



# HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road  
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554  
[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://www.nantucket-ma.gov)

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

~~ MINUTES ~~

**Tuesday, January 25, 2022**

*This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube.*

Called to order at 5:00 pm. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Holly Backus, Preservation Planner; Esmeralda Martinez, PLUS Administrative Assistant; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker  
Attending Members: Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, Dutra, Thornewill  
Absent Members: None  
Late Arrivals: Welch, 5:15 pm; McLaughlin, 5:40 pm.  
Early Departures: Welch, 8:16 pm

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion **Motion to Approve as amended. (Coombs)**

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

## I. PUBLIC COMMENT

**Linda Williams** – She took photos of the pre-stained siding shingles and asked the vendor to take a sample to the PLUS office.

**Coombs** – Regular shingles are to become available again.

**Oliver** – She informed the vendors that the stained shingles are not approvable for the old historic districts (OHD).

## II. OPEN MEETING LAW COMPLAINT DISCUSSION

Open Meeting Law (OML) complaint from Margaret Van Deusen, dated December 30, 2021: acknowledgement of the Open Meeting Law complaint against the Historic District Commission, discussion and response to same; votes may be taken.

Voting Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill

Alternates Welch, Dutra

Documentation OML Complaint; Town Counsel draft response

Town Counsel Janelle Austin, KP Law, PC

Public Margaret Van Deusen, 7 Front Street, complainant  
Linda Williams, for 8 Bank Street

Concerns (5:08) **Austin** – Town Counsel has prepared a draft response to the OML complaint for commission review and approval. It's her understanding the commissioners have a copy of the complaint.

**Van Deusen** – Asked to hear counsel's response to her complaint. She filed a public record request today. Explained the events leading to the complaint.

**Austin** – It is alleged there were discrepancies to proceedings at the hearing on September 7, 2021. The open meeting law has specific jurisdictions: postings and proceedings. It is Town Counsel's position that there were no violations with respect to the allegations of the complaint.

**Van Deusen** – Feels it's a narrow view by counsel that the violation occurred only on the day of the meeting. Reversing a public vote in private is a mischief the OML is intended to prevent. Argues that what constitutes a majority is the majority of members of the 8-member commission, not a majority those sitting. Takes exception to the comment it was a ministerial action. She doesn't know who decided to stamp the plans as approved when the vote to hold for further revisions was unanimous.

**Welch** – It's inappropriate to be deliberating the merit of the argument either side of the matter; it's outside HDC purview to arbitrate that; that determination should be made by a regulatory authority, the Commonwealth. He wants to hear the determination from that regulatory authority, so we can ascertain what actions we need to handle differently and if any have merit. It seems like the assertion isn't that the HDC violated the OML, but that staff usurped their authority; that is something we should take up under as a separate topic because what is on the agenda is the OML violation. Our counsel has stated that isn't an OML violation. Also, whether, or not staff did something improper is not on our agenda so discussing it is a violation of the OML.

**Camp** – She's confused because she chaired the 8 Bank Street discussion on 7 September 2021, not Mr. Pohl.

**Coombs** – She too chaired this project at some point. The vote we're talking about was 2 ayes and 2 abstentions; that's a split vote.

**Pohl** – Abstentions count as zero votes, so there are 2 positive votes and 2 non-votes. We need to revisit abstentions regarding a 4-person board with Town Counsel.

**Williams** – 8 Bank is her client before the Zoning Board of Appeals; this issue was brought up to as after the vote. As we understood it, the matter of the vote was referred up to Town Counsel; Town Counsel then came back with a decision and told staff they were to stamp and issue the plans.

**Austin** – Because 4 of 5 were present, there was a quorum to vote, the motion passes if the majority of those present vote in favor. Wants to ensure the discussion remains within the confines of OML. The argument is that something occurred between the September 7 meeting and issuance of the COA. The division is clear that violations of an OML must implicate the OML; our determination is that rules of order fall outside the OML.

**Pohl** – We're in a legal domain beyond the focus of the 8 sitting members of the HDC. Asked if we need to take a vote on this.

