



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 28, 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, Dutra

Absent Members: McLaughlin, Watterson

Late Arrivals: Welch, 4:40 p.m.

Early Departures: None

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

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. CONSENT

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Joan Porter 07-1370	13 Baxter Road	Roof change	73.1.4-7	Jim Reis
2. Curt Burwell 07-1383	14 Mayhew Lane	80 sf shed addition	41-44.7	BPC
3. Sankaty Head GC 07-1356	100 Sankaty Road	Rev. 03-0816: cell tower	49-2	Dan Bilezikian
4. 12 FM Real Est Trust 07-1385	12 Fulling Mill Road	Rev. 12-0294: drmr/fen	27-32	Botticelli & Pohl
5. Seventeen BR Prop. 07-1354	1 Low Beach Road	Rev. 11-0149: garage fen	73.3.2-27	Botticelli & Pohl
6. Seventeen BR Prop. 07-1353	1 Low Beach Road	Rev. 12-0399: shed win	73.3.2-27	Botticelli & Pohl
7. Two Finback, LLC 07-1352	2 Finback Lane	Gutter/trim/frnt door clr	66-521	Brook Meerbergen
8. Matt Harrington 07-1350	50 Hummock Pond Rd	Fence	56-286	Ethan McMorrow
9. Ronald Winters 07-1362	6 Essex Road	Fence	67-598	Mark Avery
10. Grey Lady Lane, LLC 07-1365	12 Grey Lady Lane	Screened in porch	66-706	Val Oliver
11. Thomas Wynn 07-1373	10 Moors End Lane	Dormers/deck/otdr shwr	43-214	JB Studio
12. Christopher Karlson 07-1386	27 Fair Street	Roof change	42.3.2-193.1	William Freed

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

Alternates None

Recused Pohl, Oliver

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns No concerns.

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

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

Certificate #

HDC2020-07-(as noted)

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Thomas Levin 07-1363	234 Madaket Road	A/C condensers	59.4-120	SSCC

- Due to lack of visibility

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra

Alternates Welch

Recused None

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns No additional concerns.

Motion **Motion to Approve due to lack of visibility. (Oliver)**

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

Certificate #

HDC2020-07-1636

IV. SIGNS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	NIR 07-1305	Straight Wharf	Projecting Sign / Respoke	42.2.4-1	Chris Bartick
2.	NIR 07-1344	Straight Wharf	Projecting Sign / Respoke	42.2.4-1	Chris Bartick
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.				
Sign Advisory	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:42)	Flynn – Both signs approved as submitted				
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-07-(as noted)

V. NEW BUSINESS CARRIED OVER FROM 7/21/20

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	62 Walsh, LLC 07-1349	62 Walsh Street	Demo/move cottage	29-85	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, 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 (4:43)	Botticelli – Presented project have an interested party; built four or five years ago. Backus – HSAB has no concerns. Welch – He’s glad Housing Nantucket might take it. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as a move-off/demolition. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Welch, Oliver, Dutra, Camp, and Coombs-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-07-1349
2.	62 Walsh, LLC 07-1348	62 Walsh Street	Move/demo garage	29-85	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), Camp, 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 (4:47)	Botticelli – Presented project. No concerns				
Motion	Motion to Approve as a move-off/demolition. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried ///Camp, Dutra, Oliver, Welch, and Coombs-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-07-1348
3.	Woodie Stevenson 07-1333	75 North Liberty Street	Front porch railing	41-140	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Val Oliver, V. Oliver Design				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:48)	Oliver – Presented project; railing is grey. Asked to hold this to talk to the owner Backus – Contemporary house; she has no concerns. HSAB comments: asked for crossbucks; concerns about white railing, would prefer natural to weather. Camp – Would prefer a simpler design such as crossbuck. Welch – The image makes the balusters look thicker than typical 5/4 baluster material. Agrees a simpler crossbuck design within the three decorative areas would be more appropriate; cross-buck railings would be even more appropriate. Coombs – She can’t see the screen share. (NCTV folks to help her work out video.) Dutra – He doesn’t mind it; it gives a Victorian feel to the house. Pohl – Suggested replacing the ornate design with crossbucks – eliminate the middle diamond.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Dutra, Coombs, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

