

# Town of Edgartown

## ~Historic District Commission~

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

# Minutes



Thursday, September 19, 2019

A regular meeting of the Edgartown Historic District Commission was scheduled for Thursday, September 19, 2019, 4 PM.

*Present: **Chris Scott** (chair), **Susan Catling** (co-Chair), **Cari Williamson**, **Cassie Bradley**, **Julia Celeste**, **Ken Magnuson**. **Absent: Peter Rosbeck**. **Staff: Doug Finn***

Site visits were scheduled as follows:

- 3:25 - 56 N. Water St.
- 3:35 – 41 Winter St.

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM, and a quorum declared.

### **4:00 –Public Hearing: 56 N. Water St. (20D-226) RJH Realty Trust (Edgartown Inn)**

Public notice was read. Agent: Mr. Chuck Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan presented an application to remove and rebuild the back building on the lot within the same footprint. According to the assessor's records, the current building was constructed in 1940. The Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System (MACRIS) study mentions the principal building, but does not mention the back building. Currently the structure is used for guest rooms and a laundry facility. The laundry has been relocated to the main building. The new building will be on the same footprint. The removal of an existing exterior deck and stairs, with the addition of gutters, a porch roof over the single entry and the replacement of two existing dormers with a single shed-roof dormer; the building will provide six housing units for staff (two on each level, and two in the basement). Mr. Sullivan described the architectural details of the proposal. The back of the building would be sided with a fire-rated cementitious clapboard (Hardiplank), a painted product, which will have a look very similar to wood clapboard, and will be painted a light grey to match the cedar shingle siding on other walls. The back wall will have no windows, in accordance with fire code. The proposal can also include a trellis on the back wall, to support climbing roses.

Mr. Ben Hall (representing a neighbor): the applicant has addressed the concerns of the neighbors; the building has been deteriorating for some time, and we are pleased to see the proposal to rebuild the project. We are in favor of the project proceeding. As a matter of note: the "cementitious" Hardiplank has also been previously used on the Federated Church.

No other comments were received. The chair asked to take the proposal in two steps – approval for the demolition of the existing structure, and then approval for the proposed new construction.

Ms. Celeste: Is the current structure able to be relocated? Mr. Sullivan: Due to the amount of rot, and the nature of the construction, there isn't really anything to save.

Ms. Celeste: What is the timetable for construction? Mr. Sullivan: We are hoping that the building will be up and operational by next Summer.

There being no further comments, Mr. Scott closed the public hearing at 4:15 PM, and asked for comments from the Commission about the project.

Ms. Catling: I don't believe the current structure contributes much to the historic district.

Mr. Magnuson: Agree.

Ms. Celeste: I also don't believe that the current building represents a significant impact, and the new building will be a net gain (better construction, better shape).

Ms. Williamson: I agree

Ms. Bradley: I also agree with the previous comments. Anything of historical significance in the existing structure seems to be recreated with the new structure.

There being no further comments, it was MOVED by Catlin, SECONDED by Williamson:

*To approve demolition.*

VOTED; 6, o, o.

Mr. Scott: Regarding the new construction: I believe that the new proposal is an improvement of the existing structure, and there are some details that improve on the original, and make it more compatible with the district.

Ms. Catling: Once concern I have relates to the skylights. Our guidelines recommend against them. I'm not sure how visible they are...

Mr. Sullivan: The skylights are on top of a dormer; there are existing skylights on the current structure.

Mr. Scott: The applicant is also prohibited (by fire code) from putting windows in the existing wall, so the skylights provide natural light into the back rooms of the building.

Ms. Williamson: I believe that the skylights are well done, and are the only option for providing light into the bathroom.

With notes related to changes of materials, it was MOVED by Celeste, SECONDED by Magnusson

*To approve construction with noted changes to materials.*

VOTED: 6, o, o.

**4:20 – Public Hearing: 41 Winter St. Winter St. (20D-218) Edward Kuchinski.**  
Hilary Grannis/agent.

Applicant proposes to add a 207 sq. ft. addition and add basement under existing house.

The Chair opened the public hearing at 4:22 PM.

Ms. Grannis: The original house will not be significantly changed. The addition will be added to the side of the house. The original basement will not be touched – the new basement will be constructed only under the rear portion of the house, with fieldstone veneer. The addition will be eleven feet high, and 29 feet back from the front wall of the house. Wood trim, and Pella casement and double-hung windows will be used. A single skylight on the addition is proposed, it is presumed not to be visible from the public way. The back of the house is not visible from the street. Painted white trim will be used.

Ms. Celeste: What is happening to the fencing on the property? Ms. Grannis: The addition will be behind the existing fence – no changes to the fence are proposed.

No correspondence was received.

Mr. Scott closed the public hearing at 4:27 PM.

Mr. Scott: I appreciate that no modifications are being proposed to the original structure. There have been periodic additions / developments to the structure; the proposed addition is not out of scale to the original structure, and seems to be in keeping with the detailing of the historic district.

Ms. Bradley: The proposal is pretty minor, and should not be impactful. I am concerned with the proposal of a skylight.

Mr. Magnuson: I agree with that concern.

Ms. Catling: Agree.

Ms. Celeste: Agree.

Ms. Grannis agreed that the skylight would be removed from the plan.

Ms. Williamson: The proposal otherwise seems very complementary.

There was some discussion related to the chimney, and the proposed colors for same, as well as the proposed color of the shutters.

There being no further comment, it was MOVED by Celeste, Seconded by Catling

*To approve as presented, with the elimination of the skylight, and clarification that the chimney will be rebuilt, painted white with a black cap, and the shutters will be painted green.*

VOTED: 6, 0, 0.

**4:40-56 Cottage St. (20B-83) Thomas & Sylvia Courtney**

Unique Design Solutions/agent. Applicant proposes to install 19 sets of Atlantic premium shutters. Mr. Courtney presented a perspective, showing the placement of the shutters on the existing structure. 19 sets of Atlantic Premium shutters are proposed. The Shutters will be Essex Green. The shutters are hinged on the 6” L-shaped hinge, and the shutters will be secured with hidden fasteners. This house is the only house in the immediate area without shutters.

The Board concluded that the change did not require a public hearing.

It was MOVED by Magnuson, Williamson

*To approve.*

VOTED: 6, 0, 0.

**4:50 – 66 Main St. (20D- 125) (The Yellow House) Christopher Celeste**

Dudley Cannada/agent. Mr. Cannada described the proposal as ‘minor changes to plans previously approved by the Historic District Commission.

Mr. Scott noted the time (4:38 PM) that the applicant, architect and Mr. Ben Hall did not object to hearing the request early.

Mr. Christopher Celeste introduced Dudley Cannada, to speak to the proposal. Work on the project is expected to begin in the first week of October; because we are preparing to break ground, the final plans have been slightly modified in order to better treat windows and entryways, which we believe will be better in the end.

Mr. Scott: Obviously we’ve had a public hearing for the project. Everything that is in the current plans have been approved. If we are talking about minor details, it may not rise to the level of a public hearing. Let’s confine our focus on only the changes.

Mr. Cannada presented the original measured elevations, and the proposed elevations, as well as the details of the proposed changes.

The footprint, exterior and dimensions of the building will not be changed.

Specific changes:

Summer Street Elevation: Five windows were originally proposed. There would only be three windows. A door originally faced town hall; we are asking to move it to the parking lot side of the building. A deck overhanging main street has been removed.

Main Street elevation: An 8-foot door has been replaced with a 6’8” door with a transom over. Two columns supporting an entry roof have been removed, and replaced with brackets. No changes otherwise.

Rosewater Elevation: Trash area has been moved closer to back; door location has changed. The door is located in an addition that was likely built in the late 1800s or early 1900s, not part of the original structure. This action allows the applicant to remove a door from the Town Hall side. A fence that previously hid mechanical equipment has been moved around a corner.

Mr. Scott confirmed: No changes to footprint, height, volume or exterior materials are proposed. The only change is the fenestration to one door.

Mr. Magnusson: Why did you change from an eight-foot high door to a six-foot-8-inch door with a transom? Mr. Cannada: Cost, generally, as well as alignment with other main street properties. It will be easier to construct with a standard height door.

Mr. Scott: The changes seem to be helping to line things up better, cleaning things up. Making the roof solid on the south-west addition is an improvement.

Ms. Catling: Reduction from five to three windows is an improvement.

Mr. Scott: Given that there is no proposed change in mass, square footage or ridge heights, should this require a public hearing? The consensus was that it did not.

Ms. Williamson also noted that moving the deck off of Main Street was a good choice.

Mr. Scott recognized Ben Hall to speak.

Mr. Hall: Regarding a public hearing, I believe that you have been misled. The dormer on South Summer Street that was approved was two separate dormers, not a single dormer with five windows. The reason you were told is that there were these little dormers, is that they were trying to save the roof rafters, which are original to the structure. The roof is part of the original structure, which was a single story structure; when the second story was added the roof was lifted. The proposal is not part of what was represented, nor approved. The conclusion is that most of the original structure is being wiped out.

Mr. Scott noted that the 'original' plan that Mr. Hall was using, while being one that was submitted at one point, is not the plan of record, which has a stamp so noting. Mr. Scott noted that multiple plans are often received for any given project; however, only a plan with the stamp of approval, and signature of the chair, is the plan of record.

Mr. Hall: That was part of the application that was received.

Mr. Scott: Yes, it was: We have had several projects where several revisions of plans were submitted to this commission; the original plan as submitted is not the plan of record; the plan of record is the final plan approved, and will be stamped and signed as such.

Mr. Cannada: The presentation that we made tonight uses the final plans that we presented and approved by this Commission.

There was some discussion related to plans, when they were submitted, and what was made available to the public for review and inspection.

Mr. Cannada spoke to the specifics as to how the current structure was built, and what is expected to be preserved.

Mr. Scott: Due to the sensitive nature of the application, and this process, any vote tonight will be conditioned on ascertaining whether the plan as submitted by the applicant is identical to the approved plan.

Mr. Hall: I believe that the changes represent changes that the public would be interested in. Because of these changes, I believe that a public hearing should be held to allow the public time to review these changes. Finally, a change made to an application made at an adjudicatory hearing should be considered only in an adjudicatory hearing. Finally, Mr. Hall said that he believes that this application should be referred to the Martha's Vineyard Commission.

Mr. Scott: The Commission only gets referrals for substantial projects and proposed demolitions that involve structures that are over 100 years old, and are outside of the established local Historic District. We don't refer projects to the commission that are inside the Historic District. Considering the issues that have been raised, we will proceed as follows: We will conduct a vote tonight as to whether the application should proceed to a public hearing. It has been the practice of the board to approve minor changes that do not impact the overall massing, structure, design, or create any new impacts of on abutters.

Mr. Hall: It is not clear how the exposed portion of the foundation will impact access to the structure. Mr. Hall discussed potential ADA compliance issues; Mr. Scott stated that ADA accessibility was the purview of the Building Commissioner.

Mr. Scott: The applicant has attested that they will be complying with accessibility requirements, and the Building Inspector will confirm.

It was MOVED by Scott SECONDED by Catling:

*To approve the minor alterations to the approved plan, as presented, with two caveats:*

- *That the Commission confirms that the plan as proposed accurately represents minor changes to the stamped and approved plans.*
- *That the Commission will review with Town Counsel our practice of approving minor changes to a project approved at a public hearing, not requiring a new public hearing.*
- *That the Commission will review with Town Counsel whether the changes require referral to the MV Commission.*

VOTED: 6, o, o.

**5:00 - 88 S. Water St. (29B-12) Jane & Ivan Bradbury.**

Chuck Sullivan/agent. The Commission received an application that proposes the renovation of an historic house, the removal of a pool and pool house and addition of 2 detached bedrooms.

*Present: Peter Gerhardt.*

Two areas are being considered. The front house, and the rear of the property. What we have learned from this house is that it is an antique, 3/4 house, moved to this location in the early 1800s. Previous work discovered an old frame and sheathing, and a post-and-beam structure behind it. The dormer on the front of the house dates to the 1940s; it will be retained. The proposal is to make the house a shingle house with cedar trim. Storms would be removed; A/C units would be removed. As much of the modern appurtenances would be removed as possible. The chimney is not suspected to be original; applicant proposes to leave the chimney, but paint it black.

The proposed structure in the rear is likely not visible from a public way; the building as proposed will be two, non-communicating areas, serving as two detached bedrooms, about 785 square feet in total area. The building will be all cedar, shed-like, no rakes, no overhangs. The windows will be Norwood 500 series. Trim would be cedar, unpainted, left to weather. If gutters would be installed, they would be zinc-coated copper.

There was some discussion related to the historic use of copper, whether it was coated or treated with another metal (zinc or lead).

Mr. Scott: This is an interesting application in that a pool is proposed to be removed, not added. That being said, I suspect a public hearing is warranted, including a significant alteration to a façade that could create philosophical issues; is this going to be accurate?

Mr. Gerhardt: it's not about making it original, or that we're restoring it to a particular date.

Mr. Scott: Many structures have been 'gussied up' over time, with shutters and trim added.

Ms. Bradley: The one thing I'm looking at is a black chimney; is there some other treatment or color that could be considered?

There was some discussion related to the current siding, and the proposal.

Mr. Gerhardt asked if approval would be required to remove shingles on the front of the house now in order to determine the overall scope of work. The consensus was that it would be more appropriate to wait until the public hearing was concluded.

There was some discussion related to the shutters, including the color of the shutters. The applicant was encouraged to take a second look at options for the shutters.

There was some discussion related to the overall application as standing out from others: moving from white painted siding to natural cedar, and the removal of the swimming pool.

It was MOVED by Mr. Scott, SECONDED by Bradley

*To move the application to public hearing, date to be determined.*

VOTED: 6, 0, 0.

**5:15 – 8 Pierce Lane (20D-76) Blecher.**

*Patrick Ahearn/agent.*

Mr. Ahearn described the proposed changes to the plans as previously approved:

The applicant will not construct four new dormers that were previously proposed – they have been removed. The existing outdoor shower will be retained. Rather than a triple set of floor-to-ceiling windows and a door with side lights, a simple French door is proposed.

The Commission reviewed the plan. There was some discussion related to the reasons for the proposed changes.

Ms. Celeste: Does moving a hot tub have any impact on things?

There was some discussion related to whether a hot tub is under the purview of the HDC.

It was MOVED by Magnuson, Seconded by Bradley

*To approve the changes as presented.*

VOTED: 6, 0, 0.

**Old/New Business:**

The minutes from September 5, 2019 were presented for review.

There being no further business, it was MOVED by Catling SECONDED by Scott

*To Adjourn.*

VOTED: 6, 0, 0.

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 5:46 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Finn

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ date \_\_\_\_\_  
Christopher Scott, Chairman