**Austin** – In her opinion, yes. A vote is needed to issue a response to the Attorney General's office; the draft has been prepared.

**Van Deusen** – If there was another meeting after Sept 7, that is the issue in the OML complaint. Her complaint isn't about the vote; it's that someone instructed or altered the final vote to hold for revisions.

**Coombs** – That meeting is on tape; anyone can watch the video to find out what actually happened.

**Welch** – It's relevant to further this for Town Counsel to comment on Ms. Van Deusen's assertion that the HDC has some authority on this.

**Austin** – Explained the complaint process. In the event the complainant is dissatisfied with the response, they can pursue a review. The OML only applies to public bodies. In her opinion, there is no requirement for Ms. Camp and Ms. Coombs to recuse.

Motion **Motion to Adopt Town Counsel's response to the OML complaint. (Oliver)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Oliver, and Pohl-aye

**III. CONSENT**

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Diane Catino Et al. 12-5459	11 D Street	Rev. 05-3892: door change	60.2.1/17	EMDA
2. 58 Squam, LLC 01-5555	58 Squam Road	Rev. 71342: window	13/33	Steven Boukus
3. Cherrington Hart 01-5560	25a Evergreen Way	Window wells basement	68/761.2	Cherrington Hart
4. 41 Beach Grass, LLC 01-5561	41 Beach Grass Road	Revision to COA	68/367	Tim Trudel
5. Local Buoy Prp., LLC 01-5562	39 Beach Grass Road	Revision to COA	68/368	Tim Trudel
6. George McClellan 01-5546	30 Macy's Lane	Window wells basement	68/105	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	Thornewill			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs, Dutra, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC(as noted)

**IV. OLD BUSINESS 12/14/2021**

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Rich Gillis 12-5319	38 Prospect Street Lot 29	Hardscape		Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, advisory comments, and deed restriction document.			
Representing	Linda Williams Rich Gillis, owner			
Public	Anne Dewez, 5 Mill Street for the neighborhood group			
Concerns (5:46)	<p><b>Williams</b> – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Asked the Mueller's letter be read into the record. Shell and driveway width are requirements of the Planning Board.</p> <p><b>Backus</b> – Read HSAB comments 12/20: This section of Prospect Street has a rural character compared to the section closer to Milk Street. This property and the old Mueller property frame the entrance onto North Mill Street; both properties have a naturalized appearance with a variety of different plant species, which are tall and help screen the new development from Prospect Street. The proposed landscape plans would drastically change that rural character to a much more formal setting. The landscaping for this new development should look to the existing character of that area for direction. Privet hedges and formal walkways are more suited to the smaller lots and density closer to Town. Encircling this property (and all the other new lots) with privet hedge would create a suburban look not appropriate for this neighborhood. The bluestone walkways and patio should be an irregular shaped stone of natural color. The stone walls should be replaced with a natural berm. The evergreen hedge and the 5&amp;1 fence connecting the two buildings are also too formal and should have a more rural appearance. Hopefully the pressure treated retaining wall in back won't be visible, but if it is, it should be faced with a natural wood or stone. The area on the Prospect Street side of the guest house should be dense naturalized vegetation to help buffer its close proximity to the street. Any new screening should be done with less formal planting</p>			

clusters rather than rigid linear plantings. The Belgian block apron should be changed to cobblestone. HSAB would like to review further revisions

These plans do not address a spa; the 5' fence is inappropriate for the setting. Driveway material would be more appropriate as natural pebble. Reduce width of driveway to 15'.

**Gillis** – Read into the record the letter of support from the Muellers dated January 6, 2022.

**Dewez** – The statement about the driveway; there's a deed restriction document that according to Mr. Mueller has not changed; read the deed restriction addressing the driveway width and material. According to that, the driveway material can be anything the HDC approves.

Discussion about the material for the driveway, the deed restriction and Planning Board restrictions.

**Camp** – This is so linked to the Mueller property, that she would prefer pebble and a deeper apron of Belgium block. Thinks the drive should curve to the right once onto the property; that would be less formal. Agrees the 5' board fence is too much.

