HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Commissioners: Raymond Pohl (Chair), Diane Coombs (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, Abigail Camp, Vallorie Oliver,
Associate Commissioners: Stephen Welch, Terence Watterson, Jessie Dutra

~~ MINUTES ~~
Tuesday, July 21, 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 4:32 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

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

I. PUBLIC COMMENT
Kevin Kuester, Sign Advisory Committee (SAC) – We reviewed the application for entry to Sand Piper Place. Hardscaping rocks had been approved, which were also free-standing signs; we had received complaints about those. Richmond Development will submit an application for revisions to the HDC approval for the rock signs.

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>1. Antone Fernandes</td>
<td>06-1155 35 Tenness</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>59.4-247</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. John Galiner</td>
<td>07-1294 34 Washing</td>
<td>Rev. 06-1134: wrdw/dr</td>
<td>31.13.3</td>
<td>Sophie Metz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. William Hunter</td>
<td>07-1313 3 Sleetswi</td>
<td>Rev. 01-0500: fence chg</td>
<td>74-27</td>
<td>NAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. John Fox</td>
<td>07-1301 72 Pochick</td>
<td>Deck/patio</td>
<td>79-154</td>
<td>Val Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. T&amp;R Realty Trust</td>
<td>07-1283 134 Old South</td>
<td>Rev. 03-0818: cell tower</td>
<td>67-38</td>
<td>Dan Bilezikian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 4 Shawkemo Rd RT</td>
<td>07-1337 4 Shawkemo</td>
<td>Paint chimney grey</td>
<td>43-91</td>
<td>Botticelli &amp; Pohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Scott Valero</td>
<td>07-1321 Exeter St</td>
<td>Omit shwr enclosure</td>
<td>76.4-1-410.1</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Joe Saluti</td>
<td>07-1319 Cliff Rd</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>41-63</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ian MacTaggart</td>
<td>07-1335 Brooks F</td>
<td>Move/demo 448 sf cabana</td>
<td>41-222.8</td>
<td>M. Cutone Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vilma Vadoklis</td>
<td>07-1340 2 Nanina Dr</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>67-592</td>
<td>JB Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vilma Vadoklis</td>
<td>07-1347 2 Nanina D</td>
<td>Extend deck</td>
<td>67-592</td>
<td>JB Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Paul Stewart Trust</td>
<td>07-1343 61 Madaket</td>
<td>Roof change</td>
<td>41-201</td>
<td>James Lydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 12 Lincoln Ave NT</td>
<td>07-1327 12 Lincoln</td>
<td>Garage door clr clbg</td>
<td>30-183</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Melanie Bundles</td>
<td>07-1338 Kendrick</td>
<td>Rev. 75272: wind change</td>
<td>76.4.1-1</td>
<td>Sanne Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 18 Orange, LLC</td>
<td>07-1342 18 Orange St</td>
<td>Demo blkhd, add wndw well</td>
<td>42.3.2/15</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Stephen Frohwein</td>
<td>07-1284 North Liberty</td>
<td>Demo/move shed</td>
<td>41-159</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Motion Motion to Approve. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Camp, Welch, and Coombs-aye

Certificate # HDC2020-(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>1. Audrey Sterk 07-1346</td>
<td>6 Marsh Hawk</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>56-396</td>
<td>Ethan McMorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due to lack of visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Terrence Newt 07-1330</td>
<td>2 White Street</td>
<td>Pool/spa</td>
<td>80-215.1</td>
<td>BPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scott Bontz 07-1329</td>
<td>4 Vinecliff Lane</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>39-43.2</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3 Shimmo Pond Rd, LLC 07-1332</td>
<td>3 Shimmo Pond Road</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>54-259</td>
<td>M. Cutone Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pool must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Peter Michalowski 07-1312</td>
<td>46 Vesper Lane</td>
<td>Basketball court</td>
<td>56-30</td>
<td>Bessey Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due to lack of visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 18 Meadow, LLC 07-1317</td>
<td>18 Meadow Lane</td>
<td>Hardscape-pool-2'ret wall</td>
<td>41-406</td>
<td>Atlantic Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must not be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternate: None
Recused: None
Documentation: None
Representing: None
Public: None
Concerns: Welch – Asked about visibility of the pool at 18 Meadow Lane.

