

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, September 6, 2018

Members in attendance: Christopher Scott – Chairman, Susan Catling, Cassie Bradley, Julia Celeste, Ken Magnuson, Peter Rosbeck & Edith Blake. Staff: Bricque Garber.

Chairman Scott opened the meeting at 4:09 PM and provided information about the public hearing process, outlining the procedure for review and public comment.

4:00 – 66 Main St. (20D-125) Town of Edgartown. Christopher Celeste & Dudley Cannada/agents. Applicants propose renovation and reconstruction of the Capt. Pease House AKA the Yellow House, including an addition to the Historic House and reconstruction of the small building on the property. The application was heard by the HDC on August 9, 2018 and referred for a public hearing on Sept. 6, 2018. There was a site visit for this application on 8.23.18. Julia Celeste is recused from hearing this application, and left the room. Mr. Cannada noting the visibility of the house on two primary public Edgartown Streets, in the center of the Historic District, stressed the historic significance of the building. Noting the poor condition of the 2.5 story building, having been vacant for 10+ years, he provided plans and specifications for the proposed work to the members of the Commission. Sean Murphy attended along with Mr. Celeste, Dudley Cannada and Gerret Conover. As Mr. Cannada was displaying the plans, Mr. Hall stood to dispute the validity of meeting and was advised by the Chairman that he was out of order (and was advised to sit down) until such time as the hearing was open for public comment.

Christopher Celeste spoke first. He read the first paragraph of the RFP and described their response to the RFP and the desire to complete this project as a town project and described all the members, of the application team, as having strong interest in the vibrancy of downtown Edgartown. Dudley Cannada, the architect for the project, displayed drawings and photos. Mr. Cannada reviewed the history which he believes may pre-date the 1805 date listed in the Walking Tour handbook and MACRIS, believing that the date is more likely 1750-1775. The building contains approx. 2300 sq. ft. The small building, previously a retail space, is approximately 550 sq. ft and was built in 2003. Mr. Cannada noted that the present condition of

the house requires significant reconstruction as it is in disrepair and much is not repairable. Noted that the building has had significant façade alterations over the years, he explained that some are inconsistent with the historic structure. Mr. Cannada noted purpose of this plan is to address the buildings only, saying that any parking lot and hardscape plans may be addressed in the future but that the parking lot and land area remain under the purview of the Town. Noting that every façade is very visible and each is addressed in the plan, he introduced the existing facades and the planned alterations and renovations to all of the four façades. Noting that the current roof is asphalt, not a historic material, he further noted missing windows and aluminum clad storm windows. The roof will be replaced with Red Cedar shingles.

There are bay windows that were installed within the last 40 years and they are not historic in character or material. The majority of the doors are not original and will be replaced with doors that are historically appropriate. Due to significantly deferred maintenance, the cedar shingle siding on three sides (Summer St. side is clapboard) has passed its useful life. The Summer St., clapboard side, of the house will receive new wood clapboards, to be painted yellow, as is the historic color. All alterations will meet current code requirements and have been designed to preserve the historic character of the house. He described gutters, historic trim detail, downspouts and shutters. Windows to be Marvin, STDL (simulated true divided light.) The chimney will be added as was shown in photographs. The parking lot side will have a fenced area for trash. A shed dormer is proposed as simple shed dormer. The applicant noted that the proposed rehab of the house represents the least degree of intervention possible. Features that are historically significant that can be repaired, will be repaired and those that are missing or cannot be repaired will be replaced in kind or where not feasible, with a compatible substitute material that effectively reproduces the historic features and will not radically change or obscure the character of the historic house.

Mr. Cannada described the one-story addition as compatible with the rest of the house, but is subordinate to the house and was designed to not compete with the primary façade. The addition is designed in a way so that it is differentiated enough so that it is not confused as being original. There will be a central door in the addition. All existing 20th century doors will be removed and replaced with more historically accurate doors. The set back, of the new addition from the historic Main St. façade is 3 ft. and proposed addition is one story. The addition adds approximately 700 square feet of commercial space. A small terrace is planned for the mechanicals and will not have a railing. All windows will remain in the same place with few exceptions.

The little building will be removed and replaced with the building that is 5 ft. wider than the existing. Mr. Cannada described this as an important building in this location that affects a softening and partial blocking of the parking lot. The little building style is Greek revival and is planned to be white clapboard on the front and

cedar shingles on the sides and back. Mr. Cannada completed his presentation and the commissioners were asked for questions and comments.

Q: Edith Blake asked about the interior walls and her desire to see some of the original construction around the windows, asking if that is possible. A: It is possible that some will remain, noting that some of the 3rd floor is structurally intact. There is a plan to retain such historic materials as can be retained including some beams and exterior doors.

Q: Why is there a door with access to the roof? A: Access the mechanicals but there is a small roof deck that is not intended for residential use.

Q: What is the total proposed square footage? A: All together, approximately twice that of the existing.

Q: Why 2nd floor dormers? A: The two story design is in concert with other 2 story buildings on the street and provides head room for the living spaces.

Q: Will there be a basement? A: We are not presenting a basement plan today but there is planned basement space. The addition of a basement and the one story addition are necessary to insure the continued use of the house. The basement will not change the look of the house.

Mr. Scott opened the meeting to the public asking for input in favor of the project? There was a letter, in favor, from the Board of Trade read to the members.

Mr. Scott opened the hearing to any opposition. Stacy Wallace provided her resume and questioned some additions as to their value in a multi-generational history of the building, including the small building and said that she views the plan as very different from the existing building. Christopher Celeste said that the small building will be offered for reuse.

Mr. Ben Hall, Jr. attended the public hearing and raised a number of issues many of which are not within the purview of the HDC, including: whether the Board of Selectmen made procedural errors in connection with the taking of the Property; whether the Town improperly used Community Preservation Act funds; whether the Town must record a historic/conservation restriction on the property; whether the HDC hearing is proper and whether there will be potential damage to the shade tree on Main St. He suggested that the HDC did not have jurisdiction over the application and the HDC did not follow proper procedure in that the HDC should swear witness and record the proceedings. Further, Mr. Hall claimed that the previous owner (he described himself as a previous owner) was required to reconstruct the small building as a replica of the addition that was once attached to the main house. He questioned handicap access on the current plan. Saying he was referring to Massachusetts law,

Mr. Hall maintained that Secretary of the Interior Standards are being violated and wants the HDC to be on notice. He further said that any changes to the building should be denied as it is owned by the government and the requirements of the law are not met, there is no lease and the use cannot be changed. In conclusion, Mr. Hall claimed that Christopher Scott, HDC Chairman and Gerret Conover, contractor for the applicant, have conflicts of interest because they participated on town committees which "evaluated" the property.

Regarding the history of the building, Mr. Hall agreed that the building was one story and a first floor was added (noting that the island wood, used in construction, creates historic artifacts). The newer windows were added in the 70's the right hand door is the historic entrance location. The left hand door was added in the 70's. He said that the 'L' of the building has historic importance (walking tour) and oral tradition notes that this 'L' was the original Methodist meeting house, or may have been the little building, but was probably the 'L'. Mr. Hall said that in 2003 the little building was planned to be moved, but was subsequently demolished, and the HDC required he rebuild a replica, with a change to include slightly heavier overhangs. He said that the current windows and doors match the original summer kitchen (current small building) exactly. He wrapped up his comments, on the small building, saying that the structure must be preserved.

Christopher Scott, Chairman of the HDC said that that is the opinion of the Town of Edgartown, Town Counsel that this commission does have jurisdiction to hear and vote on this application and that the Commission is not required to record the proceedings or swear witnesses. Mr. Scott noted that he was selected by the HDC to represent the HDC on the yellow house committee, which was an advisory position and had no statutory function and his presence on that committee bears no influence upon the decision of the HDC regarding this application and there is no conflict of interest. Mr. Scott noted that most of Mr. Hall's objections do not fall within the purview of the HDC. Mr. Scott noted that Mr. Conover's role in any previous committee does not create any influence in connection with this application.

Dudley Cannada said that the applicants are working within the Secretary of the Interior guidelines, and noted that there will be 2 handicap entrances to retail space. They are proposing to slightly lower the entrances to facilitate handicap access. Doors are 3'6" wide and all retail will be handicap accessible. Sean Murphy, Attorney for the applicants rebutted Mr. Hall's assertions and perceives Mr. Hall's arguments as disingenuous. Mr. Murphy said that HDC can vote, given the bylaws, and requested that the vote be taken. Further noting that the Hall family had multi-generation opportunities to address the repairs and restoration needed at the Yellow House. Christopher Scott said that he sees no reason for the vote to be postponed or continued and thinks that the vote can be taken tonight. He noted that any vote will be conditioned on the approval of the town council and any other boards or commissions having jurisdiction over the project.

There being no further comment from the public, Mr. Scott closed the Public Hearing. The meeting was turned to the commissioner for comments. Susan Catling noted that there is no provision in the guidelines to require that a building's use be maintained as its original use. She noted that residential and commercial use is important and contributes to the vitality of the town. Susan said that this house is a historically significant building based upon its age, features and style and location, and is an important example of a historic Colonial building in the central part of the Historic District. The proposed alterations to the existing façade and exterior features will enhance rather than detract from its historic qualities. Ms. Catling further discussed the adherence to the Secretary of Interior Guidelines and Standards, noting that this is an example of Adaptive Reuse, a phrase that is seen throughout the Guidelines and she can see no example of this project being in conflict with the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Christopher Scott noted that any issues raised, by Mr. Hall, other than those under the purview of the HDC should be referred to Town Counsel.

Mr. Scott said that each façade is highly visible and are all planned facades are consistent with preservation of the historic structure. He said that the one-story addition will not have a negative impact on the historic structure and that preservation and restoration of the house, so visible from several public ways, will serve to preserve and protect the distinctive characteristics of buildings, of historical significance to the town as described in the HDC bylaw. Preservation and restoration of the house will enhance the experience of the visitors to the town. The planned one story addition is subordinate to the historic house and materials and scale are consistent and adequate to meet the guidelines and practices of the HDC regarding additions. The restoration of the small building, so that its exterior features and style compliment the house, will advance the purpose of the HDC bylaw and guidelines. Mr. Scott noted, with regard to any previous HDC decision on the small building, that the HDC has the authority to revisit its own prior decisions in the context of a new application. Mr. Scott asked the members if there were any other comments or questions and their being none, called for a motion on the application. Motion to approve the application was made by Susan Catling. 2nd, Edith Blake. Approved Unanimously

4:30 - 73 N. Water St. (20D-289) Brian Mann. Applicant proposes to remove existing mud-room and exterior storage and construct a new addition. There was a site visit prior to this hearing. Mr. Mann presented his plans for the addition to the commissioners. Chris read the PHN. Brian Mann described that he has incorporated several changes to the original plans per discussion at previous meeting specifically the chimneys, noting that the master bath window was reduced, the bay window option was offered in response to the previous meeting discussions regarding the bay

window. He has removed the rear chimney and added 2 chimneys (plans received on 9.12.18) he provided photos of two choices to replace the originally drawn bay window. Chris asked the members for questions. Q: the chimney was not original but do you know there were originally chimneys. A: Yes. Q: Size of the proposed chimneys? A: Drawn as 2 feet. Q: West elevation has no windows? A: No, the West elevation is not visible due to the angle. Discussion ensued and the possibility of a window addition was considered. Q: Is there lighting at the new door on the west elevation. A: Yes, it will match existing lantern at front door. Q: How far is the blank wall from visibility? A: Once the addition is built the blank wall will not be visible from a public way. Right now it is visible. Q: Is there a privacy issue with neighbors? If not, why a blank wall? Chris asked about addition of windows or faux windows for the long blank wall.

It was noted that the site visit marking for the addition was not clear to the members at the site visit as was marked with string. The members discussed the string marker with Mr. Mann. Mr. Mann was not at the site visit as he did not know he should have been there. Q: How far back is the addition from the front façade? A: Will have to measure. Christopher Scott noted concern about the eaves of the house, saying it is a busy house that has been added on to over time. He agrees with Susan Catling that there is confusion regarding the site visit and would like to go back to the site prior to voting on the application. Julia Celeste made a motion to postpone until the meeting on 8.20.18 with another site visit. 2nd, Susan Catling. Voted unanimously to continue, with a site visit at 3:30. Mr. Mann said he will be at the site visit. Continued.

5:00 - 66 N. Water St. (20D-233) Murrell. Patrick Ahearn/agent. Applicant proposes to reconstruct a new rear wing to be zoning compliant, reconstruct a 1 car garage & cabana to replace an existing 2 car garage and guest house. Relocate the new garage & cabana 63'-4" back from the existing 2 car garage & guesthouse into the lot. Restore main house façade, new wood roof and siding and restore widows walk. There was a site visit prior to this hearing. Chris read the Public Hearing Notice.

Mr. Murrell, applicant, was in attendance as was his attorney, David Lyons Mr. Murrell discussed the project and the biography of his family on the Island. Noting that this house is more than a summer place for the family with 4 children, saying that the house will not be a rental and they don't consider themselves visitors.

Mr. Ahearn provided plans to the members and described the project including the oversize of the lot. He read from the notes provided with the application and described the removal of the current garage and the building of a 1 car garage. Lot coverage increases by 831 sq. ft. and minor changes have been made to the plan since the previous meeting, primarily the addition of lawn in the rear of the area designated as the drive way. He noted the proposed mass reflects that of the adjacent buildings and the addition is subordinate to the historic structure. He believes that this plan is

respectful to the neighbors and the 'wing' addition was moved to the south to create the image of the 2nd front. Primary house is dominant. The height of the addition is at the same height of the existing wing. He sees the architecture of the addition as important to the primary façade. Mr. Ahearn displayed the site plan and renditions. The plan was developed to enhance the landscape by addition of open green space with a small brick parking spot for the car. The car will be moved into the garage only when the owners leave the property and the area that would be driveway can be all grass. Trees, including boxwood & holly are added and there will be a, more lush, garden space. OR the alternative is for brick tire path drive to the garage that will have grass between the brick lanes for the tires. Referencing the HDC guidelines the garage is detached and open space is maintained and garden spaces are viewed. The 'wing' is angled to foreshorten the addition, which Mr. Ahearn sees as providing a solution to mass and scale objections. A strong view corridor is seen by enhancing the landscaping with garage set 160 feet back on the lot. He noted that on the North side the current wing is on the property line. The 'wing' is moved in by 10 ft off the property line creating a benefit to the neighbors to the north. He showed neighboring examples of brick drive ways with the grass strip in the center. Building re-detailed to original fenestration. Patrick read an email that was sent to Mr. Wolk, the Warren House abutter and read that Mr. Wolk had replied with an email supportive of the project.

Before asking the members for comment, Christopher Scott asked that the applicant limit presentation comments that do not concern architecture. Q: Susan Catling noted that the historic building is a federal style building and requested that the fenestration be maintained and that the main historic house be retained as clapboard as we have photos showing that the house was clapboard. Susan noted her preference that the drive be maintained as green space. Peter Rosbeck disagrees about the driveway noting weather concerns for maintaining a green lawn to drive over and sees decorative brick driving strips is a preference. Ken Magnuson agrees that driving on the grass, even for limited trips is not a good idea. Christopher Scott agrees with nice visual look of all green but the practical aspect of the brick strips is preferable. Mr. Murrell believes the brick tire strips create a more proper function of the driveway.

The meeting was opened for Public Comment. Speaking in favor of the project: Brian Mann, abutter, spoke to his belief that previous issues that are well addressed in this plan, specifically removal of the large gravel area and the removal of the close/large garage.

Speaking in Opposition: George Brush, attorney for abutter. Mr. Brush noted a primary concern of mass and scale and sees comparisons to the Warren House as not appropriate to this project. He noted that the Warren House was a 16 Bedroom building and was commercial. He maintains that the residential part of the street

starts with this house going north. Mr. Brush said that the the Warren house does not establish a precedent. He said that he has been unable to secure the existing sq. footage and the proposed sq. footage from Mr. Ahearn. He was provided a copy of plans with the changes as provided today. Mr. Brush's client is Charles Brizius. Mr. Brush notes that that this size addition makes the subordination of the addition as "not happening" and noted that house is just too big to meet the HDC guidelines. Patrick said that the Warren house is not perceived to have precedent here. He said that increase in sq. ft. is only 848 sq. ft. Attorney Lyons noted that the Warren house may not be a precedent but by laws discuss the mass of neighboring buildings and the Warren house is a neighbor. Bricque read the letter of Opposition from the Ludwig's. There being no further public comment the Public Hearing is closed.

Christopher Scott noted this project is looked at very closely as it is on N. Water Street and is highly visible on the premiere walking street in the town. He noted that this is an area of extremely large homes. This is a restoration of a historically important building, that while large, if the numbers are correct, adds less than a 900 sq. ft. addition to the mass on the lot. He said that movement from the north property line creates space between buildings and the one car garage moved back on the lot, enhances the open space. Ken Magnuson noted that the size of the house in comparison to Warren House, on the south, may soften the size issue. Cassie Bradley noted the south side façade is so large that it changes the feel of the streetscape and the sense of space is changed from one massive structure, rather than the smaller buildings. Julia Celeste noted the house needs love and appreciates the changes but the mass of the structure is of concern and the addition is very large. Even, given the fact that North Water Street has big houses this addition is so very large and visible. Peter Rosbeck thinks that the changes are appropriate and sees the "back to the drawing board" effort is appreciated in addressing concerns. Susan noted that the lot size is the same as the Brizius and Mann properties. She noted that the side view, of the addition, is so visible due to the way the Warren house and its additions are laid out. Discussion ensued regarding the size and the comparative lots. Peter noting there are many large homes on N. Water apart from the Warren House, sees this as a moderate addition. Chris Scott sees this addition as more attractive than the addition that is existing and the detailing as an improvement while conceding that the existing view is definitely altered.

Christopher Scott made a motion to approve the application with conditions: Clapboard painted white on the main body of the house, North and South facades and federal/colonial style, flat, corner boards. Driveway to be antique brick strips with grass between. Ken Magnuson provided the 2nd. Voted in favor- Ken, Peter, Susan, Chris. Opposed- Cassie & Julia. Approved.

Old/New Business:

Bricque explained that the VTA is seeking a rep from the HDC for the committee working on the plans for the new electric busses and the infrastructure. Chris Scott agreed to be the HDC representative.

8 Caleb Pond Road - Susan Catling asked the commission to refer the demolition request for this building on Chappy, to the Martha's Vineyard Commission. There was a discussion regarding the historical significance and prominent view of the house. Vote to refer to the MVC was approved with Mr. Rosbeck voting no. Susan will send referral in Bricque's absence.

Minutes: Motion to approve the minutes of 8.23.18. Julia Celeste. 2nd. Cassie Bradley. Approved.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:01

Respectfully submitted:

Bricque Garber, Assistant

Approved: _____ date: October 4, 2018
Susan Catling, Vice -Chairman