

# Town of Edgartown

## ~Historic District Commission~

Post Office Box 5158 ~ 70 Main St. Edgartown, MA 02539  
508 627-6155 ~ [HDC@edgartown-ma.us](mailto:HDC@edgartown-ma.us)

## Historic District Commission

### Zoom Meeting Minutes

Thursday, November 18, 2021



Members in attendance: Christopher Scott, Susan Catling, Ken Magnuson, Cari Williamson, Peter Rosbeck, Carole Berger, & Julia Tarka. Staff: Doug Finn-Host & Bricque Garber-Admin.

In accordance with Chapter 53 of the Acts of 2020, this meeting will be held through remote conference technology only. [Site visits were be done independently due to COVID protocols.](#)

**4:00 - 49 Davis Lane (20D-135.2)** Continued from 11.4.21. Gregg Jubin & Christina Aragona. Sourati Engineering Group LLC/Agent. Applicant proposes the construction of a garage and a 9x21 pool & pool fence. Mr. Jubin and Ms. Aragona were in attendance. Mr. Jubin said that they are water people, they really want a pool and they love the community. Ms. Aragona said that they feel that they are good stewards of the building and designed this home for the future generations and all of their children are swimmers. Mr. Sourati spoke for the applicant saying that they understand that the committee does not look at vegetation as a barrier to a view of the pool. He showed a 'grade' drawing showing a 3 ft. picket fence with heavy planting behind it and a 5 ft. fence behind the plantings. They believe that the 5 ft. fence solves the visibility problem. He said that in the downtown area there are other locations that have 5-6 ft. fences around pools. Mr. Jubin pointed out that he understands that the open space is important and this is a reason for the height and location of the fencing. Mr. Sourati showed a photo of a fence on Davis Lane with fence and screening hiding a fence much like the applicant has proposed. He showed a few more photos with similar picket fences, and tall fencing behind blocking the pool, at Simpson's lane. He said that there are dozens of 6 ft fences facing streets in HD. They find this to be a sensible solution. They noted that they have letters of support from neighbors. The garage, designed to mimic the architecture of the primary structure, will be revised to be more simple, in design, if the HDC finds that the plan to mimic the house, is too much.

Comments/Questions: Chris noted the members did see the location of the pool and there were no new garage plans, provided. The applicant has been provided a copy of the HDC bylaw stating that fencing is not a barrier to the view. Carole asked if they might consider a simple shed building, rather than the garage they have submitted. Julia noted 'dropping the columns' would be simpler and cleaner and shingle facade may look a little more authentic. Julia noted that a pool shown in the applicant's presented photos may have been a mistake made in the HDC approval or may have predated the HDC. Ken noted that he has been on the board 5-6 years and has never approved a 5 ft fence built to block a pool from the road. Asking if they had considered shifting the garage to hide the pool, Mr. Sourati said that there is not enough space to do it. Mr. Sourati said that they can do a 4 ft. fence or a 48" inch fence, again noting there are "dozens of pools in the district". The landscape architect, spoke wanting to know if 48 inches would be ok for the fence. Julia explained that the fence height is only part of the overall plan. Noting again, that a fence is not a barrier to the view of a structure, Chris wanted to give the applicant a clear idea of the HDC member's thoughts. Susan said that she sees the conversation as getting off track, the

height of a fence is not the consideration, it's the location of the structures. Carole said she is struck by this very important historic structure, which, as a school, was almost a public building. The building very unique and is losing its setting. She said that foundation alone is a work of art. The building is most important and the corner is very important. Mr. Jubin, asked if he could build a brick Thomas Jefferson wall? Mr. Jubin said that he has an idea, and that they want to work with the drawings, so would like to withdraw the application. Motion to allow the applicant to withdraw, Julia. 2<sup>nd</sup> Susan. Unanimously approved to withdraw.

**4:15 – 73 North Water St. (20D-289)** Brian Mann. Change to an approved plan. Applicant proposes to change the pool edge to an infinity edge and add a spa. No elevations are changed. No changes from the original plan. Motion to approve as presented, Carole. Cari provided the 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unanimously Approved.

**4:30 – 60 Cooke St. (20D-6)** Michael & Carol Berwind. Paul Pertile/agent. Applicant proposes to move the recessed portion of the fence forward to join with the street fence and add gates. A photo showing the current 23 ft curb cut was displayed. The reason to move is to add yard space. Ken asked about hardware. A: Black or bronze hardware. The fence will be replaced in-kind. The members do not think a public hearing is not warranted. Peter asked about removing the curb cut. A: They may still, occasionally, park in the area but any parking would be on the new grass where they currently have hardscape/pea stone. Motion to approve, Julia. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ken. Unanimously Approved.

**4:45 - 113 Main St. (20D-12)** Aaron & Maureen Weiss. David Brodsky/agent. Applicant proposes to reconstruct a solid picket **Fence** at back side of the drive and replace windows with Pella-Sash Replacement System. Mr. Brodsky showed the photos of the existing fence and the proposed change with the same height and width. Nothing will change except to change away from the lattice top. Julia asked about the lack of the swoop-up for the proposed change, as this is customary in the Historic District. Ken also noted the preference for a swoop from one level to the next. Ken noted that commonly, a swoop would be asked for and 5 ft. is a high fence in the area. The applicant was asked if they are willing to add swoop. A: If it is a condition of approval, the applicant will comply. Motion to approve with a swoop, Chris Scott. Cari provided the 2<sup>nd</sup>. Voted in favor: Carole, Cari, Susan, Chris and Peter. Opposed: Ken & Julia. The change to the fence is approved with the swoop condition. The **Window** replacement is sought as the exterior casings are in good shape and have been well maintained. This replacement system seeks to maintain the original integrity of the old windows. They will be a traditional profile with wood sash and increase the R value of the windows. Sash to be painted white. Motion to approve the windows, Susan. 2<sup>nd</sup> Chris. Unanimously approved.

**5:00 - 90 School St. (29A-1)** Chuck Sullivan & Ronny Jackson/agents. **Agents to discuss and answer construction/demolition questions posed by the HDC.** Mr. Sullivan (architect), Mr. Jackson (builder) and Ms. Reade Milne (building inspector) appeared. Bricque noted that she was away when there were complaints regarding demolition being greater than was expected. Chuck Sullivan noted that the front wall (originally a porch wall) was framed poorly and could not be saved. Mr. Jackson noted that he had discussed this with Reade. There were photos shown of what was saved. More roof than was expected was in need of repair and more was removed. Reade noted she sees a disconnect between the HDC presentation and the plans. The red lines, on the plan, represented the portions that were to be removed. The level of demolition was not clear from the minutes and application. It was noted that the application did not specify the % of demolition. Chris said that he is not sure if there is anything to resolve here but a better understanding of what happened is informative. Peter, a builder himself, noted that he watched the ongoing project and thinks that the builder took all steps possible to maintain the

structure and all demolition was done step by step; by hand. The work was consistent in dimension and sizing. Peter noted that they did a good job with the demolition as was needed. There was a discussion regarding demolition percentages and how to better understand how much will be removed from any structure, going forward. It was agreed the Building Inspector, Ms. Milne, will be a final arbitrator and her knowledge in the field will be honored. There was continuing conversation about this particular property and it was noted that the commission, in this case, was ultimately focused on the final form. Mr. Jackson noted that Reade called him at the time she received a complaint and all plans were immediately reviewed. Clearly, a few things could have been reviewed during the process. Bricque has adjusted the application regarding the % of demolition. In the end it was seen as helpful to discuss this project and it will serve to add clarity to the paperwork and the level of communication going forward. The members thanked Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Jackson and Ms. Milne for their time and attention. .

New/Old Business:

Minutes 11.4.21: Motion to approve Susan, 2<sup>nd</sup> Carole. Unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25.

Respectfully submitted:

Bricque Garber  
Assistant

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ 12.2.21  
As voted