



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov

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

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday August 30, 2022

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

Called to order at 4:00 pm. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Holly Backus, Historic Planner; Esmeralda Martinez, Land Use Specialist; Adrian Rodriguez, Administrative Specialist

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

Absent Members: Dutra

Late Arrivals: None

Early Departures: None

Adoption of Agenda.

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

Vote Carried unanimously

I. COMMISSION COMMENTS

1. None

II. DISCUSSION

1. Discussion of recent disbandment of HDC advisory boards

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Thornewill

Other speakers Bruce Mandel, 10 Midland Avenue

Lucy Dillon, Liberty Street

Hillary Rayport, 80 Main Street

Angus MacLeod, 'Sconset

Chris Young, 12 Seikinnow Place

Meagan Perry

Concerns (4:02)

Pohl – Last week’s ground rules still apply; he wants to discuss where we go from here to come up with a long-term and short-term solution. He wants to hear from the Board members first. Town Counsel has declared that our board as currently constituted can’t appoint an advisory board.

Coombs – HDC should unanimously support whomever the Select Board wants to appoint to an advisory board. Establish an area resident group to review applications from their locale and speak from the audience as a resident. She wants to create a Town warrant for approval at Town Meeting to remove HDC from PLUS. All the restrictions listed as public things and how to revise what we can and can’t do within our enabling legislation. We should get the Sign Advisory Council (SAC) back as a short-term answer.

Camp – The architectural review boards provide HDC insight into the various neighborhoods. She’d like to make a motion that all the current members of the advisory boards in place; they would be reinstated. She wonders if PLUS wants the responsibility of HDC and feels we’d be better off running independently.

Thornewill – She agrees with much that Ms. Camp. If PLUS finds the advisory boards too burdensome, we should be separated. The advisory boards are very important especially regarding historic structures. The more resources HDC has, the better off we are with more intelligent input. If the Select Board are going to be deciding on things, we should be involved.

Backus – Referenced an email from Mr. Vorce to Mr. Pohl dated August 17th and was circulated to Commissioners.

Pohl – To get things running in the short-term, we are not enabled to create these advisory boards, but the Select Board does. Mr. Vorce mentioned that Select Board was willing to work with the HDC.

Welch – This is an opportunity to put in a letter asking the Select Board to set up the advisory boards following their process. Believes it is important for us to establish membership criteria for new members. perhaps with some general input from chairs and vice chairs from the advisory groups. Cross section of the community, individuals with historic knowledge and expertise in their local area and people who have made changes to their properties and gone through the process may be helpful too. Thinks it’s incumbent for HDC let applicants/appointees know that they be required to get familiar with *Building with Nantucket in Mind* and the Secretary of the Interior standards for [Historic Structures] rehabilitation, etc.; that they know or learn how to read and interpret architectural plans; also, in addition to purposes of the respective advisory group, they would need to have procedures. Suggests follow HDC format in some regards, for instance one member would be designated to receive correspondence from PLUS for official communications and

speaks as the voice for the group (if at HDC). The biggest expectation is a clarification that these groups assist the HDC in an advisory capacity and that they communicate that to individual property owners when providing comments on applications, to avoid the perception they are acting in a regulatory capacity. There are examples of some simple basics to be clarified; some others are meeting frequency, whether meetings are open to the public, how do interested parties (applicants) communicate with these advisory groups, some of these are covered by infrastructure already in place. Believes these and other matters, and procedures for nominations, would be good to have in a formal document. Notes that the concept of HDC nominating advisory group members for SB ratification, if we request the groups be reconstituted and SB agrees, may take SB out of potential political quagmire.

Coombs – She feels the HDC should appoint the advisory board members, not the Select Board.

Oliver – She has nothing to add. Feels this is a knee-jerk reaction. She has looked through other locations with advisory boards and their outlines and applications which are pretty good. Putting something on paper is a good idea and agrees about getting out of PLUS.

Camp – She thinks there are not people willing to be on the advisory board and there have been quorum issues. The people on these boards now should be reinstated on the boards.

Oliver – If you miss a certain number of meetings, you should be removed from that board.

Coombs – Noted that Madaket has had the hardest time with getting a quorum at their meetings. Agrees board members should have some qualifications.

Welch – Notes that individuals who may not have historic preservation, architectural, or construction, experience, the person who doesn't have that deeper knowledge we'd like to expect from our advisory groups, those people may be helpful if they can provide history of a particular area to help inform us those individuals might be considered as a form of an at-large member, though they do not have a specific typical skill they'd know the history of their area—but should not make up even nearly a majority of the group, HDC has to rely on deeper knowledge and experience.

Pohl – Opened to public comments at 4:28 pm.

Mandel – Regarding the idea of a citizen's warrant article, it opens on September 29th and signatures and an acceptably article must be put together in 2 weeks; he has experience on this and is willing to help. Regarding reconstituting the boards, MAB thinks it's an opportunity to dislodge non-Madaket residents; we've had meetings of residents since this happened and as an independent provider of comments, we aren't constrained by the OML. We've discussed the idea of helping areas like Fisher's Landing by reviewing their projects.

Backus – This article would not be a citizen's article; it would go through the proper Town government channels. The neighborhood association and resident group comments are welcomed like any public comments.

Dillon – Her recommendation is that in the future, anyone who wants to be on an advisory board should attend 2 meetings of that board before putting in their application.

Oliver – Asked about the status of filling the alternate vacancy.

Pohl – Perhaps no one has put in an application yet.

Rayport – Referenced a letter she sent to HDC Commissioners. She'd like to hear more about the role of HDC regulations; it wasn't mentioned in the opinion KP Law put forward. Chapter 340 of the Town Code and passed by the HDC, it's in the Enabling Legislation that HDC and have regulations and also covers the SAC. Questions if its legal for a regulation, which has been on the books since 1990, can be cancelled. Noted there is a Back Bay architectural group, which is a 501-C3, and they review all applications regarding their area; something like that could be done here and sidestep what she feels could be a catastrophic outcome, especially should a case go to the Select Board for appeal.