Motion: Motion to Approve per noted conditions. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Coombs, Camp, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye
Certificate #: HDC2020-07-(as noted)

IV. SIGNS

<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. Francis Farrell 07-1296</td>
<td>5 India Street</td>
<td>Wall / RES IPA</td>
<td>42.3.1-226</td>
<td>Josh Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Francis Farrell 07-1297</td>
<td>5 India Street</td>
<td>Projected sign</td>
<td>42.3.1-226</td>
<td>Josh Moore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternate: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
Representing: None
Sign Advisory: None
Concerns (time): Flynn - Approvable
Motion: Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye
Certificate #: HDC2020-07-(as noted)

3. NIR 07-1305 | Straight Wharf | Projecting Sign / Respoke | 42.2.4-1 | Chris Bartick |

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternate: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
Representing: None
Sign Advisory: None
Concerns (time): Flynn – Held for revisions
Motion: Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye
Certificate #: HDC2020-07-1304

5. NIR 07-1304 | 2 Harbor Square | Wall / Dawn | 42.2.4-1 | Allison Deck |

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternate: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
Representing: None
Sign Advisory: None
Concerns (time): Flynn – Approvable
Motion: Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Welch, Camp, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye
Certificate #: HDC2020-07-1304
V. 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>1. Martin Anguelov</td>
<td>07-1315 19B Waydale Road</td>
<td>Hardscape</td>
<td>67-29</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, 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>Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Martin Anguelov, owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Val Oliver, Architect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>Anguelov – Presented project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver – We can provide an elevation of the front; suggested the fence die into the center post with a gate on the porch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp – Asked the material of the driveway (¾-inch gravel).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welch – He has no material concerns. Asked about where the fence approaches the house if there will be a plant. Regarding the vegetation on the driveway, suggested a climbing vine on the center fence section. The 5&amp;1 is atypical in the front yard and along the road; we could approve subject to the privet being maintained in perpetuity and due to extenuating circumstances. Climbing hydrangea would be fine but privet would be better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coombs – She has an issue with where the 5&amp;1 hits the deck and along the road; she’d prefer privet without the fence along that section with a picket fence. Wants to see a drawing of how the fence meets the front of the house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pohl – Confirmed the Belgium block along the driveway is a curb between the driveway and grass. The idea of the fence is to keep kids out of the road, but there’s a breach at the porch; the 5&amp;1 will look odd coming into the porch with the lower railing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Approve through staff with the addition of privet along the road and parking to remain in perpetuity. (Welch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-call Vote</td>
<td>Carried 4-0//Coombs, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye</td>
<td>Certificate #</td>
<td>HDC2020-07-1315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. ACK 007 Prop. 02-0644 46 Walsh Street Shed 29-101.1 Lewis Kelsey

<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.ACK 007 Prop. 02-0644</td>
<td>46 Walsh Street</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>29-101.1</td>
<td>Lewis Kelsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, 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, and advisory comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Lewis Kelsey</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</td>
<td>Kelsey – Presented project; deck post will be between door and window.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backus – Read HSAB comments: concerned about proximity of shed to the 2nd-floor deck. Her comments: no photos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver – Asked if there will be shutters (prefer not). Would be better without the shutters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coombs – Agrees no shutters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welch – Agrees no shutters; it will be a handsome little structure. There is some vegetation across the front.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Approve through staff with no shutters or window boxes. (Camp)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-call Vote</td>
<td>Carried 5-0//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl</td>
<td>Certificate #</td>
<td>HDC2020-02-0644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Thompson 07-1292 73 Baxter Road Garage 49-27 Emeritus

