



## HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

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

**Commissioners:** Raymond Pohl (Chair), Stephen Welch (Vice-chair), Diane Coombs, Abby Camp, Vallorie Oliver,  
**Associate Commissioners:** Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten, Joseph Paul

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, July 25, 2023

*Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via ZOOM.*

Called to order at 4:04 pm. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Holly Backus, Historic Planner; Esmeralda Martinez, Land Use Specialist, & Fiona Johnson, Administrative Specialist.

Attending Members: Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Paul

Remote Participants:

Absent Members: Patten

Late Arrivals: Camp (4:11pm)

Early Departures: Camp (8:14pm)

Adoption of Agenda.

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

Vote Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill-aye

### COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

**Pohl** – Wanted to have Commissioner Comments up at the front because, as we all know, the commission’s dear friend and fellow board member for so many years passed away at the end of last week. He only thought it appropriate to say how important he was to this board. He’d need to fact check this, but somebody told him that he was literally on for 50 years. He thinks he started in 1967, and then he was off for a short interval when he was a selectman. “Yeah, we all miss him”. Shared with the board that he ran into a friend of his and she said, ‘Oh, you know, how’s it going?’ He said, ‘Oh, I got to go buy some flowers to put on his bench at the top of Main Street. There’s a little shrine, and it literally was there the night after he died, and I figured I’m going to contribute to the shrine.’ So, he told his friend, ‘Yeah, I’m going to get some flowers and bring them up to the shrine.’ And she said, ‘John McLaughlin, wasn’t he difficult?’ And he said, ‘Oh yeah, like he was really difficult, but he had an abiding love of Nantucket, and he spent most of his life ensuring the welfare of Nantucket the way he knew it, and he didn’t care if he made enemies in making decisions that were counter to what people wanted him to do, and that just didn’t seem to matter to him. Like a few things that he remembers John saying innumerable times, and I’m sure you’ve heard the same sort of things, one of his favorites was he would refer to the mainland as America, and I always thought that that was kind of xenophobic, like, ‘Oh, you know, America,’ but he just meant Nantucket was a special place and it was different, and the same rule that are applying on the mainland do not apply here, and so don’t think that because you’re from the mainland you could come over and do mainland type things. So that was really one of his favorite expressions. John had, as we all know all too well, his agenda of what he considered to be right and wrong, and when first started appearing on the other side of the table from this board, he would insist on, you know, no casement windows, and then he’d get sort of bent out of shape if the casement windows got approved. One thing he’d have to say about John is, you know, over the years, his final years on this board, casement windows would get approved, and he’d say, ‘Well, you all know my opinions about casement windows, and I think they’re inappropriate, but we’re a board, and we’re going to vote like a board, and so if I’m outvoted, that’s okay.’ So, he was just a seriously great person all around. For those who don’t know, John actually wrote a couple of really wonderful little books about Nantucket folklore that he doesn’t know where you can get a copy of it, but he has a few copies. He doesn’t know, his house was full from top to bottom, particularly after Beverly died, with every copy of every meeting he went to at the HDC. Yes, and he would take notes, he would say, ‘Well, what was the vote on that? How did it pass?’ And each and every application that he reviewed; he would note down meticulously. “John we all miss you, say hi to Beverly for us. We’re going to miss you terribly.”

**Coombs** – Recalls when John was showing her something at his home and she couldn’t believe he needed to have a whole garage just to store all his HDC work and how organized it was. She hopes that the place doesn’t just get cleaned out and instead his work is somehow maintained and stored. John was very consistent.

**I. CONSENTS**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Robert Mello	41 Wigwam Rd	Add screening Rev 06-6577	77/7.1	Julius Pasys
2.	Chris & Ashley Austin	Maple Ln Lot 7	Main house revisions	67/303	Emeritus
3.	Doug Carson	2 Blueberry Ln	New Cabana	80/178	Val Oliver
4.	Sheep Pond Property LLC	14-16 Sheep Pond	Rev rotate Garage rev 02-7860	63/29&30	Emeritus
5.	Sheep Pond Property LLC	14-16 Sheep Pond	Rotate dwelling rev 02-7979	63/29&30	Emeritus
6.	Stobie/ Dorset	60 Hulbert Ave	Garage/ Apt	29/58-58.1	Thornewill Design
7.	Lynn Taliento	12 Madaquecham V.	Move shed on site	89/12	Structures Unltd.
8.	Eleven Lincoln Ave Tr	32 Jefferson Ave	GH Rev 7051	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
9.	WSTT Holding LLC	9 Miller Ln	Cabana	68/123	Emeritus
10.	WSTT Holding LLC	9 Miller Ln	Garage	68/123	Emeritus
11.	WSTT Holding LLC	9 Miller Ln	Main House color	68/123	Emeritus
12.	22N LLC	22 Nonantum Ave	Hardscape	87/19	Ahern LLC
13.	22N LP	22 Nonantum Ave	Pool House Rev	87/19	Botticelli + Pohl
14.	22N LP	22 Nonantum Ave	GH Addition	87/19	Botticelli + Pohl
15.	ETG Nominee Trust	6 Old Harbor Rd	Renew Coa 2020-10-2162 MH	40/95	Botticelli + Pohl
16.	ETG Nominee Trust	6 Old Harbor Rd	Renew Coa 2020-10-2163 Garage	40/95	Botticelli + Pohl
17.	ETG Nominee Trust	6 Old Harbor Rd	Renew Coa 2020-10-2164 Cabana	40/95	Botticelli + Pohl
18.	Ack North Star Dev LLC	26 Douglas Way	Solar Array	39/41	Brook Meerbergen
19.	32 Bartlett LLC	32 Bartlett Rd	Roof solar array	66/19	Sunwind
20.	Louie Dog LLC	15 Tomahawk Rd	Rev door and window	69/359	EMDA
21.	Folger Block Condominium	58 Main St	Historic Determination	42.3.1 219	Anne Dougherty
22.	Lubin Richard K Trust	6 Hinckley Ln	Move existing Garage On-site	30/78	Emeritus
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	-				
Recused	Pohl, Oliver, Thornewill				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	-				
Public	<b>Angus Macleod</b> – 32 Jefferson Av has a proposed airway stairway in front of the building on the street side, close to the road. In their opinion it's not appropriate.				
Concerns	-				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve consent items. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023- (as noted)</b>

