

# 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~ Minutes



Thursday, June 7, 2018

Members in Attendance: Susan Catling-Vice Chairman, Carole Berger, Cassie Bradley, Julia Celeste, Edith Blake, Cari Williamson (A), Minah Worley (A), Peter Rosbeck (A)

Ms. Catling called the meeting to order at 4:20 and read the public hearing notice for 90 N. Water St.

**Public Hearing: 90 N. Water (20D-256)** Nancy Monahan, TTE of D&N Realty Trust. Twanette Tharp & Pam Scott/agents. Applicant proposes restoration of the main house, reconstruction of connector wing, and reconstruction of detached bedroom cottage into an open pool pavilion, renovation of garage into bedroom and storage; pool and fences. There was a site visit prior to this hearing. Pam Scott made the presentation to the commissioners noting a minor change to the plan as first submitted regarding the location of the garbage area. She outlined the building site plans. She noted the sunroom floor will be brought up to the level of the family room. She displayed the floor plans and the elevations of the historic house and the 2002 addition and connector wing. All materials will match the historic home. The historic home will retain the historic windows and trims. Any trim to be replaced in kind. The window configuration will remain the same as the historic house (8x12 2<sup>nd</sup> floor & 12x12 first floor) and all materials and trims to match the historic home. The garage façade will be visible from the public way. The fence will change to closely match the house across the street. Q: Materials. A: Planned for a Red Cedar roof & White Cedar walls. Q: What is the size of the pavilion A: Same footprint as existing detached bedroom. The privet hedge will remain. There was a discussion with abutter regarding the height of the roof and the hedges. Susan asked the overall sq. ft change from the proposed to the existing. A: approximately 20 sq. ft. perhaps less as the pavilion will be open rather than an enclosed space. Pam will send the exact numbers to the Commission. There are currently 7 bedrooms which will not change. Julia Q: Asked about the size of the dormers. A: Dormers same size as the existing dormers. Q: Garage façade? A: Doors on the garage will be swinging French. Q: What is the driveway plan? A: Side walk to parking area will be solid brick but the grass strip will remain as is. Pam Scott noted that goal of the project is to maintain what is currently there. Q: Peter asked about the gutters and downspouts which are currently inconsistent materials A: All aluminum gutters will be removed gutters and new gutters will be copper, to match the garage or wood with copper downspouts to match existing house. Q: About the lanterns. A: The proposed lantern tear sheet and picture was reviewed. There was a discussion of the fence height and it was noted that the members feel the fence as proposed is a block to the view and is taller than desirable. Julia Celeste made a motion to approve, with changes to the fence from solid 6 foot fence, to a 4' fence with lattice or picket on the top. Plan for fence will be provided to the commission. 2<sup>nd</sup>. Carole Berger. Unanimously Approved.

**Public Hearing: 66 N. Water St. (20D-233) Postponed from 4.19.18. Continued from 5.17.18.** Fred & Lisa Murrell. Patrick Ahearn/agent. Applicant proposes to remove existing garage and guesthouse, add new foundation & add addition to the main house on south side. As this is a continuation, Cari Williamson was added to the panel and Minah and Peter will not discuss or vote on this application as they did not hear the first part of the presentation. Patrick distributed plans with changes from the previous plans. Susan read the Public Hearing Notice Patrick noted that the comments from the board and the abutters and abutter's attorney and described changes, made to the plans, including moving the garage back on the lot by 19'.5" creating a set back or 58 feet from the sidewalk to the face of the garage. Additionally, the existing widows walk and the chimney were discussed, at the previous meeting, and the detail of the widows walk has been 'beefed-up' and an additional chimney added to balance the widows walk. Patrick described the distance from the property line to the edge wing as 14'.2" He noted that most of the massing currently exists. He noted that the addition on the side (right) will be stepped in. On the previous plan the addition had a ridge to match the historic box. Ridge height is lowered and north side of addition is stepped back and described shorter windows, due to abutter concerns for privacy. Existing bay window which projects out on the south will be removed. Patrick compared the volume of the proposed renovation with the abutting Warren House. He noted that the front façade is a restoration with the exception of the widows walk and addition of the 2<sup>nd</sup> chimney.

The hearing was opened for comment. Q: Cassie Bradley: asked about the windows on the S. elevation. Bricque read two letters from abutters from Ed & Kathy Ludwig and Jim and Mary-Kate McKenna. Both letters expressed concerns and were in opposition to the proposed plan; both letters noted the size of the proposed house and garage.

George Brush, attorney for the abutter on the right, the James F. Reynolds Trust, spoke in opposition to the plan. Mr. Brush noted his belief that the site plan, as drawn, is incorrect and contends that the entire addition will be seen from the street. As to mass and scale, Mr. Brush does not think the Warren house should be seen as a precedent. He noted, the house at 66 is a lovely home but the addition is larger than the original structure and the combined mass is substantially larger than the next 4 houses on North Water St. Saying that the house size is inappropriate and that there no reason why this house should be this large, he requested a reduction in size and scale. Mr. Brush further discussed the set back requirements, noting window wells and the overall length of the proposed addition.

Patrick Ahearn, in response, noted his biography as to the large number of renovations he has designed within the HD. He directed his contention that the HDC is restricted by only what can be viewed from a public way and described the views from the public way as it exists today and as depicted on the plan after the renovation and new construction. He contended that the site lines as drawn on the plan are accurate and contended that this project is a matter of right and is not restricted by zoning.

There was a heated 'back and forth' between Mr. Ahearn and Mr. Brush.

Susan opened the hearing for the comments of the commissioners: Cassie Bradley noting concerns regarding the view from the public way and noted that removal of the garage, from this plan, would open the view from the sidewalk. Julia Celeste reiterated that what is currently visible is lost with the planned garage. She noted that a 10 foot side yard is not the same view as the look down the entire lot seeing the green space. Members of the commission concurred that the garage provides a visible barrier which would provide a substantial loss to the view from the public way.

Patrick and commissioners discussed the removal of the current attached garage, in favor of retaining the currently proposed 2 car garage. Cassie asked Mr. Ahearn to address the garage and asked, based on Patrick's assertions of the applicants requiring only a one car garage, "Why not make the 2 car a 1 car garage in its current location?" Patrick discussed a possible change of the garage. He thinks the garage at 58 ft. (from the sidewalk) which is 30 ft. forward of the existing garage is reasonable and noted his belief that if this (garage) was front of a judge, it would be viewed as consistent with bylaws. Mr. Ahearn further argued his case for the house and garage, as drawn. Cassie Bradley in discussing the characteristics of North Water St. noted her vision that the retention of the garage in its current location or its removal and reconstruction as a one car garage, in the current garage location, is more consistent with neighboring houses on North Water St.

Susan Catling discussed tourism in Edgartown and the perspective of visitors with regard to the landmark streets of Edgartown, especially North Water Street. Susan noted the value of the "Walking Village" is not just the front facades of the stately homes but also the gardens, green spaces, flower boxes, fences and related structures and plantings creating a "shared purpose of place creating a meaningful reason for residents and visitors to experience and lay claim this place". Susan read from Learning from the Vineyard, paraphrasing from the summary titled 'Minor Place of the Car,' "One of the distinguishing features of the Island is the minor visual presence of the car. This is probably an important aspect of the Vineyard's appeal to summer people as an escape from their winter environments and one of the many "Island-like" qualities of which Islanders are proud and justly protective. Design can solve the problem of accommodating the undeniably necessary vehicles without allowing them to establish the character of a place (through siting or by providing for a density of houses which can visually predominate over the presence of streets and cars). It seems a shame to allow development which could exist anywhere to occur on an island with such a heritage and distinctive tradition of place."

Susan Catling asked for the sq. footage changes and was told that the sq. ft. increase is 648 sq. ft. given the inclusion of the sq. ft. in the addition, from the reduction in size of the garage and removal of guest house. Mr. Brush suggested that the HDC have a discussion with Town Council given Mr. Ahearn's reference to litigation. Mr. Brush further noted that window wells may protrude into setback and the plan does not address the placement of mechanicals.

Mr. Ahearn said that he needs to discuss these concerns and suggestions with his client and requested a further continuance to discuss the project with his clients. Julia Celeste made the Motion to continue until the next meeting on 6.21.18 to include another site visit. 2<sup>nd</sup>, Cassie Bradley. Unanimously approved to continue with a site visit prior to the continuation of the hearing.

**84 Peases. (20B-59)** John and Cyndy O'Hara. Continued from 5.17.18 Patrick Ahearn/agent . **House:** Applicant proposes to add 1,645 sq. ft. addition at rear, relocate bay window, add 215 sq. ft., entry porch add Nantucket dormer at rear, south and north side. Add new basement foundation, new wood roof and cedar siding, brick veneer foundation, new chimney, Pella windows. **Barn:** New doors, dormers, windows, cedar roof. **Cottage:** New French doors, windows, wood roof, siding, shutters throughout (Application has been forwarded for Public Hearing on 6.21.18). There was a site visit prior to this hearing. This application was heard at 6:00 and "out of order". Patrick Ahearn displayed the plans for the cottage. Ms. O'Hara was in attendance. Patrick showed existing cottage and plans. Plans for the changes were discussed. The rear of the house will be extended 8 feet. Site plan was displayed and changes noted. Dormers and roof and South side all visible from the public way. The plan includes a 8x20' addition to the house, with a total addition of 164 Sq. Ft. at the rear. There is 12 sq. ft bay window

with a plan for relocation of one bay and a stoop. Windows pattern planned to be more consistent. There will be a basement, with brick foundation & brick chimneys. All the ceilings are lower than code thus the swoop up of roof by 8 ft. Barn unique detail will remain as is, with the existing door to be replaced with 2 doors and a simple gable window. Plans were discussed in detail. The goal is to preserve the cottage with a modest addition and there is no change to the bedroom count. Patrick noted that the barn is not changed, as to size. Fence stays and parking stays as it is. He described the project as mostly a restoration. The house will be lifted but put back at the same height 19' to the ridge. Fireplace is planned to be put in what is believed to be its original space. Current chimney will be removed in favor of the new chimney (not the same location).

Q: Carole asked about the garage/barn. A: Mimicking the barn door. Carole noted the current barn exterior is unique and would be a shame to change the façade. Cassie asked about a possible change from 2 doors to one door (barn). Cassie noted her thought that this plan takes away from the current barn style and detail. Mrs. O'Hara discussed her interior space preferences. Peter Rosbeck asked about the possibility of 2 sliding barn doors, one sliding behind the other and keeping the hayloft door. This will allow access to both sides, but one at a time. Discussion ensued and there was an agreement that a sliding set of barn doors would be a benefit to the plan and Mrs. O'Hara agreed that it would work for her. Patrick noted as did Ms. O'Hara that this is an agreeable solution. Susan, noting concerns, asked about the proportion of the dormers on the barn. Patrick noted that they could use the same gable dormer as on the house or shed dormer reducing the size. There was a discussion about 2 or 3/ 6 light windows on a small dormer with the roof reading as more dominant and the dormer secondary. He described a possible shed dormer of approx. 6' long by 18 inches high with 2-3 small awning windows. Mr. Ahearn drew a sketch on the plan of the facade. It was noted that this would create more of a "pure barn" look. The hayloft door will remain as existing. The color of the barn was discussed. The plan was to shingle the barn with natural shingles, left to weather. However, the majority of the members of the commission would prefer to see the barn remain white. Cari agreed that the keeping of white color is good idea and noted that this barn is unique in both style and color and that uniqueness contributes to the whole. Motion to continue Cassie. 2<sup>nd</sup>, Julia. Unanimously voted to continue.

**58 S. Summer (20D-145)** Thomas Mac Cowatt. Reade Milne/agent. Change to approved plan. Applicant proposes to add a small section of fence between garage and neighboring property. Applicant did not appear. Application will be rescheduled to a future hearing.

**104 Main St. (20D-56)** RJH Realty Trust. Chuck Sullivan/agent. Applicant proposes new exterior lighting. Nelson Giannakopoulos, as agent for Mr. Sullivan's office, showed pictures of proposed lighting. Susan Catling asked the dimension of the existing front door side lights. A: The proposed are approximately the same size as was existing. Q: Carole asked about the finish? A: Bronze and clear glass is noted on the specifications. Susan noted that this is a big change and asked why the big change. A: Chosen by Boston Interior designer. Mr. Giannakopoulos said that the current light fixtures are not savable and have been removed. Q: Why is the current fixture un-savable? A: Unknown. Susan noted that the existing is traditional and the new one is quite contemporary. Members commented that the original lanterns are more appropriate to the building. Cari Williamson noted that she does not think these fixtures are appropriate for this facade. She further noted that the interior and exterior are two different things. The designers use of a modern focus on the inside should not be carried through to the traditional front façade of the building. It was suggested to the applicant that he request a continuance to confer with the designers, which he did. Cassie made the motion to continue. Minah 2<sup>nd</sup>. Voted to Continue to 6.21.18. At this point, Julia Celeste left the meeting.

**1 Dock St. (20D-321.1)** Edgartown Yacht Club. Richard Feldman/agent. Change to approved plan. Applicant proposes addition of a roof top deck for public access. Mr. Feldman explained the reason for the addition of the deck as there is a requirement for public access per the State of MA. This is the Yacht Clubs best solution for meeting this requirement. This access was chosen as a remedy as it is located on the reception office which is not part of the historic building, and provides a view toward Chappy Point. The DEP requires each parcel to contribute to the public access. This deck is very small as compared to the Memorial Wharf and does not impact the historic parts of the building. The Certificate of Appropriateness from EHDC is critical for moving the project forward. Susan noted her thoughts that the deck looks appropriate on the building and the commissioners concurred. Peter Rosbeck made the motion to approve. Carol Berger provided the 2<sup>nd</sup>. Approved.

**1 Pierce Lane (20D-80)** Giordano. Ted Rosbeck/agent. Applicant proposes wood and metal pool fence. Peter Rosbeck is recused as the applicant is his brother. Ted Rosbeck presented the plan for the pool fence, noting a change on the application. Cassie Bradley made the motion to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>, Minah Worley. Approved.

**New/Old Business:**

**Minutes:** Motion to Approve: Cassie Bradley. 2<sup>nd</sup>, Cari Williamson. Approved.

**Lead Paint (Bricque)** There was a brief discussion regarding mitigation when lead paint is noted in a remodel or reconstruction. It was noted that the applicants on Peases Pt. Way S. will be relocating the historic building and are looking for guidance regarding lead paint.

The meeting was Adjourned: @ 6:53

Respectfully submitted:

Bricque Garber  
Assistant

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ 6.21.18  
*Christopher Scott, Chairman*