<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>3. Thompson 07-1292</td>
<td>73 Baxter Road</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>49-27</td>
<td>Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Pohl, Coombs, Camp, 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, and advisory comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development</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</td>
<td>MacEachern – Presented project; reviewed discussion about demolition of the existing circa 1940s structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backus – Read SAB comments: want to see the east elevation porch and grade; add elements, i.e. deep overhangs, of existing garage; simplify look along the street; should feel connected to house and mirror house details; appreciate the placement. Read SAB comments for move off/demolition of existing garage: retain and reuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flynn – The demolition is tracking the main house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welch – He’s uncomfortable reviewing and approving this when we don’t haven’t approved the demolition, and we don’t know the design elements on original garage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver – Agrees with Mr. Welch about approving a new dwelling when we haven’t ironed out the demolition. This would be close enough to the house that it could be connected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coombs – This doesn’t look anything like the existing house and it should; looks more like a guesthouse than a garage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pohl – The eaves of this garage will be higher than the house eaves. He’d like to see the elevation of the house and proposed garage together as seen from Baxter Road. This bungalow-style house is very low and grounded where this garage is vertical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Motion to Hold for additional information to be reviewed with the garage demolition and main house. (Camp)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-call Vote</td>
<td>Carried 5-0//Welch, Oliver, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye</td>
<td>Certificate #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Stephen Frohwein 07-1285** 32 North Liberty Street  Addition  41-159  Emeritus

**Certification:** HDC2020-07-1285

**Certificate #** 80-141  Botticelli & Pohl

**Voting** Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

**Alternates** None

**Recused** None

**Documentation** Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.

**Representing** Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development

**Public** None

**Concerns (5:31)**
- **MacEachern** – Presented project; circa 1907.
- **Backus** – Based upon National Historic Landmark (NHL) data circa 1835 and 1840; recommend every effort used to create an addition sensitive to the existing structure and secondary in scale. Read HSAB comments: addition overwhelms and dominates original structure; should have same windows and pitch; 2nd-floor connector too high; additions should be lower ell off the rear; no east elevation pent roof and large added chimney; lower plate and cave.
- **Coombs** – The addition is too tall and too big; it should drop down. Current additions are all 1 story and keep the main house important. The addition chimney should be finished off the same as the existing. East elevation porch doesn’t fit this style of the house. South elevation is not sensitive to the old house.
- **Welch** – Agree with HSAB and staff’s comments. Suggested an addition off the south would be better than this ambitious addition to the west which isn’t historical. To get 2nd-floor space, it would have to be smaller. Regarding the ell concept, that would expand the footprint and retain the bay window; it would be a shame to lose that window.
- **Pohl** – Agrees with his fellow board members, HSAB, and Ms. Backus.

**Motion** Motion to Hold for revision. (Welch)

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

---

5. **Kathleen Krall 06-1252** 15 Masaquet Avenue Demo-move MH  80-141  Botticelli & Pohl

**Certification #** HDC2020-06-1252

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

**Alternates** None

**Recused** Pohl

**Documentation** Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.

**Representing** Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl

**Public** None

**Concerns (5:49)**
- **Botticelli** – Presented project.
- **Backus** – Non-contributing, circa 1982 according to NHL. No comments.

**Motion** Motion to Approve as a move off or demolition. (Camp)

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

---

6. **Kathleen Krall 06-1254** 15 Masaquet Avenue Demo-move garage  80-141  Botticelli & Pohl

**Certification #** HDC2020-06-1254

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

**Alternates** None

**Recused** Pohl

**Documentation** Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.

**Representing** Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl

**Public** None

**Concerns (5:54)**
- **Botticelli** – Presented project; addition built in 1983. No concerns.

**Motion** Motion to Approve as a move off or demolition. (Oliver)

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

---

7. **Kathleen Krall 06-1255** 15 Masaquet Avenue New dwelling  80-141  Botticelli & Pohl

**Certification #** HDC2020-06-1255

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

**Alternates** None

**Recused** Pohl

**Documentation** Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

**Representing** Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl

**Public** None

**Concerns (5:56)**
- **Botticelli** – Presented project; visibility is of the north elevation.
- **Oliver** – No concerns with massing or the details.
- **Welch** – Appreciates that the north isn’t a gable parallel to the street. Asked depth of 2nd-floor deck; looks appropriate.
- **Coombs** – Ask why the front door isn’t centered in the main mass; it’s the only thing off balance.

