



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, Jessie Dutra, Carrie Thornewill

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, January 19, 2021

*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, HDC Compliance Coordinator; Holly Backus, Preservation Planner; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker
Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra, Thornewill
Absent Members: Dutra
Late Arrivals: McLaughlin, 4:39 p.m.
Early Departure: None

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

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

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

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. CONSENT

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	NIR Retail, LLC 01-2667	22 Old South Wharf	Roof change	42.2.4/2	T&T Roofing
2.	Hristo Rashdov 01-2668	8 Lewis Court	240sf addition	67/37	Self
3.	Amy Ambrecht 01-2665	13 Giny Lane	Rev. 72120: drmr	41/850	Robert Newman
4.	Allie Schieffelin 12-2533	23 Starbuck Road	Addition	60/107	Thornewill Design
5.	Liam Mackey 01-2688	4 Nautilus Lane	Rev. 1538: add stairs	67/176	Val Oliver
6.	Barbara Phillips Trust 12-2628	7 North Liberty Street	Renew COA 58357	42.3.4/6	Val Oliver Design
7.	Town of Nantucket 01-2689	7 Hillside Avenue	Add wall extension	87/2	Mark Voight
8.	William McKenna 01-2690	6 Kings Way	Rev. 2622: reduce deck	30/276	NAG
9.	Garfield Bloise 01-2685	42 Monohanset Road	Roof change	79/55	Self
10.	ZSP, LLC 01-2684	2 South Pasture Lane	Shed	80/297.2	Michael Hajjar
11.	ZSP, LLC 01-2683	2 South Pasture Lane	Fence	80/297.2	Michael Hajjar
12.	Elihu Tuttle 01-2681	11 Ticcoma Way	Shed	67/160	Self
13.	Thomas Greeley 01-2680	1 Wamasquid Place	Shed	56/113.1	Structures Unlimited
14.	Maverick Trust 01-2687	245 Hummock Pond Road	Rev. 2527: front door	82/32	Normand Residential
15.	Nant. 62 Walsh, LLC 01-2686	62 Walsh Street	Shed	29/85	Botticelli + Pohl

Voting Coombs (acting chair), Camp, Welch

Alternates None

Recused Pohl, Oliver, Thornewill

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns No concerns.

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

Roll-call Vote Carried 3-0//Camp, Welch, and Coombs-aye

Certificate # **HDC2021-01-(as noted)**

III. CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Robert Newman 01-2669 • Due to limited visibility	6 Topping Lift Road	Rev. 0405: window	66/308	Self
2.	Steven Phillip 01-2664 • Due to lack of visibility	4 Okorwaw Avenue	Temp storage container	79/131	Self
3.	Blake Richard 01-2682 • Due to minimal visibility	71 Tom Nevers Road	Shed	75/137	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns	No additional concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Welch)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Welch, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	HDC2021-01-(as noted)

IV. OLD BUSINESS CARRIED OVER

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Coffin Farm 06-1119	31 Fairgrounds Road	Demo/move off MH	67/149	Brook Meerbergen
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Brook Meerbergen Billy Cassidy, co-owner				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:36)	<p>Meerbergen – We filed extensions while this was being reviewed by the Planning Board for a multi-unit subdivision. This project is for the greater good and will help a lot of people. This house has been spoken for as a residence on South Shore Road. There is a 50% open space requirement by the Planning Board, and we want that to be on Fairgrounds Road; keeping this would mean going back to the Planning Board to amend the plan. The by-right subdivision plan would obliterate everything.</p> <p>Cassidy – This will be moved to become part of the covenant program. The open space is proposed to encourage passive recreation and to be used like a yard; the pavilion, shown on the site plan, might or might not be built. He suggests the house would be better served by moving it and going into the covenant program. One thing not discussed is the efficacy of this building as part of the subdivision; any value of streetscape would be lost by moving it to the side and rehabilitating it to fit in with the proposed subdivision.</p> <p>Oliver – There was a lot of context for what is planned to replace this. She sat through the Planning Board meetings and what will come to us is an anomaly for the area. She fails to understand how a perfectly good house must be removed to make way for something else all in the name of affordable housing. This whole area is changing; the Planning Board has slated this area for urbanization which she does not support. Suggested it could be used as the on-site management office.</p> <p>Coombs – It shouldn't be moved; there is room for it to remain and be reused. The plan presented to HDC before was not in keeping with Fairgrounds Road. They should figure out how to reuse it and keep it as part of the Fairgrounds streetscape. The house doesn't have to stay in its exact position; it is part of that street and keeping it is cheaper than building a new house. The gentleman who wants it could still buy it and use it where it is. This program needs more thought.</p> <p>Camp – She's okay with the concept of the proposal; but listening to fellow commissioners, she wonders if it could be reused where it is to set the tone for the development behind it. Moving the house out of this neighborhood is not maintaining the streetscape proportions and doesn't solve the issues Ms. Oliver and Ms. Coombs are referring to. Would like them to present some options on how to keep this here.</p> <p>Pohl – Asked why the concept of keeping the existing house on the property is not being considered. The house could replace the proposed pavilion and be a home for someone without interfering with the open space. Given the tone of the conversation, this will not get an approval to move off. Even if this were a normal subdivision, that doesn't mean HDC would approve the move off. There's a lot about the subdivision we don't know – limitations and freedoms.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions, more information, and other options. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Coombs, Oliver, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

