

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
Town Hall
Provincetown MA

WEDNESDAY, JULY 5, 2017

Members Present: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep.; Laurie Delmolino (LD), Historical Commission Rep; Martin Risteen (MR), Alternate; Hersh Schwartz, (HS), Alternate.

Excused Absence: Marcene Marcoux, Vice Chair, Chamber of Commerce Rep; Lisa Pacheco-Robb, PAAM Rep.

TB called the meeting to order at 3:30pm, said he hoped that everyone had enjoyed their 4th of July, and noted it as one of the busiest days of the year.

1. Work Session

a) Determination as to whether the applications below involve any Exterior Architectural Features within the jurisdiction of the Commission; with Full Reviews to be placed on the August 2nd agenda and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

- i. 510 Commercial St. – *(continued from the meeting of June 21st)* – To replace front door in kind.
TB referenced the front glass door, asked if HDC had done a site visit. LD said she didn't think it was an original door.
TB made a motion to treat as an Administrative Review; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
LD noted therma-true fiber glass material and TB made a motion to accept as presented with the condition that the door be wood and two glass panels at the top to mimic what's there. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
- ii. 496 Commercial St. – To re-shingle.
TB made a motion to accept as Administrative Review; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0, TB, LD, MR, HS; after which TB remarked it had been approved as presented. No vote was taken on approval.
- iii. 48 ½ Bradford St. – To replace and add siding.
TB asked if anyone was available to present as he was confused by the application. No one came forward and TB read from the copy, requesting to remove a existing 3' fence on the front and east side of property, add 3' scallop fence on the west side; cross driveway to garage with center gate to backyard; add 3' scallop fence on the east side of the home with a gate; existing fence west of garage to remain.

MR remarked that the rest of the garage was currently being built as evidenced by a platform in place. LD asked if this was the property with the masonry retaining wall.

TB said he didn't necessarily see a problem with it, noted Crosby fence, asked if HDC should consider a Full Review and the proposal was closely studied for dimensions. LD asked where the 6' cedar fence was going.

TB noted 16 6' posts and made a motion to continue to the meeting of July 19th. LD asked if they wanted to put a 6' fence in front of an existing 6' fence. No vote was taken.

iv. 25 Tremont St. – To replace roofing and repair shingles.

TB asked if anyone was available to present; no one came forward.

TB read from the copy, noted aspects of the proposal, such as to replace asphalt roof with rubber roof, deck board with Azek, replace pressure treated railing with rails and balusters, trim in white Azek; rail system with Azek trim, Azek decking.

TB made a motion to accept as Administrative Review; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

TB noted it was hard to tell what was and was not visible from a public way and made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Aug. 2nd. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

TB signaled the completion of determinations, noted the number of applications was down.

b) Review and approval of Minutes: June 1, July 20, August 3, September 21, October 5, 2016; February 1, February 15 and April 19, April 26, May 3 and May 17, June 7 and June 21, 2017.

No minutes were read into the record.

2. Public Comments: On any matter not on the agenda below.

a) TB commented on a notification he received of a forced demolition involving a combination of the buildings that burned in the Historic District; noted that fortunately the building that houses the Surf Club is only a partial demolition, that the first floor was left and therefore does not have to be fully demolished and raised 4' because it's in the flood zone; that the other building was a full demolition in the flood zone, has to be raised 4'.

b) Two men presented for **34 Pearl Street**. TB referenced a letter from the applicant's engineer, which the applicant distributed to HDC for review. TB said HDC would sign off on the drawings and noted the section where the 1940's portion meets the 1850's version, which the applicant said would be set back 1'.

TB said they were very happy with the design itself, and that their concern was with the demolition portion, made a motion to approve as presented, allowing the demolition from the 1940's section. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

c) A man representing **496 Commercial St.** approached to ask if his case had been heard. TB replied that it had been approved earlier in the meeting and the man thanked HDC and left the room.

d) **HDC 17-273**

Tom approached HDC to address his application regarding a fence that was not on the Agenda today. LD said she thought it had been approved but that HDC had questions. HDC searched their packet for the file documents.

The man spoke about his plan to minimize the 6' fence, questioned if he had complicated the request and that maybe he should revert to the original design.

MR noted the property used to be a school; suggested the fence reduction would trigger something else, that an ancillary property would be revealed.

TB said the applicant had a choice as the 6' fence would be pre-existing and so could be replaced in-kind. Applicant said the neighbors requested the portion bordering their property remain 6'.

