



MANCHESTER-BY-THE-SEA
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Town Hall, 10 Central Street
Manchester-by-the-Sea, Massachusetts 01944-1399

MINUTES
MANCHESTER-BY-THE-SEA
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Virtual/Online Meeting January 28, 2021

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Rosemary Costello, Donald Halgren, Tracy Gothie, Richard Smith, and Robert Coppola.

Commissioners Not Present: Joseph Sabella.

Ms. Costello called the Historic District Commission (“HDC”) to Order at 7:05 p.m. Ms. Costello then introduced the Board Commissioners to those in attendance and explained the HDC meeting procedures. Ms. Costello also explained that if the HDC members approve an application and agree to waive the public hearing on an application, the abutters of the applicant's property will receive a Waiver of Public Hearing by US mail and then there is a 10 day appeal period. Once the appeal period is over, the applicant will receive the Certificate of Appropriateness. This process takes approximately two weeks. It is noted that this meeting is a virtual/online meeting and is also being digitally recorded by Ms. Ardolino, the HDC clerk, and the typed minutes represent the permanent record of the Board. The format of the hearing was explained to those in attendance by the Chairman.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Mr. Round introduced the application of **Rosemary Costello** for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic District Commission, or other such relief as may be necessary, to construct new fencing to match existing fencing (white, wood, tongue and groove, six (6)feet high) along the garage side of the property. One existing eight (8) foot long section will be modified from sloping to full height across. The existing three (3) foot high picket fence and gate will be replaced with the same six (6) foot high, white wood, tongue and groove fence and gate. The gate will have lattice at the top. In addition, a new section of fence will run from the tongue and groove fencing between the driveways of 12 Bennett Street and 13 Bridge Street, which will be three (3) feet high, white wood (3 inch plank) picket with a flat rail cap, 24 feet in length. This same style of capped picket fencing will also replace an inexpensive, contemporary, black metal fence that exists in the front of the house, enclosing the planting area, with a gate across the

center entry path, at **12 Bennett Street**, Assessor's Map No. 28, Lot No. 49A, in District G, filed with the Town Clerk on December 28, 2020.

Ms. Costello introduced herself as the applicant and shared photographs of her proposed fencing project on Zoom. Ms. Costello explained the proposed project as follows: There are two components of this project. One is to construct a fence across the front where there is presently a black contemporary iron fence. The iron fence will be replaced with a white, wooden (cedar), 3 foot tall, flat rail picket Story fence with a gate across the front, and cap rail across the top. The second component involves constructing a similar fence (approximately 24 feet long) 3 feet between the driveways at 12 Bennett and 13 Bridge Street. This existing fence which is low with a low gate will be replaced by a new Story fence extended 8 feet across and 6 feet high to the lattice topped gate and then drops to 3 feet, with a lattice topped gate in the middle of this fence to provide better screening of the side yard, which is approximately 10 feet wide and 20 feet to the back fence. The fence will not extend to the garage—there will be a 10 foot space between the fence and the garage. The plan is to begin this project in the early spring.

Our neighbor at 38 Bennett Street liked the look of this proposed style fencing and have a similar fence between their driveways. Our neighbor at 25 Bridge Street has a 6 Foot fence. 28 Bridge Street has a fence between the driveways. Therefore, these types of fences between driveways are already in existence in the Historic District.

Mr. Halgren asked if Ms. Costello would be interested in a composite type fence if there are any of these products that are now improved to the point that they look like real wood, because this type of fence would not deteriorate as quickly as wood. Ms. Costello replied that she didn't see a composite product offered by any of the fence companies.

Mr. Round asked if Ms. Costello's neighbors are aware of this proposed project, and she replied yes, but one of the neighbors raised some objections, but those objections were not related to Historic District Commission Guidelines or purview.

There were no further questions or comments from the HDC members or the public regarding this application.