**Coombs** – There are too many 5' board fences enclosing the property in an area that is open. Put a small fence around the air conditioning (A/C).

**McLaughlin** – The A/C is visible from the street and needs to be screened. Clarified the properties around this site.

**Welch** – This area was considered rural; now it's becoming more urban; in context, it's more of a rural setting. He's uncomfortable with discussing like/dislike and necessary/unnecessary; we need to stick to architectural appropriateness. He'd love the driveway to be reoriented, but it is appropriate as drawn. Cobble or Belgium block could be appropriate apron materials and gravel more appropriate than shell given the rural context. We've used fencing to screen A/C; the proposed fences at the A/C and between properties are appropriate. It might not be appropriate across the front, but it is very distant from the street. He feels the small planting bed is appropriate. The seps at the back of the guesthouse would be inappropriate if they were visible. Regarding retainage, cross sections are important, and we had those while reviewing the structures; the retainage allows the structure to be set into the hill.

**Pohl** – The apron is labeled as cobblestone, but it's drawn as Belgium block; cobble is more appropriate, and the apron should be 3' deep. He prefers gravel over shell. He's okay with the taller fences on the sides and rear; in the front it should be no more than 4' high.

Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with the apron to be cobble 3' deep; drive material to be pea stone; and front fencing to be only 4' high. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-1//Welch, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye; Coombs-nay Certificate # **HDC2021-12-5319**

**V. NEW BUSINESS 12/21/2021**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	3 Beaver St, LLC 12-5316	3A Beaver Street	Dormers, raise foundation	55.1.4/97	Polly Walldorf
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:36)	<b>Williams</b> – Asked this to be held. Not opened at this time.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Thornewill, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
2.	John Manera	4 Larabee Lane	New dwelling	55/102.7	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:37)	<b>Williams</b> – Asked this to be held. Not opened at this time.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

3. Sam Shamoun	<b>01-5571</b>	9 Field Avenue	New dwelling	80/162.1	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Linda Williams				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:38)	<b>Williams</b> – Presented project; height is 28’3”.				
	<b>Camp</b> – North & south elevations, the gable windows should be vertically formatted 4-light windows.				
	No other concerns.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the gable end windows to be vertically formatted 4-light. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2022-01-5571</b>	

**VI. OLD BUSINESS 12/28/2021**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. NIR Retail, LLC <b>11-5041</b>	4 Harbor Square	Renovate building	42.2.4/1	Workshop APD
Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:43)	<b>Backus</b> – Mr. Kotchen has asked this to be held for Thursday, January 27 <sup>th</sup> . Not opened at this time.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Coombs, Oliver, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
2. Nice to Be Back, LLC <b>11-5037</b>	43 Kendrick Street	New pool	76.4.3/31	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	David Bartsch			
Public	Nopne			
Concerns (6:43)	<b>Bartsch</b> – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; explained the fieldstone planter.			
	<b>Coombs</b> – Appreciates shortening the pool so it fits better behind the house. It would be nice to have pictures of the planter.			
	<b>Camp</b> – Clarified the grade change and site plan showing the 2’-tall planter around the septic field. Asked what will screen the pool from the Conservation land; the natural vegetation should remain in place.			
	<b>McLaughlin</b> – He’s been out there and finds that it won’t be visible as laid out on this plan.			
	<b>Dutra</b> – This is the last house on a dead-end road. No concerns.			
	<b>Pohl</b> – No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve with the pool not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter. (McLaughlin)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Coombs, Dutra, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye; Camp-nay		Certificate #	<b>HDC2021-11-5037</b>
3. Matt O’Connor	16 Tashama Lane	Add spa & retaining wall	55/481	KM Designs
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Welch, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver, Dutra			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and video.			
Representing	Katy Mitchell, KM Designs Linda Williams Matt O’Connor, owner			
Public	Gregg Tivnan, 13 MacLean Lane Thomas Barrett, 14 Tashama Lane John Barrett, 18 Tashama Lane			
Concerns (6:54)	<b>Mitchell</b> – The neighbors support a 6’ fence around the side and rear of the property; reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Willing to use red cedar or clethra instead of arbor vitae. There is a plan to enclose the pool equipment with a fence.			
	<b>Tivnan</b> – There is no large tree between our property line and the wall; it’s completely open. Asking for vegetation on the wall to block the 6’ fence. Still concerned about the lower level, which is our driveway. Asking that the pool equipment be enclosed so as not to be heard.			
	<b>T. Barrett</b> – A viewing string was laid out on the property to show placement of the fence 3’ inside the property. This plan shows the fence on the property line; we talked to Mr. O’Connor about moving the fence away from the property line about 3’.			