Pohl – Any letter from HDC to the Select Board would include a request that we have a hand on who would be on the advisory board. If it ever came down to an appeal, it would be to the HDC because we have final word.

Discussion about the HDC appeal process and the SB ruling in opposition to the appointed members.

Rayport – The advisory boards are critical because they fill a role otherwise filled by staff. This might be a time to study some of the points about confusion, bylaws, and rules.

MacLeod – He submitted a letter regarding this; HDC's independence is valuable, and the advisory boards have been a tool to accomplishing your work. There has been a dynamic that has been spiraling out of control of the applications themselves getting more complicated and larger as HDC staff has dwindled and been less experienced. He thinks much of the problem is the inappropriateness of the applications requiring months to be brought into compliance. The advisory groups have often ended up doing the clerical work regarding incompleteness and missing elements before HDC sees the application. Urges HDC to petition the town for more independence and support.

Young – He's has been on the SAC for approximately 25 years. Noted that all 5 members are anxious to get back to work. We aren't happy with the situation but aren't walking away from their work. Asked HDC to reconstitute the SAC as quickly as possible. One of the most important things we do is have a dialogue with the applicant so that it's been vetted so HDC looks at an approvable project.

Pohl – Appreciates all the comments. He will try to draft a letter.

Thornewill – It sounds like SAC should be done as quickly as possible. They should get it on the SB agenda.

Backus – Chapter 124 of Town Code is where the SAC is included per KP Law's email. If SAC is to be reconstituted, Chapter 124 should be amended to specifying the scope of SAC's purview and allow the SB to reconstitute the board under those provisions. The Special Legislation doesn't grant HDC that authority.

Pohl – Our letter would request the Select Board to reconstitute the SAC per Chapter 124.

Rayport – The Chapter 340 regulation is not mentioned in the KP Law opinion; feels that should be looked into.

Pohl – He would request clarification on Chapter 340 in the letter.

Welch – His understanding is that Select Board can appoint the SAC at their pleasure. He wants clarification on what the HDC wants to happen through the SB and what we want to inform them on specifically. We have a lot of points here.

Oliver – Wants to know why this was discussed a year ago and we didn't hear about it until two sentences in a meeting.

Thornewill – It sounds like Select Board could reconstitute the SAC at their next meeting; that's topic 1. Number 2 is that we all want to use the other advisory boards for everyone's benefit and that we think they're worthy and we are willing to work with the Select Board on who is on them.

Welch – When other Boards are a member short, the Select Board selects the interim member with the Board in attendance.

Coombs – She has a copy of a letter dated March 14, 2022, from HDC to Mr. Vorce. We should send the letter with a statement that Mr. Pohl is to be advised regarding further discussions barring executive sessions. If we had known a year ago, we could have been working on it.

Camp – Thinks HDC should independent legal counsel.

Perry – Pointed out the Conservation Commission has it's own legal counsel for litigation against the Select Board.

Pohl – He'd like to take this all under advisement and come up with a strategy that follows what Ms. Thornewill said. That memo would be brought back for review.

2. Discussion to request Select Board to formally reconstitute SAC under Town Charter provisions. – voted August 23rd.

3. Discussion of the Introduction to the Worchester Polytechnical Institute (WPI) Project ref. solar – project liaisons: Energy Coordinator & Preservation Planner

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Thornewill

Other speakers

Concerns (5:03)

Backus – She and Lauren Sinatra, Energy Coordinator, have put together a student task, one of 5 projects for WPI students to explore HDC efforts with the Solar Workgroup. This could include updated solar guidelines, solar permitting checklists or suggestions, and produce/update public informational resources on solar energy. This came out of the warrant article that wanted to change enabling legislation. It will show that there are guidelines available, and that Nantucket is a frontrunner in solar energy in historic districts. You have approved 250 solar applications between 2015 and 2021. As staff liaison, she adequately enforces the guidelines to its fullest potential. Encourages support of the students in this task.

Pohl – The crux of the issue is that somewhere along the line, there was mention of a poll. His concern is that if WPI takes a poll and the Town decides solar should be a priority of the requirements for the old historic districts, it could do a lot of damage should that information got the paper by making HDC look obstructionist.

Oliver – We can drive the direction of the questions; she has taken an opportunity to rewrite a part of this to prevent a potential roadblock. It's important to remember this is for the HDC's benefit, not eliminate the existing regulations.

Welch – Solving for X. Would like to start with those currently involved, which is 2/5ths the HDC's elected members, the HDC Organizational Focus Committee (OFC), Andy Buccino (sponsor of the article to change the enabling legislation), Ms. Sinatra (Town's Energy Coordinator), and Ms. Backus (Town's Preservation Planner). Reviewed a draft of the Nantucket A22/B22 IQP Project Descriptions for the Nantucket Historical Association compared to the HDC's tasking, established the HDC has no goals or deliverables included in the student project. Reviewed deliverables, which HDC might want to be included. We suggest the OFC be involved as project liaison and provide input on policies, to avoid issues with respect to conflicting goals of the Town and the HDC; HDC workgroup's charter is to assess and recommend guidelines that promote integration of sustainable energy in a manner that furthers the HDC mission; this is in contrast to the Town's stated goal, which is to better balance Nantucket's energy goals with its historic identity. Noted that there is nothing inherently wrong in independent agencies having incongruent goals. Suggests further that it is not that they are incongruent that's important, what is important is how we work through them. OFC has suggested one of its members or more than one, be involved as project liaison—not in the day-to-day management or micro-management level—but on policy determinations. OFC is clearly looking at protection of an independent regulatory agency. Part of that is whether a public survey is even relevant in determining the outcome or directing how a regulatory agency makes its determinations. Or, if not in directing the agency, applying pressure on them. OFC is not suggesting that there is an intent to direct or pressure the HDC; instead, simply suggesting it's incumbent upon the Organizational Focus Committee to make a recommendation given likely unintended consequences, to try and prevent an unnecessary issue from arising, where the HDC is basically clobbered. We've identified where and how surveys might be helpful, but surveys (and interviews) on aesthetics, or formulating guideline recommendations (to the HDC), are not to our mind a good source where an agency has an established regulatory mission. We do believe public involvement and information, including from individuals during meetings, is helpful to the workgroup's mission—we encourage this. Suggested this go back to the OFC to bring the project into conformance with the OFC's request pertaining to the workgroup's charter, to ensure functionality with respect to that and HDC moving forward. OFC has sussed a lot of this out, but so far haven't gained ground on this; thinks it may be a miscommunication, believes it can be worked through by distinguishing finer points of incongruent goals, identifying them and establishing workarounds so we can then get on to those aspects of goals and deliverables that are in alignment. OFC has suggested Town Energy Coordinator have has specific information helpful for the Town, developed by through the student project, and we can partition the project and report in the sense there would be a Town section and HDC section. And in those areas where we all felt there was