Mr. Round requested the following motions on the application of **Rosemary Costello** for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic District Commission, or other such relief as may be necessary, to construct new fencing to match existing fencing (white, wood, tongue and groove, six (6) feet high) along the garage side of the property. One existing eight (8) foot long section will be modified from sloping to full height across. The existing three (3) foot high picket fence and gate will be replaced with the same six (6) foot high, white wood, tongue and groove fence and gate. The gate will have lattice at the top. In addition, a new section of fence will run from the tongue and groove fencing between the driveways of 12 Bennett Street and 13 Bridge Street, which will be three (3) feet high, white wood (3 inch plank) picket with a flat rail cap, 24 feet in length. This same style of capped picket fencing will also replace an inexpensive, contemporary, black metal fence that exists in the front of the house, enclosing the

planting area, with a gate across the center entry path, at **12 Bennett Street**, Assessor's Map No. 28, Lot No. 49A, in District G, filed with the Town Clerk on December 28, 2020.

Mr. Halgren made a motion to waive the public hearing on the application of Rosemary Costello, 12 Bennett Street. Ms. Gothie seconded the motion.
Vote: Mr. Round, Mr. Halgren, Ms. Gothie, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Coppola voted unanimously in favor of waiving the public hearing on this application.

Mr. Halgren made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness on the application of Rosemary Costello, 12 Bennett Street. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.
Vote: Mr. Round, Mr. Halgren, Ms. Gothie, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Coppola voted unanimously in favor of approving the Certificate of Appropriateness on this application.

Ms. Costello introduced the application of **Jennifer D. Gilligan, RN, Cove Aesthetics** for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a business sign to be added to the Elm Street Sign. The sign is a 12" x 72" x 1/2" MDO double-sided sign, painted to match existing signs with black high performance vinyl lettering capital letter height 5.5" attached to existing posts with aluminum two ear bracket, at **1 Elm Street**, Assessor's Map No.53, Lot No. 23 in District G, filed with the Town Clerk on January 14, 2021.

Jennifer D. Gilligan, RN, from Cove Aesthetics introduced herself as the applicant and explained the proposed business sign as follows: Ms. Gilligan stated that she has been operating Cove Aesthetics for approximately 2 years at 13 Elm Street; however, people were having difficulty finding Cove Aesthetics, so she has decided to hang her sign with the other signs on the Elm Street Sign. The sign is designed by Christine Lebell of Lebell Signs. The sign is a 12" x 72" x 1/2" MDO double-sided sign, painted to match the existing signs hanging on the 1 Elm Street Sign. The background of the sign is painted white, with black high performance vinyl lettering. The capital letter height is 5.5" attached to existing posts with aluminum two ear bracket with a black painted bird silhouette located on the left of the sign before the lettering. This sign is in harmony with the other signs.

Ms. Costello asked Mr. Nathan Desrosiers, P.E., Town Engineer & Facilities Manager for the Manchester-by-the-Sea Department of Public Works to comment on whether or not the Elm Street Sign will be affected by the proposed roadway/bridge/fence outside Seaside 1. Mr. Desrosiers replied that this sign will have to be taken down temporarily during the project, but will be returned approximately 8 to 10 feet from its original location and further down on Elm Street.

There were no further questions or comments from the HDC members or the public regarding this application.

Ms. Costello requested the following motions on the application of **Jennifer D. Gilligan, RN, Cove Aesthetics** for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a business sign to be added to the Elm Street Sign. The sign is a 12" x 72" x 1/2" MDO double-sided sign, painted to match existing signs with black high performance vinyl lettering capital letter

height 5.5” attached to existing pots with aluminum two ear bracket, at **1 Elm Street**, Assessors Map No.53, Lot No. 23 in District G, filed with the Town Clerk on January 14, 2021.

Mr. Smith made a motion to waive the public hearing on the application of Jennifer D. Gilligan, RN, Cove Aesthetics, 1 Elm Street. Mr. Round seconded the motion. Vote: Ms. Costello, Mr. Round, Mr. Halgren, Ms. Gothie, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Coppola voted unanimously in favor of waiving the public hearing on this application.

Mr. Halgren made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness on the application of Jennifer D. Gilligan, RN, Cove Aesthetics, 1 Elm Street. Mr. Round seconded the motion. Vote: Ms. Costello, Mr. Round, Mr. Halgren, Ms. Gothie, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Coppola voted unanimously in favor of approving the Certificate of Appropriateness on this application.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Presentation by Mr. Nathan Desrosiers, P.E., Town Engineer & Facilities Manager for the Manchester-by-the-Sea Department of Public Works: Review of the culvert design items for the roadway/bridge/fence outside Seaside 1. Mr. Desrosiers introduced Daniel Murphy and Brian Brenner the consulting engineers from Tighe & Bond and explained as follows: We have been in the process of obtaining all our required environmental permits and during this time we have come up with a better solution regarding the guardrails and how we can safely construct these guardrails, especially on the north side (Elm Street side). The guardrail to be constructed on south side of the culvert is fairly straightforward and located between Sea Side 1 and Black Arrow and address the HDC members' concern regarding the overall aesthetics of the guardrails and we have explored the options available by Mass DOT.

Mr. Desrosiers explained that Dan Murphy and Brian Brenner of Tighe & Bond have been reviewing traffic data and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation ("Mass DOT") regulations. The plan is to request that Mass DOT waive the crash guardrail on the north side. Mr. Murphy explained that the Manchester-by-the-Sea ("MBTS") Police Department reports that the traffic in that section of Central Street is approximately 7,000 vehicles/day with an average speed of 23 mph, making it a low volume/low speed road. Mass DOT shows no crashes at this intersection during 2017-2019, so there is a low probability of a vehicle departing the roadway in this area. The proposal is to remove the bridge barrier rail, leave the fence on the north side of the bridge and the regular barrier on the south side of the bridge. Mr. Brenner explained that our opinion is that the south side of the bridge should have a more substantial barrier and we will be meeting with Mass DOT for the Chapter 85 Bridge review, so it is important for us to show the crash resistant barrier on the south side of the bridge. Mr. Halgren suggested and Ms. Gothie agreed that a substantial wooden rail would be more appropriate for a small town like MBTS. Mr. Brenner replied that Mass DOT doesn't have a crash rated wooden rail, but only crash rated rail designs that we can select from. Mr. Brenner shared a photo of the S3-TL3 and S3-TL4 options. The S3-TL4 ornamental

black iron fence that could be considered to replace the existing chain link fence on Elm Street. Mr. Round suggested that both fences should have a matching black finish. Mr. Brenner stated that the application for this project has passed the state test and we will move on to national approval. Mr. Desrosiers stated that construction could begin in the spring of 2022.

Tuck's Point Project: Mr. Bion Pike, the MBTS Harbormaster introduced himself and explained this proposed project as follows: The additional proposal had an additional 75 feet going out the harbor towards the yacht club, but after meeting with the MBTS Conservation Commission ("ConCom") and concerns about the pilings, we decided to get rid of the three additional floats that were proposed and their pilings. The original design had a 30 foot long, 6 foot wide pier with a shorter ramp to the floats. Unfortunately, the rotunda and walkway will have to be raised because the pilings underneath are very close to aging out (since 1971). The new engineering standards will require that this whole facility will go out 7 feet. We decided to construct a single ramp from the same access point that exists down to the float, then when the facility raises up, we just raise the end of the ramp up. State and federal agencies would not want to have a separate structure when there already is one that is used for that same purpose. Also, it would go over salt marsh, which is a protected environment. The January and March 2018 storms destroyed the deck that you step down onto to get to the ramp to get to the floats across the walkway. The deck was reattached but has since been condemned, which is the reason we are where we are today. This facility has never been engineered or permitted since 1896. MBTS was in the process of permitting the existing facility, but it failed.

Mr. Pike continued that there will be all new pilings, because there were never any pilings there—this was a mooring-supported bottom floor system. The engineers will not sign off on this, particularly with the ramp because of the movement of the facility on a bottom floor system. The facility will have to be raised up 14 feet 1 inch low tide to 21 feet. If we build the facility out on pilings and move it north, we will get the underside away from the bedrock, less pilings, a walkway with pavers, and a year-round ramp. Pilings are part of an appropriate, well-engineered, waterfront facility. All the MBTS commercial facilities are on pilings, because they are safer and easier to maintain. The pilings need to be this height in order to get the permits. We can reconfigure the floats as long as we don't add linear or square footage within this reconfiguration zone without re-permitting. The floats have been moved 25 feet further to the north. The floats are moved out from November to March.