**J. Barrett** – Asked if the trees would have to go on his property; there’s only about 12” between the wall and property line. He’s opposed to using arbor vitae.

**Welch** – Pointed out that the pool and fencing were approved without a grade change; the grade change shown is terraforming and that’s inappropriate; we need to put a stop to it. Any landscaping should not burden the neighbors and they shouldn’t be beholding to a screening mechanism or maintenance or replacement costs when deer eat the trees; the photo from MacLean Lane shows the degree of unacceptable grade change. Plant materials should be able to take up water. The only appropriate solution is to lower the wall 3 courses at least, install indigenous plant material interior to the wall with a swale to hold water, and inside the swale put the removed courses to create terracing. The noise of the pool equipment should be attenuated.

This work was done without approval; the significance of that is we’re now talking about a 6’ fence on top of the wall which is essentially a 9’ fence; that is inappropriate. The pool and shed approvals did not indicate a grade change; he wants to know who is responsible for putting in the wall; the grade change of about 29” without approval is not appropriate; doesn’t think berming is an appropriate solution.

**Thornewill** – The fence has to go inside the property. The buffer should not be outside the wall because it’ll be on the neighbor’s property. Loves the idea of terracing the walls down from the pool equipment and thick plantings on the southwest corner.

**Camp** – The neighbors have observed their 10’ setback; that was disregarded here. She finds this application frustrating. The back fill, retaining wall, and proposed screening are egregious; she feels the pool equipment should go into the shed.

**Coombs** – This is a mess that we can’t solve properly. Looking at all the photos from the abutters, there is no 5’ fence visible. Surrounding this with a 6’ fence is wrong. Agrees with putting the pool equipment in the shed. The board fence should be no more than 4’; the plantings should all be native.

**O’Connor** – Apologized about the impact of the unpermitted retaining wall. The wall wasn’t a portion of Mr. Dutra’s and Ms. Oliver’s work. He’s putting time and energy into find a mitigating solution for the wall; it was done with the intent of retaining water. The shed and pool equipment were approved.

**Pohl** – Frequently concerns of neighbors are congruent to concerns of the HDC; sometimes they are not. The visibility of an aggressive, 29” retaining wall needs to be taken care of. Some of Mr. O’Connor’s points would be possible revisions.

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

Motion

Roll-call Vote

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

Certificate #

**VII. NEW BUSINESS 01/04/2022**

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Barbara VonDerGorben 12-5388	132 Main Street	Hardscape: patio	42.3.3/45	Grady Murtagh

Voting Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver

Alternates Welch, Dutra, Thornewill

Recused None

Documentation Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.

Representing Grady Murtagh, Murtagh Landscaping

Public None

Concerns (7:49) **Murtagh** – Presented project; 10X9 patio won’t be visible; there is an existing bluestone walk.

**Backus** – Read HSAB comments 1/10: No concerns but would prefer brick or a more irregular stone. She concurs about the material; bluestone is very formal, though it won’t be visible. A proper site plan would make the project much clearer.