**II. CONSENTS WITH CONDITIONS**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	73 Hulbert Nom Trst	73 Hulbert Ave	New Pool	29/5	Ahern LLC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity &amp; pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.</li> </ul>				
2.	Ack North Star Dev LLC	26 Douglas Way	Pool House/ 2 <sup>nd</sup> Dwell	39/41	Brook Meerbergen
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce overall height by one foot (w/out changing roof pitches)</li> </ul>				
3.	Ack North Star Dev LLC	26 Douglas Way	Pool/hardscape	39/41	Brook Meerbergen
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity &amp; pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.</li> </ul>				
4.	Surfside Beach Ventures LLC	9 Auriga Way	Deck outdoor shower, add stairs	87/113.1	JB Studio
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dimensions are to be added to the plan, &amp; deck should be 8' on the second floor without a cantilever.</li> </ul>				
5.	Johannesen Renee Trust	9 Carew Ct	New shed	73.3.2/23	JB Studio
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>revised site plan meeting setbacks (for placement).</li> </ul>				
6.	22N LP	22 Nonantum Ave	New Garage	87/19	Botticelli + Pohl
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Downsize By 1/2 Or Remove Cupola</li> </ul>				
7.	Eleven Lincoln Ave Tr	32 Jefferson Ave	MH Rev 6917	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>second floor deck on the front porch is no deeper than 8'.</li> </ul>				
8.	Robert Lapiene	13 Bayberry Ln	Roof solar array	67/64	Sunwind
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vegetation to be retained, maintained and/or replaced as of time of inspection and thereafter.</li> </ul>				
9.	87 Bartlett LLC	87 Bartlett Rd	Roof solar array	66/407	Sunwind
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vegetation to be retained, maintained and/or replaced as of time of inspection and thereafter.</li> </ul>				
10.	Stobi/Dorset	60 Hulbert Ave	Shed Demo- Move off	29/58-58.1	Thornewill Design

- need historic information on shed.

Voting Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul  
 Alternates -  
 Recused Pohl, Thornewill  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing -  
 Public **Angus Macleod** – Concerned with the age of 60 Hulbert Av Shed. Would prefer it be saved instead of taken away.  
 Concerns **Holly Backus** – Included the 60 Hulbert application in consent with conditions. Was looking for more information on the shed and would also prefer to see the shed moved instead of demolished.

**Motion** **Motion to approve consents with conditions. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye Certificate # **HDC2023-(as noted)**

**III. TOWN BUSINESS**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Town of Nantucket	20 South Water	Windows	42.4.2/29	SMRT
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill				
Alternates	Paul				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Linda Williams</b> –				
Public	<b>Angus Macleod</b> – Agrees with Holly’s comments.				
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b> – The board this previously approved this through staff with a window survey and a window in file, but the application was indicating for TDL versus SDL. Therefore, there was a request for them to go to SDL. There is a window survey on file for both structures. This proposal is for windows to be SDL Green Mountain with no triple tracks. Supports the proposal. <b>Pohl</b> – The technology on simulated glass has advanced quite a bit. Provided an example of what he saw at the Vineyard where every window seemed to have simulated divided lites <b>Oliver</b> – Without having seen what this window looks like, she would like to see a sample. This will set a precedent and therefore this decision is very important. More concerned about the spacer bar if SDL’s are approved in the OHD. <b>Coombs</b> – Agrees with Val as to why an SDL should not be on a building in the OHD. TDLs are what should be on all buildings in the OHD. <b>Camp</b> – Was told that this would be similar or the same as 11 Pleasant. Is in favor of the proposed. <b>Thornewill</b> – Thinks Abby is correct in wanting to see this done before SDLs go on any other structure in the OHD.				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve with the proviso that this is a test case, and the board will decide if using SDL windows on this town building worked or not. If not, then storm windows would be installed. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-2 // Pohl, Camp, Thornewill-aye // Oliver, Coombs-nay			Certificate #	
2.	Town of Nantucket	16 Broad St	Window replacement	42.4.2 30	SMRT
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver				
Alternates	Thornewill, Paul				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Linda Williams</b>				
Public	<b>Angus Macleod</b> – Considering the age of the building – 1960’s, SDL windows would be appropriate and look better.				
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b> – This structure is contributing. Supports the Green Mountain SDL windows without triple track. Also supports the like kind replacements on the application. <b>Welch</b> – Based on the conversation that’s been had he is concerned the board would be adding as a condition for approval on historic and contributing structures what the use is. The board’s decision should rest on the merits of the structure. Is more concerned about the first floor than the second floor. Believes the second floor and rear of the structure would be approvable. Thinks if anything on this application comes back as inappropriate then what should be on the table are the frame panel storms with screen inserts, not triple track. Suggests a sash be removed and a smaller window be put in place so that it can be viewed in place and the project potentially receive an approval to proceed all at once. <b>Coombs</b> – Agrees with Stephen that the board’s decision should rest on the merits of the structure. <b>Oliver</b> – Agrees with the board that this is a big decision. Is unsure whether the board would approve this bigger structure as well as the smaller structure that was just approved before this application. <b>Camp</b> – Is of the same mind as the approval for the smaller building.				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve through staff as option A or option B at the determination of the applicant. Option A would be that the windows on the second floor and rear of the structure which parallel East Chestnut St be approved as submitted. Option B would be that somewhere on the Broad St side of the structure where visible sediment to Green Mountain sashes will be inserted in place of an existing sash for commissioner viewing for determination of the first-floor window replacements. (Welch)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 3-2 // Pohl, Welch, Camp-aye // Oliver, Coombs-nay			Certificate #	

**IV. NEW BUSINESS 07/11/2023**

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Nicholas Tesino	74 Arkansas Ave	As built Fence	59.4 41	Nicholas Tesino
Voting					
Alternates					
Recused					
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing					
Public					
Concerns	Application not opened				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>No action.</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Patten-aye			Certificate #	<b>HDC2023</b>

**V. OLD BUSINESS 07/18/2023**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. CCTACK LLC <b>04-6106</b>	120 Old South Rd	New structure	68/969	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Chip Webster</b>			
Public	-			
Concerns	<p><b>Camp</b> – Is concerned about the congestion to these three buildings. Would be ok with the proposal if a few feet of space could be gained between each structure. Suggests that a pair of the pent roofs be combined rather than have them all separated.</p> <p><b>Thornewill</b> – Would like to see a little more variation in the gables (as proposed they're all doing the same thing). Wonders how the middle low sloping roof section is going to look off Old South Rd.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Confirmed through Chip Webster that there's about 6 feet of distance between each structure. Suggests there be more like 10 feet of space between buildings. Prefers option A from the proposed.</p>			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-04-6106</b>
2. CCTACK LLC <b>04-6105</b>	122 Old South Rd	New structure	68/969	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Chip Webster</b>			
Public	-			
Concerns	-			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-04-6106</b>
3. CCTACK LLC <b>04-6104</b>	124 Old South Rd	New structure	68/969	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Chip Webster</b>			
Public	-			
Concerns	-			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0 // Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-04-6104</b>

**VI. NEW BUSINESS 07/25/2023**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Stobie/Dorset	60 Hulbert Ave	Additions to Main House	29/58-58.1	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates	Camp			
Recused	<b>Thornewill</b>			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	Luke Thornewill			
Public	<p><b>Angus Macleod</b>- The roof walk feels out of place in this style and adds height to an already tall building. The rounded balcony doesn't integrate well into the roof below. If this were squared off and pulled back a little, it would conceal the deck edge and trim and nestle into the roof better. A shingled rail would be an improvement.</p>			
Concerns	<p><b>Holly Backus</b> – The proposed dormer on the roof is introducing a new architectural feature that adds on to its verticalness and is not appropriate. The North is what faces the harbor and Hulbert Ave, not sure that the proposed enclosed porch addition in the second-floor balconies is appropriate, especially the curbed deck. Would like to see a window survey for the proposed removed windows.</p> <p><b>Paul</b> – His only concern is the roof walk perching on top of an already tall building.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Is concerned about the feature of the two dormers on the north on either side.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Agrees with Joe on the roof walk.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Roof walk must go.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – Agrees with the rest of the board.</p>			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Coombs)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye		Certificate #	

2.	Keegan Hodges	32 Union St	Historic structure color chng	42.3.2/85	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	Camp				
Recused	<b>Thornewill</b>				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Carrie Thornewill</b>				
Public	<b>Angus McCloud</b> – No concerns.				
Concerns	<p><b>Holly Backus</b> – There’s a lot of individual uniqueness to this structure and she thinks looking at the color of this individually significant structure is very important.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Is concerned about the proposed yellow.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Thinks the yellow is inappropriate on this house. The gray makes it more pronounced.</p> <p><b>Paul</b> – The door should be black if the clapboard is yellow.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – No concerns.</p>				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve through staff subject to the door being black. (Welch)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye			Certificate #	

3.	James Abbott	6 Chester St	New Pergola	42.4.3/65	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul				
Alternates	Camp				
Recused	<b>Thornewill</b>				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Carrie Thornewill</b>				
Public	-				
Concerns	<p><b>Holly Backus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns about proposed natural-to-weather finish for the pergola.</li> <li>- Comparison to existing white-trimmed house and porch, which historically stood out.</li> <li>- Suggests pergola's natural-to-weather finish might draw more attention than white, given its visibility.</li> <li>- Calls for commission discussion on the pergola's color choice due to its potential visual impact.</li> </ul> <p><b>Oliver</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The lattice on the building's edge (between one and two) will be less noticeable when weathered compared to being painted white.</li> <li>- The natural wood color will likely blend in better than the wood color of the nearby boxes.</li> <li>- Val is okay with either option (natural or painted), as both would work well in their opinion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Coombs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The lattice should be left natural as it would blend better with the surroundings.</li> <li>- Mentioned the Trello cell phone, nearby boxes, and how white paint would make the lattice stand out.</li> <li>- Natural wood would be a better choice considering the intention to grow plants on it.</li> <li>- Avoiding yearly removal of roses and other plants if painted; natural weathering is preferred.</li> </ul> <p><b>Welch</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrees with Diane.</li> </ul> <p><b>Paul</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Initially inclined towards white color.</li> <li>- Concerned about the design due to one post and brackets, comparing it to a bracket on the front porch where no post exists.</li> <li>- Suggests placing brackets at the ends of the pergola for a more balanced look.</li> <li>- Acknowledges that both natural and painted options are acceptable but recommends the design alteration.</li> </ul>				
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve through staff with the pergola being natural to weather and for there to be brackets added where the beams hit into the exterior of the building. (Coombs)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye			Certificate #	

4. Gentzel	54 Orange St	Windows Repair/ Replace	55.4.1 18	Gryphon Architects
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates	Camp, Paul			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Ethan Gryphon</b>			
Public	<b>Angus McLeod</b>			

- Originality belief: Views the elements as original design.
- Logical placement: Believes window wouldn't be added later behind fireplace.
- Blind windows: Considers blind windows part of design rhythm, avoiding void.
- Preference for retention: Wants blind windows to stay as they are.
- Importance of shutters: Views shutters as character-defining, should be retained.

Concerns

**Holly Backus**

- The building is a significant 1835 Greek Revival listed in the HTC.
- Removal of faux window casings and shutters is not supported as it disrupts the rhythm of the bays.
- Character-defining features like shutters and window trim should not be removed; even if shutters have been replaced elsewhere on the structure.
- Interior photos suggest originality of the window location; suggests a window survey for replacements.
- Mentions the end chimney's significance and doubts about original window placement without further evidence.
- Notes NHA photo from the 1900s indicating faux window with shutters.
- No concerns about proposed repair/replace of other windows.
- Strongly opposes the removal of the entire bay of faux windows due to its impact on the building's rhythm and significance.

**Thornewill**-Agrees with Holly and Angus.

**Welch**

- Agrees with others but has a different perspective.
- Interruption in pattern: Notes interruption by closed shutter windows.
- Lower elevation rhythm: Sees proposed lower elevation with unevenly spaced windows and shutters.
- Existing pattern: Identifies existing interruption with uniform and distinct elements.
- Different conclusion: Acknowledges pattern benefits but arrives at a different decision.

**Coombs**

- Opposition to removal: Disagrees with removal of shutters.
- Uncertainty about changes: Not sure when shutters became narrow or were replaced.
- Building's importance: Believes the building's significance justifies its preservation as is.

**Oliver**

- Indifference towards fake windows: Doesn't have a strong opinion about removing fake windows.
- Support for shutter retention: Favors keeping shutters on windows.
- Inquiry about northwest side: Questions if removing shutter on northwest side effects fake window removal.

**Pohl**

- Rationale behind shutter removal: Discusses the owner's desire to remove shutters due to incongruence with chimney and ongoing renovations.
- Alternative approach: Suggests keeping shutters open and using clapboard to represent former window locations, maintaining building's evolving nature.

**Motion**

**Motion to hold for revisions and more information. (Coombs)**

Roll-call Vote

Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill-aye

Certificate #

Voting Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver

Alternates Thornewill, Paul

Recused

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.

Representing **Matt MacEachern**Public **Angus McLeod**

- The addition of a pent roof seems heavy for the simple details of the structure.
- If changing from the current pergola, suggests lowering the rake board and roof to bracket height for a simpler look.
- Avoid having a wrap-around band and shingling above it before reaching the roof.
- Suggests simplifying the design while maintaining the existing elements that work well.

Concerns

**Holly Backus**

- The history compiled in the packet suggests that the structure might have been a boathouse during the early 20th century.
- There's a 24-light window on the west-facing Easy Street that might have been from the turn of the last century.
- Concerns about adding another glazed element like a door next to the existing 24-light window due to excessive glazing on that elevation.
- Suggestion for a Dutch door that resembles a six-panel door for a commercial space while maintaining a classic look.
- Existing six-panel solid door might be more appropriate than a two-panel Dutch door.
- Question about whether the existing trim color will remain and consideration for providing a view due to the location.

**Welch**

- Three main issues for review: second door matching the first, pent roof design, and fenestration.
- Proposes that the secondary door should not match the style of the first door; suggests a nine-light French door with a panel at the base.
- Supports a pent roof but suggests simplifying it to a 4:12 pitch and eliminating lattice to align with the simplicity of the structure.
- Recommends burying the header in the rafter tail to streamline the system and have only one fascia.
- Questions the necessity of flanking windows on the next elevation due to the small space; suggests having just one of them.
- Doesn't have concerns about the 15-light doors being different from the others on a different elevation.

**Camp**

- The pent roof over the front door appears a bit heavy; suggests finding ways to lighten it while keeping the trellis.
- Questions the purpose of the structure but acknowledges liking the quirkiness of having just one picture window.
- Confirms that the space is intended for retail use, which aligns with the design.
- Supports the inclusion of a second window but inquires about the proposed Dutch door's location.
- Open to the Dutch door proposal on the side of the structure.
- Overall, finds the design sensitive and doesn't have many additional comments.

**Coombs**

- Believes the small commercial space is well-suited for a single window, door, and a small trellis, which matches the building's size and adds charm to the area.
- Strongly suggests keeping the single window and door on the front to maintain the character of the building and the charm of the street.
- Has no objections to the proposed Dutch door on the sides and other proposed elements.
- Overall, supports the design with a single window and door on the front and is fine with the other proposed changes.

**Oliver**

- Thinks having two windows is acceptable but suggests maintaining uniqueness by making the second window a different size to avoid perfect symmetry.
- Recommends a smaller, more diminutive element over the door.

**Pohl**

- Suggests adjusting the pitch from 3 and 12 to 4 and 12 for the pent roof.
- By doing this, the eave would drop and reduce the bulk on the front face of the structure.
- Overall, the pent roof is the only issue Ray has with the design.

**Motion**

Roll-call Vote

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

Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver-aye

Certificate #



6.	Carolina Save	4 Birdsong Lane	Rev 4338 Sunroom/ door windows	55.4.4/80.1	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul				
Alternates	Oliver				
Recused	<b>Thornewill</b>				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.				
Representing	<b>Luke Thornewill</b>				
Public	<b>Angus McLeod</b>				
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Echoes the sentiment that the previously approved screened porch was more successful.</li> <li>- Suggests a decision between two options for the porch: using windows to create a filled-in appearance or leaving it as an open, unmolded space.</li> <li>- If using windows, recommends ensuring that the number of windows is appropriate for the available space.</li> <li>- Notes that having too many windows would leave only a small shingle space on the sides.</li> <li>- Overall, emphasizes the importance of balance in the design.</li> </ul>
Concerns					<p><b>Holly Backus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The previously approved left-side screened porch was more successful than the proposed design.</li> <li>- Fenestration changes are generally successful, especially on the east and north sides.</li> <li>- Preferred the gable roof with the screened porch compared to the proposed hip roof.</li> <li>- Appreciates the fenestration changes but has reservations about the proposed change to the screened porch.</li> </ul> <p><b>Camp</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Acknowledges that the success of the screened porch is due to its better relationship with the main mass of the building.</li> <li>- Suggests spreading out the windows more to achieve a sun porch that appears like it was once a screened porch filled in with windows.</li> <li>- Wants the sun porch to have more visual weight and connection to the main mass.</li> <li>- Notes a significant difference between the sun porch and the top of the main mass and wishes for better visual harmony between the two.</li> </ul> <p><b>Coombs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrees with Abby's perspective about the screened porch.</li> <li>- Believes that the sun porch would look better resembling an old-fashioned screened porch rather than using modern windows.</li> <li>- Appreciates the nostalgic feeling it brings.</li> <li>- Notes that on the North elevation, various porch elements have been converted into windows.</li> <li>- Suggests that the French doors could have kick panels and other similar elements for coherence.</li> <li>- Considers the porch as the most significant change to the facade and recommends using more traditional porch windows.</li> </ul> <p><b>Paul</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports the idea of portraying the porch as an enclosed space, resembling an enclosed porch.</li> <li>- Suggests using larger windows instead of double-hung windows and referencing the size of previous screen openings.</li> <li>- Emphasizes that using windows would remove ambiguity and clearly convey the porch narrative.</li> <li>- Recommends incorporating a continuous sill that wraps around the porch, similar to the screen porch.</li> <li>- Expresses concern about potential proportions if extending too far, but believes proper detailing can balance this out, mentioning columns and trim details.</li> <li>- Considers the possibility of a Gable roof, especially if the porch narrative is followed and the roof's pitch can be adjusted to allow for a steeper Gable.</li> <li>- Acknowledges the north side's less visible nature and the presence of other hip elements on the structure.</li> <li>- Believes a Gable roof is more in line with the current design and setting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Welch</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrees with Joe's comments, particularly the idea of portraying the porch as an enclosed space.</li> <li>- Suggests specific detailing: adding a section of screen and converting it to a window.</li> <li>- Proposes not shingling below the new window section to create a panelized effect and change the focal point.</li> <li>- Recommends using vertical separators for the panels to create a distinct visual effect and perception of scale.</li> <li>- Less concerned about the other elevations due to their visibility.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pohl</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrees with the conceptual ideas discussed about the porch or sunroom being seen as a converted screen porch.</li> </ul>
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for revisions. (Camp)</b>				
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye			Certificate #	

7. Ack North Star Dev LLC 26 Douglas Way New Dwelling 39/41 Brook Meerbergen  
Voting Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill  
Alternates Oliver, Paul  
Recused None  
Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
Representing **Brook Meerbergen**  
Public -  
Concerns **Camp**

- Suggests the chimney is made a little taller. That is her only concern.

**Coombs**

- Believes the chimney needs to be wider; its current width appears off in relation to the house.
- Suggests making the chimney wider and more proportional to the size of the house.
- Appreciates the materials used for the chimney (brick) but feels it's currently too small.
- Proposes breaking down the uniform height of the house by occasionally having different heights, especially for one-story additions.
- Recommends adding one-story elements to vary the height and break down the overall size of the house.

**Thornewill**

- Questions if the columns are round and tapers them around.
- Prefers round columns for a different kind of building, suggesting square columns for this context.
- Appreciates the porch detail on the North elevation but notes it's unique and not repeated elsewhere.
- Has concerns about the metal railing with horizontal cable on the North elevation's second floor, especially if visible from the street.
- Suggests either emphasizing the curve as a feature or reconsidering its presence.
- Expresses uncertainty about the appropriateness of the cable railing and its visibility.
- Agrees with previous comments about the chimney and loves the scale and overall design of the house.

**Welch**

- Agrees with the previous comments and doesn't have any disagreements.
- Finds the structure attractive and appropriate.

**Pohl**

- Appreciates the overall appropriateness and harmony.
- Describes the architectural details: round tapered columns, Moorish feeling, cable rail.
- Not a fan of the cable rail on the Douglas wayside arches.
- Suggests finding a different roof form for Priscilla's Nook.
- Shed roof should typically be in a dormer, not projecting off the main roof.
- Noticed site flattening to uniform lower level.

**Motion**

Roll-call Vote

**Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Camp)**

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

Certificate #

**HDC2023-01-7686**

8. Ack North Star Dev LLC      26 Douglas Way      Studio Garage      39/41      Brook Meerbergen  
 Voting      Pohl, Welch, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill  
 Alternates      Oliver, Paul  
 Recused      None  
 Documentation      Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing      **Brook Meerbergen**  
 Public      -  
 Concerns      **Welch**

- Concerned about the overall height of the studio.
- Finds the hip roof dormer pronounced and oversized.
- Notes the absence of hip roofs on the secondary dwelling.
- Suggests considering another hip element for Priscilla's Nook.
- Questions the location of the hip roof on the main structure.
- Feels the hip roof is large and prominent compared to other elements.
- Overall, no concerns except for the height and dormer size.

**Coombs**

- Notices a discrepancy in measurements (23.9 vs. 26.99).
- Correct height should be 24 feet.
- Mentions the width of 30 feet and expresses a desire to reduce it if possible.

**Camp**

- Suggests considering a shed roof if there's no parallel for a hip roof.
- Notes the presence of a portico entrance on the front of the house facing Braeburn.
- Emphasizes the need for better visual integration of design elements.
- Likes the "Brokeback" profile but suggests extending it further down.
- Recommends simpler garage doors, such as using a v-groove design.
- Expresses concern about the windows' compatibility with other elements.
- Appreciates the building's simplicity.

**Pohl**

- Acknowledges resonance with Steven's point about the hip roof.
- Expresses a need to address the width and flatness of the current design.
- Considers options like narrowing the design or increasing the roof pitch.
- Agrees with Abby's suggestion to revise the garage doors.
- Mentions a new input about removing the curve bracket element.

**Motion**

**Motion to hold for revisions. (Welch)**

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

9. 2 Corby Way LLC      2 Corby Way      Rev Redesign new dwelling      67/3      EMDA  
 Voting      Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul  
 Alternates      Thornewill, Pohl  
 Recused      None  
 Documentation      Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.  
 Representing      **Ethan McMorrow**  
 Public      -  
 Concerns      -

**Motion**

**Motion to approve as submitted. (Paul)**

Roll-call Vote      Carried 5-0 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul -aye      Certificate #

Voting

Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill

Alternates

Paul

Recused

**Pohl**

Documentation

Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.

Representing

**Lisa Botticelli – Botticelli & Pohl**

Public

-

Concerns

**Oliver**

- Roof walk is the main concern that prevented consent.
- Front view of the roof walk looks acceptable.
- Sides of the roof walk appear overly large.
- No issues with the rest of the design.

**Coombs**

- Agrees with Val.
- Notices that the nearby houses are simpler in design.
- Considers the "move fork" addition unnecessary.
- Believes the addition breaks up the long roof but suggests an alternative approach.
- Agrees with Carrie's suggestion to reposition it.
- Expresses interest in finding out the width (likely around 8 feet) for better proportions.
- Proposes dimensions around 8 by 21 feet but advises bringing it in slightly.

**Camp**

- Mentions the addition of a new gambrel on the north elevation.
- Observes that the new gambrel is to the right.
- Notes that the new gambrel is situated close to the chimney mass.
- Suggests shifting the new gambrel slightly to achieve better centering.
- Comments that the original look was simple, but the addition seems less associated and slightly complex.

**Welch**

- Agrees that the roof walk should be one-third the length of the roof at its longest point.
- Finds the overall design appropriate and attractive.
- Acknowledges the prior simpler design.
- Believes relocating the second-floor dormers along the axes is important.
- Suggests shifting the roof walk to align with the existing dormer for better visual harmony.
- Notes that the current placement seems visually elaborate compared to the simpler design that was there.

**Motion**

**Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Camp)**

Roll-call Vote

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

Certificate #

11. 256 Polpis LLC	256 Polpis Rd	Demo Shed	25/25	Botticelli + Pohl
Voting	Welch, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates	Thornewill			
Recused	<b>Pohl</b>			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing Public	<b>Lisa Botticelli – Botticelli &amp; Pohl</b>			
Concerns	<p><b>Holly Backus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site is associated with a circa 1930 colonial revival building.</li> <li>- Main house and shed could be of the same vintage.</li> <li>- Application should specify moving the structure, not demolition.</li> <li>- Requests more information about the building's history.</li> <li>- Interior photos and additional details should be provided.</li> <li>- Appreciates the provided photos, but more information is needed.</li> <li>- Suggests researching the possibility of moving the building due to its historical significance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Coombs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrees with Holly's assessment.</li> <li>- The building appears to be in good condition.</li> <li>- Suggests it should be easy to remove from the area.</li> <li>- Recommends researching moving the building instead of demolition.</li> </ul> <p><b>Camp</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Believes the building adds a unique flavor and history to the site.</li> <li>- Considers it important to the overall character of the area.</li> <li>- Views the building as contributing to the site's identity.</li> <li>- Supports the idea of preserving the building by moving it.</li> </ul> <p><b>Paul</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Considers the building's historical and story value.</li> <li>- Believes the location is not approvable today, adding to its significance.</li> <li>- Supports the idea of moving the structure off the site.</li> <li>- Expresses a preference for the building to be moved rather than demolished.</li> </ul>			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve through staff as a move off demo with advertising and more information for the file. (Oliver)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Welch, Camp, Coombs, Paul-aye // Oliver-nay		Certificate #	

12. Laura Jan Hedrick	10 Everett Lane	Move off Garage	73.3.2/3	Laura Jan Hedrick
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates	Welch, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing Public	<b>Laura Hedrick</b>			
Concerns	<p><b>Rob Benchley</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No concerns.</li> </ul> <p><b>Holly Backus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site includes a contributing main house from around 1904.</li> <li>- There's an HDC survey indicating the garage as circa 1949, making it also contributing.</li> <li>- Glad the structure has a pending new home.</li> <li>- Notes the inclusion of a fence in the application, which is unique.</li> <li>- Normally, only one Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) is issued for such cases.</li> <li>- Considers the fence fitting the era of the house.</li> <li>- Leaves the decision regarding the fence to the commission.</li> </ul> <p><b>Camp</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Believes the garage complements the old-fashioned cottage style.</li> <li>- Feels moving the garage takes away its integral site presence.</li> <li>- Glad the garage is being saved but laments its loss from its original position.</li> </ul>			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve through staff as a move off with a site plan noting where the structure existed for record keeping purpose. Chairman also makes the applicant aware that a move-on application will be required for the move on to Polliwog. (Oliver)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1 // Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye // Camp-nay		Certificate #	

13. Laura Jan Hedrick	10 Everett Lane	Move on Cottage	73.3.2/3	Laura Jan Hedrick
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul			
Alternates	Welch, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Laura Hedrick</b>			
Public	<b>Rob Benchley</b>			
	- No concerns.			
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b>			
	- The 2017 renovation will also be preserved with the move.			
	- Ben designed a new location for the cottage that was approved by the commission.			
	- Glad to know there's interest in taking the cottage.			
	- The cottage's contributing status will remain intact due to no "donut holes" in the historic district.			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve as submitted. (Oliver)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Oliver, Paul-aye		Certificate #	

14. Ready RE Trust	17 Cannonbury Ln	New Pool	73/45	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	<b>Oliver</b>			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Val Oliver</b>			
Public	-			
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b>			
	- Appreciates the "five in one" fence and the use of vegetation for blocking visibility.			
	- Finds elevation details valuable for understanding the overall site composition.			
	- Expresses concerns about the potential impact on visibility due to the pergola's location.			
	<b>Thornewill</b>			
	- Appreciates the effort to screen the fence and the pool from the road.			
	- Expresses agreement with providing 10 feet of vegetation in front of the foundation.			
	<b>Coombs</b>			
	- Believes that adequate protective measures have been taken to prevent easy visibility.			
	- Anticipates that the house, garage, and other factors will obstruct the view from different angles.			
	- Expects the pool area to be effectively concealed.			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to approve as submitted with the gates to match the fence. (Paul)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Paul, Thornewill-aye		Certificate #	

15. Jeff Morash	8b Bayberry Ln	Roof solar array	67/72	AckSmart
Voting				
Alternates				
Recused				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing				
Public				
Concerns	Application not opened.			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>No action.</b>			
Roll-call Vote			Certificate #	

16. Melissa Neier	11 Prospect st	New Shed	55.4.4/42	Twig Perkins
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates	Paul			
Recused	-			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.			
Representing	<b>Alyssa Corry</b>			
Public	<b>Angus McLeod</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The siding's arrangement is influenced by the side entry and layout.</li> <li>- Moving the shed closer to the existing driveway rather than Prospect Street integrates it better with the yard.</li> <li>- Suggests that the current placement seems to make the shed appear closer to the street than the neighboring houses.</li> </ul>			
Concerns	<b>Holly Backus</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HDC guidelines suggest sheds should be behind the house, but exceptions are rarely approved.</li> <li>- Location is chosen due to the corner lot configuration, even though there's some space on the left side.</li> <li>- Shed's proposed design is almost like a mini garage and may be difficult to use.</li> <li>- Custom double barn doors should be redesigned to something simpler and in line with Greek Revival style.</li> <li>- Roof shingles for the shed should match the architectural type used on the main house.</li> <li>- Trim should be simpler or match the Greek Revival style.</li> </ul>			
	<b>Thornewill</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Feels the charm of the old house is lost due to the new shed's presence.</li> <li>- Suggests reducing the shed's height and moving it towards the driveway to better match the existing historic structure.</li> <li>- Believes relocating the shed closer to the driveway would enhance its visibility from both Prospect Street and her own street.</li> <li>- Mentions the shed appears to be elevated on a wooden frame, like a deck.</li> </ul>			
	<b>Coombs</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrees with Carrie that the chosen location for the shed isn't suitable, given its attractiveness and visibility on the street corner.</li> <li>- Suggests exploring alternative locations for the shed.</li> <li>- Recommends reducing the shed's design complexity, specifically the windows on the garage door.</li> <li>- Prefers a simple and minimalistic design.</li> <li>- Unsure if there's space to move the shed closer to the house, but believes the current location isn't favorable.</li> </ul>			
	<b>Welch</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests moving the shed closer to the driveway and shortening its height by using a mud sill.</li> <li>- Agrees with Carrie's viewpoint that the current location offers an iconic view that should be preserved.</li> <li>- Emphasizes the importance of respecting property rights while also considering simple solutions to address concerns.</li> <li>- Advocates for achieving both preservation of views and property rights if possible.</li> </ul>			
	<b>Pohl</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests relocating the shed closer to the driveway, away from Prospect Street.</li> <li>- Recommends placing the shed on a slab instead of a deck-like structure to reduce its prominence.</li> <li>- Expresses agreement with the idea of moving the shed for better positioning.</li> <li>- Mentions a third suggestion related to the East Elevation being windowless and noise-reducing.</li> <li>- Emphasizes the benefits of these changes for the shed's design and impact.</li> </ul>			
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Motion to hold for minor revisions. (Oliver)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0 // Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill-aye		Certificate #	

17. Geaux Dahlin LLC	12 Darling St	Window Rev	42.3.2/115	Gryphon Architects
Voting	Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	<b>Pohl</b> (abutter)			

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, advisory comments.

Representing **Ethan Gryphon**

Public **Angus McLeod**

- Agrees the picture window is not appropriate.

Concerns **Holly Backus**

- The property was significantly renovated in 1997, causing some confusion about the original plans from 24 years ago.
- The rear of the property has a secondary second-story addition, which includes a picture window that is considered inappropriate.
- Holly has no concerns about the other changes on the west side of the property.
- Points out that the picture window change is visible from Ray's driveway and is atypical.
- Offers comments mainly for the record and suggests informing the owner about the color change and estimate.

**Coombs**

- Agrees that the picture window and other things are not appropriate.

**Thornewill**

- Also agrees that the picture window is not appropriate at all. It is highly visible.

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

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Paul, Thornewill-aye Certificate #

**Rest held for next meeting -**

18. Gifford Benjamin	4 Head of Plains	Rev to dwelling	63/7	Gryphon Architects
19. Bank of Boston/America	65 Main St	Windows replace	42.3.1/197	B Bisbano
20. Town of Nantucket	10 Sun Island	New Dorm	69/3.1	Gryphon Architects
21. 8 High Brush Path LLC	8 High Brush Path	Addition	56/370	Emeritus
22. Soros Jeffery Trst	47 Baxter Rd	Rev add window	49/14	JB Studio
23. Miroslava Ahern	38 Appleton Rd	Garage renovation & addition	66/42	Ahern LLC
24. Harold Brothers Realty LLC	2-4 Highland Ln	Pool Hardscape	30/289	Jardins Intl.
25. Harold Brothers Realty LLC	6 Highland Ln	Sports Court	30/288	Jardins Intl.

Approved Minutes –	
Review Minutes -	
Other Business -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Next HDC Meeting- August 1<sup>st</sup> at 4pm *HYBRID &amp; IN-PERSON @ 4 FAIRGROUNDS RD. - COMMUNITY RM – Hybrid</b></li> </ul>
<b>Potential Items for Discussion-</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Classification of street trees &amp; vegetating mapping</li> <li>● Discussion of Wind Turbines</li> <li>● Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, Intro (update as needed)</li> <li>● Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings</li> <li>● Hardscaping</li> <li>● Discussion of salvaging demos</li> <li>● Discussion of options for house moves</li> </ul>

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 8:39pm. (Coombs)**

Vote Carried 5-0 // Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill, Paul-aye

Submitted by:

Esmeralda Martinez & Adrian Rodriguez

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/6JZ1Q5kaTQQ>