Mr. Pike stated that he has applied to the CEC for a 20% of the cost. It will probably be a little less because MBTS has already paid for a significant amount of the engineering. We applied to the Seaport Economic Council for 80%. Finally, the MBTS CPC for the balance, which will be voted on at Town Meeting. The total cost for this project is approximately \$860,000.00, in large part due to block socketed steel pilings we will have to use. These steel pilings resemble metal pipes. There will be pilings holding up the rotunda will rest on the bedrock. These pilings are a foundationally tied together unit so that they do not tip over and not very deep. The engineering firm that did the test

borings told us that the pilings underneath the rotunda need to be addressed, depending on the piling, in 1 to 5 years.

Mr. Round asked Mr. Pike if the Building Inspector referred this project to the HDC, and Mr. Pike replied no. Ms. Costello thanked Mr. Pike for including the HDC with an update of this project.

Mr. Pike explained that the entire system/facility will be further north than it ever has been, so the view of the harbor will be less impacted than it ever has been by floats.

Ms. Costello suggested sending an opinion letter to the Planning Board regarding this project that should include the HDC reviewed the documents, photographs, and proposed changes to the original facility, Mr. Pike attended the January 28, 2021 HDC meeting to summarize the project and answer the HDC members' questions.

Historic Buildings Not Located in the Historic District: Mr. Round asked Ms. Costello to comment on the topic of a number of structures throughout town that are considered to be of historic significance, although they are not located in the Historic District, if something is going on with these structures the HDC should be informed and provide comment. Ms. Costello replied that a letter from 2011 containing a list of structures or places in MBTS that are not located in the Historic District that the HDC at that time mentioned to the Board of Selectmen ("BOS") that the HDC should weigh in on anything that happens with these structures, but there was not a response from the BOS, so it is not clear whether the HDC is entitled to make any comment. If we are requested to make a comment, but the HDC is not necessarily bound to make a comment and not necessarily authorized to make an official comment. Ms. Costello stated that according to state law, we as a Commission deal with the boundaries of the Historic District. The HDC can be authorized by the BOS to weigh in on anything that they authorize the HDC to. Mr. Smith suggested that this subject be brought up again to the BOS.

Mr. Round suggested that a mechanism be put in place when it is necessary for the HDC to become involved with changes to a building or other structures of historical significance, and Mr. Round referred to the Crowell Chapel project approximately 7 years ago that involved CPC funding.

Antique Table Restaurant Neon Sign: There is a small neon sign in the window of the lounge area of Antique Table. It is stated in the HDC Guidelines Signage Section that neon signs are prohibited in the Historic District.

Ms. Gothie and Mr. Smith suggested that this neon sign should be removed, but Mr. Smith added that he would not want to take any action at this time that would have an adverse effect on Antique Table's business. Ms. Costello suggested that the HDC give Antique Table a fair amount of time to remove this sign, given COVID-19 and its effect on restaurant businesses. Mr. Halgren remarked that Sotheby's (corner of Elm and Central Streets) has its window garishly illuminated. Ms. Costello stated that she agrees with Mr. Smith regarding encouraging businesses in town to stay. If we give Antique Table a 3 month warning to remove the neon sign because neon signs are prohibited

according to the HDC Guidelines. Ms. Gothie suggested that we give them a month, not 3, because all businesses have been adversely effected by COVID-19 and the HDC's job is to preserve the Historic District. Mr. Round stated that he agrees with Mr. Smith and Ms. Costello about giving Antique Table a warning note, but this situation is unprecedented, but would like Antique Table to be in business a year from now, so sending them a note to make them aware of the HDC lighted signage restrictions. Ms. Costello stated that she will send Antique Table a letter with a copy of the HDC Signage Guidelines, giving them 3 months (by May 1, 2021) to remove the neon sign and remind them that they must file an HDC signage application for approval of any proposed signs and neon signs are prohibited in the MBTS Historic District. Ms. Gothie and Mr. Smith agreed.

It was agreed that the HDC members would individually go by Sotheby's during the day and evening and discuss this matter at the February 25th HDC meeting.

Ms. Costello asked if everyone has reviewed the HDC Meeting Schedule for 2021, and they had.

There were no further questions, issues, or comments by the HDC members.

Adjournment: Mr. Smith made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Round seconded the motion. Vote: Ms. Costello, Mr. Round, Mr. Halgren, Ms. Gothie, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Coppola voted in favor of adjourning this meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Adele Ardolino, Clerk
Historic District Commission
Manchester-by-the-Sea, MA