congruence, we'd develop that. Seemed a mature way to acknowledge we have differences, and to show through the body of the report and in the conclusion how we've overcome them; seemed helpful for the community. Noted that solar is not the only solution; we've talked about distributed wind, micro-nuclear (after attending a Geschke Lecture seminar on island—don't laugh, it's coming much sooner and much safer than you can imagine—involving national and international scientists); in addition to studies on what types of solar are on the horizon, we've discussed determining studies about future-forward concepts, we believe having a seat at the table, making those determinations up front, is beneficial. All the foregoing is said with utmost respect for Holly our Town Preservation Planner, and Lauren as Town's Energy Coordinator. We'd like to see this go back to OFC and get support and meaningful cooperation from TPP and TEO. Noted all this has been discussed at the meetings; Andy Buccino commented there that he appreciates our clarity of mission and that it's spot on.

Coombs – This is a fascination project with future ramifications. She would like to know more about it and what is being worked on for the future. She'd like to know what happens to current solar panels when they can be replaced.

Welch – That is something the WPI students would look into as well as it's beyond our capacity and that of staff; including not only what happens to it (that's taken down), but when (due to the way technology is trending), and what reclamation will look like. Also, what would be the material load be if the HDC continues its rate of approval or increases it by say 30%, what is the material load going to be, what are potential ramifications for the landfill, or shipping off island, and what types of things do we need to consider and implement to help ensure these panels don't become like many of the historic roof walks, which just rotted on the buildings until they fell off. We've suggested this is not a quick-in-and-out single project, and if we can get the support of the sponsors and WPI is willing, we'd map out a 2-semester study program to culminate in information very useful for community-oriented determinations. We want to figure out a way to move forward resiliently with respect to historic structures and our historic landmark in many ways isolated from the rest of the world. OFC is approaching this all with an open mind, we think a lot can be accomplished. We ask you to take up the project as we've suggested.

Pohl – Can't imagine anyone is going to have any objections to us wanting to have our interests on the HDC represented.

Oliver – Innovative renewable energy is becoming more accessible and efficient; those should be the goals HDC is setting. The project description states that "many in the community" feel the HDC is an obstacle to fixing climate change.

Backus – Asked for bullet points from the OFC. This [held up a paper] will be the syllabus for the class; the students will be here soon. The students are planning to meet with the HDC to go over the questions and comments.

Welch – In response to comment about incongruent goals, displayed Nantucket Sustainability document, a Town document, that basically says the Town Preservation Planner and the Town Energy Coordinator have partnered to encourage the HDC and Nantucket Historical Commission (NHC) to update our sustainability guidelines to better balance Nantucket's clean energy goals with hits historic, cultural identity. That is, with respect to the HDC's mission, an incongruent goal. He feels it is fair to that point it out and address it upfront, to move on. Believes HDC should have control over the outcomes, not with respect to the date the students determine, but with respect to the categories relevant to the HDC. Believes this is honest, true and fair. Given push-back, if we had to make a decision today, he'd recommend HDC not be involved—there is no HDC outline of what we want from the study in the syllabus. Unlike other sponsors, we cannot even get our needs, concerns, goals and deliverables on the table—solving for X. The way this has been set up, that needs to be done on the ground; that's why the OFC should have a seat at the table to have a voice to bring this home. Suggested a simple memo of understanding.

Pohl – Asked if HDC could put together a Memorandum of Agreement stating that the study has to be done with the goals of the OFC in mind.

Motion **Motion to have the WPI project go back to the OFC with the request that, if the HDC is involved, the project come into conformance with the workgroup's charter and that the OFC membership sit as liaisons and sponsors, if necessary; the goal is to identify where we have goals that are not aligned, how we will work around them in the report and in the students' project and get onto the business of what is in alignment and the HDC deliverables. (Welch)**

Vote Carried unanimously

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IV. VIOLATIONS/ENFORCEMENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Hedges, LLC	10 Bassett Road	Trim color change	26/39	
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Thornewill			

Concerns (5:45) **Backus** – This is for transparency, so everyone knows the letter is going out. It was approved as grey/natural to weather and is being painted white.

Pohl – They need to come back to us for review of that change.