TB made a motion to accept as presented with a 6' fence in front section and a 3' in secondary area; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS. Following the vote, Tom initialized height determinations on the plans.

3. Public Hearings: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

a) **HDC 17-275** *(continued from the meeting of June 21st)*

Application by **Dana Masterpolo** requesting to add 5 skylights and a stainless steel chimney pipe to the structure at the property located at **8-10 Atlantic Avenue UD**.

Dana Masterpolo (DM) presented, distributed plans with modifications, noted property is from the 1850s; apologized for missing her appointed hearing on June 21st; said the building had been purchased recently and had damage in the interior due to the recent flood; applicant did some prelim demolition work.

DM said side elevations were the ones for modification and the front would remain as is; that the number of skylights had been reduced from five to three with two on the north elevation – the one closest to Bradford St. and not really visible from the street; the third skylight is a small unit proposed for the south elevation, close to the roof line to add light to a dark space.

DM reported that they had found the chimney in pretty rough shape and as they had to replace their boiler recently, they had a problem with the ridge beam their structural engineer requested; new, proposed faux chimney is 3'8" in height and 1'4" in width with standard masonry joints, to be framed out with 2-by4s; add brick to give it an authentic look and, with codes cleared, move the flue pipe inside the new unit with only standard metal mushroom-top visible 6" above it.

DM added lastly a request not on the application to add a window on the north elevation in the gable that is in keeping with the adjacent property.

No public comments or letters.

LD asked why the flue pipe could not be direct-vented out through the rear gable-end. DM replied that the boiler is being transferred to a gas system. LD felt the plans would make a condition of too much glass to wood ratio, asked if an additional skylight could be added to the rear side of the gable. DM said that the dormer is too high. LD said adding a third window into the dormer space does not follow HDC's guidelines; DM asked if the window was reduced, would that help.

TB said he was alright with everything except the extra window; that it looked out of place. MR and HS said they agreed with TB. LD asked per a possible sky tunnel. DM said she would look into another skylight or other solution.

TB made a motion to accept as presented with the condition that the proposed window on the north gable not be constructed; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

b) HDC 17-281: (continued from the meeting of June 21st)

Application by **Mark Kinnane**, of **Cape Associates, Inc.**, on behalf of **Chris Amplo**, requesting to remove a rear section of a structure and replace it with a new two-story ell, install a new foundation and replace all siding, roofing and windows in kind on the structure at the property located at **16 Prince Street**. Mark Kinnane (MK) presented, distributed new drawings, mentioned changes included raising height of chimney.

LD said she thought the dormers were not to extend to the ridge; MK said he wasn't aware of that. TB noted it was minimally visible.

TB made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR HS.

c) HDC 17-282 (continued from the meeting of June 21st)

Application by **Michael McIntyre**, on behalf of **Gary Pasnick**, requesting to add a dormer with new windows, matching trim and shingles on the structure at the property located at **212 Bradford St.**

Peter McDonald (PM) and Michael McIntyre (MM), presented; noted changes to plans as HDC directed, including moving skylights and installing a window at the gable end to match the front.

No public comments or letters.

TB noted that it appeared the applicant had done everything HDC requested and LD said it was perfect. MR remarked on the two skylights down from four.

TB made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

d) HDC 17-288 (continued from the meeting of June 21st)

Application by **Don DiRocco** of **Hammer Architects**, on behalf of **Jay Anderson**, requesting to detach, re-locate and renovate an existing shack, including adding a dormer and addition on the north elevation, replacing windows and doors, adding new siding, roofing and trim and installing a new foundation to raise the height of the structure pursuant to FEMA regulations on the property located at **51 Commercial Street**.

Don DiRocco (DD) presented; said they did a lot off head-scratching and going through zoning rules on what could be done with the shack, which they propose to reduce down to its original square; addressed partially covered pergola.

LD noted they get a whole cottage from a shack. DD highlighted wood shingles for the roof, all wood cedar trim and large glass doors to open it up a bit.

No public comments or letters.

TB said he felt they did a great job; DD said the client was amenable. MR echoed TB's remarks and that the design was a credit to the property; LD added also as a credit to the Historic District.

TB made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

4. Pending Decisions:

Eight on the agenda; none noted, or assigned.

5. Any other business that shall properly come before the Commission.

VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

TB read a document from the State Preservation office regarding the status of **4 Baker Avenue** and concluded HDC could expect an application on the property forthcoming.

LD asked per the doors at **Angel's Landing**. TB said the item should be tabled and directed HDC to conduct a site visit before the next meeting.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:45 pm; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil