one of the primary requirements is an array not be on the primary structure.</p> <p>Oliver – She can't follow how many panels are used and which way they are oriented; it's just a shaded block. No further comments.</p> <p>Pohl – He appreciates this is a 1-story house and there will be year-round vegetation planted. We will be looking for a layout to address Ms. Coombs concerns.</p> | | | | | |
| Motion | Motion to Hold for revisions to the array layout, a planting plan, and drawing of the grid pattern of the 20 panels. (Camp) | | | | | |
| Roll-call Vote | Carried 5-0//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye | | | Certificate # | | |
| 8. | Hale Everts | 12-0300 | 46 Monomoy Road | Deck add/ext alterations | 54-71 | Self |
| Voting | Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch | | | | | |
| Alternates | None | | | | | |
| Recused | None | | | | | |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos. | | | | | |
| Representing | Hale Everts, owner | | | | | |
| Public | None | | | | | |
| Concerns (6:25) | <p>Everts – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Camp – Good job in keeping the character of the building; okay with the removal of the turret.</p> <p>Welch – The vocabulary works without the turret.</p> <p>Oliver – They have cottage corners on the whole house in the renderings but not the drawing; cottage corners seem more subdued. He did a good job.</p> <p>Pohl – This is a very appropriate renovation.</p> | | | | | |
| Motion | Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver) | | | | | |
| Roll-call Vote | 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, Cotuit Solar | | | |
| Public | None | | | |
| Concerns (6:44) | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Oliver – Mostly okay; wonders who will determine the scope of the screening.</p> <p>Coombs – If they are willing to screen as much as possible, she can support this.</p> <p>Pohl – Ms. Flynn does the site inspections; she will make the final determination about the screening.</p> | | | |
| 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 | | | |
| Public | Abby Camp, 27 Lily Street | | | |
| Concerns (6:57) | <p>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.</p> <p>Flynn – Read a letter of concerns from Charles Harkness, owner of 8 & 21 Lily Street, into the record.</p> <p>Troast – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Were told they needed HDC approval before going to the Department of Public Works (DPW).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Discussion about the height of the foundation on the new addition.</p> | | | |
| 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, Camp, Oliver, Welch | | | |
| Alternates | None | | | |
| Recused | None | | | |
| Documentation | Landscape design plans, site plan, and advisory comments. | | | |
| Representing | Linda Williams | | | |
| Public | None | | | |
| Concerns (7:21) | <p>Williams – Reviewed additional information and changes made per previous concerns. Will have a flagstone between the wall and the patio at the gate.</p> <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments: would like a stepping stone inside the gate to differentiate.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>No further concerns.</p> | | | |
| 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 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 12. 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) | <p>Williams – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. She will probably have to come back for path of travel.</p> <p>Welch – The 26X12 at-grade deck with ramp, asked which side is at grade (the outside).</p> <p>Coombs – It says the three trees will remain, confirmed the chestnut tree will remain.</p> <p>No further concerns.</p> | | | |
| 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 | 25 Dukes Road | New dwelling with solar | 41-530.2/530.1 | Self |
| Voting | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch | | | |
| Alternates | None | | | |
| Recused | None | | | |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos. | | | |
| Representing | Charles Lenhart, owner | | | |
| Public | None | | | |
| Concerns (7:35) | <p>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.</p> <p>Camp – She has no concerns with the house or the solar.</p> <p>Oliver – No concerns. Asked how much power would be lost if the 2nd-floor panels were removed.</p> <p>Welch – Okay with the house; can't support the solar array due to inconsistency with the guidelines.</p> <p>Coombs – Okay with the house and doesn't think the solar will be that visible.</p> <p>Pohl – Has no concerns.</p> | | | |
| 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 | 1 Magnolia Avenue | Add dormers | 73.3.1-123 | Val Oliver |
| Voting | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch | | | |
| Alternates | None | | | |
| Recused | None | | | |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, documentation, and advisory comments. | | | |
| Representing | Val Oliver, V. Oliver Design | | | |
| Public | None | | | |
| Concerns (7:47) | <p>Backus – Read SAB comments: looks great.</p> <p>Oliver – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Camp – She's very excited about this; loves the addition bringing back the Tudor style; doesn't think the dormers need the rake overhang.</p> <p>Welch – No concerns; appreciates the changes.</p> <p>Coombs – No concerns.</p> | | | |
| Motion | Motion to Approve. (Camp) | | | |
| Roll-call Vote | Carried 4-0//Coombs, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye | | Certificate # | HDC2020-06-1237 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| 15. Will Forbeth | 06-1121 | 58 Walsh Street | New dwelling | 29-97 | Sanne Payne |
| Voting | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver | | | | |
| Alternates | None | | | | |
| Recused | None | | | | |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments. | | | | |
| Representing | Sanne Payne | | | | |
| Public | None | | | | |
| Concerns (7:50) | <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments: awkward design; should be 1½ story, which would bring the eaves down; would like photos of the historic neighborhood. The lot is about 5227 square feet.</p> <p>Payne – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; a 6-foot hedge might help alleviate the vertical-board skirt.</p> <p>Camp – The reduced roof walk now looks too small; suggested enlarging 6 inches on each side. The north elevation is over fenestrated.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Pohl – There are houses in this area that are 1½ 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 to 1½ story.</p> | | | | |
| Motion | Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp) | | | | |
| Roll-call Vote | Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye | | | Certificate # | |
| 16. NBGC | 06-1145 | 69 Sparks Ave | New dwelling | 55-139.2 | Emeritus |
| Voting | Pohl, Coombs, Oliver | | | | |
| Alternates | Camp had stepped out for the prior hearing. | | | | |
| Recused | None | | | | |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos. | | | | |
| Representing | Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development | | | | |
| Public | None | | | | |
| Concerns (8:10) | MacEachern – Asked this be held for additional changes. Not opened at this time. | | | | |
| 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 |
| Voting | Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver | | | | |
| Alternates | None | | | | |
| Recused | None | | | | |
| Documentation | Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos. | | | | |
| Representing | Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development | | | | |
| Public | Jeff, owner Sarah Alger, Sarah F. Alger P.C. | | | | |
| Concerns (8:11) | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | | | | |
| Motion | Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp) | | | | |
| Roll-call Vote | Carried 4-0//Coombs, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye | | | Certificate # | |

18. 12 Lincoln Ave NT 06-1159 12 Lincoln Avenue Rev. 73364: re-site pool 30-183 Emeritus

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
 Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
 Matthew Cunningham, Landscape Architect
 Public None
 Concerns (8:30) **MacEachern** – Reviewed the project and introduced Matthew Cunningham.
 Cunningham – Presented the landscape plan: fencing, pool screening, and planting plan; we can discuss alternatives to the Leland Cyprus.
 Oliver – No Leland Cyprus; they grow too symmetrically and become a wall. Doesn't think the picket fence will screen the air-conditioning units. She's okay with the wire fence as long as it's imbedded in a double-row of privet.
 Camp – She has no concerns.
 Coombs – This is alright as long as the Leland Cyprus is changed.
 Pohl – These are all great plants but they aren't our purview; we want to ensure the pool is invisible from any public way year-round. Confirmed the board fence between this property and DeMarco's property will remain.
 Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with the wire-mesh fence located on the inside of the vegetation and with the pool and air conditioning units to be screen so as not to be visible from a public way at time of inspection and thereafter. (Oliver)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Camp-abstain; Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-06-1159**

| V. OTHER BUSINESS | |
|---------------------|---|
| Approve Minutes | None |
| Review Minutes | June 1, 4, 8, 16 & 30 and July 2 & 6 |
| Other Business | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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:

- 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