**Motion** Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)

**Roll-call Vote** Carried 4-0//Welch, Camp, Oliver, and Coombs-aye
**Proposed HDC Minutes for July 21, 2010**

### 8. Kathleen Kral 

**Identification:** 06-1251  
15 Masaquet Avenue  
New garage  
80-141  
Botticelli & Pohl

**Voting:** Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Oliver, Welch

**Alternates:** None

**Recused:** Pohl

**Documentation:** Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

**Representing:** Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl

**Public:** None

**Concerns (6:01):**
- **Botticelli** – Presented project; only north elevation would be visible from the street, but the lot is pretty wooded.
- **Oliver** – She would like to see it next to the house.
- **Camp** – No concerns. Thinks spreading out the windows in the dormers would draw attention to them.
- **Welch** – He’s also fine with this.
- **Coombs** – Would prefer the 4 windows in the east elevation dormer be spread out to fill the dormer. Same with the 3 windows in the west elevation dormer.

**Motion:** Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)

**Roll-call Vote:** Carried 4-0//Welch, Camp, and Oliver-aye; Coombs-nay

**Certificate #** HDC2020-06-1251

### 9. Habitat for Humanity 07-1278  

31 Beach Grass Road  
New dwelling  
68-378  
Richard Hussey

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

**Alternates:** None

**Recused:** None

**Documentation:** Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

**Representing:** Richard Hussey, Habitat for Humanity Coach Building Committee

**Public:** None

**Concerns (6:06):**
- **Hussey** – Presented project; trim platinum grey, doors Hussey green and cottage red, sashes white, and roof is grey.
- **Oliver** – The building is fine, but we usually try to see the context either side. Would like to hold for what was approved around it regarding color, height, and scale. East elevation concerns include the width of the dormers and size of the windows, raise the porch roof to mitigate the shingle space. East elevation, the 1st-floor window headers are much higher than the doors.
- **Welch** – He thinks this is the first of the three lots in a row. Could drop another beam under the soffit area of the porch roof and wrap the trim. Agree with Ms. Oliver about viewing this in context; because the others haven’t come in, this might be the dormer allotment for this cluster of three on the street. Agrees about the width of the dormer. Modular structures have additional height; asked that a condition of the approval is that the height is approved due to its being a modular construction. The east elevation 1st-floor windows could be lowered.
- **Camp** – Likes platinum grey but would prefer simpler colors considering how much is going on around it.
- **Coombs** – The east elevation windows in the dormer align over the 1st-floor windows; not so on the west. The east elevation 1st-floor windows should stay where they are. The proposed roof color is different from what we’ve approved.
- **Pohl** – Make the dormer narrower to reduce the shingle between the corner and windows; keep the windows aligned. The top of the east elevation porch should be raised to be closer to the 2nd-floor window sills. Window headers higher than the door is common in older houses. He doesn’t support white sashes; should be platinum grey.

**Motion:** Motion to Approve through staff with the sash and trim to be white and adding a 6- to 9-inch beam between the column posts and porch roofing shell. (Welch)

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

**Certificate #** HDC2020-07-1278

### 10. John Halliwell  

Trust 07-1277  
2 Webster Road  
Rev. 02-0719: garage  
79-146  
Thornewill Design

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

**Alternates:** Dutra

**Recused:** None

**Documentation:** Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.

**Representing:** Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design

**Public:** None

**Concerns (6:30):**
- **Thornewill** – Presented project; half-round window is an element on the existing house; color is white – main house is currently natural to weather but coming in with a revision to go to white.
- **Oliver** – She would like to hold for a view and photos of the other structures. The half-round faces away from the street so not concerned. The cupola seems too vertical. East elevation, the stacked windows lend to the verticality.
- **Coombs** – The cupola isn’t in keeping with the rest of the structure. The half-round will be hard to see.
- **Pohl** – Doesn’t want to approve this as white then find white isn’t appropriate for the house.

**Motion:** Motion to View. (Welch)

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

**Certificate #**

---
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11. 262 Polpis N.T. 07-1288
262 Polpis Street
Rev. 72782; cabana addition
25-1
M. Cutone Architecture

Voting
Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra

Alternates
Welch

Recused
None

Documentation
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photo.

Representing
Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture

Public
None

Concerns (6:38)

Cutone – Presented project; front could potentially be visible from the harbor.

Oliver – This is visible from the public landing. This is the biggest cabana she’s seen; she doesn’t support enlarging it.

Coombs – Visible from Pocomo Road. She thinks it’s too big; enlarging it makes it look like a dwelling.

