

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
Town Hall
Provincetown, MA
WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 19, 2020

Members Present: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep.; Laurie Delmolino (LD), Historical Commission Rep.; John Dowd (JD), PGB Rep.; Christopher Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep.; Michela Carew-Murphy (MCM), Alternate; Martin Risteen (MR), Alternate.

Excused Absence: Hersh Schwartz (HS), Chamber of Commerce Rep.

Others Present: Anne Howard (AH), Building Commissioner.

Work Session: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

1. Update on potential violations reported to the Building Commissioner.

Permits

AH said there was nothing really inside the District; reported she has issued (2) siding permits for 432 Commercial St. and 231 Bradford St.; and (3) roofing permits for 335 Commercial St., 179 Commercial St., and 108 Commercial St.

9 Conway St.

TB asked if the roof of the dormer at 9 Conway was asphalt. AH said it is because it is much easier to flash the tracks of the solar panels through asphalt, that red cedar makes it much more difficult; said that there is perhaps one example of cedar roofing with solar array – at 61B Commercial St. – and it proved problematic for the roofer to flash and counter-flash.

2. 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 Public Hearing agenda of March 4, 2020, and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

TB made a motion to consider the following for Full Review:

vi) 435 Commercial St.; vii) 212-214 Commercial St.; viii) 259-263 Commercial St., U2.

CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MCM.

TB made a motion to consider the following for Administrative Review:

i) 15 Conant St., #3; ii) 522 Commercial St.; iii) 8 Cottage St. iv) 606 Commercial St., #1; v) 452 Commercial St.

CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MCM.

i) 15 Conant St., #3 – To replace (2) doors in kind.

No one presented.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. CM seconded the motion but LD asked if the exteriors were wood and what is ‘ultra-block technology.’ AH said it was

perhaps a new finish on a wood door, adding that she had seen one of these doors fail horribly at two years old at 368 Commercial St. LD said that without a storm door, it just doesn't hold up and AH agreed.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the exterior be wood. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MCM.

- ii) 522 Commercial St. – To replace a patio door that is not visible from a public way.

Paul Bannon presented. LD recused herself.

TB noted the renovation was primarily for interiors and the sliders at the back.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the trim be wood. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, CM, MCM, MR.

- iii) 8 Cottage St. To replace a front door in kind.

Mark Kinnane of Cape Associates presented; said it would match as the door is 7' tall; trim to remain the same.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-1; TB, JD, CM, MCM, approved; LD, abstained.

- iv) 606 Commercial St., #1 – To replace a door in kind.

Per AH, no one was available to present due to health reasons.

JD asked of the replacement, to which AH said she believed they were removing the whole door frame and replacing it. JD objected to the design in stating that while it is not bad what exists is much finer. AH said the trim was not discussed with the applicant. TB weighed in favor of a Full Review to which MCM and CM agreed, but LD said perhaps not if the side-lights are not affected.

TB made a motion to approve replacement of the door only. LD seconded the motion, but the motion was left incomplete and further discussion ensued.

TB made a motion to consider for Full Review. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MCM.

- v) 452 Commercial St. – To replace clapboards, siding and roofing shingles and replace a fence in kind.

No one presented. AH said they are working on the egress stairs discharge on the Bangs St. side; that the fence disintegrated and was irreparable.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that any trim and molding to be replaced be replicated exactly as is; fence to be replicated exactly, as wood. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, LD, CM, MCM.

3. Any other business that shall properly come before the Commission:

AH reported that due to lack of a quorum, the HDC sub-committee meeting previously scheduled for tomorrow is cancelled and would be rescheduled at a time TBD.

TB made a motion to reschedule tomorrow's HDC subcommittee meeting LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, JD, CM, MR.

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

None.

Town Manager Robin Craver entered the meeting to introduce herself to the Board.

5. Public Hearing: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

TB opened the Public Hearing at 4:30pm.

a) **HDC 20-112** (continued from the meeting of February 5th)

Application by **Mark Kinnane**, of **Cape Associates, Inc.**, requesting to demolish and rebuild a rear section of a structure and add a dormer to create a second floor on the property located at **18 Prince Street**.