Motion **No action at this time.**

Vote N/A

Certificate #

V. SIGN

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. University of Florida WITHDRAWN	11 Center Street	Sign	42.3.1/203.6	Marsha Fader

VI. CONSENTS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 22 Easton St, LLC 08-6919	22/24 Easton Street	Rev. 05-3643: new dwelling	42.1.4/12.12.1	APD
2. Shane Perry 08-6952	3 Hussey Farm Road	Rev. 69482: main house	56/14.2	S. Perry
3. Pocomo Sandune, LLC 08-6953	29 Pocomo Road	Addition	14/50	McMullen & Assoc
4. Doc Ryder, LLC 08-6954	1 Doc Ryder Drive	Rev. 05-3747: color change	66/209	BPC
5. Mag Ventures, LLC 08-6957	30 Devon Street	Add chimneys guest house	76.4.2/1	JB Studio
6. Mag Ventures, LLC 08-6958	30 Devon Street	Add chimney main house	76.4.2/1	JB Studio
7. Adam Kessler 08-6951	11A Meadow Lane	Main house revisions	41/448	Robert Alves
8. Nadia Smith 08-6916	17 Vesper Lane	Add window	55/13	Nadia Smith

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Thornewill

Recused None

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns None

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

Vote Carried unanimously

Certificate # **HDC2022-(as noted)****VII. 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. 76 Pocomo, LLC 08-6955	76 Pocomo Road	New pool	15/38	B. Champoux
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter and to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.				
2. 59B Polpis Rd, LLC 08-6956	59B Polpis Road	New pool	54/26.1	V. Oliver Design
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter and to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application.				

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill

Alternates None

Recused Oliver

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns None

Motion **Motion to Approve through staff per noted comments. (Camp)**

Vote Carried unanimously

Certificate # **HDC2022-(as noted)**

VIII. OLD BUSINESS 07/26/2022

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	88 Pocomo Rd, LLC 03-5885	88 Pocomo Road	New dwelling	15/42	Emeritus LTD
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Thornewill				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and video.				
Representing	Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law P.C.				
Public	Arthur Reade, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, & Gifford LLP for 90 Pocomo Road Paul Santos, Nantucket Surveyors for 90 Pocomo Road				
Concerns (5:47)	<p>MacEachern – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. Staked the top of 1st-finished floor for the main house and guest house and the coping and also set up ridge poles at the gable ends and center. Grade around the structure is planned to be at elevation 40.</p> <p>Oliver – Reviewed photos she took of the poles. A surveyor post put the existing ground elevation at 32.5. There will be low visibility from the road.</p> <p>Reade – His client is concerned with the height and manipulation of the grade. This is highly visible from the harbor. The Gamble house was moved back from the bank. This is on higher ground and taller than the Gamble house so more visible. Our surveyor is on this call.</p> <p>Santos – The plateau grade as it sits is at 42.9 so the top stake on the plateau says 42.88 and cut down 0.88 for top of foundation per the plan approved by the Conservation Commission (ConCom), which sets the top of foundation at 42.00; the 1st floor would be above the pad as it exists today. That plan puts the finish grade around the structure would be at about 41. Architectural plans show a height of 29’3”, which puts the ridge at elevation 70. There is a height as related to average mean height to maintain the 30’ per Zoning. The 45 is consistent with what he’s seen for this site. They’ve lowered this from the previous submittal; our client wants to confirm at the building permit level that it complies with the Zoning Bylaw limiting the building height at 30’ from grade.</p> <p>Pohl – Mr. Welch brought up the “highest point of the site” is reading at elevation 45. The 1st floor in the architectural plans is about 1’ above grade.</p> <p>Ahern – The peak of the berm is at 42.9; the finished floor will be at 42.</p> <p>Cohen – The berm is irrelevant in that it isn’t the finished grade. This house is designed to be consistent with those around it. The plan show that this is set in the environment correctly.</p> <p>Oliver – She doesn’t have a problem with the house and appreciates the changes. The fill was alarming and it’s happening more and more; it is in our guidelines to not allow the grade to be significantly changes. As long as there’s a benchmark on the 1st floor and overall height, we’re good.</p> <p>Camp – Ms. Oliver demonstrated lack of visibility from the road. Her concern is visibility from the water; that needs to be mitigated. The ridge line appears as 1 line. West elevation, the 4-ganged windows in the dormer should be reduced to 3; the impact of the left side should be reduced. The chimneys could be shifted off center of the ridge. The 2nd-floor decks should be pulled into the sides of the French doors.</p> <p>Welch – West elevation right, the gable has more headspace over the window and could be made to more like the other one. The height designations are taken off the top of the roof walk rail on the flanking houses; dropping the 4’ off those brings their heights to elevation 61 & 73. The elevation 69 ridge is closer to 70; that makes him uncomfortable. The ridge of this is at least 2’ taller than the roof walk rail on the Gamble house. Done a good job of decreasing the sense of mass; his concerns revolve around the height of the ridge and feels it should be lowered more. He’s interested in establishing a benchmark based upon the prior grade.</p> <p>Coombs – With the porches, this is over 100’ long. When they were building the Gamble house, there was concern about the fenestration and how it was visible from Town; west elevation has a lot of glass and consideration needs to be made of what it will be like when it’s lit up. The chimney’s need to be reconsidered. Shed dormers need to be brought in a bit.</p> <p>Pohl – Confirmed the beach stairs are existing; that should be memorialized as the benchmark. Asked that Dan Malloy give a spot elevation at the top landing.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the chimneys pulled off the center of the ridge, go from 4-ganged west elevation dormer to 3, the jerkin head on the south elevation gable to match the one on the main gable, west elevation 2nd-floor decks to be no wider than the French doors, establishment of a benchmark at the beach stair top platform, and overall height to drop 1’; per Exhibit A. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 4-1//Welch opposed			Certificate #	HDC2022-03-5885

2. 88 Pocomo Rd, LLC **04-6092** 88 Pocomo Road New guest house 15/42 Emeritus LTD
 Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates None
 Recused Thornewill
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development
 Public None
 Concerns (6:58) **MacEachern** – Asked this be held for revisions to track with the main house. Not opened at this time.
 Motion **Motion to Hold revisions ant to come back on September 6. (Coombs)**
 Vote Carried unanimously Certificate #
3. 88 Pocomo Rd, LLC **05-6419** 88 Pocomo Road Sport court 15/42 Emeritus LTD
 Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates None
 Recused Thornewill
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC
 Public None
 Concerns (7:01) **Ahern** – Reviewed existing vegetation that would be screening of the court; fence is 8’ black metal; the base is compacted clay. No concerns.
 Motion **Motion to Approve due to lack of visibility and not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter and to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application. (Oliver)**
 Vote Carried unanimously Certificate # **HDC2022-05-6419**
4. 88 Pocomo Rd, LLC **05-6420** 88 Pocomo Road Pool & hardscape 15/42 Emeritus LTD
 Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates None
 Recused Thornewill
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.
 Representing Miroslava Ahern, Ahern Design, LLC
 Public None
 Concerns (6:44) **Ahern** – Elevation of the pool deck is 3’6”; that’s the same as the guesthouse finished 1st floor. Reviewed dimensions of the retaining walls and materials; no wall is more than 4’ tall.
Coombs – Would prefer the walls be eliminated and the grade to slope naturally.
Camp – None of this will be visible. If this is approved, all the existing shrubbery would have to remain.
Oliver – This is all below the hump. No concerns.
Welch – Suggests this might be visible from space.
 Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with the grade dropped 6” and not to be visible at time of inspection and thereafter and to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application. (Welch)**
 Vote Carried 4-1//Welch opposed. Certificate # **HDC2022-05-6420**

5. Sandy Ack 04-6147		6 Sandy Drive	New dwelling	29/76	NAG
Voting	Pohl, Camp, Coombs, Thornewill				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory comments.				
Representing	Linda Williams Steve Theroux, Nantucket Architectural Group				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:06)	<p>Williams – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns and ConCom no-build restrictions; height now 27’6”; white trim and windows.</p> <p>Theroux – Reviewed neighborhood context photos as related to the changes to this project. We made changes after the HSAB 8/1 meeting.</p> <p>Backus – Read HSAB comments 8/1: There are some improvements from the previous submission, but this house is missing a recognizable main mass; currently it is a complex blend of gables with confusing hierarchy. The north forward gable is the most massive but a smaller 2 story gable projects in front of it. It needs to be simplified and organized into a more traditional form. The multiple balconies and 2 story narrow gables add to the confusion. This must follow Resilient Nantucket guidelines and will need a elevation certificate. The engineer site plan indicates a portion of the structure to be relocated onto piers; asked if that is new construction (all new). This still feels boxy and tall. Appreciates vertical boards, reduction of height, head-on front stairs, and echo comments on the main mass. Doesn’t see any brick piers or flood compliance breakaway panels. The site plan should include permeable surfaces.</p> <p>Camp – Appreciates the changes; the entrance is more welcoming. There’s still a disconnect between the main mass and left secondary mass. Likes how the windows relate. The north elevation, 2nd-floor, far right ganged windows should be 1.</p> <p>Thornewill – North elevation feels disorganized; agrees with Ms. Camp. All the waterboard should be level.</p> <p>Coombs – West elevation 2nd-floor, the 3 right windows and the ganged windows on the left should be reduced. Appreciates the changes. There is no attempt to have a 1-story mass. Agrees with Ms. Camp; looks like they’re trying to get as many windows as possible and fenestration should be simpler. North elevation, can’t tell if one of the 2 gables projects; there is no flow. There is no attempt to break up the long ridge.</p> <p>Pohl – This is a very confused house; the deck over the front door is stepped out 9”; right of that is a mud room access carved into the mass with a column holding up a second for with a shed and shed behind it. The fenestration is chaotic. The water table will make the white stand out and it bobs up and down. This needs more organization.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 4-0			Certificate #	
6. NHA Properties Inc 08-6774	27 Dartmouth St. Apt A	Solar roof array	76.4.2/363	Ack Smart	
7. NHA Properties Inc 07-6765	27 Dartmouth St. Apt B	Solar roof array	76.4.2/363	Ack Smart	
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver. Thornewill				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Camp				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and manufacturer spec sheet.				
Representing	Tobias Glidden, ACK Smart				
Public	None				
Concerns (7:26)	<p>Glidden – Reviewed the project and changes; on the southwest, we will add one horizontal panel.</p> <p>Coombs – No concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – This is dead-end way not highly travelled because it appears on the front of both units. Appreciates the attempt to square off the southwest elevation array.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver.</p> <p>Thornewill – No concerns.</p> <p>Pohl – Also agrees with Ms. Oliver.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve both due to minimal visibility. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried unanimously			Certificate #	HDC2022-07-6774/6765

8. Brandon Casement 07-6722	6 New Street	Dormer	55.4.1/34	Brandon Casement
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Brandon Casement Leah Casement			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:40)	<p>Casement – Provided photos; the rear is not visible; provided examples of historic houses with end-to-end dormers; the stairs have non-compliant head room.</p> <p>Backus – She was able to locate a 1957 Town aerial showing this house with a front shed dormer on this is circa 1840sand shouldn't be replicated; the interior should not dictate the exterior. The dormer should be 3' off the sides, 1' off the wall and 6" off the ridge. Even if you can't see it, this is a historic resource to be protected</p> <p>Welch – The north elevation dormer could be slightly wider and 4" off the ridge and do the same on the rear. The dormers in the photos showing other homes include a rebate from the gable-end; it's within our jurisdiction to request the dormer be more conforming.</p> <p>Thornewill – The roof pitch of the existing dormer is inappropriate and not typical; she can't support the dormer going from end to end; they would have to remove a lot of the roof to do that.</p> <p>Coombs – Doesn't know that widening the back dormer will solve the issue and it'll make the house look like 2 stories on the rear; it doesn't fit in and would damage the historic standing of this structure. Would like to know if there is any other way to do this.</p> <p>Camp – The rear shed dormer should be reduced to accommodate at least the staircase.</p> <p>Pohl – 25 Pine Street across from his, is a cottage Victorian with flush shed dormers on both sides; it looks fabulous because of the Victorian details on the gable forward so it's all in how it's rendered. Because this is simple, the flush wall-to-wall dormer would be more dramatic. We can provide exemptions to certain building codes due to the age of this house. Rebate it a little so it won't be completely flush with the sides.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried unanimously			Certificate #

