



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

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

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

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, June 11, 2019

Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room – 4:30 p.m.

Called to order at 4:33 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: John Hedden, HDC Compliance Coordinator; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker
 Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver, Welch, Dutra
 Absent Members: Watterson
 Late Arrivals: Camp, 4:33 p.m.
 Early Departures: Dutra, 6:40 p.m.

Agenda adopted as amended by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

II. CONSENT

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Manca, Christina – 72557	13 Parson Lane	Color change	75-103	Self
2. Roberts, Andrew – 72558	16 Allen's Lane	Rev. 71476: deck	55-92	Self
3. Plandowski, Ruth – 72559	10 Thistle Way	Rev. 71996: pent roof	67-816	Val Oliver Design
4. Cisco Sanctuary, LLC – 72560	5 Bartlett Road	Addition	65-14	Gryphon Architects
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Dutra			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Approve. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	72557 to 72560	

III. SIGNS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Bloom, Philip – Hold	34 Centre Street	Wall sign	42.3.1-120	Self
2. Bloom, Philip – 72561	34 Centre Street	Projecting sign	42.3.1-120	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Sign design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	None			
Sign Advisory	Kevin Kuester , Sign Advisory Committee – Recommend holding the wall sign; the projecting sign is approvable.			
Concerns	No additional concerns.			
Motion	Motion to Hold Item 1. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #		
Motion	Motion to Approve Item 2. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	72561	

IV. OLD BUSINESS

	<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1.	North Head Trust, LLC	Tuckernuck	Roof solar on shed	96-2.4	John Phinney
2.	Taylor, John Et al Trust	Tuckernuck	Roof solar on shed	96-2.2	John Phinney
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:37)	Staff – Read Tuckernuck Advisory Board comments: approval as black or aluminum – no paint.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for more information. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
3.	Smith, Jared	24 Clarendon Street	Roof Walk	76.1.3-125	Self
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Watterson, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:39)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		
4.	Corry, Andrew	36 Pochick Avenue	Color change	80-285	Sarah F. Alger
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, previous approval, paint chip, and photos.				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:39)	Coombs – This is the last house at the end of Pochick near Boulevard. Staff – Read previously approved colors: white going from blue to white. This is behind some trees.				
Motion	Motion to Approve as submitted. (Welch)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72562	
5.	N.I.R.	25 Center Street	Door/sash color change	42.3.1-166	Patrick Taaffe
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:42)	Staff – From Essex green to black sash and doors. Pohl – Read HSAB comments: stick with Essex green. Oliver – We turned down a similar change to black; this should remain Essex Green. Coombs – Essex green is more appropriate. Camp – Agrees. McLaughlin – He thinks it’s appropriate; there are other homes with black trim and doors.				
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #		