**Camp** – Suggested two steppingstones to the arbor and/or the stairs and have the patio be a separate rectangle.

**Coombs** – Likes Ms. Camp’s idea.

**McLaughlin** – This is virtually invisible.

**Oliver** – No concerns.

**Pohl** – Also likes Ms. Camp’s idea.

Motion

**Motion to Approve through staff with the patio to be a 9X10 rectangle and steppingstones up to the steps and gate. (McLaughlin)**

Roll-call Vote

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

Certificate #

**HDC2021-12-5388**

2. Brad Henke **12-5409**                      14 Oak Hollow Lane                      Roof solar                      56/114                      Cotuit Solar

Voting                      Coombs (acting chair), Oliver, Thornewill  
 Alternates                      None  
 Recused                      None  
 Documentation                      Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, manufacturer spec sheet, and deed restriction document.  
 Representing                      Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar  
 Public                      None  
 Concerns (7:37)                      **Alence** – Held for a view. There is a deed restriction that prevents any subdivision; also, there are several wetlands so no room for a ground array. The roof array would not be visible from the road. They want to keep the roof medium grey.  
**Thornewill** – She drove down there; you can see the roof but it’s very far away. On this road, she thinks the panels would be okay on the front; it is a 1-story structure set way back. A black roof would make the array disappear.  
**Oliver** – She went down there as well; it’s very remote. If the roof were black, it would be perfect; she’d vote for this if the roof were black.  
**Coombs** – It’s important that solar applications be considered on an individual basis. Agrees that this would be approvable if the roof were black.

Motion                      **Motion to Approve through staff with the roof to be reshingled black. (Oliver)**  
 Roll-call Vote                      Carried 3-0//Thornewill, Oliver, and Coombs-aye                      Certificate #                      **HDC2021-12-5409**

3. 1 Caroline Way, LLC **12-5439**                      1 Caroline Way                      MH & GH revisions                      82/59                      Vicente Burin

Voting                      Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver  
 Alternates                      Dutra, Thornewill  
 Recused                      None  
 Documentation                      Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.  
 Representing                      Paulo Vicente, Vicente-Burin Architects  
 Public                      None  
 Concerns (7:57)                      **Vicente** – Presented project; the guesthouse and main house are connected so under the building code count as a single building. The stair railing is horizontal boards with 1” spaces between.  
**Oliver** – North elevation main house, the transom over the door is too much glass; dormer “K” windows are larger than any others and should match the “H” windows to the right. Northeast elevation, asked if the stairwell railing is horizontal or shingled. Anything that simplifies this will be better received. East elevation, the stairs within the porch are very confusing looking and atypical. Light from the rear window wells can be addressed in the landscaping. The site is a wide-open corner lot.  
**Coombs** – Agrees this has to be simpler; all four sides are visible; Caroline Way is very rural. The exterior stairs with vertical boards will be visible and are not typical to the Island. East elevation, the front door is an inappropriate design (approved). North elevation, not sure the horizontal board railing should be approved; it isn’t found anywhere else. The fenestration should be reduced.  
**McLaughlin** – There is too much glass. The east elevation front door should be a typical 6-panel door; the vertical board next to the chimney looks like lattice.  
**Camp** – This feels very chaotic. North elevation, the “K” windows are too large; the 3 windows over the nano-doors are too large. Suggested the chimney be pargetted and painted; brick is very formal.  
**Pohl** – The details are great and subtle. The dormer windows could be the same size as other windows.

Motion                      **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote                      Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye                      Certificate #

4.	1 Caroline Way LLC <b>12-5414</b>	1 Caroline Way	Pool, pergola, & hardscape	82/59	Ahern, LLC
Voting	Pohl, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and correspondence.				
Representing	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC				
Public	Susan Evans, 6 Wall Street				
	Matt Erisman, President Cisco Civic Assn				