2.	218 Cliff Road Associates 12-2461	218 Cliff Road	Main house	40/61.1	Workshop/APD
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop APD Michael Luft-Weissberg, Workshop APD				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:04)	<p>Kotchen – Reviewed the project and changes made per previous concerns; the poles in place were for the revised ridge height. Trim is natural to weather.</p> <p>Oliver – She viewed this. One thing that stands out is this is 98 feet long; another problem is the pool is in front of it. It is a lot of structure up on that hill with the garage on the same lineal line. Suggested it change to an ell or have more additive massing. Another foot could come out of the height; the doors are 7’6” and use a mud sill.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees about the length. The right addition is almost the same size as the main mass and should be reduced. Appreciates there is no roof walk. There’s enough room to move the garage back.</p> <p>Camp – Likes the design but it is too suburban for this area and doesn’t reflect the natural topography of this lot. She’s worried about the view from Cliff Road of a very-long, over-fenestrated, tall building.</p> <p>McLaughlin – He viewed this; coming in from Madaket, the north elevation will be visible; the 4-doors should be reduced to 2 doors.</p> <p>Pohl – Appreciates the revisions. Whatever is done to satisfy other commissioners, he will be fine with.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
3.	218 Cliff Road Associates 12-2459	218 Cliff Road	New 2 nd DU/garage studio	40/61.1	Workshop/APD
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Andrew Kotchen, Workshop APD Michael Luft-Weissberg, Workshop APD				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:20)	Kotchen – Asked this be held for revisions and to track with main house.				
Motion	Motion to Hold to track. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	
4.	218 Cliff Road Associates 12-2400	218 Cliff Road	Pool and hardscape	40/61.1	Ahern, LLC
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC Michael Luft-Weissberg, Workshop APD				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:21)	<p>Ahern – Reviewed the proposed grading changes. Existing retaining walls are about 4 feet and will be kept.</p> <p>Oliver – The cross section of elevations of the grades indicates how visible this house will be. The north elevation, which faces Cliff Road, won’t have much vegetation. The building plateau should be between grades sinking the whole thing down. She would like to see corrected height poles from end to end with a pole in the middle of the main mass.</p> <p>Camp – Her main concern is the length if the building and its impact; the landscaping is secondary.</p> <p>McLaughlin – If the commission decides the driveway is a travelled way, the pool will be visible; otherwise, it isn’t visible.</p>				
Motion	Motion to View with height poles at each end of the building with one at the center of the main ridge and the pool to track. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye			Certificate #	

5. Kingfisher Realty Trust **12-2488** 278 Polpis Road Cottage 25/2 Gryphon Architects

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill
 Alternates None
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and correspondence.
 Representing Ethan Griffin, Gryphon Architects
 Whitney Gifford, Reade
 Public Rhoda Weinman, abutter
 Paul Santos, Nantucket Surveyors for Ms. Weinman