6.	Halbern, Robin	17 Washaman Avenue	Dormers	55-523.9	Kent Murphy
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Welch, Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Kent Murphy – Presented project; has photos of a precedent for 3 rd -floor dormers in the area.				
Public	None				
Concerns (4:47)	<p>Coombs – Almost all the photos are of small, single dormers; these are too heavy. All buildings on Washaman tend to be 1.5 or 2 stories. Dormers on the 3rd floor front are too much. In the rear these are dormers on top of dormers and to many; if the rear is reduced to two dormers with two windows each, that would be better.</p> <p>Oliver – On the front, you could bring the walls in to the edges of the windows to scale down the dormers. She has never seen anything like what’s proposed on the rear.</p> <p>Camp – Agrees with what’s been said. On the front, she could go with one window in the 3rd-floor dormer, but a triple gang is too heavy. The back is not appropriate.</p> <p>McLaughlin – It’s too much for this structure. Many 3rd-floor dormers predate the HDC. There are 35 windows, which is visually overpowering.</p> <p>Pohl – If there is going to be a dormer on the front, it should be a single dormer. He has less of an issue with the ones on the rear because he doesn’t think they’ll be visible.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	
7.	Long, Dean & Melissa	11 Phippen’s Way	2 nd Dwelling- Barn	43-94.2	Gryphon Architect
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	Camp				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	Ethan Griffin , Gryphon Architect – Visibility is extremely limited from Pippens Way; reviewed changes made per previous concerns; natural to weather trim and red sash.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:00)	<p>Welch – No concerns.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The little wart should be all barn board. The “E” windows are listed as awnings; they should be fixed.</p> <p>Coombs – Doesn’t think this will be visible so she has no concerns.</p> <p>Oliver – Her concern was the height of this as it relates to the main house, but they are far apart.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the wart to be vertical board and the “E” and “C” windows to be fixed sash. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	72563
8.	Halik, Robin	46 Surfside Road	Duplex	67-120.3	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	<p>Carrie Thornewill, Thornewill Design – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; moving it back more might interfere with the rear parking requirements and the ability to pull out of the rear garage. It sits proud of its neighbors.</p> <p>Sarah Alger, Sarah F. Alger P.C., for Robin Halik – There is a line of long buildings coming down this street.</p>				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:10)	<p>Camp – She has no concerns; this reads as a smaller building on Surfside Road.</p> <p>Coombs – Appreciates it’s some shorter and the garage roof is lower. West elevation, separate the 2nd-floor ganged windows to take up more wall space. A solid black roof next to the red roof would draw attention to it; it should be light.</p> <p>Staff – The application says light-grey three tab.</p> <p>Welch – Appreciates the applicant having worked with the board to reduce the size and create additive massing. He still has concerns about the overall massing between the two one-story buildings; the locus shows this on a line with the front of the neighboring structure to the right and the other corner almost aligns with the front of The Muse; he would like it moved back a couple of feet. He would prefer a black roof because it would give the structure a sense of weight and ground it, but the expanse would be visible; dark grey would be fine. Having seen the more accurate site plans, it reads significantly better.</p>				
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the roof to be charcoal grey 3-tab and to ungang the west elevation 2nd-floor windows as much as possible. (Coombs)				
Vote	Carried 4-1//Welch opposed			Certificate #	72564

9. Famiglio, Mark	2 Harbor View Way	Hardscape	42.4.1-31	Julie Jordin
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:27)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	Motion to Hold for representation. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried unanimously		Certificate #	
10. Hohlt, Richard	121 Madaket Road	New Dwelling	40/60.1	Botticelli & Pohl
Voting	Coombs (acting), Camp, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Pohl			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	Lisa Botticelli , Botticelli & Pohl – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:28)	<p>Camp – Appreciates the elimination of the roof walk and the reduction in height. It’s so far off the street, the first floor won’t be visible. A chimney would break up the 40-foot roof.</p> <p>Welch – Confirmed the grade where the house sits was lowered 6 inches from elevation 51.5. The drawing scales the house at a height of 25’11”; that height is fine because it is the grade height, which makes this a house on a hill on the highest point around. The design, massing, and structure and flow and vocabulary work. Concerned about the overall height on top of a hill; it would be more appropriate to lose another 6 inches on the overall finished-floor height.</p> <p>Oliver – Appreciates the changes.</p> <p>Coombs – Also appreciates the changes. On the north and west elevation looks like there are outdoor showers on the 2nd-floor decks; believes they will be visible.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with a brick chimney centered on the mass to break up the 40-foot roof. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 3-1//Welch opposed		Certificate #	72565
11. Leo, Nick	6 Madaket Road	Rev. 70948: fenestration	41-184.1	EMDA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:41)	<p>Staff – Mr. McMorro asked this be heard; he said he did everything that was asked.</p> <p>Oliver – There’s a disconnect with the 6-light door and the transom.</p> <p>Coombs – Agrees about the door; the transom; the 6-panel door was a better choice.</p> <p>McLaughlin – There are 34 windows and 4-different types are casements; those shouldn’t have been approved.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the west elevation front door to be a 6-panel door. (Coombs)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72566
12. Eighty-Six Main St.	86 Main Street	Gate & arbor	42.3.3-66	Brian Pfeiffer
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Brian Pfeiffer – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; the grade inside the gate is higher than the sidewalk. The stones in the front will be an application in the future but are not part of this.			
Public	None			
Concerns (5:48)	<p>Camp – No concerns.</p> <p>Welch – Looking at the middle elevation partial cross section, it shows brick reflected in the lower elevation but nothing on the other side. He thinks it will be an odd detail to have; you don’t see the grade change from the outside, you see the retaining wall; from the inside you see the wood fence.</p> <p>McLaughlin – Agrees with Mr. Welch. Clarified the location of the 13-foot sliding gate.</p> <p>Coombs – That caught her eye as well. If the wood fence screens the brick, she could go with that. Asked about the replacement of the historic stones along the front.</p> <p>Pohl – Suggested running the vertical board fence down in front of the brick on the south side of the wall. Noted that the stones are not part of this application; it is not officially on the table and will not be voted at this time. Asked for a motion on this application.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the north side of the fence modified to screen the brick retaining wall to match the south side. (Camp)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72567

Discussion about sidewalk stones

Pfeiffer – Referred to a packet on the history of the Connecticut schist stone paving; it is heavy with mica. Explained how the broken stones were replaced and, where possible to fit together, and reset in sand.

Coombs – She was told all the stones were removed from the ground while the stoop was worked on. It seems at one point the stones were relaid perfectly and brand new. Asked how much of the stone is new.

Pfeiffer – Very little. They kept and reused those stones that could be saved; several stones were missing and had to be replaced; and toward the east end, the stones were badly broken and sat loose; too many bits were lost.

Coombs – The sidewalk was not so perfect as what was done. The west end is neat and tidy and looks new in front of an historic house. Personally, if you keep the curb stone low on the northeast corner, it will be safer. The main complaint she heard was the neat and tidiness of the sidewalk as well as the stone color, which is different and looks brand new.

Pohl – This packet is fascinating information, and we now have a document showing the original method of laying out the sidewalk. People think the stones should have gone back down the way they were; in fact, they went back down as they had been laid originally. When the water meter was put in, the water company broke the stones; at the turn, trucks cutting the corner broke the stones and those fragments were laid in concrete. He thinks the method Mr. Pfeiffer used is the correct method and in 10 years it will look like it did. People like the rag-tag mess.

Dutra – When we have a home in disrepair, we have you put it back to the original state. The sidewalk being repaired back to its original state is no different.

Welch – This is very upsetting to him for a number of reasons with respect to the joint meeting with the Select Board and all the discussions HDC has had with the Department of Public Works (DPW); try not to be upset about, thinks this was a missed opportunity in establishing a process to be used for the more historic walkways. This is clearly a significant and contributing section of sidewalk and it would have been a great opportunity to walk through and learn a process; does not believe we've lost the opportunity but that we would have benefited from doing it at the front end vs. back end. There is certainly some ambiguity about how a process will work. Thinks that if this had come to us, we could have taken some leadership and addressed it in a way that we could be consistent when the Town is in front of the HDC; we try to hold them to a standard, thinks this could have been an important step. Along the lines of opportunity thinks one of the things that could have been identified and the discussion that could have been had was his standardizing this wonderful packet of information, which is fascinating. We also could have had some discussion about what could have been restored. The definition of restoration is to replace with a similar or like-kind material utilizing methods that were used at the period. One concern is that replacements appear to be very straight, rectilinear, finished edges, which was a big complaint we had about the non-antique granite with sharp-edge corners, which would have come up in discussion, which contributes to this being a missed opportunity. The other aspect, in applicant trying to address irregularities, his concern, shown on Page 6, schematic drawing bottom of page at the left of the entry way: the schematic shows primarily the rectilinear form of the running bond (left of the house) has been maintained; towards the right it looks like some pieces were replaced which looks very organic replacement of materials; however, in the pictures above, the picture on the left shows the replacements with rectilinear form where it would have been more appropriate for those edges had been eased. On the right, where there is a missed opportunity, is in replacing materials that couldn't be salvaged, those that were broken up that were organic look appropriate, organic look being as if it happened over time; however, there are several points where replacements create in-organic irregularities—they look like Tetris pieces. His point is to articulate that what might have been sussed out in discussion once, to set a process and methodology, so we won't do this each time a sidewalk comes in, would mean we now have a process in place.

Pfeiffer – This is not a restoration. Someone else took it upon themselves to start the work; I finished it off. In the end, the Town will govern what happens here. For years, the Town neglected repair; when they did make repairs, they used concrete. This repair took 3 days with a minimum amount of labor and material.

Welch – That gets to the other point; he believes we should request this comes in as a formal application, so this area can be finalized with a set of sketch drawings, page 6 schematic being appropriate, so it can be resolved so that it does come back as a restoration of the original form and stone, using materials that were at least closely sourced to be used at the time, as reasonably available. And so that we have source for follow up so that it does not just get left as it is—find the inorganic shapes troubling, etc. This is about what we accept now and establishing a transparent and reasonable standard. In response to comment from applicant about Town's lack of maintenance, replied that the Town's resources and philosophy on maintenance of capital assets, in this instance sidewalks, has changed—which is a process itself—and this was not a Town project. Without an application process for this type of work in place, we'll continue to redo the same discussions, as we did with HVAC mini-splits, fences, etc. before a process was in place to make it simpler for everyone; if we are going to be involved we need a process in place. Referenced his understanding that this is an important part of the Side Walk Repair Workgroup update, having been brought up by our HDC representative to the group. Asked this be continued as an agenda item to determine if it going to be something we are responsible for and if so, we work out the details—otherwise, feels it important we not waste other peoples' time, or our own.

Coombs – Cited areas where historic material was removed and replaced with modern materials and concrete.

there is a lot of vegetation that losing it might be some concern. Another concern might be it's moving closer to the neighbor on the south. Agrees about dropping the roof pitch. Her concern is the see-through effect of the great room with four doors on the front and on the back; would like to see windows on one side. Asked if the original house is historic. (No) NHA photos show a large structure next door that was tall. West elevation, the connector doors should be a door and window; separate the windows in the dining area. Agrees with what's been said. Agrees no white.

Motion	Motion to Hold for revisions. (Welch)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	
15. Center St. ACK	Kuisition	29 Centre Street	Addition/alteration	42.3.1/122.2 Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Matt MacEachern , Emeritus Development – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:32)	<p>Oliver – The post on the side now ties in like it was a porch. She appreciates the double-hung windows. No concerns.</p> <p>Welch – South elevation, the freestanding rail at the steps should connect with the portico.</p> <p>McLaughlin – The triple deck stairs are not a concern and won't be visible. No concerns.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the rail to engage the freestanding rails at the steps back to the portico column, per Exhibit A. (McLaughlin)			
Vote	Carried 4-0		Certificate #	72569
16. Deuster, Bob	13 Monomoy Road	Open air structure	54-198	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	<p>Lindsay Congleton, Atlantic Landscaping Inc. – They made no revision because they want to argue keeping this without white trim. Evergreens will be planted to screen the pool from any public way, so this shouldn't be visible from Sandwich.</p> <p>Bob Duester, owner – This design picks up the look of the sweeping decks with hipped roofs of the main house.</p>			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:41)	<p>Oliver – The porch is a 4/12 or 5/12 pitch, and this is a 12/12; it should be less. Also, this has double posts. In her opinion, simple would be better because this is a small open structure. Okay with double posts with lattice between.</p> <p>Coombs – Okay with the double posts with lattice and the roof pitch being shallower.</p> <p>Welch – Agrees with Ms. Oliver; the roof should be no more than a 9/12, preferably a 6/12. If the double posts are on the main house, they can be here with lattice. Agrees white is stark and this should be natural to weather; if it's not visible and you want white, you could come back once it's built for revisions.</p> <p>McLaughlin – No comments.</p> <p>Pohl – The issue was the white walls would stand out. The back wall should be natural to weather; if it isn't visible, you can come back and apply for white. Agrees 6/12 or 7/12 would be a better roof pitch. The double posts with lattice is a charming detail and would reduce the level of formality. The posts could be white, but the lattice should be natural to weather.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with natural to weather lattice between the posts, the roof pitch reduced to 6/12, and the back wall natural to weather, per Exhibit A. (Oliver)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	62570
17. Scheier, Mark	10 Sunset Ridge Lane	Driveway-hardscape	73.4.2-49	Atlantic Landscaping
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	Lindsay Congleton , Atlantic Landscaping Inc. – This was held for a view; the retaining wall is at a maximum 18 inches and drops to zero at the road; he will do a natural cap.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:52)	<p>Welch – Asked what the stone retaining wall maximum height is; suggested it be established.</p> <p>Coombs – We don't allow bluestone caps on walls.</p> <p>Oliver – The retaining wall faces the house.</p>			
Motion	Motion to Approve through staff with the retaining wall not to have any cap and a maximum of 2 feet tall. (McLaughlin)			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	72571

18. Swindell, Mark **(NB)** 21 Kendrick Street New 2nd Dwelling 76.4.1-1 Sanne Payne
 Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Camp, Oliver
 Alternates Welch
 Recused None
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, and site plan.
 Representing **Sanne Payne** – Presented project; contends this is completely not visible; the main house was determined not visible; we want natural to weather trim and gutters and cobblestone sashes to match the house.
 Public None
 Concerns (7:56) **Oliver** – It would be nice to have pictures of the main house. No concerns.
Camp – No concerns.
McLaughlin – The brackets should be straight 45.
 Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with vertical panes in the garage doors, brackets to be 45 straight and natural to weather trim. (Camp)**
 Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate # **72572**

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Approve Minutes	May 21, 2019 and May 28, 2019: Motion to Approve. (Oliver) Carried 5-0
Review Minutes	April 10, May 30, 2019, and June 4, 2019
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of plastic shed located 138 Orange Street, Marine Home Center: Oliver – She wanted to bring it to someone’s attention; it’s sitting in front of the Marine Home Center garden center; she wanted to bring it to the Board’s attention. Welch – Having it sit out front denotes it as something that is regularly sold and approved. Pohl – He’s going to talk to manager to not sit it in the front parking lot and that if they sell it to explain that if these are visible, HDC will cite them. Discussion of update on Vineyard Wind project: Welch – Received a letter from Bureau of Ocean Energy Management stating it’s required to close out its Section 106 review toward the end of August; our efforts as the workgroup and under the auspices of the Town with counsel is to reach a point we can accurately determine the adverse effect to appropriately inform mitigation measures, which effort is on-going; encourages Commission members to ask him any questions that may or could be of concern so that after the process no question is left unanswered. The mitigations are listed in the letter Mr. Welch submitted on behalf the HDC, outlining specific initiatives that protect and help maintain and manage the character of the National Historic Landmark, which Mr. Hedden forwarded to commissioners. One request being discussed is that the turbines be removed from view from the National Historic Landmark. Discussion of synthetic materials. Discussion and update on Nantucket Sidewalk Work Group.
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Packet on the history of the Connecticut schist stone sidewalk paving at 86 Main Street
2. Photo of plastic shed at 138 Orange Street

Adjourned at 8:09 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board Sconset Advisory Board Madaket Advisory Board Sign Advisory Committee