IX. NEW BUSINESS 08/02/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 5 Step Lane Condo 08-6963	5 Step Lane	Like-kind replacement	42.4.2/43	Scott Andersen
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Scott Andersen			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:33)	<p>Backus – Circa 1840 built by Joseph Nickerson, trader. Was damaged by the Veranda House fire. Photos of it before the fire and the fire damage should be in the file. It's going back as is with appropriate fire safety between the condos. The scope of work is to replace the removed damaged area in kind. The application needs to be clear regarding materials to be used, color, and true-divided-light windows.</p> <p>Andersen – We will be replacing only the exterior damage. Windows are salvageable.</p> <p>Welch – The south elevation bathroom window is gone. He supports, but recalls the front as clapboard; colors to match existing (shingled).</p> <p>Camp – The one-over-one windows should be changed to 6-over-6.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with dormer windows to be 6-over-6 and color and sidewall to match existing. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried unanimously			Certificate # HDC2022-08-6963

2. Lisa McKechnie 07-6729	6 South Water Street	Fence	42.3.1/130.1	L. McKechnie
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Lisa McKechnie, owner			
Public	None			

Concerns (8:04) **McKechnie** – Presented project; the goal is to provide privacy while construction of Zero India is taking place.
Backus – Read HSAB comment 8/15: This type of 5/1 privacy fence is not appropriate in the downtown area; a simple natural-to-weather cedar board fence 4 or 5 feet high would be more acceptable, but not close to India Street; tall fences should be kept away from the sidewalk edge; fences higher than 3 feet should be kept at least 6 feet in from the edge of the sidewalk.

Structure is new construction 2001. Agrees with HSAB; a 4’ board fence would be more appropriate.

Oliver – Okay with a 5/1 fence set back aligning with where the bushes are now and be simpler and lower toward the street.

Coombs – A 5/1 is not appropriate for downtown. Should be a short, simple fence.

Camp – Normally the fence should be on her side of the arbor vitae.

Welch – A 5’ fence anywhere at the rear no further forward than the steps is approvable; a fence forward of that toward India is problematic. The applicant could extend the plant material to the sidewalk.

Pohl – Agrees with much that’s been said. We prefer the vegetation on the neighbor’s side; would accept a 4’ fence going up to the sidewalk.

Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with a 6’ board fence on the applicant’s side of the exclusive use Unit 1 line inside the arbor vitae starting from the corner of the patio extending no further than the bottom of stairs and plant material can be planted up to the sidewalk, per Exhibit A. (Welch)**

Vote Carried unanimously Certificate # **HDC2022-07-6729**

Rest held for Sept. 6

3. Richmond Great Pt 08-6778	4 Blue Court	New dwelling	68/348	KOH
4. Richmond Great Pt 08-6779	5 Blue Court	New dwelling	68/345	KOH
5. Richmond Great Pt 08-6777	7 Blue Court	New dwelling	68/344	KOH
6. Richmond Great Pt 08-6788	8 Blue Court	New dwelling	68/347	KOH
7. Richmond Great Pt 08-6787	9 Blue Court	New dwelling	68/343	KOH
8. Richmond Great Pt 08-6786	11 Blue Court	New dwelling	68/342	KOH
9. Richmond Great Pt 08-6789	5 Sandplain Court	New dwelling	68/349	KOH
10. Richmond Great Pt 08-6784	7 Sandplain Court	New dwelling	68/350	KOH
11. Richmond Great Pt 08-6783	21 Sandplain Court	New dwelling	68/387	KOH
12. Decatur XIX, LLC 08-6791	12 Westerwyck Way	Demo/move off garage	82/64	Val Oliver
13. Brandon Lower 08-6790	146 Main Street	New garage, patio & perg	41/518	Matthew Rider
14. Brandon Lower 08-6781	146 Main Street	Clapboard, perg & trim clr	41/518	Matthew Rider
15. Ack N Back, LLC 08-6785	33 Quidnet Road	Pool & hardscape	21/27.2	Ahern
16. 5QPR, LLC 08-6782	5 Quaise Pasture Road	New barn	26/21	Botticelli & Pohl
17. 42 Easton St, LLC 07-6755	42 Easton Street	Add shutters	42.4.1/21	Emeritus

X. OLD BUSINESS 08/09/2022

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 14 Bishops Rise Nant, LLC	14 Bishop Rise	MH alterations	40/124	Emeritus
2. NHA Properties 02-5779	7 Fair Street	Replace Windows	82/59	Linda Williams
3. Liz Powell 12-5445	71 Cliff Road	Cabana	30/160	Thornewill
4. Cordts – Pearce 02-?572?	76 Pleasant Street	Addition	55/367	LFW/ JB Studio
5. Ack N Back, LLC 06-6501	33 Quidnet Road	New dwelling	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
6. Ack N Back, LLC 06-6503	33 Quidnet Road	Garage studio	21/27.2-27.4	WAPD
7. Maple Ln, LLC 07-6675	2 Maple Lane	2 nd dwelling	67/303	Dustin Maury
8. High Tide Partners, LLC 04-6196	26 Douglas Way	Main House	39/41	BPC
9. High Tide Partners, LLC 04-6197	26 Douglas Way	Pool	39/41	BPC
10. High Tide Partners, LLC 04-6172	26 Douglas Way	Shed	39/41	BPC
11. High Tide Partners, LLC 04-6193	26 Douglas Way	Gazebo	39/41	BPC
12. High Tide Partners, LLC 04-6198	26 Douglas Way	Garage	39/41	BPC
13. 450 Green Park, LLC 11-5272	2 Stone Alley	Addition	43.3.1/103	Emeritus LTD
14. Mike Romano 05-6245	55 Easton Street	Addition & move on site	42.4.1/ 68	Shelter 7
15. CC VTACK, LLC 04-6106	120 Old South Road	New commercial bldg. A	68/969	Link/CWA
16. CC VTACK, LLC 04-6105	122 Old South Road	New commercial bldg. B	68/969	Link/CWA
17. CC VTACK, LLC 04-6104	124 Old South Road	New commercial bldg. C	68/969	Link/CWA
18. Amanda & Kevin Jacobs 04-6226	4 Rays Court	Addition & historical reno	42.3.2/3	Design Assoc. Inc.
19. K225, LLC 03-5944	126 Main Street	Renovation	42.3.2/98	Linda Williams
20. Bank of America 06-6494	15 Sparks Avenue	Lighting plan	55/177	Bisbano Assoc.