Concerns (5:45) **Griffin** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns: trim and doors grey, barn doors and front door cascade blue.
Pohl – The high point closest to the structure is elevation 18; asked what the elevations are for any other crowns.
Santos – Recapped Ms. Weinman’s concerns. Ridge poles in place are for the main gable and don’t represent that the dwelling is 70 feet in length. Elevation 18 reflects the mounded septic.
Weinman – She has stated her concerns in the past meetings and through letters; asked for a more appropriate location for this structure. The garage/studio is unlike anything she’s seen on Nantucket. A letter from Martha Gray, an abutter, had very appropriate comments.
Gifford – Rebutted comments in Ms. Weinman’s last letter.
Camp – She has been out there 4 times; twice she couldn’t find the turnoff. From Polpis Road, you can’t see this; when you do drive down the driveway, you see gently rolling hills. For our purview, you can’t see it.
Thornewill – Agrees with Ms. Camp. She was well onto the property before she could see the ridge poles. The two houses next door are also on the highest point of their property. Appreciates that it is outside the 100-foot buffer to the wetland.
Oliver – She agrees; this is a huge lot and this structure is mindful of what’s around it. It is 618 feet from Polpis Road and similarly from the harbor and is only 17 feet tall with grey trim.
Coombs – She understands the concerns, but at 17 feet it’s small enough to bend around.
Pohl – The single-story nature of this building and it’s being set so far back on the property allows him to approve this.

Motion **Motion to Approve. (Oliver)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Thornewill, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-12-2488**

V. NEW BUSINESS CARRIED OVER

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Candice Heydt Trust 12-2626	20 Brant Point Road	Stairs to roof walk	29/153	Val Oliver Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Val Oliver, Val Oliver Design			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:10)	Oliver – Asked this be held for revisions per HSAB. Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold at applicant’s request. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Welch, Thornewill, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
2. Grey Lady Lane, LLC 12-2627	3 Grey Lady Lane	New dwelling	66/713	Val Oliver Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	Thornewill			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Val Oliver, Val Oliver Design			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:11)	Oliver – Reviewed approved structures in the subdivision and presented project. Coombs – Asked if the other structures are at 30 feet (just about). Camp – Would like more telescoping, dropping of eaves, and mixing up of massing. The impact of all of these having similar architecture won’t be attractive. McLaughlin – No comments. Welch – Agrees with Ms. Coombs. Given the approved density, to have a smaller structure would be out of character. Pohl – He’d prefer it a bit shorter but he’s okay with it as proposed.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Welch, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye; Camp-nay		Certificate # HDC2020-12-2627	

3. William Buckland **12-2631** 113 Hummock Pond Rd As-built patio and pergola 56/59 Self

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates Welch, Thornewill
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing William Buckland, owner
 Public None
 Concerns (6:20) **Buckland** – Presented project; PVC covered treated pine from Lowes; there are issues with the wetland so can't move it to the rear.
Oliver – Because it's white, it stands out from the street; it might blend in if it were painted grey with plantings along the road to mitigate visibility. This was cited without a fine; the applicant brought this in on his own when he realized it should be applied for. Suggested moving it to behind the house.
Camp – She passes this a lot and she cringes every time; she'd like it to be removed.
Coombs – She agrees with Ms. Camp. As "plastic" it could come unsnapped and should come down. Her concern is all the stuff on the top; could remove every 1 in 6 board.
McLaughlin – It does stand out; suggested painting it brown to blend in with the lattice on the house.
Pohl – Some would like it removed; he thinks PVC can be painted and should be look into. Ms. Oliver had good suggestions.

Motion **Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//McLaughlin, Oliver, Camp, Coombs, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2020-12-2631**

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. Grey Lady Cap., LLC 12-2381	33 Pilgrim Road	Cabana addition	41/834	JB Studio
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Juraj Bencat, JB Studio			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:32)	Bencat – Reviewed the project. Oliver – This is a 32-foot cabana and is too big for the site; the 18 feet of doors are absurd. This needs to be scaled down and something to mitigate the height. Suggested starting over with something smaller. This is visible from the road. Coombs – Agrees with Ms. Oliver. Camp – Also agrees. This overwhelms the site. McLaughlin – West elevation, too much glass. Agrees it's too big.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, McLaughlin, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
2. Vazirani Akshay 12-2436	26 Lyons Lane	MH: dormer/window well	71/9	JB Studio
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Juraj Bencat, JB Studio			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:40)	Bencat – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns, circa 1982. Oliver – He did a good job with the dormer window arrangements; that's what will be visible from the road. Coombs – Okay with the front. Confirmed the skylights are existing. McLaughlin – Asked if the 5 skylights were approved; would like to see the permit for them. Camp – This is better; it would be more traditional if the French doors were centered with flanking windows. Pohl – There should be signoff for the skylights.			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted based upon the assumption the skylights were previous approved. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate # HDC2020-12-2436	

3. Vazirani Akshay 12-2438	26 Lyons Lane	Pool, firepit, etc.	71/9	JB Studio
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Juraj Bencat, JB Studio			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:49)	<p>Bencat – Presented project; not visible; no change to the firepit walls. Coombs – The firepit walls should be dropped; they are too high at 2 feet and with coping will be visible. Camp – She has no feeling about this; thinks it won't be visible. Oliver – Agrees with Ms. Camp, it won't be visible. McLaughlin – No comments. Pohl – He also believes it won't be visible.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Oliver)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Camp, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye; Coombs-nay	Certificate #	HDC2020-12-2438	

4. Luis Daniel Xavier 10-2070	5 Blackfish Lane	Pool cabana	73/123	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver took a break.			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Chip Webster, Chip Webster Associates			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:53)	<p>Webster – Reviewed the project and changes made per previous concerns; we could give this a ridge of 6 or 8 feet with a Dutch hipped roof. Thornewill – This is simple; not much to say. Camp – Something draws attention to this; suggested a Dutch hipped roof. McLaughlin – This is very inconspicuous. Coombs – Her question is the amount of space between the counter and the second set of posts. Pohl – The site plan shows it as a gable roof as opposed to a hipped roof. Likes the idea of a north-south Dutch hipped.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with a Dutch hipped roof. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Thornewill, McLaughlin, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye	Certificate #	HDC2020-10-2070	

5. Nantucket 62 Walsh 12-2551	60 Walsh Street	Rev. 1512: deck/siding	29/85.2	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	Thornewill			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:04)	<p>Botticelli – This was held for a view; reviewed project; submitted a planting plan for the screen; trim grey and batten-board natural to weather; will be vegetated for privacy; we don't want it to read as another shingled, white-trim house. Backus – HSAB said there is no precedent for a barn in Brant Point area. Welch – Asked if the board and batten would be knotty pine or what (natural-to-weather, square-edge cedar). A finished V-groove would be a mistake. It should be further simplified. Camp – If the siding and trim were natural to weather, it would fade in better. She's okay with this. Oliver – What we have to look at is a building we aren't reviewing; that's confusing. McLaughlin – The board and batten doesn't match anything in the neighborhood and there would be no continuity; should all be shingled. This is a chaotic structure with the mixed materials.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp) not carried.			
Roll-call Vote	Motion to Approved through staff as shingled with white or grey trim. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, McLaughlin, Welch, and Coombs-aye	Certificate #	HDC2020-12-2551	

6.	Catherine Kinsella 12-2534	19B Hummock Pond Rd	New dwelling	56/468	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch				
Recused	Thornewill				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design Catherine Kinsella, owner.				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:24)	Thornewill – Held for a view; no revisions were made; owner willing to go with shingles. Kinsella – Reviewed the project. No concerns.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (McLaughlin)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2020-12-2534	
7.	Ana Collins 12-2485	48 Orange Street	New driveway/patio	42.3.2/297	Tom Hanlon
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:30)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0// Camp, McLaughlin, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #		
8.	Sam Slosek 10-2096	16 Pippen's Way	Rooftop solar	43/94.8	Cotuit Solar
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.				
Representing	Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar Sam Slosek, owner Moors End Farm				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:31)	Alence – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Slosek – The new drawings clean it up. Paul Bennett is putting his shingles up tomorrow. Camp – Her concern is still visibility from Polpis Road; thinks the upper panels will catch your eye. Coombs – She doesn't think this will be noticeable from Polpis Road unless you stop and look. When the rest of the farm goes solar, it will blend in. It is important for our farms to have relief on electrical bills. Oliver – It is highly visible on a wood roof. She's okay with the panels on the lower southeast roof plane. This is a complicated and high roof. Welch – His concern is similar to Ms. Oliver's; but it's distant enough that it overrides his concern.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Coombs)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-2//Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye; Oliver & Camp-nay		Certificate #	HDC2020-10-2096	
9.	Josh Hande 09-1638	83 Eel Point Road	Solar panels	32/12	Cotuit Solar
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.				
Representing	Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:41)	Alence – Presented project; will plant along the eastern side to screen; the owner doesn't want screening close to the house. Asked for a denial. Oliver – The idea that vegetation along the road blocks this house is absurd. We asked last time that vegetation be planted closer to the house; appreciates the context photos, but they best illustrate why we have the rules we have. Trees near the parking area would be close enough. Coombs – We have considered this house several times; it is small but stands out. We have stated we would like vegetation closer to the house; it's not what the applicant wants but what we require. Camp – She doesn't support this at all because it's inappropriate. Pohl – To get this approved, there would have to be vegetation closer to the house.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs) Carried but withdrawn at applicant's request. Motion to Deny because it does not meet the solar guidelines. (Oliver)				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2020-09-1638	

10. 14 Lowell, LLC 10-2188	14 Lowell Place	New dwelling	41/164	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments, and <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> (BWNIM).			
Representing Public	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development Zander Farkas, owner of 7 & 9 Barnabas Place and representing Bill and Lisa Becker at 20 Woodbury Lane Victoria Rakov, 12 Lowell Place			
Concerns (7:52)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; this is appropriate and contextual to the area.</p> <p>Backus – HSAB has not seen the revised plans; they mentioned it was too tall and massing inappropriate. There are letters from abutters.</p> <p>Farkas – This is attractive but not in context with this neighborhood of structures built in the 1920s and 1930s. BWNIM mentions visibility of a clearly defined main entrance; this entrance is hidden. It has excessive fenestration and a roof line far more complicated than anything on the street.</p> <p>Rakov – Agrees with everything Mr. Farkas said. In height and scale, it is out of character with other structures on Lowell Place.</p> <p>Coombs – This is visible from Barnabas and Woodbury. The south elevation is 89 feet long, which is 3 times longer than any other house on Lowell Place. It’s lovely but too big for this area and has no greenery around it. This must be redesigned smaller.</p> <p>Welch – Traditional trim is appropriate. East elevation, adding the covered porch and the hipped roof element is helpful – actually, very much so in any other area—here, east elevation, really what would be considered the front 1/3 of the primary mass, is too tall for the setting of small 1-story homes in the area. Regarding duration of review, which I bring up only in response to Mr. MacEachern’s comment and while not intended to be pointed about it – it’s certainly not unheard that we approve sensitive designs in a single setting.</p> <p>Oliver – She appreciates the traditional windows and lower height. This straddles two different neighborhoods – Lowell and Woodbury. This has a modern skew in a neighborhood that abuts the old historic district, i.e., the front door is too suburban. Wishes it weren’t so long. There is extra ceiling height and 7’6” doors. The side facing the pool is over fenestrated and would be visible from Barnabas. The garage, at the size it is next to the house, doesn’t help the impact of the house.</p> <p>Pohl – He agrees with much that’s been said both positive and negative. Doesn’t think this will be approved without further reduction in the main ridge height. This building’s context is Lowell Place, not Woodbury Lane.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Oliver, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	

11. FAE Andrew, LLC 12-2463	17 Sherburne Turnpike	New GH/garage	30/172.1	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing Public	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development None			
Concerns (8:26)	<p>MacEachern – Added the retaining walls to the site plan at the commission’s request; they will be applied for separately with landscaping.</p> <p>Pohl – This is about 10 feet below the road.</p> <p>Oliver – The only concern we had were the walls; previously it looked like the grade ran into the house. Only the east elevation might be visible. No concerns.</p> <p>Camp – No concerns.</p> <p>Coombs – No concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – East elevation, the doors are drawn as having a roller tracks.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	HDC2020-12-2463