Dutra – He’s not sure about the visibility.

Camp – She has no concerns; this is a simple, low building at 18 feet.

Pohl – He thinks to see this you have to be out by the oyster beds. It is a long way from the boat launch and is low. No concerns.

Motion
Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp) Not carried.

Motion to Hold for the beginning of the old business hearing. (Camp)

Roll-call Vote
Carried 4-0// Dutra lost connectivity; Oliver, Coombs, Camp and Pohl-aye.

Certificate #

12. Ross Silverstein 07-1334
51 Orange Street
Roof walk color change
42.3.2-183
M. Cutone Architecture

Voting
Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates
Dutra

Recused
None

Documentation
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photo, historic documentation, and advisory comments.

Representing
Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture

Public
None

Concerns (6:51)

Backus – Read HSAB comments: biggest concern is the skirting with no posts showing.

Cutone – Roof walk built in 1998; owner is open to modifying to express the posts through the skirt; owner wants the skirt to be white as well.

Oliver – If they are willing to make the roof walk look typical, she has no concerns.

Camp – No concerns.

Coombs – No concerns.

Welch – Okay with the white skirt in town and on a formal structure.

Pohl – This roof walk is built egregiously incorrectly; the posts should be visible all the way through; the skirt board shouldn’t be proud of the posts.

Motion
Motion to Approve through staff with the posts expressed to be continuous down to the roof. (Coombs)

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

Certificate #

HDC2020-07-1334

13. George Hornyak 07-1281
61 Somerset Road
Roof top Solar
66-89
SunWind, LLC

Voting
Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates
None

Recused
None

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

Representing
Tim Holmes, SunWind, LLC

Public
None

Concerns (6:59)

Holmes – Presented project; the lower southwest roof might get too much shade.

Oliver – The roof color is working against this. The front is only visible once you pull into the driveway; suggested putting the porch roof panels on the lower southwest roof. She can support this due to lack of visibility if the front panels are removed.

Welch – He will defer to Ms. Oliver’s judgement.

Camp – No concerns.

Coombs – She’s with Ms. Oliver.

Motion
Motion to Approve through staff with the panels on the front lower roof being removed. (Oliver)

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

Certificate #

HDC2020-07-1281
14. Lisa Hood 07-1282
17 Derrymore Road
Roof top Solar
41-114
SunWind, LLC

- Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
- Alternates: None
- Recused: None
- Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.
- Representing: Tim Holmes, SunWind, LLC
- Public: None
- Concerns (7:06):
  - Holmes: Presented project; the rear mass roof is very low and about 4/12 pitch with trees; part of the application is to replace the roof with black shingles.
  - Oliver: There’s a rear mass facing the same direction on which to place the panels; they won’t be on the highest roof.
  - Welch: They are on the primary mass and visible; he can’t support this.
  - Coombs: They are visible; she can’t support this.
  - Pohl: The panels are on the 2nd-floor and are visible

Motion: Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 4-0//Camp abstain; Coombs, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl -aye

Certificate #

15. Scott Bowman 07-1336
7 Folger Avenue
Roof top solar
80-166
Cotuit Solar

- Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
- Alternates: None
- Recused: None
- Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.
- Representing: Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar
- Public: None
- Concerns (7:13):
  - Alence: Presented project; this is very hard to see this from the road.
  - Oliver: She walked the route; you can barely see the structure; she’s okay due to lack of visibility.
  - Welch: He did a driveway; it’s not on the primary structure and visibility heavily helps. Would prefer “limited” visibility.
  - Dutra: No concerns.
  - Coombs: No concerns.

Motion: Motion to Approve as submitted due to limited visibility and that it’s appropriately placed on the secondary structure. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Welch, Dutra, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl -aye
Certificate #

16. ARl, LLC 07-1318
10 Delaney Road
As-built color change
41-120
Self

- Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
- Alternates: None
- Recused: None
- Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
- Representing: Tracy Cullinane
- Public: None
- Concerns (7:18):
  - Cullinane: Presented project.
  - No concerns.

