

**Historical Review Board
Truro, Massachusetts
Meeting Minutes**

Saturday, October 17, 2015

Hearing Location: Truro Public Library, Cobb Conference Room

Present for the Historical Review Board: Matt Kiefer, David Perry, David Kirchner, Fred Todd

Present for the Historical Commission: Richard Larkin, Robin Robertson

Present for the Applicant: Margaret Sovek, Hillary Kerry, Brian Enyedy, Chris McGrath (Pine Harbor Wood Products)

Also Present: Beckman Rig, abutter, 42A Castle Road

Hearing to Review Demolition Delay for Property 'Over the Top', Unit #8 of Sladeville Condominiums located at 42 Castle Road, Truro was opened by Chairman Kiefer at 2:00 PM.

Mr. Kiefer reviewed the Historic Preservation By-Law and the role of the Historic Review Board to 'hold public hearings on demolition permit applications to determine if the intended demolition would be detrimental to the historical, cultural or architectural heritage of the Town; whether the work proposed will materially diminish the building or structure's significance to the Town's heritage; and to explore alternatives to demolition.' He noted that the Sladeville cottages came under the Board's review because they are significant buildings due to being constructed over 75 years ago and are part of district eligible for listing on the State or National Register of Historic places.

Mrs. Sovek explained the proposed project and background. Sladeville cottages were purchased by the Ghebelin family from the heirs of Caleb Slade in approximately 1965 with the intention of keeping the group of cottages which date from 1890 in operation. Mrs. Sovek and two siblings inherited the property in 1998 and continued to operate it as a seasonal cottage colony. In 2010, the colony was reorganized as a condominium so that individual cottages could be sold, subject to continued seasonal use and restrictions on any alterations. The Master Deed provided that Unit #8 could be demolished and rebuilt due to its deteriorated condition. Mrs. Sovek signed a Purchase and Sale agreement for Unit #8 subject to approval by the condominium association's approval of a plan to demo and rebuild the unit. Approval was obtained and she purchased the property on September 18, 2015.

Mrs. Sovek and her builder, Mr McGrath, presented plans (site plan by Slade Associates, building plans by Pine Harbor) for the demolition and replacement. In their determination, the structure was too crudely built and too deteriorated to make reconstruction feasible. They proposed a new 2 bedroom, 1 bath cottage with a footprint of 20 x 28 feet with a reverse floor plan — living area on the upper floor, bedrooms on the lower floor, like the current "Over the Top" structure. If possible, a full basement will be built. The building would have a 12 pitch roof, 2 over 2 windows, exterior shingle siding similar to the two adjacent cottages on the south side, and pine paneling and beadboard on the interior walls (similar to other Sladeville cottages). The unit will not be heated (three-season use only). A deck is proposed off the east elevation, off the living area. The location of the cottage would be shifted to the east and roof gables will align with the other cottages. The new

location will allow better organization of the on-site parking and protect views from the cottages on either side.

Questions and discussion followed the presentation of the plan. The abutter, Mr. Rig, was supportive of the proposed construction and incidentally thought the parking and access would be improved as a result. Mr. Perry questioned further about the feasibility of reconstruction, perhaps demolishing the garage portion and saving the rear section Mr. McGrath explained that the whole structure was compromised, from inadequate foundation on up, and that the floor plan was contorted.

Mr. Kiefer summarized the issues under consideration. The building dated from 1890 and was part of a significant complex, although it was heavily altered and was not typical of the design of the other cottages. He asked about looking more closely at saving the building, and if not, whether the replacement was consistent with the remaining structures. He noted that, in this case, the building was visible not only from the road but from the river and that should be taken into account.

Mr. Perry was generally in favor of the replacement but suggested some consideration of more details including a small hip downturn at the gable ends to make the new building more in keeping with the irregular rooflines of the other cottages; he spoke in favor of the new position of the building on the site and how it reinforced the alignment of the other cottages. Mr. Kiefer asked about the proportion of the dormers. Mr. McGrath indicated willingness to consider the suggestions. Ms. Robertson questioned the reverse floor plan. The owner liked keeping with the 'over the top' arrangement. Mr. Larkin asked about insulation; a minimal amount is proposed for the exterior skin of the building, unadorned the shingle siding. Mr. Todd also asked about the reverse floor plan and whether a more developed patio off a first floor living area would be preferable to the second level deck. Mr. McGrath thought maybe addition of a screened in porch at the first floor with deck above would be an improvement.

Mr. Kiefer asked board members whether they thought asking the applicant to come back with revised plan would be warranted. Members thought it would not be necessary.

Mr. Todd made a motion in the matter of Unit #8 that the Board elect not to impose a demolition delay, finding that the existing structure was not suitable for renovation or reconstruction and that the proposed replacement was appropriately designed to be compatible with the surrounding Sladeville cottages and that the new site plan reinforced the overall harmony of the colony. The motion was seconded by Mr Perry.

Voted in favor: Kiefer, Perry, Kirchner and Todd.

Other Business:

Demolition ByLaw notification procedures.

Paragraph 6-5-4 of the Preserving Historic Properties ByLaw outlines the requirements for publication of notice of time, place and subject matter of any proposed Historic Review Board hearing. While the newspaper advertising section of the paragraph is consistent with other Town boards, the remainder of the paragraph about notification of abutters has been confusing. After discussion, Mr. Todd made a motion to recommend to the Town that the demo delay by-law be

amended to clarify the notice provision to require the applicant to notify abutters in accordance with Chapter 40A of the General Laws. If revised, the Review Board notification process will be similar to provisions of the ZBA, Planning Board and Conservation Commission requirements and clarify that the applicant is responsible for obtaining the list of certified abutters, abutters to abutters and owners across a public way from the applicant's property and for sending the notices by certified mail, return receipt, and demonstrating that they have done so. Exact wording will be drafted and submitted to the Town for consideration. Mr. Perry seconded.

Voted in favor: Kiefer, Perry and Todd; not present, Kirchner.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 PM.

Signed,



Frederick Todd



MATTHEW J. KIEFER, CHAIR

