



BOX 1447, OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS, 02557, 508-693-3453,  
FAX 508-693-7894 INFO@MVCOMMISSION.ORG WWW.MVCOMMISSION.ORG

## Martha's Vineyard Commission

### DRI 675 - Westman/29 Franklin Historic Demolition

### MVC Staff Report – 2017-05-18

Note: New information is printed in bold type.

#### 1. DESCRIPTION

---

- 1.1 Applicant:** William Westman and Cees Van Eijk
- 1.2 Project Location:** 29 Franklin St., Vineyard Haven, MA (Map 7N Lot 5 – 0.115 acres)
- 1.3 Proposal:** To be permitted to demolish a house in Tisbury built in at least 1850 (possible earlier).
- 1.4 Zoning:** Residential.
- 1.5 Surrounding Land Uses:** Residential, Village Cemetery, Methodist Church; Tennis Courts.
- 1.6 Permits:** Demolition Permit; Building Permit; Board of Health; Zoning Board of Appeals (for demolition, reconstruction and expansion of a pre-existing non-conforming structure).
- 1.7 Project History:** The building was built in at least 1850 (possible earlier) in a Greek Revival farm house style. It has been in the Look family for a long time. Before that it was in the Luce family. The interior of the building has been gutted.
- 1.8 Project Summary:**
- The proposal is to demolish a house in Tisbury built in at least 1850 (possibly earlier).
  - The Applicant has plans to build a similar style house on the footprint with dormers and a **816 sf addition {2(24' X 15') = (12' X 8')}**
  - The Applicant has said he and his partner originally intended to restore the house but when they got inside and began removing plaster and paneling found the house to be too far gone.
  - The Building is outside of the William Street Historic District by 2 houses.
  - The house is not listed on the Massachusetts Historic Commission M.A.C.R.I.S. site.
  - **The Applicant met with the William Street Historic District (WSHD) on May 3, 2017.**
  - **The Applicant has made the following modifications to the plans since the first MVC public hearing and his meeting with the WSHD:**
    - Lowered the ridge height on the addition by approximately 1.5 feet.
    - Roof pitch on reconstructed main building is 12 over 10 with 12 over 5 dormers.
    - Roof pitch on subordinate addition is 12 over 8 with 12 over 5 dormers
    - Removed door on Center Street where bulkhead is.
    - Re-using original door jamb.
    - Will install 6 over 6 windows.
    - Will install shutters on the front of the house.
  - The WSHD, which is advisory to the BOS for projects outside the WSHD, submitted the following: **"The THC recommended Conditional Approval for demolition of the property ... pending implementation of design changes suggested and accepted during the meeting of the THC. Final approval of the design changes and exterior details must be approved by the Tisbury Historical Commission prior to the issuance of a demolition permit."**
  - **WSHD Recommendations Conditions:**
    - *The applicant will catalog exterior trim details with photography and full scale tracings and submit to the THC prior to demolition. These details will include: window and door sill, casing, headers, soffit, fascia, rake, frieze and crown moldings, clap board and wood shingle exposure as these will be replicated in the new building.*

- *The applicant will provide the THC finalized plans with roof slope and design emulating the modest [seaman's] Greek Revival homes that are of similar design within the William Street Historic District.*
- *The applicant will reduce the size of the second floor windows, make them smaller than the first floor windows, and submit for approval by the THC.*
- *The applicant will modify the addition making it subordinate to the main house by lowering the ridge while maintaining the same roof slope on both the main house and the addition. The implementation of small dormers will be entertained by the THC to accommodate expanded headroom. The new design will be submitted to the THC for approval.*
- *The applicant will work on redesigning the Center Street elevation to reduce the mass of the shed dormer. Discussions included a Nantucket style dormer or multiple dormers. The applicant will submit a new design for THC approval.*
- *The Franklin Street elevation of the main house will receive white painted clapboards with an exposure no greater than 3-1/2". The remaining elevations will receive wood shingles with an exposure not to exceed 5". The applicant may leave the shingles natural or stain them white.*
- *The roof will be completed with GAF Timberline or equal black, slate or gray asphalt shingles.*

## 2. ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY

---

- 2.1 **DRI Referral:** The Tisbury Zoning Board of Appeals.
- 2.2 **DRI Trigger:** 8.2ii (Demolition of a building over 100 years old); a Concurrence Review.
- 2.3 **LUPC:** February 2, 2017. February 14, 2017.
- 2.4 **Public Hearing:** Determined to be necessary March 16, 2017. P.H. April 13, 2017; **continued to May 18, 2017.**

## 3. PLANNING CONCERNS

---

### 3.1 Some Key Issues

- Is this house too historically significant and structurally sound enough to allow being demolished?
- **Do the revised plans** (May 17, 2017) for the replacement house fit the style and materials of the historic building **and neighborhood?**

## 4. CORRESPONDENCE

---

- 4.1 **Public: Chris Baer** has written that he is very sad to hear that the historic house previously owned by Doug Look and originally owned by Fred C. Luce is proposed to be demolished. **Dana Hodsdon** wrote in April of the significance of this historic house which is part of the second wave of houses in early Tisbury. He asks that the MVC return the review to the Tisbury Historic Commission (The Applicant subsequently went to the WSHD). **Hyung Suk Lee** has written urging the Commission to reject the demolition of this important example of early Holmes Hole and make the applicant perform a proper restoration. **Hyung Suk Lee** has submitted a sketch which shows a reduced building envelope based on his interpretation that if you voluntarily demolish a building you surrender the pre-existing non-conforming setbacks. **Jeffrey and Wendy Lott** of Center Street have written that though they support preservation they are convinced this building cannot be saved. They add that new construction should observe the 20' setback.