21. Bank of America 06-6396	65 Main Street	Lighting plan	42.3.1/197	Bisbano Assoc.
22. Not So Easy, LLC 06-5679	26 Easy Street	New mixed-use structure		Emeritus

XI. NEW BUSINESS 08/16/2022

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Gail Johnson	21 South Water Street	Replace awning	42.4.2/102	Gail Johnson
2.	Michael Dubois	5 Lilac Court	Solar roof top array	68/361	Ack Smart
3.	Cisco Sanctuary, LLC	162 Hummock Pd Rd	Metal roof replacement	65/13.3	Gryphon Architects
4.	Richmond Great Pt.	23 Honeysuckle Drive	Fence	58/392	KOH
5.	37 Starbuck, LLC	37 Starbuck Road	Move on site	60/37	NAG
6.	37 Starbuck, LLC	37 Starbuck Road	Renovation	60/37	NAG
7.	Erin Wilson	6 Swayzes Drive	Addition	66/162	EMDA
8.	John Sully	47 Pleasant Street	As-built Window replace	55/17.1	Aldain Allen
9.	KMS126 NT	126.5 Main Street	New dwelling	42.3.3/98	Linda Williams
10.	Lisa Lawler	80 Orange Street	Demo or move off garage	55.4.1/24	Gryphon Architects
11.	Lisa Lawler	80 Orange Street	New garage studio	55.4.1/24	Gryphon Architects
12.	Chris Tofalli	122 Main Street	Fence replacement	42.3.3/100	Frank Daily
13.	Richmond Great Pt.	6 Honeysuckle Drive	New Dwelling	68/888	KOH
14.	Richmond Great Pt.	3 Lilac Court	New Dwelling	68/360	KOH
15.	Richmond Great Pt.	24a Evergreen Way	New Dwelling	68/351	KOH
16.	Richmond Great Pt.	6 Gooseberry Place	New Commercial Dwelling	68/341	KOH
17.	Richmond Great Pt.	7 Gooseberry Place	New Commercial Dwelling	68/341	KOH
18.	Richmond Great Pt.	8 Gooseberry Place	New Commercial Dwelling	68/341	KOH
19.	Sheep Pond Prop.	14 Sheep Pond Road	Move off/ demo	63/29	Emeritus LTD
20.	Sheep Pond Prop.	16 Sheep Pond Road	Move off/ demo	63/30	Emeritus LTD
21.	Sheep Pond Prop.	14 + 16 Sheep Pond Rd.	New dwelling	63/29 +30	Emeritus LTD
22.	Robert Kulin	9 Orange Street	Hardscape & driveway	42.3.1/150	Robert Kulin
23.	Daniel Conway	3 Meadow Lane	Like kind Replace doors	41/398	Daniel Conway
24.	Scott Dehm	8 Ash Street	Hardscape & pergola	42.4.2/94	Jardins Intl.
25.	Melissa Neier	11 Prospect Street	Add fenestration	55.4.4/42	Twig Perkins
26.	39 Monomoy, LLC	39 Monomoy Road	Addition, reno, move	54/79	Emeritus LTD
27.	Stark Point, LLC	16 Easton Street	New guest house/ garage	42.1.4/11	Botticelli + Pohl
28.	Auburn Cottage, LLC	46 Easton Street	Addition & reno	42.1.4/22	Botticelli + Pohl
29.	*Fair City, LLC	115 Old South Rd Lot F	Commercial Building	68/112	EMDA
30.	*Fair City, LLC	115 Old South Rd Lot E	Commercial Building	68/112	EMDA
31.	Morgan Family	24A New Lane Sias	Demo or move off dwelling	49/395.2	Val Oliver
32.	Morgan Family	24A New Lane Sias	New Dwelling	49/395.2	Val Oliver
33.	NIR Retail	7-8 Old South Wharf	Fenestration Changes	42.4.2/2.4	Permit Plus
34.	*11 Hulbert, LLC	11 Hulbert Avenue	"Screened-in" Porch	29.2.3/2	Val Oliver

XII. OLD BUSINESS 08/23/2022

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	30 Pear, LLC 07-6593	20 India Street	Addition	42.3.4/137	Botticelli & Pohl
2.	David and Diane Lilly	4 Quince Street	Rear stair egress	42.3.4/20	McMullen & Assoc
3.	Riono Foot, LLC 03-5844	9 Sherburne Way	Demo	30/37	Topham Design
4.	Victor Haley 07-6668	94 Orange Street	Addition	55.1.4/47	Paul Dresher
5.	Soren Sorensen 03-5929	51 Fair Street	Color change	42.3.2/40	Emeritus
6.	Chris & Ashley Austin 07-6692	7 Maple Lane	New dwelling	67/303	Emeritus
7.	Eric Silfen 07-6665	3 Meadow View Drive	Rooftop solar	56/92	Cotuit Solar

XIII. NEW BUSINESS 08/30/2022

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	Michael Zarcone	16 Cherry Street	New shed	55/379	Structures Unlimited
2.	John Ribik	12 Chuck Hollow Road	Bulkhead shed	72/29	Linda Williams
3.	Bruce Turner	9 Long Pond Road	Solar roof array	59/33	Ack Smart
4.	Stephen Cheney	67 Bartlett Road	Roof replacement	66/435	Cheney Custom Hmes
5.	Corkish Coop	320e Polpis Road	New shed	24/1.5	Structures Unlimited
6.	Kristina Conley	91 Hummock Pond Rd.	New dwelling	56/118	EMDA
7.	Steven Cohen Trust	8 Sachus Road	Rev. 05-6259: cabana	30/239	WAPD
8.	Steven Cohen Trust	8 Sachus Road	Demo shed	30/239	WAPD
9.	Steven Cohen Trust	8 Sachus Road	New shed	30/239	WAPD
10.	Kim Glowacki	13 Woodland Drive	Move on studio	79/208	Structure Unlimited
11.	Kim Glowacki	13 Woodland Drive	Move on	79/208	Structure Unlimited
12.	Olsen Family	28 Prospect Street	Driveway apron & parking	55.4.4/77.1	Val Oliver
13.	William Fordyce	3 Darling Street	Handicap ramp	42.3.2/163	Val Oliver
14.	6 Yawkey Way Nom Tr	6 Yawkey Way	New duplex	69/298	Val Oliver
15.	Lamb & Nassif	38 Wauwinet Road	Window replacement	20/21	Val Oliver

HDC Minutes for August 30, 2022, adopted Sept. 13

16. Anthony Mazotas	29 Essex Road	Rooftop solar	67/614	Cotuit Solar
17. Kathryn Cook	85 Low Beach Road	Demo main house	75/31.3	Michael Bard
18. Kathryn Cook	85 Low Beach Road	Demo garage	75/31.3	Michael Bard
19. Kathryn Cook	85 Low Beach Road	Demo pool house	75/31.3	Michael Bard
20. Steven Cohen trust	179 Eel Point Road	New shed	33/25	Val Oliver
21. Braine- Ivey	10 Lily Street	Rev 06-6530: dormer	73.3.1/111	Val Oliver
22. Douglas Kern	73A West Chester Street	New cabana	41/359	Botticelli + Pohl
23. Douglas Kern	73A West Chester Street	New pool	41/359	Botticelli + Pohl
24. Eleven Lincoln Ave Trust	32 Jefferson Avenue	Demo main house	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
25. Eleven Lincoln Ave Trust	32 Jefferson Avenue	Rev. 12-5457: main house	30/132	Botticelli + Pohl
26. 55 Eel Point Holdings, LLC	55 Eel Point Road	Resite garage rev 04-6096	32/47	Botticelli + Pohl
27. Shenandoah Trust	40 Easton Street	Rev. 11-6592: fenest chng	42.1.4/20	Botticelli + Pohl
28. Joseph Motta	38 40 Cliff Road	Addition	42.44/43	Thornewill
29. Mike Romano	55 Easton Street	New shed	42.4.1/186	Shelter 7
30. Sarah Vazirani	26 Lyons Lane	New shed	71/9	JB Studio
31. Nick Pappas	7 Beaver Street	Rev. 03-6067: main house	55.1.4/82	Val Oliver
32. CCH 67 Br, LLC	67 Bartlett Road	Roof top solar	66/435	Sun Wind
33. High Cliff Trust	11 E. Hallowell Lane	Rev 04-6206: windows	30/17	Botticelli + Pohl
34. High Cliff Trust	11 E. Hallowell Lane	Rev. 04-6191: grg windows	30/17	Botticelli + Pohl
35. Sea Realty Trust	25 Squam Road	Demo cottage	21/5	Botticelli + Pohl
36. Auburn Cottage, LLC	46 Easton Street	Rev. 06-6463: main house	42.4.1/22	Botticelli + Pohl
37. Edward O'Brien	9b Hussey Farm Road	Addition	56/96.2	Linda Williams
38. Jeannette & Bob, LLC	43 Kendrick Avenue	New guest house	76.4.3/31	CWA
39. Michael & Meg Gallugi	11 Gray Avenue	New pool	67/909	LINK
40. Jay Harmon	Lot 2 Maple Lane	New pool	67/303	LINK
41. Jay Harmon	Lot 2 Maple Lane	Porch addition	67/303	LINK
42. Nicola Day	5 Essex Road	Add egress windows	67/602	LINK
43. Nantucket Lifesaving Museum	158 Polpis Road	Replace windows	27/28	LINK
44. Dorothy ACK, LLC	2 Mariner Way	New dwelling	55.1.4/72.4	Linda Williams
45. Dorothy ACK, LLC	2 Mariner Way	Hardscape	55.1.4/72.4	Linda Williams
46. Dorothy ACK, LLC	4 Mariner Way	New dwelling	55.1.4/72	Linda Williams
47. Dorothy ACK, LLC	4 Mariner Way	New garage	55.1.4/72	Linda Williams
48. Dorothy ACK, LLC	4 Mariner Way	New pool & hardscape	55.1.4/72	Linda Williams
49. Dorothy ACK, LLC	6 Mariner Way	New dwelling	55.1.4/72.2	Linda Williams
50. Dorothy ACK, LLC	6 Mariner Way	Hardscape	55.1.4/72.2	Linda Williams

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Approved Minutes	August 16, 2022
Motion	Held
Vote	N/A
Review Minutes	August 23 & 25, 2022
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next HDC Meeting: Tuesday, September 6th @ 4:00 pm Hybrid – Zoom & 2 Fairgrounds Rd, Conference Room • Discussion of Wind Turbines • Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, intro (update as needed) • Review policy of Move/Demo hearings in relation to new dwellings • Hardscaping • Discussion of salvaging demolitions • Discussion of options for house moves

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Email dated August 17th from PLUS Director Andrew Vorce to HDC chairman Ray Pohl
2. *Building with Nantucket in Mind.*
3. KP Law letter dated August 17th
4. Memorandum – Updating Nantucket’s Solar Guidelines & Resources
5. Nantucket A22/B22 IQP Project Descriptions – Story Maps about Rising Sea Levels on Nantucket.
6. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion **Adjourned at 8:17 pm. by unanimous consent.**

Vote N/A

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton