

Town of Edgartown

~Historic District Commission~

Post Office Box 5158 ~ 70 Main St. Edgartown, MA 02539
508 627-6155 ~ HDC@edgartown-ma.us

Historic District Commission

Zoom Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 2, 2021



In accordance with Chapter 53 of the Acts of 2020, this meeting will be held through remote conference technology only.

Members in attendance: Susan Catling, Carole Berger, James Cisek (A), Peter Rosbeck, Cari Williamson, & Ken Magnuson. Absent: Christopher Scott & Julia Tarka.
Staff: Doug Finn-Host & Bricque Garber-Administrator

Susan Catling opened the meeting at 4:02.

Public Hearing: 127 S. Water St. (29B-35) Change to an approved plan. Tina Kohlen. Patrick Ahearn/agent. Applicant proposes to eliminate carriage house and relocate approved new house on lot & minor modification to house exterior. Bricque read the Public Hearing Notice. Peter Rosbeck requested to be recused from hearing this application. Mr. Ahearn explained that the reasoning for moving the house is due to the elimination of the approved guest house. He reviewed the minor adjustments to fenestrations. The site plans were displayed indicating that they will remove the current carriage house and incorporate a one care garage to allow for more yard space. There were no questions from commissioners. Ms. Catling opened the Public Hearing. Mike Long spoke in favor of the project but had a question regard the location of the chimney, noting a concerned that the chimney will be upwind of their home. Patrick explained that the fireplace will be gas and they will lower the chimney by approx. 4 feet, which satisfied Mr. Long. There being no further comment the Public Hearing was Closed for member deliberations/comments. Carole Berger sees no issue with the change and things is better to move the house back. James Cisek had no objection. Noting that 'less is better', Cari and Ken agreed with Carole, Susan & James. Motion to approve with approx. 4 ft. reduction in chimney height. Carole Berger, 2nd Cari Williamson. Unanimously Approved.

Public Hearing: 114 N. Water St. (20C-271) Michael Hegarty. Patrick Ahearn/agent. Applicant proposes to remove existing one car garage, remove side porch, and construct new 2 car garage at rear of the house, new cabana & pool, new side addition to existing rear ell, add new decorative rail above existing front porch. Bricque read the Public Hearing notice. There were 2 site visits prior to this hearing. Mr. Ahearn noted that the current aluminum siding will be removed. The decorative railing over the front porch, discussed at the previous hearing, will be eliminated. The side porch will be cut back so will not be easily seen from N. Water St. Mr. Ahearn noted that the pool equipment inside the garage. Grass strip on existing driveway will be left in place. Rear elevation shows removal of the one story porch in rear. Patrick described the restoration and new windows as a subtle adjustment. He noted that the current garage is in very poor condition.

Member Questions:? Carole. Berger: Re: the front porch, Carole noted concern that there are so many periods of architecture and asked if the slate floor will remain? A: Patrick noted that the proposed, new columns will be beefed up and have more weight and the slate will be replaced with brick. Carole said that she has no objections to the rail over the porch, she further noted concerns about the trees on the lot, hoping the large trees can be looking at the lot, can trees be saved. She noted the Cabana is quite large, and wondered if it can be attached to the garage to reduce the number of buildings, less density, and provide more open space? Cari Williamson agreed with Carole noting that from the street the removal of the one garage is good but adding the 2 car garage, visible from the street on the left side, you will see both the garage and the cabana. A: Patrick said that they can eliminate the current cabana and put it at the rear of the garage turn the pool by 80 degrees, and still have a functional cabana. James Cisek asked about the pool equipment location once the 2 structures are connected. A: Patrick said the equipment will be in the interior of the building. Patrick noted that the change will allow for a view from N. Water through the property and the guest house and cabana will be 'bookends' for the pool .

The Public Hearing was opened and there being only one letter of support and no public comment from attendees, the Public Hearing was closed. Cari Williamson addressed the front railing noting her opposition as there are so many railings on the house and a front railing detracts from the simplicity of the house. It was noted that the porch was likely added in the 1920's as a simple porch. Susan agreed with Cari. It was noted by Mr. Ahearn that the plan had updated without the railing. Peter Rosbeck noted that the railing was removed from the plan but he sees the railing as consistent with other properties on N. Water St. He described that most if not all the buildings will a flat roof porch have a decorative railing. Further noting that as this porch as an add-on to the original house he feels the rail is a better choice. There was further discussion regarding the front porch railing, noting that it is moot if removed from the plans by the applicant but given the added porch is very tight, Mr. Rosbeck sees the railing as a positive addition. Ken Magnuson likes the decorative railing on the front saying that he sees it as providing more balance to the front façade. James Cisek sees that "no railing" will eliminate the generic look of the house, and makes the house more distinctive. Peter further noted that the pitched roof porches may not have railings but all the flat roof porches have a railing. Patrick can see the railing from both sides and is content with either decision by the members. The rail as shown is a crest or cap detail which is appropriate for the house but can go either way but noted he sees it as looking more finished with the rail. Susan Catling said that she does not feel strongly about the railings. Cari, agreed and after further discussion it was decided that the porch railing will be include in the final approval. Ken Magnuson made the motion to approve with a railing on the front porch, the Cabana relocated attached to the garage and the pool rotated to be parallel to the garage. Carol Berger 2nd. Unanimously Approved.

4:30 – 7 Pease Pt. Way South (20D-47) Edward Williams. James Moffatt/agent. Applicant proposes to demolish 40% of building, lift front & pour new foundation, build new rear section. Mr. Moffet discussed the history of the house. Noting an approximate build date 1858. Drawings displayed showing the existing main house on the NW side of the lot. They will keep the front portion of the building, with a new foundation. The one story front porch is on slab and may have to be rebuilt after the lift. The back addition to

be removed and rebuilt. The back portion was not dated but appears to be an addition. photos were shown. The Cottage in the rear is not being changed. The house has vinyl siding that will be replaced with wood clapboards. The plan is to keep the windows and doors as existing and add clad windows in the rear of the house. The railing shown is a decorative rail only without any access. The fireplace will be removed and relocated on to the side. New addition on the rear of the house was shown as combination of cedar shingle and vertical boards. The covered porch, 2 steps up from grade with a small balcony. The goal is to keep the addition tucked behind the house but there is a small protrusion. Q: Carole Berger noted the detailing described as vertical boards on North Elevation and finds the vertical boards to be incompatible with the architecture. She suggested stacked shutters in the locations where shutters are not seen on the elevation. James Cisek noted the combination of the elements including the vertical boards, as shown is 'out of keeping' with the house saying that simple shingles would be much better choice. Susan noted the bay is an elegant touch and the formality of the house is not enhanced with the materials as shown. Ken sees the porch as breaking up the look sufficiently and noted that vertical material is jarring and does not fit with the house. Ken noted the ridge height of the addition and there was a discussion. A: It is 10 inches lower than the house ridge. Noting that the work to be done is quite visible from the Public Way the commissioners were polled for the need for a Public Hearing. All members were in agreement to send this application forward for Public review. Peter asked if there was a way to move the pipe from the front corner and suggested it be moved if possible. It was noted, given the view of the project, there is a need to pay special attention to both sides. Motion to send to Public Hearing, Cari Williamson. 2nd Carole Berger. Unanimously approved to send to PH.

4:45 – 105 Main St. (20D-65) Daniel Santangelo. Applicant proposes two additions to the existing garage, built in 2010. Dan Santangelo said his goal is to gain storage space, given the mechanicals and the indoor stairway have limited the space available. Mr. Santangelo stated that the two 'bump-outs' are secondary to the original garage. He noted that the drawings show 'shakes' as the siding for the additions but he intends the siding to be clapboard. Susan Catling read from the Place for Houses, noting the visibility of this location. Susan noted that the current garage is built in the style of a 3 car garage with an open space in the middle and is a large structure close to the street. Carole Berger noted she finds it hard to imagine adding to what is already a long building in such a visible location and is not in favor of increasing the density on this streetscape. Mr. Santangelo noted the large size of the lot and said that the density is less than neighboring properties down town, noting there is much open space. Susan Catling noted that the two additions are close to, or larger than, the historical residence and not subordinate to the historic structure. Mr. Santangelo said that he plans to work on the main historic house but wants to complete this project first. James Cisek, see it as inappropriate noting that the additions glamorize a 3 car garage. Mr. Santangelo noted that this is not a unique design showing a picture of a similar style structure on Pent Lane. He said that he thinks it is appropriate. Cari Williamson noted that there should not be a bump out on either side of the current garage, noting that it may be a large lot but the building is close to the street and this plan totally detracts from the current design. Cari further noted that massing is a problem. Susan explained that the commission considers each application on a 'case by

case' basis and further noted the location and visibility of this garage. Ken Magnuson noted this proposal creates too much mass given the proximity to the street. Peter Rosbeck noted that the Pent Lane project is a different project and bump-outs are smaller. Carole Berger noted that there is a very historic house here and this plan does not defer to the very prominent Historic building that looks like a poor cousin in comparison. Susan noting the comments of the members asked Mr. Santangelo if he would like a vote on the application or would he like to withdraw the application. Mr. Santangelo requested to withdraw the application. He compared his plan with the Pent Lane garage. Susan explained that the HDC is looking at this application only. Susan further explained that it would be helpful for the HDC to see a plan for entire property. Motion to approve the applicant's withdrawal of the application. Susan Catling. 2nd James Cisek. Approved.

5:00 - 89 S. Water St. (29B-17) William Lynch. Josh Gothard/agent. Applicant proposes restoration of the historic Greek Revival structure. Demolition of the non-historic additions and guest house to be replaced with new addition within the majority of the existing footprints. Josh Gothard along with Twanette Tharp displayed the plans and the changes proposed. He described all the facades shown. The perspectives displayed both existing and proposed facades. Susan noted the removal of the bay window will help bring the attention to the old house and noted the transom and upper windows over the front door. Josh said that the plan to keep it as close as possible to the existing in the front over the door. Carol Berger noted that the rear addition shows as towering over the garage, on the plan. A: Twanette noted the land goes down in the rear and the 2D drawing is deceptive there will be only a small visibility of the addition's roofline from the streetscape. The drawing perspective just looks taller on the 2D image. Noting that the 2 story structure is sitting behind the courtyard and the land is lower it will be mostly blocked by the structure in front of the 2 story. The rear 2 story structure would not be easily seen unless you were standing on a ladder. Peter asked about noting the ridge height at the site with a ridge pole for the site visit. Applicant said they will put up put up 2 ridge poles to note the ridge of the garage and proposed 2 story building. No further questions. Ken asked to review the lighting proposals. There is a lamppost in front and all fixtures are copper-to weather. There will be no reflective or mirrored backings on the fixtures. Motion to send to Public Hearing with a site visit, Cari Williamson. 2nd Carole Berger. Approved for PH.

5:15 - 88 North Water St. (20D-255) Matt Fruhan. Patrick Ahearn/agent. Applicant proposes modifications to rear ell, 1 story addition, new one car garage, pool & pool cabana, no change to existing guesthouse, new side entry, new 6 ft. fencing and gate at existing brick drive. Continued from 8.19.21. Mr. Ahearn reviewed the project for the members. A notification was sent to the abutters and there were no letters received in the HDC office, as a result of the notifications. Patrick reviewed the plans and drawings. The pool cabana will be out of sight as the garage is moved back. The cupola will be removed from the plans. There were no further questions. Cari noted the nice design and Peter agreed. Motion to approve, without the cupola. Ken Magnuson. 2nd Susan Catling. Unanimously Approved.

New/Old Business:

- A zoom meeting will be held for all HDCs but Christina at the MVC on September 14. Susan will send a reminder to all members.
- Bricque will be on vacation until October 1, 2021.

Minutes 8.19.21:

Motion to approve the minutes, Peter Rosbeck. 2nd Cari Williamson.
Unanimously Approved.

Adjourned @ 5:42

Respectfully submitted:
Bricque Garber

Approved: _____ October 7, 2021
As voted