Mark Kinnane presented; dispersed engineer's report from Richard P. Anderson of SEA&B Engineering, which TB read into the record and which detailed reasons the add-on portion of the home was deemed to be unfit for occupancy.

Mr. Kinnane said they have dropped the ridge on the proposed addition, increased the set-back on both sides to 1', 1'6" and added dimensions as requested; jog on further back section to mimic previous specifications at 3'6" thereby making the section even smaller; said exact same re-vamp was performed on 16 Prince two years ago without an engineer's report.

CM remarked that 16 Prince was larger in scale at two stories and that he felt this design is still too large, questioned the portion of the building that was reportedly built just for animals which, he felt, did not sound credible; said he was okay with expanding the back space without seeking to destroy the whole historic nature of the property, that the other property is blocked from the façade a bit where this one is not; recommended adjusting placement of the slider and suggested the middle portion should stay as is.

LD said CM had summed up a lot of what she was thinking; weighed in favor of keeping the rear section larger and the middle lower, and adding a couple of small dormers to the middle. Mr. Kinnane said the front building reads as two-stories and offered to get the addition lowered by 2' or possibly 3'. LD said there was an original flow to the house which they are seeking to maintain and that the house is now proposed to be greatly expanded

MR agreed with efforts to maintain the flow of the building, asked how the second floor might be addressed in terms of lowering the roof line. Mr. Kinnane said the roof line could be lowered but access in the original building would be affected. JD suggested retaining the stairs to the second floor as exists and Mr. Kinnane asked if it would be acceptable if the section at the jog on A1.2 was left a one-story and then expanded to two stories going back.

TB spoke on behalf of scope and scale and felt the building should stay as a one-story and not amass more than the original structure, to which MR and MCM agreed. TB added that JD's proposal still shows more mass in the rear than he finds acceptable. Mr. Kinnane said the owner will not be amenable to the HDC's recommendations and then approached the panel for further consultation on potential compromises to the plan.

Concluding consultation, Mr. Kinnane agreed to get back to AH and the HDC with options for revisions.

TB made a motion to approve the time waiver as requested. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MCM.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of March 4, 2020. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MCM.

b) **HDC 20-134** (continued from the meeting of January 15, 2020)

Application by **Peter McDonald, Architect**, on behalf of **Jay Anderson**, requesting to demolish a three-story non-contributing structure and rebuild two residential buildings at the property located at **53 Commercial Street**.

Lester J. Murphy, Jr., Attorney, and Peter McDonald presented. Mr. McDonald made note of new changes to the plan including elimination of the sugar house, removal of the metal roof over the entry; stair bump-out fixed; front door changed; reduction in the number and varying sizes of windows; adjusted text of notes for legibility; elimination of garage doors on the guest house; hip roof proposed for over the stairway.

No public comments or letters.

LD thanked Mr. McDonald for the revisions; asked per shack on A3.A, which Mr. McDonald said is an outdoor shower; added that the owner did not like JD's roof alternative.

LD said per the bump-out on A6.A that the vertical siding would be better rendered as shingles and questioned the alignment of two windows. Mr. McDonald said the design of the windows is based on their location in a stair landing. LD asked if on A5.A the windows could be three sets of two. TB said it works best if the panes are vertical.

JD referenced A6.A wherein he questioned if the four windows might be rendered as one large window and relate it in proportion to the screens to further the dialogue in the design, and which MCM noted might be similar to the window at the Hawthorne Barn.

Mr. McDonald said an 8' fence exists between the property and the parking lot. LD said of the number of windows that they are of historic proportions. MCM said she agreed with both JD and LD, noted that contemporary structures which are being approved lately are all glass and that the applicant had made all the changes the HDC requested at the previous hearing.

Mr. Murphy suggested a window from the ganged section on the second floor to be removed and the kitchen window below altered as suggested. Mr. McDonald offered to lose the fourth window from the left on the second floor, but sought to retain the windows on the first floor. LD spoke out, with TB's support, for a window removal from the first floor which Mr. McDonald said would make the kitchen on the first floor a bit darker.