Motion: Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra, and Pohl -aye;
Certificate #

17. Stephen Erisman 07-1302
2 Saccacha Avenue
Outdoor shwr/lattice fence
82-23.2
Val Oliver

- Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra
- Alternates: None
- Recused: Oliver
- Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
- Representing: Val Oliver, V. Oliver Design
- Public: None
- Concerns (7:21):
  - Oliver: Presented project.
  - Welch: His concern is the width of the boards and the fence; it looks like a stockade fence on posts with caps and lattice behind it. The details are a concern. He’d like to see a photo of the view from the travelled way.
  - Coombs: The shower enclosure is too big, and the lattice should be removed; the basement would be better with a picket fence.
  - Dutra: He’d like to view this.
  - Pohl: Planting around it would mitigate it.

Motion: Motion to View. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Camp, Welch, Dutra, Coombs, and Pohl -aye
Certificate #
18. Doug Raymond 07-1324 5 Cornish Street Addition 42.4.1-95 SMRD

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
Alternates: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
Representing: Steve Roethke, Steve M. Roethke Design
Public: None

Concerns (7:28)

Roethke – Presented project; thinks there’s confusion on the actual date; it was his impression it’s circa 1970s; north elevation isn’t visible; only the south elevation is visible.

Backus – NHL has this as a 1933 cape; proposal transfers a simple cape; proposed connected gable dormers is out of place, should be single shed; west elevation little window; north elevation appreciate the dormer. Read HSAB comments: not sure of alterations; railing not extending on the west elevation and wrapping around; push front dormer back 6 inches; one large dormer on front; rear dormer busy; trellis would be more attractive. She looked at both the NACR and NHL surveys; both listed this as circa 1933 and this structure we are looking at is the one indicated in the NACR survey.

Coombs – The front dormer should come off the ridge; it’s overwhelmingly large.

Oliver – The building on three sides is okay; her concern is the front dormer. Suggested eliminating the window in the connector. Suggested the front dormer be a shed with windows across and flipping the interior floor plan so the rear could be made a gable dormer.

Welch – He has the same concern as seen from the west elevation. The west elevation will be obliquely visible from the street. South elevation, would prefer the gable dormers go to 9/12 allowing for the ridge to be lowered, especially the shed portion. Would be prefer a double-hung in place of the “C” window in the connector. This design is charming and creates a story around the simple cape. He would like clarification on the date of this and if there is anything contributing about it in its current form. The perspective view reinforces his opinion the front center window should be double-hung. The outdoor air-conditioner line should be boxed in cedar.

Dutra – It’s quite charming. He’s having a hard time understanding the front dormers from a visual standpoint. He likes the window in the middle.

Pohl – Liked the comment about changing the roof pitch from 10/12 to 9/12 keeping the plate height. West elevation, asked about the lattice panel.

Motion: Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Coombs, Welch, Dutra, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

Certificate #

19. Leah Cabral 07-1336 7 Marble Way Roof top solar 66-443.1 Karen Alence

Voting: Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
Alternates: None
Recused: None
Documentation: Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.
Representing: Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar
Public: None

Concerns (7:53)

Alence – Presented project; without the 8 panels on the front, this isn’t viable.

Oliver – The photos tell the whole story; anything on the south is not acceptable, especially on a cedar roof, and it will be visible. Panels on the rear and side shed roofs are okay.

Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; the rules are no panels on the front.

Backus – There is vegetation, but there is a secondary lot behind it that could be cleared for a house.

Dutra – He will go with the Board.

Welch – Agrees with what’s been said. Suggested eliminating the panels on the front and putting 6 panels on the upper portion of the rear roof.

Motion: Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)
Roll-call Vote: Carried 5-0//Dutra, Welch, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

Certificate #
20. Blackberry Prep 07-1309 26 West Chester Street Hardscape-spa-ret wall 30” 42.4.3-56 Atlantic Landscaping

Voting
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.
Representing Lindsay Congleton, Atlantic Landscaping Inc.
Public None

Concerns (8:02)

- Congleton – Presented project; no visibility from West Chester; there is some visibility from Lily Pond Park so proposing evergreen screen across the back and up the side.
- Backus – NHL says pre-1920s; NACR says circa 1800s; proposed hardscaping will be visible from Lily Pond; topography would be helpful. Read HSAB comments: concerned about visibility; no pool-fence details; and site cross section.
- Welch – Agrees with comments made; he’d like to see the topography, a cross section front to back, spot elevations, and elevation drawings showing features from Lily Pond including structure.
- Coombs – Asked about the fence (auto-cover, no fence required). Wonders how they will transfer from the driveway to the beginning of the house, to the spa, and down to Lily Pond.
- Oliver – Looking at an aerial, the rear is exposed to Wesco Place. Agrees with what’s been said.
- Dutra – It makes sense to hold for more information.
- Pohl – We do need to get information about the amount of retainage.