4. Eliza & David Silva	07-1316	16 Helen's Drive	Re-site & fenestration changes	66-53	Self
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	Coombs having video issues.				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Eliza Silva, owner				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:56)	<p>Silva – Presented project.</p> <p>Oliver – The two-over-two windows are an odd proportion because they are using the existing openings; however, visibility is minimal in the proposed location.</p> <p>Camp – Doesn't think this will be visible; okay with the proposal.</p> <p>Dutra – No concerns due to lack of visibility.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with comments made but okay due to limited visibility.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried //Dutra, Oliver, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-07-1316
5. Eliza & David Silva	07-1303	16 Helen's Drive	New dwelling	66-53	Self
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	Coombs (resolved video issues after hearing started)				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Eliza Silva, owner				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:05)	<p>Silva – Presented project; should only be able to see the west and north elevations and that will be limited.</p> <p>Oliver – The west elevation needs more fenestration on the 2nd floor of the main mass; it's 30-feet tall and no windows. The west elevation has the same expanse of shingled wall. There are a lot of anomalies but thinks lack of visibility will carry it. South elevation has two entry points. Regarding the front door, the existing building is a simpler style; the new house has large overhangs and is more complicated, which detracts from the front door.</p> <p>Camp – She'd like more consistency in the size of window; the front door looks random. Suggested it's possible for that 30-foot roof to come down; would also like to see something in that gable. South elevation, the 1st-floor windows could be more consistent in size. North elevation, the large roof plane under the dormer looks odd. West elevation, the front door doesn't look like a front door.</p> <p>Dutra – West elevation, agrees raising the middle mass roof up would help and agrees it needs a more traditional front door; suggested something over the door to give it more presence. Okay with the north elevation. South elevation, understands the problem with mixed window sizes; suggested moving the French doors left so the "A" windows could be increased in size; the 5 ganged windows could be reduced by one and spaced. East elevation, not that concerned since it's the back.</p> <p>Backus – Pointed out that the existing structure is 30 feet tall and this is proposed as 30 feet as well.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with much that's been said. A viewing would benefit the whole project. On the proposed west elevation, the comments to raise the middle mass roof height will help eliminate the expanse of shingle on the main mass. He wants to reserve comments on other elements until after he has viewed this.</p> <p>Coombs – The east side of the building needs to be viewed from Miacomet Avenue</p> <p>Pohl – Suggested raising the middle gable roof; that will minimize the expanse of shingle wall. Agrees with the idea of fenestration being more homogenous in size and minimizing the upper-level expanse of shingle.</p>				
Motion	Motion to View and hold for revisions and a good resolution Google aerial view from about 500 meters up. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Dutra, Camp, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
6. Eliza & David Silva	07-1320	16 Helen's Drive	Pool & hardscape	66-53	Self
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	Coombs having video issues.				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Eliza Silva, owner				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:25)	<p>Silva – Presented project.</p> <p>Camp – She's okay with Belgium block; but not sure about the shell.</p>				
Motion	Motion to View and hold to track. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Dutra, Welch, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

VI. OLD BUSINESS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 262 Polpis N.T 07-1288	262 Polpis Road	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 photos.			
Representing	Doug Mills, Mark Cutone Architecture			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:29)	<p>Mills – This was held due to a technical glitch.</p> <p>Pohl – Some commissioners had concerns with the size of the cabana creating a split vote without Mr. Dutra.</p> <p>Coombs – The proposal is too large for the area.</p> <p>Oliver – She feels it’s too big to start with and is getting bigger.</p> <p>Camp – She thinks its low enough not to be obtrusive.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-2//Coombs and Oliver-nay; Dutra, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2020-07-1288
2. Tim Quinlisk 03-0793	88 Quidnet Road	Partial demo/re-site/addition	21-109	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Welch (acting chair), Coombs, Camp, Dutra			
Alternates	Coombs & Camp Read back in			
Recused	Pohl, Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documentation, and neighborhood map.			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl Sarah Alger, Sarah F. Alger P.C. Tim Quinlisk, owner			
Public	Linda Williams, for 90 Quidnet Road owners Quidnet Properties, LLC			
Concerns (5:40)	<p>Held for Mr. Dutra to get back on line.</p> <p>Botticelli – Reviewed additional information submitted and changes made per previous comments; addressed concerns expressed in a letter from attorney Yankow and context photos.</p> <p>Alger – There is eclectic architecture in the area and the proposal is in keeping with that; it is a modest proposal.</p> <p>Williams – The south elevation is of most concern to her clients; there is a substantial grade change rising up to 88 Quidnet. Asked for a view with ridge poles to better understand the new placement and height. Asked for shingled rails. Reviewed her historic packet on the house; circa 1910.</p> <p>Quinlisk – Feels the architecture is in the context of Quidnet village; encourages the commissioners to look at the privet in place and the context of the area. The design is trying to maintain the low profile.</p> <p>Dutra – Appreciates the work that’s been done; it’s charming architecture. South elevation is the largest concern regarding the silhouette of what it used to be; asked that the little gable forward be represented.</p> <p>Coombs – They did a good job at reflecting the historic elevation. South elevation, agrees the gable mass could be maintained. Sorry to see the 1-story element with a chimney being eliminated. Would like the height brought down by using more one-story additions. The east elevation has a very long ridge and would like to see that broken up. The ganged windows should be separated.</p> <p>Camp – Ms. Botticelli has been very sensitive to the Quidnet vernacular and appreciates her colleagues’ comments. The flush dormers take away from the beautiful design. Agrees about the loss of the 1-story element with the chimney; that was a very charming element. East elevation, the deck isn’t appropriate and detracts from the design; a gable with a simple window would be better. The north elevation is her favorite and the sun-porch windows are great; eliminating the ganged windows in the gable would help emphasize the sun porch; French doors with windows in the upper gable are inappropriate where a simple window would be best.</p> <p>Welch – The clipped gable hip is appropriate and gives a nod to the atypical hip on the original structure. Appreciates changes on the west. South elevation, the clipped gable hips help a lot; thinks an element of the original bump-out gable might be worked in as such at the outdoor shower to mitigate perceived height. Agrees a shingled railing at the 2nd floor porch would be appropriate. North elevation of the porch will run into a roof structure, that would not have the same railing treatment in any event. East elevation, that railing as balusters is fine—even if a portion of the porch on the south elevation were shingled. Regarding the sun-porch and rear gable fenestration, takes to heart comments on those. The north elevation is the most successful due to its simplicity. The more global comment, he’d like them to consider a mudsill to eliminate the step up; that will help bring down the height of the south elevation. Poled the sitting members regarding a view. He’s okay with return of some sort of dormer on the east elevation if it helps break up the ridge line; though that elevation has limited visibility.</p>			
Motion	Motion to View with a ridge pole and a stake at the southwest front-most corner. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Camp, Dutra, Coombs, and Welch-aye		Certificate #	

3. Nancy Digiulio	06-1181	35 Dartmouth Street	Aluminum roof shingles	76.4.2-304	East Coast Metal Roofing
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Paul Lechiara, East Coast Metal Roofing				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:36)	<p>Oliver – Thanked the applicant for the samples. She can't approve this; it's too much of an anomaly; the color choices are flat.</p> <p>Pohl – The aluminum shingles don't look remotely like asphalt shingles.</p> <p>Camp – She will go with the rest of the board.</p> <p>Coombs – She feels aluminum shingles are inappropriate.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Deny due to architectural inappropriateness. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Coombs, Camp, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-06-1181
4. Stephen Erisman	07-1302	2 Saccacha Avenue	Outdoor shw/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 (6:35)	<p>Oliver – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; railing is around air-conditioning units (A/C); reviewed precedent photos; lattice is square, which is the only difference from the solid board of the approval.</p> <p>Coombs – She went out and looked at this; she no longer has concerns. It will weather in nicely.</p> <p>Camp – Doesn't understand why this is before us.</p> <p>Welch – Originally, he spoke against this with respect to what he could see in the image. He viewed this to get a better image, and it is set back away from the street; the design is all over the area.</p> <p>Dutra – No concerns.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Camp-abstain; Welch, Dutra, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-07-1302
5. Sheila Wilner Trust	01-0548	10 Beach Street	demo	73.2.4-10	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and historic documentation.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	Linda Williams – for resident about 100 feet away				
Concerns (6:45)	<p>MacEachern – Presented project; he hasn't seen the email; at the last hearing, material was submitted just before the meeting and it is happening again, and that timing feels unfair to min and his client. He's surprised at everyone's response to this project; it was held up for months due to COVID; pre-COVID we were talking about exterior structural details. He knows this structure is not indicative of 1880s historic Codfish Park; contends it is dated circa 1930s-1940s, not 1920s.</p> <p>Backus – This has a charm everyone appreciates and is an important part of 'Sconset; circa 1920s. Read Nantucket Preservation Trust (NPT) email regarding Codfish Park. SAB did not meet.</p> <p>Williams – Reviewed her historic packet; no one knows where the building came from. A lot of the low cottages/shacks have been lost to structures like what's proposed. Would like some of the historic structure maintained.</p> <p>Oliver – This is a lot of information; we should have an opportunity to digest. She's starting to struggle with the idea of reviewing new structures when HDC hasn't decided about the demolition/move-off; wants the Commission to work out the demo/move first and discuss a policy on this</p> <p>Camp – She would hate to lose this structure; it's got a lot of history of Codfish Park; it's her job to preserve Codfish Park.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with much that's been said and reiterates his previous comments, be reference; he too would like to review the information; if the applicant has further information, he would like to review that too. He is concerned about the wholesale loss of this structure and would like it honored.</p> <p>Pohl – The new information submitted by opponents should have been submitted in time for the applicant and his agent to review it, just as the applicant must make information available for the public. Agrees with what's been said. It is not indicative of the 1880s buildings in Codfish Park regarding the steep roof pitch, but the scale is. We did the applicant a benefit by reviewing the new application to get it more in scale with the variegated architectural style found in Codfish Park. Asked for a discussion of the policy about reviewing applications removing historic structures be put on the agenda.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for review of information submitted today with the inclusion of all minutes to day in the next packet. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Camp, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

6. 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, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:10)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; asked commissioners to review recent approvals in Codfish Park. Doesn't think he can bring the plate height or ridge height down and more.</p> <p>Backus – There was no SAB meeting but read into the record statements from some SAB members: changes superficial; current design pays no respect to history of Codfish Park and should incorporate current structure.</p> <p>Welch – Too large and overpowers the site; 1¾ structure inappropriate; needs simplification; it's actually appropriate in many locations but in this location it's too homogenous to the point it won't fit in; still uncomfortable talking about this design without having resolved the demolition/move-off. The wall above the 1st floor is very tall.</p> <p>Oliver – She doesn't feel comfortable without resolving the demolition. The changes look positive. Concurs with Mr. Welch; this is a modern structure and lacks the additive "carbuncles" of Codfish Park.</p> <p>Camp – Nothing to add; she agrees.</p> <p>Pohl – Like the SAB comment about salvaging the doorway. Agrees with what's been said.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold to track the demolition/move-off. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Oliver, Camp, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

7. Nantucket Island Res 06-1267		29 Broad Street	Railings	42.4.2-38	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and historic documentation.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:24)	<p>Williams – Suggest portion of railing (as seen from Ash Street) next to brick to go to red and the piece off the right go to grey; they know they have to deal with the two huge condensers on Centre Street.</p> <p>Oliver – She doesn't want to see the railing different colors; it's white now and thinks it best to keep it that. Agrees with the Centre Street railing matching the existing fire escape.</p> <p>Camp – The white stands out; she likes the plan where railing disappears into the building. We'd all like to see the J.C. House return to the 1880s wrought iron; the next best thing is to let it fade into the background.</p> <p>Welch – It needs visual cloaking so it's almost not there; his problem is that the metal railing is so perfect – no inclusions or dents in the material. Up close it looks like metal and that is troublesome in the old historic district (OHD). The railing visible from Ash Street will be hard to ascertain details if it's painted red. Grey on the abutting section helps to cloak the fact there are no imperfections. Anything above the eave should be painted red. The railing on Centre Street should be largely similar to existing.</p> <p>Coombs – Likes the proposal which blends the Ash Street railing into the building; white is too obvious. Okay with the old fire escapes on Centre Street.</p> <p>Pohl – The red and grey will serve to downplay the railing.</p> <p>Flynn – She would have to pull the file to double check that the as-built fee was paid.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff as proposed at the table; the railing on Centre Street to match the details and color of the fire escape; and with the as-built fee paid. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2020-06-1267

8. Isaiah Tryman **01-0551** 10 Polliwog Road Lift house/add basement 55-423.4 Self
Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch
Alternates None
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Isaiah Tryman, owner
Public None
Concerns (7:39) **Tryman** – Reviewed changes made to mitigate amount of exposed foundation and number of steps, per previous concerns. It’s being raised because the water from the pond floods the yard.
Welch – He’s fine with this. On the north and west elevation, the grade should come up one more step; it will make it more balanced. South elevation, it appears the lines indicating the foundation under the bump out are missing. Presented a photo of a similar structure raised a similar amount as proposed; it’s foundation was mitigated by plantings.
Oliver – She thinks it looks weird being so high up. Mr. Welch’s photo alleviates her concerns.
Coombs – It looks like there are 5 steps; that makes the front door so high. Only one basement windows should be exposed; the window wells can be constructed in a way to keep the water out.
Camp – No concerns.
Pohl – This would not be too unlike houses in Town.
Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with the grade raised 8 additional inches to reduce the exposed foundation by one step. (Coombs)**
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Welch, Oliver, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-01-0551**
9. 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 Jessie Dutra, not a sitting member on this.
Concerns (7:54) **Carruthers** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns and everything they have done to gain an approval.
Coombs – It’s only 1 story and added trees will help screen the array; could approve with visibility screened in perpetuity.
Camp – Asked why they can’t put the evergreen trees in first and then we look at this. We’re all worried about this being on the front of the house. She can’t support this. The approval should specify the type and caliper of the trees.
Oliver – If it’s screened, she’d want to know what types and size of trees will be used. He’s doing a lot of positive things; she’s willing to do this due to the location and limited visibility.
Welch – He appreciates the changes and proposed screening and roof; for him it’s a matter of consistency with the guidelines: it’s on a primary structure and a primary façade.
Dutra – (Speaking as a citizen) you could specify the height and screening from ground to first branch on the tree.
Pohl – Scrub pine would be an effective screen; he has the same tree at his office and the canopy starts about 4 feet up. He feels with the added stipulation that the panels will have limited visibility and year-round screening at time of inspection would be enough for him to approve this.
Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with the screening trees to be 8 feet tall evergreens planted as noted in the diagram; the trees are to be in place at time of inspection and screening as shown in the diagram. (Coombs)**
Roll-call Vote Carried 3-2// Welch & Camp-nay; Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-06-1227**
10. Richmond Meadows II **02-0614** 4 Iris Place Aluminum handrails 68-366 KOH Architecture
Voting Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch
Alternates Camp stepped off
Recused None
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
Representing Dinah Klamert, KOH Architecture
Public None
Concerns (8:12) **Klamert** – Reviewed the project and the redesigned railing; posts are wood and handrail metal.
Oliver – Black is appropriate for this building; it ties into the black sash. Not sure about natural to weather posts with the black handrail; the posts should be painted to match the trim.
Welch – Agrees the wood posts should be painted to match the trim.
Coombs – Agrees.
Pohl – He likes that idea too.
Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with the railing to be black and posts to be grey to match the trim. (Oliver)**
Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-02-0614**

11. Richmond Meadows II 02-0623	2 Orchid Place	Aluminum handrails	68-337	KOH Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Camp stepped off			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Dinah Klamert, KOH Architecture			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:21)	<p>Klamert – The only difference is the house trim is white.</p> <p>Oliver – Keep it simple and go white on white to blend into the house.</p> <p>Welch – Asked if there will be other railings (one more on the other side of the site). As long as there won't be one at every building, he's okay with Ms. Oliver's proposal.</p> <p>Coombs – Feels the railings should all be one subdued color rather than matching the building.</p> <p>Pohl – Agrees with Ms. Coombs; black rail with grey posts is pretty neutral.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with grey posts and black rail. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Welch, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2020-02-0623
12. Brian Harris 06-1164	50 Weeweeder Avenue	New dwelling	79-15	M. Cutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:28)	<p>Cutone – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; also held for a view with poles.</p> <p>Oliver – Northwest and southeast elevations look like a hotel; this is long and looking at it on an angle doesn't help.</p> <p>Welch – Whatever height we settle on, he would like the application revised to reflect the final reduction of the ridge height. Northwest elevation, the transition from 4-bay to 1-story is atypical and elongated; to the right, that bump out addition seems disproportionate as well. West elevation, the long stretch on an angle. It's like a federal was added onto with a different type of structure. South elevation, this reverts to a contemporary Nantucket building. Southeast elevation, the rendering alludes to the disparity in the structure.</p> <p>Coombs – Feels this building is just too big; it's way beyond what's normally in a rural beach-side area. The architecture doesn't work together and is not appropriate in this location.</p> <p>Pohl – The angles aren't helping; the geometry is splayed out. The rendering of the northwest really shows the long, uninterrupted 1.5 story ridge lines. The more it can come down and the more the perceived length can be reduced will help.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
13. Brian Harris 06-1163	50 Weeweeder Avenue	Barn	79-15	M. Cutone Architecture
14. Brian Harris 06-1162	50 Weeweeder Avenue	Cabana	79-15	M. Cutone Architecture
15. Brian Harris 06-1165	50 Weeweeder Avenue	Pool- hardscape	79-15	M. Cutone Architecture
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	Mark Cutone, Mark Cutone Architecture			
Public	None			
Concerns	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold to track with the main house. (Oliver)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Welch, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	

16. Leah Cabral **07-1336** 7 Marble Way Roof top solar 66-446.1 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
 Leah Cabral, co-owner
 Matthew Hill, co-owner

Public None

Concerns (8:52) **Alence** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; contends panels on the front dormers won't be visible
 Cabral – Explained their desire for the solar; the flush dormers have a very shallow roof pitch; also, the road is one way with existing apple trees to help screen.
 Hill – This area is mostly commercial and not that heavily travelled.
 Oliver – She thinks the dormer panels will be visible, and they are on a wood roof.
 Dutra – He has no concerns; the dormers are shallow, on a barely travelled road, he feels it meets the criteria.
 Welch – It's on a cedar roof; however, unlike other applications, it is consistent with the guidelines in that the arrays are on a secondary mass with limited visual impact; only the edge of the panels will be visible. He has no concerns.
 Coombs – She thinks this is good. Asked about visibility of the rear from Sleep Hollow.
 Pohl – We will see the edge of the panels on the front; but that's not seeing the panels.

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

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-1//Oliver-nay; Coombs, Dutra, Welch, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-07-1336**

17. Martha Morris 06-1233	9 Dennis Drive	Roof top solar	67-366	ACK Smart
18. Bartlett Farm Hous LLC 05-1032	24 Bartlett Farm Road	New dwelling	65-86	Emeritus
19. Bartlett Farm Hous LLC 06-1110	24 Bartlett Farm Road	Pool	65-86	Emeritus
20. Whitney Gifford 06-1232	32 Pocomo Road	New dwelling	14-77	Emeritus
21. 78 Wauwinet Road 06-1065	78 Wauwinet Road	New dwelling	14-18	Emeritus
22. Will Forbeth 06-1121	58 Walsh Street	Roof changes	29-97	Sanne Payne
23. Nantucket B&G Club 06-1145	69 Sparks Avenue	New dwelling	55-139.2	Emeritus
24. Thompson 05-1039	73 Baxter Rd	Demo-move garage	49-27	Emeritus
25. Thompson 07-1292	73 Baxter Rd	Garage	49-27	Emeritus
26. Elizabeth Pagnum 05-0865	19 Lily Street	Hardscape	42.4.3-42	David Troast
27. John Halliwell Trust 07-1277	2 Webster Road	Rev. 02-0719: garage	79-146	Thornewill Design

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra
 Alternates Oliver
 Recused None
 Documentation None
 Representing None
 Public None

Concerns (time) Not opened at this time.

Motion **Motion to Hold for the beginning of the next meeting. (Welch)**

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

VII. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approve Minutes	June 23 & 30, July 2, 6, 10 & 13, 2020 - Held
Review Minutes	July 21, 2020
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next HDC Meeting Old Business Thursday 7/30/20 at 1:00-4:00pm - cancelled • Next HDC New Business meeting Monday 8/3/20 at 4:30pm • Discussion of Certified Local Government (CLG) and possible vote • HDC review of revisions to HDC Background Summary to finalize for web page including vote Welch – Asked commissioners to read this prior to the vote on it. • Discussion of adding Tuckernuck to MAB
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed
2. HDC Background Summary

Motion to Adjourn at 9:09 p.m. (Camp)

Carried unanimously//Oliver, Coombs, Camp, Dutra, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:
 Terry L. Norton