Main House

TB read through the following conditions: eliminate (2) windows on the east side; bump-out where the stairs are to be shingled; (4) windows to be redesigned into one multi-pane window with similar proportions to one of the screens.

Guest House

Window GA on the G3 elevation was discussed per placement according to shingles and the ridge line.

TB suggested two and not three ganged windows would be more historic, and LD noted the elevation as the most important façade of the house as it sits on the street. MCM observed, and others agreed, the (2) windows down from (3) should be made bigger and TB said this change should affect the windows on both floors, but that everything else looked good on the plans. Mr. McDonald added that the door is 9-lite, did not have a spec sheet on hand, but would provide one; confirmed that there would be space between the newly revamped G3 windows and the units moved up to center. TB described the Provincetown Door as wood, single-pane, single-lite with single panel above and three or four panels below.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the following conditions; 6-lite window on Commercial St. façade be centered between the bottom of ridge and windows below; (3) ganged windows be changed to (2) GC windows on 1st & 2nd floor and to not be ganged, but spaced and match GC; Provincetown door. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, JD, CM, MCM.

Main House

TB made a motion to continue the hearing of the main house to the meeting of March 4, 2020. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MCM.

Mr. McDonald said he would not be on hand at the March 4th meeting, but Mr. Murphy said he would.

TB made a motion to approve the time-waiver for 53 Commercial St. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MCM.

c) **HDC 20-146** (continued from the meeting of February 5th)

Application by **Don DiRocco**, of **Hammer Architects**, on behalf of **William Lampeter**, requesting to add a new dormer on the north elevation, replace all doors and windows, relocate windows, replace an existing French door with windows, relocate/replace a skylight, install new red cedar roofing, replace shingles, and repair/replace siding, casing, roofing and trim as needed on the structure located at **10 Atwood Ave.**

MCM recused herself.

Don DiRocco and Leif Hamnquist of Hammer Architects presented. Mr. DiRocco said he believed the only outstanding issue is the dormer and said the client is amenable to the doghouse dormer as suggested by LD.

Rachel White spoke as a neighbor, not a direct abutter, in approval of whatever might be proposed that could be seen as a welcome improvement.

LD asked per the request of a lower ridge line regarding the dormer. Mr. DiRocco said the lowering compromised head height and that they were hoping the doghouse dormer would allow the proposed ridge line to remain; referenced a local property that reflects their design in terms of the roof line. LD said she recognized exceptions all over Town, but that the idea is always to not have a dormer dominating the roof. Mr. DiRocco said the elevation is not visible from a public way, but LD countered that the wall is, to which Mr. DiRocco said they are not touching the south elevation out of respect for the neighborhood, hoping for leeway.

MR read the bylaw on dormers.

JD said he is familiar with the building's owner who is an antique dealer and believes he is trying to do right by the design; said he prefers the original design as proposed than what has been recommended by the HDC regarding changes and that the initial dormer as rendered by the architects would be more suitable in terms of historic perspective. TB said he agreed, but suggested the problem with the shed dormer is that there is no space on the right side regarding the original roof height. LD said she could be fine with the original design based on its setback and lack of visibility, although she would prefer a few inches below the roof line and stressed that were the visibility from a public way a factor, HDC could not condone the design.

TB made a motion to approve as presented based on January 3, 2020 drawings. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MR.

d) **HDC 20-153**

Application by **Kathryn A. Olsen** requesting to demolish a garage/storage structure on the property located at **6 Wareham Road.**

Kathryn Olsen presented; said the demolition is to provide for septic; no plans to re-build; roof of the garage is open to the weather and there is rot throughout; walls bulging out; would like to rebuild in the future to conform to both the road and the side bounds.

Rachel White spoke on behalf of the applicant offering her approval based on her knowledge of the structure and familiarity with the owners. No letters.

TB made a motion to approve demolition as requested. MR seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-1; TB, MR, LD, JD, in favor; CM, abstained.

LD asked of the designation of the structure which MR said would qualify as an accessory building of an accessory building – which has been greatly altered over time.

e) **HDC 20-155**

Application by **Mike Czyoski**, on behalf of **Marianne Colacray**, requesting to construct a shed on the property located at **12 Franklin Street.**

Maxine Notarro presented; said they are seeking approval of an 8'x10' shed on west side of property with gable ends, cedar side-wall, red cedar roof; 6-over-6 window, factory-applied.