Motion

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

21. Kamadif, LLC 07-1310 32 Dukes Road Patio/ret wall 30” high 56-188 Atlantic Landscaping

Voting
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Lindsay Congleton, Atlantic Landscaping Inc.
Public None

Concerns (8:13)

- Congleton – Presented project; the rear neighbor’s plateau is about 8 feet higher than our pool.
- Oliver – She wants to view this; the guy in back was going to accrete vegetation onto this property. Your site plan doesn’t locate the Hollis-Webb property and house; wants to know how this will impact his property. We need more topographical information.
- Welch – There is a 6-foot grade change between the wall and what’s behind it; right now, it’s so steep they will cut out and fill in. Wants lines to show existing versus proposed grade changes.
- Coombs – It is very important that we have the abutting houses on the plans. Doesn’t see why the retaining wall needs to be bowed. She’d like to see the topography and abutting houses to include the 81 Vestal Street property and house location.
- Dutra – Agrees with what’s been said. A 30-inch wall isn’t a big issue, but we have to scrutinize this area.
- Pohl – The level of the patio around the pool is lower than where the trees are proposed; that patio cuts into the hill. Looking for topography that extend onto the abutting properties and north-south cross section; put 30-inch stakes at the pool with orange tape to show extent of grading.

Motion

Motion to Hold for topography extending onto neighboring properties and showing those houses; spot elevations; and 30-inch stakes with orange tape. (Dutra)

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

22. Rodney Goldstein 07-1311 6 Sankaty Road Addition 73.1.4-38 Botticelli & Pohl

Voting
Alternates None
Recused Pohl
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.
Representing Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl
Public None

Concerns (8:26)

- Botticelli – Presented project.
- Backus – According to NHL and NACR surveys, circa 1920 colonial revival; recommend additions provide colonial revival architectural elements and new windows be in keeping with existing windows. Read SAB comments: should add similar odd number windows; south elevation, add pent roof; existing chimney being removed.
- Welch – South elevation, okay with the small hipped roof or change the gable to hipped or change the gable roof pitch; as viewed from the east, a hipped roof would be too much.
- Oliver – Nothing to add.
- Dutra – He has nothing to add.
- Coombs – Asked why the east chimney was removed (non-functional and no basement support).

Motion

Motion to Approve through staff with the south elevation small gable to go to 8/10 pitch. (Welch)

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Oliver, Dutra, Welch, and Coombs-aye Certificate # HDC2020-07-1311
23. Kevin Dale Trust 07-1299
7 King Street
Move building & addition
73.1.3-41
Botticelli & Pohl

Voting
Coombs (acting chair), Oliver, Welch, Dutra

Alternates
None

Recused
Pohl

Documentation
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.

Representing
Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl

Public
None

Concerns (8:35)

- Botticelli – Presented project: move closer to Shell Street away from King Street; explained removal of chimney due to poor condition.
- Backus – Read SAB comments: Edward Coffin circa 1893; additions are sensitive to historic character; if there are any revisions, wants to see those; east elevation, 2 windows replace 1 seems odd; 8-foot tall basement window shouldn’t be visible, should be below grade.
- Oliver – No concerns.
- Dutra – It looks good; would like to see the chimney brought back.
- Welch – Agrees about the chimney coming back and basement windows not being visible. It is important to note this is an important contributing structure and it is being relocated on the site such that the changes are not a detriment.
- Coombs – She’d like the chimney to be replaced as it is shown in the historical photo.

