

# 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, November 4th, 2021



In accordance with Chapter 53 of the Acts of 2021, this meeting was held through remote conference technology only. The meeting was recorded.

Members in attendance: Christopher Scott, Susan Catling, Julia Celeste, Cari Williamson, Ken Magnuson & James Cisek (A). Absent: Peter Rosbeck. Staff: Host-Doug Finn. Administrator-Bricque Garber. Mr. Scott called the meeting to order.

**Public Hearing: 7 Starbuck Neck (19A-9)** Hisao & Karen Kushi. Patrick Ahearn/agent. Mr. Scott is recused from this application. Applicant proposes renovations and additions to the existing dwelling. Removal of non-conforming wing of the existing house, pool & pool equipment enclosure, remove non-conforming guest house, construct new 2 car garage with detached bedroom above, landscaping and related work.

The Public Hearing notice was read. Mr. Scott is recused from hearing this application. Before beginning the presentation, Susan Catling explained that she had had some questions regarding the set-backs and the status of the dwelling as “pre-existing/non conforming, Ms. Catling had spoken to the Building Inspector and both she and Patrick Ahearn were in accord regarding the location of the house that will not be changed or moved.

Mr. Ahearn discussed the plans and renderings that were displayed. He explained his understanding of the building history based upon previously obtained building permits. There was a wing that existed in 1800’s but the wing was modified by Mr. Conover in 1988 changing the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. In 1999 there was a foundation added. Neighbor was under the impression that the wing was on his property. The only part of the wing that was on the neighboring property was 2 small steps to an outdoor shower. The old photo showing the wing was, though later changed, part of the old house. Mr. Ahearn explained that the wing will stay and be changed to eliminate the upper railings and deck. The south elevation shows the changes to the upper deck the original roof wrapping and covering the lower porch. It was also noted that in 1988 the shed dormer was modified along with windows and a secondary porch. The new plan, said Patrick, more closely resembles the original house and adds a new front door. The site plan was reviewed noting the 1974 guest house and garage to be removed are currently in the setback. A new companion wing will be built on the main house. The drawings illustrate the new Carriage house and the location is seen on the site plan. The house sits 115 feet back from Starbuck Neck. All details will match the existing house, including the red cedar roof, white cedar shingle walls & Pella windows. Patrick said that the carriage house looks like what may have been original to the house. Mr. Ahearn completed his presentation. The commissioners had no new questions. The Public Hearing was opened and closed as there were no abutters present. Three letters were read in favor of the project (one letter a qualified approval).

The meeting was opened for commissioner comments: Carole Berger said she has no objections. Cari: The new entry and carriage house are improvements and she appreciates that the house is not to be moved which is appropriate. Ken: No issues and he appreciates the changes from the original application review, he has no objections. Julia: Agreed large strides made in this application from the original plan. Julia noted that viewed, from the lighthouse, the house will have a ‘good feel’. James

noted that Patrick has worked diligently to make many improvements. Motion to approve this plan as presented, Ken. 2<sup>nd</sup> Carole. Unanimously approved.

**Public Hearing: 99 N. Water St. (20D-280)** North Water St. Properties LLC. Guy Grassi/agent. Applicant proposes to demolish 2 chimneys, remove 2 doors, new wall openings. Remove portion of porch roof/sheathing & remove 9 windows and add solar panels. The Public Hearing notice was read. There was a site visit to view proposed solar panels, from rear dock, on Wednesday 11.3.21. Mr. Grassi made the presentation. House is located at the beach level the roof is visible at grade with the street level. The house dates from 1948 – 1950. The house is one story. The owners and Mr. Pertile are at the meeting. The roof plan was displayed. There are no additions proposed. The solar panels are on a 2 inch rack. There are currently 2 chimneys -one for the BBQ and one for a boiler. No fireplaces exist in the house. The waterside elevations were reviewed and discussed. The BBQ will be removed along with picture window. . They will replace the window with sliding glass doors. The solar panels are on the flat part of the roof but those on the sloping roof will provide more sun/power. Some of the proposed skylights are visible from N. Water St. but will provide some natural light to the house.. Two wide windows will be removed, described as ‘not visible’. Photos were shown from the street, the harbor and aerial views. They are proposing to add a section of glass roof at the flat roof over the porch. Q: Carole asked about the blocks holding the panels, as seen at the site visit? A: The blocks are taller than the racking. The racking will be approx. 2” high. The location of the mock up is up on the roof farther than it will be when installed. The panels will be moved down so they are closer to the flat roof than to the ridgeline. A: What will the roofing material be? A: Existing red cedar shingles. Paul Pertile noted that #'s 99 and 101 are owned by the same owner and the rear decking is connected. Q: Julia asked if there is roof space on the other house that may be more suitable for solar. A: They would be \more visible than on 99. It was noted that there is much glass added to this project outside of the solar panels. Susan: Said that this is a rather “low key” is building experiencing so many changes with these plans. The skylights will be visible on the iconic streetscape and the loss of the chimneys is significant. All the glass feels like a lot of glass and has a” Florida” feel to it on the harbor side. The Public Hearing was opened and closed as there were not public comments or letters.

Deliberation of members: Chris noted that, in this case, the removal of chimneys does not bother him much for this 50’s structure, and the fenestration on the waterside provides better balance. Solar panels do not impact the view from N. Water. Carole: The loss of the central chimney is significant. The loss creates a loss of the house from the street and she would like to see remain. The house is so out of site and friendly the chimney helps. It may be a ‘Florida’ looking house but was built that way. Solar panels are a bigger concern. Susan does not object to the glass roof. Cari. No objections. While the removal of the chimneys open up the view to the water, Ken sees there is a lot going on here and he agrees with Carole about the central chimney. Would like to see a chimney remain or be removed and rebuilt, even in an alternate location. Ken noted that he is opposed to the skylights. James: He does not see a big problem with removing chimney but skylights should not be placed on the roof. Julia showed a photograph from the past and said that the chimney should stay or be rebuilt. There was applicant support to remove the large chimney and rebuild a faux chimney of the same size and height on the ridge of the house thus the solar panels will be placed below the chimney. Mr. Grassi further noted that they will remove the skylights from the application. It was noted that the rear railings are are not really railings just a post with board on top “perhaps a place to set a drink”. Julia they may be odd but they add depth to the rear elevations. Carole walked around and held onto railings given the multiple levels of the deck. Carole made the motion to approve, conditioned upon the deletion of the skylights and the addition of a replica of the chimney of the same height, width and appearance at the ridge AND the solar panels will be matte black, place on a 2” black racking and moved closer to the roof edge than the ridge. 2<sup>nd</sup> Chris. In favor: Chris, Carole, Cari, Ken, Susan & James. Opposed, Julia. The application with the listed conditions is approved.

**32 Pierce Lane (20B-42)** Richard Behr. Renewal by Anderson/agent. Applicant proposes to replace 4 gliding double windows. Jake Roberts presented for Renewal by Anderson. 4 double casement windows will be replaced with no changes to the window frames. The windows will look the same with the same grill pattern but be sliders rather than casement. Q: None. Motion to approve, Ken. 2<sup>nd</sup> James. Unanimously approved.

**49 Davis Lane (20D-135.2)** Gregg Jubin & Christina Aragona. Sourati Engineering Group LLC/Agent. Applicant proposes the construction of a garage and a 9x21 pool & pool fence. Mr. Sourati presented the application for the additions of a one story garage and a pool. George showed an area site map and noted pools and garages in the immediate area. Members noted the need for a Public Hearing. Mr. Sourati noted that the proposed pool and the garage are smaller than was originally proposed at the time of the original remodel application and that there are several letters of support from abutters. The Pool equipment will be inside of the garage. Single car/one story garage will have “typical” garage doors. The garage will be clapboard with a 2x2 window at the ridge to match the residence. He showed photos of the neighbor’s garage.

Chris noted the large scope of this project though the garage size is reduced from an earlier proposal. He noted that the HDC has not approved pools visible from public way and this is very visible corner. Ken reiterated that the HDC does not approve pools visible from the public way and asked if it can be moved behind the garage? Noting that would create a loss of green space. Described as a rather elaborate garage building, Susan want to see the fence plans and noted that the proper fence in this location is white picket and that she would not approve of other than picket, saying that this would be the only solid and only green fence on Davis. Susan further noted that on the locus map presented by the applicant, almost without exception the pools are behind the buildings. It was noted that the ‘matching’ garage competes and that a stylized garage would not have been seen in the 1840’s This is a very prominent structure with a long and interesting history. It was noted by several members that the renovation of the main house is lovely. There was a discussion about next steps and the applicant chose to continue this part of the hearing until November 18, 2021. Chris made the motion to continue. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ken. Unanimously approved, to move to next agenda.

**2 Morse St. (20D-287)** David Malm. Colonial Reproductions/agent. Applicant proposes to remove and replace roof shingles, paint exterior (no color change), replace entry columns in kind, replace electric awning, change 2<sup>nd</sup> floor deck rail. Mr. Rankow presented the request and reviewed the upgrades to the house. Railings/awnings. Painting white on white. 2 houses built at the same time in the mid 90’s. no comments. No objections. Motion Julia. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ken Unanimous

**4 Morse St. (20D-288)** David Malm. Colonial Reproductions/agent. Applicant proposes to replace roof shingles, paint exterior (no color change), replace underside of 1<sup>st</sup> floor deck Koma bead board, painted white, replace 2<sup>nd</sup> floor decking, replace 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, harbor side - French door and sidelights (to match existing. Mr. Rankow presented the application. Same window with a change to hardware only. Motion to approve, Ken. 2<sup>nd</sup> Susan. Unanimously approved.

**74 N. Summer St. (20D-95)** Howard & Alex Powers. Paul Pertile/agent. Applicant proposes to replace fence as seen with change to the pickets from 4 inch width to 2 1/2 inch width. Painted Koma. Mr. Pertile. Curve will remain. Cari the thin pickets are more formal, approves. Motion to approve, Cari. 2<sup>nd</sup> James. Unanimously Approved.

**21 Plantingfield Way (20B-36.2)** Geoffrey Caraboolad. Paul Pertile/agent. Applicant proposes construction of a pool & pool fence. Mr. Pertile presented the application noting that Mr. Caraboolad owns the abutting parcels. Pool equipment will be located behind the pool. There will be blue stone coping. The deck off main house is blue stone. Q: James asked about a dry well. A: Yes, there will be a dry well for the lowering of the pool for winter. Q: Julia. Does the additional hardscape require drainage mitigation measures? A: No. Chris noted that this pool is barely visible from a public way and asked if the members want a public hearing. All members: No public hearing needed. Motion to approve, Chris. 2<sup>nd</sup> Susan. Unanimously Approved.

**New/Old Business:**

**Minutes 10.21.21**

Motion to approve, Susan. 2<sup>nd</sup> James. Unanimously approved.

- ❖ Discussion regarding mechanicals as can be seen from the public way. Bricque noted that a neighbor on South Water St, who had objected to the location of certain condensers, has withdrawn his objections. But, she further noted that the location of mechanicals and pool equipment is often missing from the plans that are presented to the HDC and the pool equipment location has been an abutter issue in the past. Mr. Scott has had a discussion with Town Council regarding the HDC Jurisdiction regarding the mechanicals and it is viewed as reviewable by the HDC.
- ❖ New place to view the meeting materials: Beginning with the next meeting, the meeting materials (applications & plans) may be viewed at the Town of Edgartown website. This will save a few steps for the staff and may be easier for the public to access.
- ❖ James asked about the 90 School St. demolition. A: The Architect and the builder will be available to answer HDC questions at the next meeting on 11.18.21.

Susan Catling read 2 pro and 2 con comments, posted to the Gazette, to illuminate differing public views regarding house size and history of Edgartown/Island homes. Comments *from Gazette articles*:

- *“Each house is part of a bigger picture, the island whole. As the fabric is degraded with the destruction of old houses one by one, the island tips towards a characterless holiday island and the chain of built continuity, stretching into the past, is broken.”*  
*“These precedents will be hard to undo, and once history is destroyed it cannot be recreated with similar roof pitches, and gables, tacked on a house twice the size of what was torn down.”*
- *“OK so new owners want NEW & some have better taste than others. Can't control that. But at the very least the MVC can control the new build out to original square footage/footprint. So an old 2,800 square foot house will still have to be 2,800 not 3,800 square feet. After all, the land doesn't increase in size.”*
- *“The Karen generation is at its peak; outrage over everything. Who cares, it's not your house or your island. Deal with it.”*
- *It's a free market and people can spend their money to do what they want. That's how it works. We don't get to live here all year round, have the island to ourselves for 10 months, while having summer residents subsidize us with the taxes they pay and also get to set the rules on what they can and can't do. Not how capitalism and free markets work. That's the trade off we make when we decide to live here year round. It's a pretty good arrangement we have.*

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10.

Respectfully submitted:

Bricque Garber  
Assistant

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ 11.18.21  
As voted