Rachel White spoke from the public, said she is very familiar with the property and would be okay with whatever is proposed.

JD asked if the window was wood and true divide-lite. Ms. Notarro said she wasn't sure.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the window be divided-lite or simulated divided-lite, but AH objected in declaring that the structure is already built and that Pine Harbor will simply take it out on the property owner. JD asked what then the HDC's purpose if not to make determinations based on the bylaws governing historic buildings and added that vinyl is not acceptable.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of March 4, 2020 following a site visit by the HDC. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MR.

AH read copy from the window bylaw into the record.

f) **HDC 20-156**

Application by **Purple Point, LLC** requesting to replace windows and doors on the structure located at **334 Commercial Street**.

Peter Okun presented; said they started by taking out sliders put in the back as windows and are now seeking to take out windows on the west side which are casements to be replaced with same size, double-hung Anderson 400 series; hoping to continue with 6-over-6s as exist in the back; noted 2-over-1s are on the porch units.

JD said the house was originally designed with 6-over-6 windows as a Greek Revival, so the plan is a return to form. Mr. Okun said there is a small, narrow window on the east side, like an awning window with a pieced-in casement over it that they wish to remove and replace with a shorter one, 4-over-4, rather than 6-over-6.

LD said the HDC requests an appropriately sized window, such as square-over-square. Mr. Okun sought guidance, but maintained that he wanted to keep the same opening.

No public comments or letters.

Discussion continued on window options with TB asking if the new unit could be the same height as the one next to it. Mr. Okun indicated the model option on the plans, which the HDC concurred as appropriate.

Mr. Okun next reported that the east-side full-lite door would now serve as the main entrance to the apartment, to be removed and replaced with a 6-lite, Shaker-type fiberglass door with 3-over-3s; door on the other side is non-functional and the window needs to be replaced – proposed to take out this door and replace it with two double-hung windows altogether to meet the egress code which was discussed per proposed specs, but per LD was inconclusive as the actual size of the window opening was unknown.

JD said the 6-lite door is not appropriate to the building's historic design, promoted the Provincetown Door as an alternative.

TB made a motion to approve with following conditions: Two ganged windows be TW2852; Provincetown door, single-lite; TW2042 for single window; 6-panel steel to be replaced with 6-panel fiberglass. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, JD, CM, MCM.

JD asked if trim could be applied, which Mr. Okun said would be fine. A spec sheet was requested, as well.

6. Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

TB made a motion to approve the February 5, 2019 decision of **HDC 20-136; 5 Conwell Street**, written and read into the record by CM. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, JD, CM, MR.

TB made a motion to approve the February 5, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-124; 3 Cudworth Street**, written and read into the record by CM. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MR.

TB made a motion to approve the February 5, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-145; 15 Atwood Avenue**, written and read into the record by CM. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MR.

TB made a motion to approve the February 19, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-156; 334 Commercial Street** written and read into the record by LD. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, JD, CM, MR.

TB made a motion to approve the February 5, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-132; 46 Bradford Street**, written and read into the record by LD. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, LD, JD, CM.

TB made a motion to approve the January 15, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-126; 6 Pleasant Street**, written and read into the record by TB. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, JD, CM, MR.

TB made a motion to approve the February 5, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-141; 232 Bradford Street, #2**, written and read into the record by LD. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, JD, CM, MR.

TB made a motion to approve the February 19, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-146; 10 Atwood Avenue**, written and read into the record by TB. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MR.

MR noted that, per HS, **HDC 20-109; 286 ½ Commercial Street, #1-#5** was filed with Town Clerk on February 11, 2020; **HDC 20-133; 122 Commercial Street** was written and read into the record on January 11, 2020, but cannot be filed until new plans are received and signed.

7. Review and approval of Minutes:

TB made a motion to approve the HDC meeting minutes of February 5, 2020. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, LD, JD, CM.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:26pm. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, JD, CM, MR.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil