

Edgartown Planning Board Meeting
Tuesday, January 20, 2015 at 5:30 PM
Minutes

Members in Attendance: Chairman Fred Mascolo, Robert Cavallo, Michael McCourt, and Robert Sparks

Members Absent: Alan Wilson and James Cisek, Alternate

Staff in Attendance: Georgiana Greenough, Assistant; and Lucy Morrison, Clerk

Chairman Fred Mascolo called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

6:00 PM: Tiedtke, Philip. 41 Dunham Rd (29B-70) SP: Coastal District. Construct a 6'8" x 10' widows walk on a roof between two pre-existing chimneys on a pre-existing non-conforming lot.

In Attendance: Gerret Conover

Mr. Conover approached the Board. Mr. Mascolo stated that only four of the Board members are present, and that the application would need a unanimous vote to be approved. Mr. Conover stated that he understood and asked to proceed.

The primary dwelling on the property was built in 1966. The homeowners were before the Board last year to request a special permit for an addition that has since occurred. The application presently before the Board is to construct a widows walk.

Mr. Conover displayed photographs of other widows walks in town. He used the historical examples to examine the aesthetics. The proposal has advantages, the roof pitch of the home is shallow, and there are two existing chimneys. They are both 4 ½ feet tall on the short side, 6 feet tall on the high side, with a width of 42 inches. One of the chimneys is active; the other is a dummy with fake bricks and stucco. The widows walk would run for the 10 feet separating the chimneys, and would extend out 6 feet 8 inches to provide a small platform.

The access to the widows walk would be through a pop-up trap door in the attic. The door would be galvanized and flush with the deck. The access would not be seen from the ground.

Mr. Conover displayed other photographs to show different railing options. The Board agreed that the options chosen by the applicants are the best fit for the house.

Mr. Mascolo asked about the depth to the floor and the height of the railing. He also commented on how he liked how the view would be blocked from the side.

Mr. Conover stated that the skirting will be flush with the roof, with ¾ of an inch for drainage. Mr. Conover and the Board agreed that when the skirting is not flush with the roof, it is aesthetically displeasing.

Mr. Sparks commented that the building code mandates a maximum of a four-inch gap between the spiles that make up the railing. Mr. Conover noted that the code for widows walks is the same as an enclosed porch.

Mr. Conover stated that he has discussed the application with the neighbors and there have been no problems or concerns.

There were no letters to be read and no one present in the audience to speak.

Chairman Mascolo closed the public hearing at 6:13 PM.

Mr. Cavallo stated that he was in favor of the application.

Mr. Sparks stated that he was in favor of the application because the plan conforms to other houses on the Edgartown waterfront and the historic whaling captain's houses. He suggested conditioning the application to be aesthetically similar to __[insert address of property here]___ in terms of being spatially centered between the chimneys, with spirit boards flush with the roof, and with the platform built into the roof.

Mr. McCourt asked about the height of the railing. Mr. Conover stated that the building code requires at least four feet, but with the depressed platform the railings will be three feet tall.

Mr. Mascolo noted that the widows walk appeared to make the house more symmetrical.

The Board commented that the recessing the structure into the roof is historically appropriate for the house.

Mr. Sparks moved to approve the special permit for the construction of a widows walk with the picture attached as a guideline for aesthetics in terms of height, size and scale, the depression into the roof. Mr. Sparks stated that the proposal conforms to other houses and there is no detriment to the neighborhood. Mr. McCourt seconded, and the application was approved unanimously, 4-0.

Mr. Mascolo stated that he was happy that to add a widows walk to a waterfront property, to preserve the historical feel of downtown.

Ms. Greenough mentioned the decision of the Mullen Way subdivision. The Board discussed whether or not the open space counts as a lot. It has been the perception of the Board that developments of nine lots and open space did not trigger the MVC review. Mr. Mascolo stated adamantly that the Edgartown Boards are capable of handling the application, and that it should not be sent on to the MVC for review.

The next Planning Board meetings were scheduled for February 10th and March 10th at 5:30 PM.

Mr. Sparks moved to adjourn. Mr. McCourt seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lucy Morrison

Clerk