Motion
Motion to Approve through staff with the chimney added back on and the basement windows to be below the grade. (Oliver)

Roll-call Vote
Carried 4-0//Dutra, Welch, Oliver, and Coombs-aye

Certificate # HDC2020-07-1299

24. Nant. 62 Walsh, LLC 07-1286
60 Walsh Street
Move/demo dwelling
29-85.2
Botticelli & Pohl

Voting
Coombs (acting chair), Oliver, Welch, Dutra

Alternates
None

Recused
Pohl

Documentation
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.

Representing
Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl

Public
None

Concerns (8:45)

- Botticelli – Presented project; garage-guesthouse was approved.
- Oliver – No concerns.
- Dutra – No concerns.
- Backus – HSAB had no concerns.

Motion
Motion to Approve as a move off-demolition.

Roll-call Vote
Carried 4-0//Welch, Dutra, Oliver, and Coombs-aye

Certificate # HDC2020-07-1286

25. Audrey Sterk 07-1345
6 Marsh Hawk Lane
Rev. 0325: rotate/windows
56-396
Ethan McMorrow

Voting
Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch

Alternates
None

Recused
None

Documentation
Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos.

Representing
Ethan McMorrow, E. McMorrow Design Associates

Public
None

Concerns (8:50)

- McMorrow – Presented project; not visible.
- Oliver – Would have been clearer with the appropriate site plan. The application needs to be filled in regarding the material and colors.
- Camp – Rotating it 180 degrees has no impact on her approval; it’s low and already approved; could put the not-visible caveat on it if people are concerned about the stucco and modern style.
- Coombs – Likes the chimney; no concerns.
- Welch – No concerns.

Motion
Motion to Approve through staff with the materials and colors called out on the application. (Camp)

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

Certificate # HDC2020-07-1345
Proposed HDC Minutes for July 21, 2010

26. 202 Eel Point, LLC 07-1341 202 Eel Point Road Rev. 11-0103: roof walk 38-2.3 Sanne Payne

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing David Silva
Public None

Concerns (9:01) Motion to Reopen. (Coombs) Carried 5-0//Oliver, Campbell, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye
Payne – Presented project; most of the house is existing.
Oliver – West elevation is all that’s visible; no concerns.
Coombs – From the side, the roof walk is off set and looks odd; thinks it could be visible from the road. No other concerns.
Camp – No concerns; the roof walk goes with the extensive decking.
Welch – Agrees with what’s been said; shave off just the right amount on the roofwalk.
Pohl – The roof walk is very wide in both dimensions.

Motion Motion to Approve through staff with taking off a foot off either side of the length of the roof walk. (Camp)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye Certificate # HDC2020-07-1341

27. 62 Walsh, LLC 07-1349 62 Walsh Street Demo/move cottage 29-85 Botticelli & Pohl

28. 62 Walsh, LLC 07-1348 62 Walsh Street Move/demo garage 29-85 Botticelli & Pohl

29. Woodie Stevenson 07-1333 75 North Liberty Street Front porch railing 41-140 Val Oliver

30. Eliza & David Silva 07-1316 16 Helen’s Drive Re-site/fenestration changes 66-53 Self

31. Eliza & David Silva 07-1303 16 Helen’s Drive New dwelling 66-53 Self

32. Eliza & David Silva 07-1320 16 Helen’s Drive Pool-hardscape 66-53 Self

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing David Silva
Public None
Concerns Not opened at this time.

Motion Motion to Hold for Tuesday, July 28th. (Oliver)
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Dutra, Welch, and Coombs-aye Certificate #

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes
Roll-call vote June 1, 4, 8 & 16, 2020. Motion to Approve. (Welch)
Carried 5-0//Coombs, Oliver, Dutra, Welch, and Pohl-aye

Review Minutes June 23 & 30, July 2, 6, 10 & 13, 2020

Other Business
• Discussion of Certified Local Government (CLG) and possible vote
• HDC review of revisions to HDC Background Summary to finalize for website

Commission Comments
Welch – We have more to do on Vineyard Wind but it’s premature to discuss it this evening. We’ve been asked at yesterday’s Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) meeting, to work through topics of mitigation and the BOEM request.
Camp – Wants a discussion about Tuckernuck being wrapped into MAB put on Other Business.

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed.

Motion to Approve Adjourned at 9:15 p.m. (Camp) by unanimous consent
Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Dutra, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:
Terry L. Norton
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