Concerns (8:21) **Ahern** – Presented project; the cabana on the plan is a placeholder.  
**Evans** – None of her concerns address HDC purview: endangered species, noise, light, and her view.  
**Erisman** – Asked if commissioners had seen the letters of concerns. This is an oversized lot for Cisco; the cabana is an outside bar. The pool is huge at 52' long. This is going to be a problem for everyone in the surrounding area and is out of place for Cisco. The natural vegetation is going to be almost completely removed. This is a very fragile area.  
**McLaughlin** – It's a big pool; he thinks it won't be visible.  
**Coombs** – The pool is too big; 18X40 is a more appropriate size. This is Cisco and there is no greenery or trees currently on this lot; she doubts the proposed plants will grow in this sandy, windy area. She wants to see a lighting plan; HDC has reviewed landscape lighting in the past. Dark Sky is part of the HDC mission and we're ignoring it. Wants to see the elevations for the pergola. Wants to see the MESA report.  
**Camp** – The only way to get more naturalness is to bring the proposed vegetation right up to the house and leave the rest to nature; when you drive by, you should see the lot as it is now. Agrees about reducing the pool at least 10 feet. You're looking right down the driveway at the pool; it should be smaller and tucked closer to the house.  
**Oliver** – Our mission is to take into consideration the character and setting of the neighborhood. We need to start thinking about protecting scenic vistas in public areas precious to our community; people come here to enjoy the beach. Use low-lying vegetation and scrub and keep clearings and alterations to a minimum. Pools have created a problem because they shouldn't be visible; that involves fencing, screening, and screening of fences. There's a lot on this that is incongruent to the area: picket fence, hedges, huge amount of hardscaping, and buildings for screening; all that speaks contrary to historic Cisco. The landscaping is too formal for the area. Fieldstone walls are atypical; when they are used its to line a planting area. The pool equipment is shown in back of a building that doesn't exist. People need to consider Nantucket, the neighborhood, and HDC's mission and work to fit in.  
**Pohl** – He wishes someone would float an article to ban pools in Cisco.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Oliver)**  
Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Coombs, Camp, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate #

Rest held for Thurs

5.	Johnson Charles Trust <b>12-5415</b>	24 Bassett Road	Driveway & hardscape	26/61	Ahern, LLC
6.	66 Easton, LLC <b>12-5417</b>	66 Easton Street	Fence	42.4.1/62	Toni Yacobin
7.	Eleven Lincoln Trust <b>12-5444</b>	32 Jefferson Avenue	Demo or move off studio	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
8.	Eleven Lincoln Trust <b>12-5447</b>	32 Jefferson Avenue	Demo or move off GH	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
9.	Eleven Lincoln Trust <b>12-5443</b>	32 Jefferson Avenue	New guest house	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
10.	Ali & Zach Smith	232 Madaket Road	New Dwelling	59.4/120.1	JN Design
11.	Ali & Zach Smith	232 Madaket Road	New Garage	59.4/120.1	JN Design
12.	Courtney Arnot	8 New Street	Fence	55.4.1/35	Courtney Arnot
13.	Larry Maury	23 Washington Street	Like-kind window replace	42.3.1/39	Larry Maury

#### VIII. OLD BUSINESS 01/11/2022

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Darlene DeMichelle <b>11-5252</b>	Lot 26- Birdsong	New dwelling	55.4.4/80.2	Meerbergen Designs
2.	Darlene DeMichelle <b>11-5254</b>	Lot 26- Birdsong	New 2 <sup>nd</sup> dwelling	55.4.4/80.2	Meerbergen Designs
3.	Darlene DeMichelle <b>11-5255</b>	Lot 26- Birdsong	New garage	55.4.4/80.2	Meerbergen Designs
4.	Prickly Pear <b>11-5155</b>	17 Broadway- Sconset	Storage containers	73.1.3/112	Val Oliver
5.	Anne M Rose <b>10-4998</b>	62 Boulevardde	New dwelling	79/211	Botticelli + Pohl
6.	32 Hulbert Ave Trust <b>11-5220</b>	32 Hulbert Avenue	New Dwelling	29/72	Botticelli + Pohl
7.	Harborside Partners <b>11-5242</b>	5 York Street	Rev. fenest & pergola	55.1.4/162	Gryphon Architects
8.	33 North Mill St, LLC	7 North Mill Street	New Shed	55.4.4/77	Sophie Metz
9.	33 North Mill St, LLC	7 North Mill Street	New Garage/Studio	55.4.4/77	Sophie Metz
10.	33 North Mill St., LLC <b>11-5126</b>	7 North Mill Street	Hardscape	55.4.4/77	Atlantic Landscaping
11.	Geradi Prolopov <b>11-5187</b>	80 Surfside Road	New dwelling	67/194	DTA
12.	Geradi Prolopov <b>12-5328</b>	80 Surfside Road	Hardscape & pool	67/194	DTA
13.	Jonathan Jacoby <b>12-5435</b>	3 Tautemo Way	New garage revision	83/22	EMDA
14.	Hoehn- Saric <b>10-4865</b>	34 Easton Street	New dwelling	41.1.4/18	CWA
15.	Tack3, LLC	26 Washington Street	Rev COA: Roofwalk, entry,	42.3.2/23	CWA
16.	Tack3, LLC	26 Washington Street	Move off/demo	42.3.2/23	CWA

#### XI. NEW BUSINESS 01/18/2021

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Rebecca Moesinger <b>01-5484</b>	45 Surfside Road	Front steps& color change	67/14.4	Portia Moesinger
2.	Thomas Sleeper <b>01-5529</b>	8 Osprey Way	New dwelling	82/401	Christopher Hall

Proposed HDC Minutes for January 27, 2022

3.	Thomas Sleeper 01-5532	8 Osprey Way	New pool	82/401	Christopher Hall
4.	Thomas Sleeper 01-5531	8 Osprey Way	Cabana	82/401	Christopher Hall
5.	Thomas Sleeper 01-5530	8 Osprey Way	Move shed on site	82/401	Christopher Hall
6.	6 Lincoln St, LLC 12-5462	6 Lincoln Street	Addition 2 <sup>nd</sup> fl dormer	73.4.2/86	Val Oliver
7.	Vanessa Halper	73 Burnell Street	New dwelling	49.3.2/1.2	Topham Designs
8.	Vanessa Halper	73 Burnell Street	New pool	49.3.2/1.2	Topham Designs
9.	Eleven Lincoln Ave Trust	32 Jefferson Avenue	MH addition	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
10.	Lot 27 N Mill, LLC 12-5466	Lot 27A (22 N. Mill)	Garden shed	55.4.4/80.3	Meerbergen Designs
11.	Lot 27 N Mill, LLC 12-5465	Lot 27A (22 N. Mill)	Garage	55.4.4/80.3	Meerbergen Designs
12.	Lot 27 N Mill, LLC 12-5457	Lot 27B (22 N. Mill)	Garden shed	55.4.4/80.3	Meerbergen Designs
13.	Arline Bartlett 12-5454	21 Pleasant Street	Fenestration & sm addition	55.4.1/1	LINK
14.	Richard Snowden 12-5455	11 Massachusetts Avenue	Fences	60/80	LINK
15.	20A Bishop Rise Inv.	20a Bishops Rise	New Dwelling	40/127	Linda Williams
16.	20A Bishop Rise Inv.	20a Bishops Rise	New garage	40/127	Linda Williams
17.	20A Bishop Rise Inv.	20a Bishops Rise	New pool	40/127	Linda Williams
18.	20B Bishop Rise Inv.	20b Bishops Rise	New Dwelling	40/127	Linda Williams
19.	20B Bishop Rise Inv.	20b Bishops Rise	New garage	40/127	Linda Williams
20.	20B Bishop Rise Inv.	20b Bishops Rise	New pool	40/127	Linda Williams
21.	8 Walsh LLC 12-5475	8 Walsh Street	Addition	42.4.1/83	Meerbergen Designs
22.	Nantucket Land Bank 01-5479	168 Hummock Pnd Rd	Gate	65/13.2	J. Kuszpa
23.	Rich Oneslager 01-5497	8 Cliff Road	L/k window replacement	42.4.4/23	Rick Johnston
24.	The Braes, LLC 01-5496	23 Baxter Road	Add outdoor shower	49.2.3/12	Botticelli + Pohl
25.	John Jacoby	3 Tautemo Way	Garage move off	83/28	Nancy Mack
26.	Nancy Mack	4 Tautemo Way	Garage mv onsite & addtn	83/28	Nancy Mack
27.	Nancy Mack	4 Tautemo Way	Shed demo	83/28	Nancy Mack
28.	NIR Retail 01-5488	29 Commercial Wharf	Roof replacement	42.2.4/3	T & T Roofing
29.	NIR Retail 01-5489	4 Harbor Square	Roof replacement	42.2.4/5	T & T Roofing
30.	Zero India St, LLC 01-5514	1 Cambridge Street	Rdc ftrprt/rf replace/fenst	42.3.1/130.2	Emeritus
31.	Jeremy Trottier 01-5513	4 Windsor Road	Rf mass/hght chng/add drmr	49/193	Emeritus
32.	Sheila & Carmine Giardini	7a Clifford Street	New dwelling	79/19	McMullen & Assoc.
33.	Sheila & Carmine Giardini	7a Clifford Street	New garage/studio	79/19	McMullen & Assoc.
34.	Sheila & Carmine Giardini	7a Clifford Street	New pool & hardscape	79/19	McMullen & Assoc.
35.	Sheila & Carmine Giardini	7a Clifford Street	New gazebo	79/19	McMullen & Assoc.
36.	Salty Dogz, LLC 01-5503	9 Tashama Lane	New frnt door/stoop bnch	55/471	LINK
37.	Self J Douglas 01-5517	3 Martins Lane	New shtrrs/2 new winws	42.3.2/133	LINK
<b>X. OLD BUSINESS 01/25/2022</b>					
	<b><u>Property owner name</u></b>	<b><u>Street Address</u></b>	<b><u>Scope of work</u></b>	<b><u>Map/Parcel</u></b>	<b><u>Agent</u></b>
1.	Rich Peterson	30 Main Street Sconset	Relocate garage & addition	73.3.1/46	Concept Design
2.	Marshall & Holly Pagon 11-5250	28 & 32 Baxter Road	Pool house & pergola	49.23/29	Design Associates
3.	3 Beaver St, LLC 12-5316	3A Beaver Street	Dormers, raise foundation	55.1.4/97	Polly Walldorf
4.	LeSelect Properties 11-5144	1 Ash Street	Fenestration changes	42.4.2/85	Normand Residential
5.	Trogoh Nominee Trust 05-3640	26 Easy Street	Mixed Use- Retail & Resid	42.4.2/23	Emeritus
6.	Cindy Helfrich 12-5354	37 Fair Street	Roof & fenestration changes	42.3.2/121	Emeritus
7.	BC Sconset, LLC 07-4226	9 Hawks Circle	Hardscape	74/37.1	Ahern
8.	Brett Fodiman 12-5374	3 Tetawkimo Drive	New dwelling	53/41	CWA
9.	Brett Fodiman 10-4969	27 Cato Lane	New dwelling	55/118	CWA
10.	Brett Fodiman 10-	27 Cato Lane	Garage	55/118	CWA
11.	Theodorakos Vaios Trust	79 Pocomo Road	New dwelling	15/5	CWA
12.	Anthony Noto 11-5270	10 Lincoln Avenue	Addition & reno	30/184	Emeritus
13.	450 Green Park, LLC 11-5272	2 Stone Alley	Adtn, Alter, & Foundation	42.3.1/103	Emeritus



X. OTHER BUSINESS	
Approved Minutes	January 11, 2022
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve.</b> (Coombs)
Roll-call vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye
Review Minutes	January 18 & 20, 2022
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next HDC Meeting: <b>Thursday, January 27, 2022 at 1:00 pm. ZOOM</b></li> <li>• Discussion of Advisory Board Review</li> <li>• Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, intro</li> <li>• Discussion of additions and new dwellings added to the consent agenda</li> <li>• Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings</li> <li>• Hardscaping</li> <li>• Discussion of salvaging demolitions</li> <li>• Discussion of options for house moves</li> </ul>
Commission Comments	<p><b>Backus</b> – Reminded everyone about the shingles.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – A builder told him the supply chain for unstained red-cedar shingles will be back in operation by April.</p>

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 9:02 pm. (McLaughlin)**  
 Roll-call vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Camp, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:  
 Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board
Sconset Advisory Board
Madaket Advisory Board