12. Andrew Reger 12-2469	7 East Lincoln Avenue	New dwelling	42.4.1/8	Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development			
Public	Anne Mastain, abutter to the east			
Concerns (8:33)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p>Backus – HSAB did not review these revisions. This board previously approved a demolition with the condition it went hand-in-hand with approval of the replacement structure.</p> <p>Mastain – No issue with the style. We are disturbed about the siting; it looks like it’s right on the setback line when there is plenty of room to move it to the center of the property. The massing is out of proportion to the neighborhood; almost all are small bungalows.</p> <p>Camp – She loves the design. However, suggested it be moved farther west off the property line.</p> <p>Coombs – Appreciates the changes made to the fenestration. Looking at the site plan, it could be moved more toward the center with the garage moved back to align its rear wall with the back wall of the main mass.</p> <p>Thornewill – Agrees with what’s been said. Other houses on this street are centered on their lots; this is a big lot, but it has a big house. She has problems with the roof walk on this style; it doesn’t seem appropriate.</p> <p>Pohl – Moving it closer to the lot would keep a large house from looming over a smaller house. He’s okay with the roof walk. The west elevation side door doesn’t need that massive staircase.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions and a sun study. (Camp)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Coombs, Thornewill, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
13. Nerijilus Paulauskis 12-2396	3 Cachalot Lane	Hoop tent	67/781	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Ned Paulauskis			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:51)	<p>Paulauskis – Reviewed additional information; he has planted screening.</p> <p>Oliver – The pictures used as precedent are on Old South Road; Cachalot is off Ticcoma. Might be okay if it’s temporary with a time limit and screening between it and the road.</p> <p>Thornewill – Horizontal to the road isn’t a good idea; if it were perpendicular and set back farther, it would be better and allow for more plantings.</p> <p>Coombs – This is not appropriate in front of the house. It should be at the back of the lot.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments.</p> <p>Pohl – The goal is to minimize its impact on Cachalot by turning it and moving it back on the lot with additional screening.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Thornewill, McLaughlin, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	

Following items held for Thursday, January 21, 2021.

14. Mary Louise Cohen 11-2315	32 Cliff Road	front porch/stoop	42.4.4/37.1	SMRD
15. Patricia Wright 12-2481	10 Cherry Street	Rooftop solar	55/383.1	Cotuit Solar
16. Sea La Vie, LLC 11-2255	42 Dukes Road	Pool pavilion + shower	56/249	NAG
17. Shlosser FT 12-2565	6 Elbow Lane	Add parking	73.2.4/31	McMullen + Assoc.
18. Paul Piccirillo 10-2053	6 Baltimore Street	New dwelling	60/106	Val Oliver Design
19. William Scannell 12-2446	119R Eel Point Rd	New dwelling	33/17.1	BPC
20. Nineteen Pond View NT 10-2112	19 Pond View Drive	New guest house	81/26	BPC
21. High Tide Partners 12-2468	8 Ackermuck Way	Pool and hardscape	41/618	BPC
22. Susan Doughan 12-2406	134 Main Street	Hardscaping – driveway	41/37.1	Gryphon Architects
23. Tamara Wing 12-2582	52 West Chester Street	Additions + alterations	41/381	Emeritus
24. Brett Fodiman 11-2217	111 Surfside Road	New dwelling	80/70	Emeritus
25. Brett Fodiman 11-2210	111 Surfside Road	New garage/studio	80/70	Emeritus

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Approved Minutes Motion Roll-call vote	December 29 and 31, 2020 Motion to Approve. (Oliver) Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, and Pohl-aye
Review Minutes	January 4, 7, & 8, 2021
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next HDC Meeting- Old Business Thursday 1/21/21 at 01:00pm • HDC review of revisions to HDC Background Summary to finalize for web page including vote • Discussion of additions and new dwellings added to the consent agenda • Discussion of 6 Fair Street Minimum Maintenance • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings
Commission Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oliver – Asked when 27 North Liberty Street will come back up. • Flynn – She has emailed the applicant on available dates. • Camp – There was a statement that if you move or touch an historic building, it comes off the National Historic Landmark list. Asked if that is true. • Backus – Yes, it is part of the Secretary of Interior Standards we follow.

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 9:04 p.m. (McLaughlin)**
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, Oliver, McLaughlin, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:
 Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board

Scotset Advisory Board

Madaket Advisory Board