

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
Town Hall
Provincetown, MA
WEDNESDAY APRIL 15, 2020

NOTE: THIS IS A REMOTE PARTICIPATION MEETING. Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the Provincetown Historic District Commission will be conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible. Specific information and the general guidelines for remote participation by members of the public and/or parties with a right and/or requirement to attend this meeting can be found on the Provincetown website, at <https://www.provincetown-ma.gov/>. For this meeting, members of the public who wish to watch/listen and participate in the meeting may do so in the following manner:

1. Watch on PTV GOV Channel 18, as well as an online live stream of PTV GOV at <http://www.provincetowntv.org/watch.html>

2. To listen and participate in this meeting, dial (833) 579-7589. When prompted, enter the following conference ID number: 778 521 005#. When prompted, state your name, then press #. Please do not speak until the chair or the meeting moderator asks for public comments or questions. If possible, please mute your phone until you are called upon to speak.

No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings in real time, via technological means. In the event that we are unable to do so, despite best efforts, we will post on the Provincetown website an audio or video recording or other comprehensive record of proceedings as soon as possible after the meeting.

Members on telecom: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep.; Laurie Delmolino (LD), Vice-Chair, Historical Commission Rep.; Hersh Schwartz, Clerk, (HS), Chamber of Commerce Rep.; John Dowd (JD), PGB Rep.; Christopher Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep.; Michela Carew-Murphy (MCM), Alternate.

Excused Absence: Martin Risteen (MR), Alternate.

Staff present: Anne Howard (AH), Building Commissioner; Thaddeus Soule (TS), Town Planner.

TS gave opening remarks at 3:32pm and called for quorum by roll call.

TB called the meeting to order then gave the meeting over to TS who read the rules governing how Public Meeting would run under current government guidelines.

Work Session: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

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

AH was requested today to review what was approved for the cottage building at 522 Bradford St. which sits largely on Bradford. AH said letters have not gone out to this property nor 206 Bradford St. AH has previously approved plans per JD's request to review 347 Commercial St., said the owners will be on hand at the meeting to address the storefront and other windows.

TB asked per the horizontal skirt at 6 Commercial St. that had been requested changed-out, but JD noted it had been approved, which AH concurred and added that the granite steps at 143 Commercial St. had also been approved but she will look further into the rear privacy fence and granite steps at 12 Cudworth St. TB cautioned about granite steps going up throughout Town where not appropriate and asked per the privacy fence at 68 Bradford Street, site of the Carl's Guest House. AH said there was a fence there and she would consult photographs.

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 May 6, 2020, and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

TB made a motion to consider v) 19 Central St., U2 & 3 – To remove a deck, replace existing skylights, add a skylight, and replace (2) entry doors for Full Review. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, LD, JD, CM.

TB made a motion to consider the following for Administrative Review: i) 92 Commercial, U1A; ii) 30-32 Pearl St.; iii) 522 Commercial St.; iv) 238 Bradford St. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

- i) 92 Commercial St., U1A – To replace a bay window in kind and re-shingle white cedar siding and red cedar roofing shingles on the window unit.

Dimitri Papetsas presented; said replacement is the lower bay widow unit, one for one, identical as exists, Anderson 400 series; shingles with white cedar and roof replaced with red cedar as exists on bay unit; on south elevation, any trim will be pine or red cedar.

JD asked if the shutters would be put up, to which Mr. Papetsas said they would seek guidance on that element. TB said technically they are against the bylaws and should come down, asked if the owner would consider doing something a bit more historically accurate, with mullions in the window. Mr. Papetsas said they could do grilles, 2/1s.

MCM mentioned that what is pre-existing is within the owner's purview. JD spoke against the shutters, said (2) singles windows spaced-apart would be historically correct, preferred removing the bump-out. TB suggested that getting rid of the bump-out proposes a bigger ask. JD asked if the shed canopy would be re-built and if the horizontal member could be beefed-up. LD said she agreed with JD's assessment.

JD made a motion to accept as presented with the stipulation that the horizontal molding above the window be possibly 4" to appear more expansive and to remove the shutters. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; JD, CM, TB, LD, HS.

- ii) 30-32 Pearl St. – To rebuild a chimney in kind.

No one presented.

TB noted the work is being done by Gahleo (sp), who, he said, is one of the best contractors around. CM said as it's being done in kind so there is not much to deliberate on. LD agreed with TB on the reputation of the contractor.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM

- iii) 522 Commercial St. – To install a rooftop solar array.

David from Cotuit Solar presented; said it's an existing garage on the west-facing roof where (20) panels will be applied around existing skylights; not very visible as the elevation is perpendicular to Bradford St. AH noted there is no current roof on the building.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM

iv) 238 Bradford St. – To install a rooftop solar array.

No one presented.

TB noted the Provincetown Theater location, remarked on the number of proposed panels. JD asked if they were to be in the front or back. TB replied it would affect the entire front and some side area. LD sought clarification that solar is no longer under the HDC's purview. AH said predominantly no, but on the larger Commercial buildings she's asked for an appearance at a hearing with the Commission for its recommendations based on mass or scale.

CM asked why the applicant is not seeking to align the rear of the property rather than the Commercial St. side. TB said it might be due to the south-facing plane getting substantially more sunlight. HS agreed. LD suggested asking if the rear would work for the applicant but also noted a big commercial building is in question. JD agreed, as did MCM.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the question put forth if the applicant could consider moving the panels to the rear-east portion of the building. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

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

347 Commercial Street

AH mentioned JD's e-mail referencing the rolled crown on the front gable end in a photo submitted this week by JD; said drawings that were approved showed flat-stock with a little depth above the store-windows and that she hoped they were putting back what was pre-existing. JD said his concerns are the corner-boards on a Victorian style building with rounded stock that slightly caps the corners and had doubts, as such, the feature would be replaced in kind. AH said there will an opportunity to meet with the applicant and address the issue at the next meeting.

AH clarified for Dave from Cotuit Solar that when the skylights were proposed, plans were approved without the knowledge that solar panels would be a forthcoming proposition.

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

None.

5. Public Hearing: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

TB opened the Public Hearing at 4:13pm.

a) HDC 20-171 (continued from the meeting of April 1st)

Application by **Ocazo Construction, Inc.** requesting to replace a front door on the structure located at **606 Commercial Street, #1.**

No one presented and no materials were submitted.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of May 6, 2020. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

TB encouraged the Board the go by and review the entrance as an example of historic features to be preserved.

b) HDC 20-175 (continued from the meeting of March 18th)

Application by **Nathaniel Fridman** requesting to add a dormer and windows and replace an existing bump-out picture window with a similar style of window on the structure located at **8 Court Street, Unit C**.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of May 6, 2020. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

c) **HDC 20-179** *(continued from the meeting of April 1st)*

Application by **John DeMatteis & Kevin Bazarian**, on behalf of **1620 Landing, LLC**, requesting to construct a new single-family structure on the property located at **3 Pilgrim's Landing**.

Kevin Bazarian presented from new drawings; mentioned elements by elevation; on west, more symmetry with the sliders; proposed slider to face the waterside; stairs at second level should be turned around at 90 degrees coming down the hill; small 3' overhang is not supposed to be in the plans; south elevation overhang; windows on second floor more square rather than rectangular, design overall more square in aspect; Brazilian mahogany and stainless panels; dressing up front entry with a simple, contemporary pergola to better identify.

No public comments or letters.

JD said he printed the drawings at larger scale for review, referenced Gropius house and an eave to have more of an overhang, questioned if a modern railing system needed a space between. AH said a maximum space was required so that a 4" sphere would not pass through. JD suggested a solution that would prove more modern, to which Mr. Bazarian agreed, but would opt for steel cable in lieu of glass; said they could do stainless steel posts.

TB asked per fenestration. LD said contemporary buildings are not her forte, but symmetry is an acceptable property for any architecture, yet without making it boring. JD questioned the vertical position of the ground floor and asked if a more horizontal orientation would be more beneficial to the accompanying landscape, also allowing a graying of the exterior to blend, similar to PAAM. TB agreed. MCM asked if the pool was the same on the plans, just at a different angle; agreed with TB and JD per shingles, referenced a modern-home Lower Cape tour she went on recently.

CM said he'd clad the whole building in shingles and combine the modern architecture with the historic elements, asked to focus a bit more on the details of the symmetry; said he's not a fan of the second floor and noted half of a balcony, cited importance of details. Mr. Bazarian reminded that the Board had previously advised against shingles. TB said he was in favor of shingles. Mr. Bazarian replied to JD that he would be in favor of the railing going all the way across and TB said that a glass rail, as discussed, is usually held up by steel.

TB said he thought the rear would also slope up the hill and found the entire design uninspired; west elevation all sliding glass doors; forgotten windows on the north where the units would be highly visible. CM said he agreed with TB but felt the plan is moving in the right direction and the property offers a unique opportunity to go outside the box as the site dictates as much being in the vicinity of the Gropius house.

LD asked Mr. Bazarian if it would be possible to tour other local modern buildings such as found in Wellfleet for inspiration. CM offered to send visual suggestions to AH for distribution, to which TB concurred and thought everyone on the Board could follow suit and send their materials to AH by next Wednesday, or Thursday, the latest, so they can be forward to Mr. Bazarian.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of May 6, 2020. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

d) **HDC 20-188**

Application by **Derik Burgess**, of **Cape Associates, Inc.**, on behalf of **David High**, requesting to replace selected windows and doors on the structure located at **36 Commercial Street**.

Derik Burgess presented; said they want to remove the casements and awning windows on the rear and replace the awnings with historic double-hungs with applied grilles and spacer bars, leaving front/north elevation as is with original windows in place.

No public comments or letters.

HS remarked that a lot of the property is not visible from a public way.

LD noted all changes as proposed are for the contemporary portion of building; referenced the double-door on the little bump-out on the left which has replaced a window, asked if there was a little too much door per elevation A4. Mr. Burgess said this is not on a plane with the front elevation. LD suggested a single door, to which CM said he agreed, confirmed with AH that Point St. is a public way with a visible side. TB added the rear west side is very visible.

CM questioned if a window should be added on the second floor, didn't think the door on the first floor at the kitchen is historical; suggested two double-hungs at the garage on the first floor, which Mr. Burgess said was not possible as there's no room. CM said he felt the elevation on Point St. should be addressed, as well.

MCM said she didn't have any problem with the door at the back, as did JD. Mr. Burgess said the owners are hoping to have more access from that elevation. HS said she didn't have a problem with French doors as set back. CM countered that even if minimally visible, the house and feature are prominent and historic. TB said he agreed with CM, even as the French doors are on an addition, cautioned against seeing such doors more on visible or front exposures. Mr. Burgess said the second story deck was not being altered and JD requested that if it ever should that it does not inappropriately protrude. Mr. Burgess concurred.

CM said he had issue with the rear elevation, but the sentiment was not shared by others.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the double French doors facing Commercial St. be reduced to a single 15-lite French door. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

e) **HDC 20-192**

Application by **Edward MacLean**, on behalf of **David Frost & Michael Richards**, requesting to replace a fence and replace and relocate a gate on the property located at **414 Commercial Street**.

Edward MacLean and David Frost presented; related a poured concrete retaining wall and proposed planters.

No public comments or letters.

HS said she had been by the property and went through the design plans with the owner; suggested the steel railing as proposed would be inviting. LD weighed in against the cable railing, in favor of a straight picket. Mr. Frost said the fence would be replaced with planters and Mr. MacLean said the cables were to continue the line, which Mr. Frost said could be removed. JD said he didn't understand the concept of the steel combined with the pickets in such a short space. Mr. MacLean said the planters would sit atop the fence and correspond to the same height.

JD said he didn't understand the combination of steel and pickets in such a short space. Mr. MacLean further explained the concept as the fence section removed from the retaining wall with planters placed on top of the fence, into the parking lot at about 8", cited safety concerns.

MCM said the HDC has been very diligent at preventing cable railing on visible elevations and that landscaping is not in its purview. AH noted Young's Court is private; asked if the yard was down from the parking area, to which Mr. MacLean said is about 44," which AH noted indicated the need for some sort of barrier. CM asked what was applicable as Young's Court is a private way. HS responded by claiming that the steel railing is not visible from Commercial. JD said he plugged in Google maps and discovered the back corner is visible. CM asked if the combination of arbor and pickets ran afoul of the HDC fence bylaw.

Mr. MacLean asked if, instead of the picket or cable, have a length of wood strapping to run across the length as proposed. LD thought this could be a good solution. JD questioned the

aesthetic issue in getting rid of the picket. TB polled the Board for options. JD led a discussion on the wood post alignment.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the conditions that the steel posts and cable rail be eliminated, an all wood design, and the top solid, horizontal board align with the top rail of the picket fence. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-1-0: TB, LD, HS, JD, in favor; CM, opposed.

f) **HDC-193**

Application by **Jay Abbiuso**, requesting to replace all windows and trim on the structure located at **19 Central Street, U2 & 3**.

Mr. Abbiuso apologized for linking the add skylights to the application, as indicated in the Determinations section of today's Agenda; said all wood to be used and pine product replacement; is fine with options for grilles and elimination of shutters, noted two types of sashes and stated preference for the traditional model; windows are 1/1s, possibly replaced in the 1970s with storms on the outside.

No public comments or letters.

JD addressed the photo of the pediment above the door; asked if this trim is being replaced. Mr. Abbiuso said this area can probably be repaired.

TB questioned the need to replace all the trim as he found much of it in pretty good shape. LD agreed. JD noted some rotted spots but concurred in other areas. Mr. Abbiuso said he'd not be opposed to salvaging what is possible, but is invested in longevity. JD cautioned against contractors making replacements that come as a sacrifice to historic integrity.

JD said flat-stock trim replacement wasn't an historic issue; proposed window options as 9/6 or 6/6, to which Mr. Abbiuso said he would prefer 6/6. JD asked per the deep eave that seems to wrap around the building and questioned if both eaves of the building should be the same, based on the design. Mr. Abbiuso related that he has owned the property for less than four weeks and may not be fully aware of background elements.

JD made a motion to accept as presented with the conditions that windows be 6/6 configuration, elimination of shutters, all moldings and eaves and frieze board that is salvageable be retained rather than replaced and those that must be replaced be replicated exactly as existing. TB seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; JD, TB, LD, HS, CM.

g) **HDC-195**

Application by **Tom Thompson**, on behalf of **John Meulendyk**, requesting to install new double-hung windows and a new front door on the structure on the property located at **435 Commercial Street**.

Tom Thompson presented; referenced prior recommendations by the HDC to re-configure the grille pattern and address door location; captured balusters have been employed.

No public comments or letters.

JD said he felt the building looks great, vast improvement. HS agreed. JD asked per the in-fill regarding 6-lite windows which were supposed to be horizontal, half-sash and top sash of a 6/6 unit, asked if the building to be a 2/1 is now out of kilter with the rest of the design. Mr. Thompson said he'd prefer to see no grilles and didn't believe the bathroom windows had been previously addressed. JD asked if the dormer window specs were approved for no grilles. AH referenced a prior meeting that Mr. Thompson did not attend and said she would locate photos whereby 12 panes were indicated. Window options were discussed in terms of 6-lite vs. 2/2. AH said the east elevation windows would need to be amended per approval.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the east elevation reflects (2) 12-lite windows as approved in HDC 20-150. JD seconded the and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, HS, CM, MCM.

6. Review and approval of Minutes.

HS made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of April 26, 2017. TB seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; HS, TB, JD, CM, MCM.

HS made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of May 3, 2017. TB seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; HS, TB, JD, CM, MCM.

HS made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of April 1, 2020. TB seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; HS, TB, JD, CM, MCM.

LD left the meeting at 6:15pm.

7. Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

TB made a motion to approve the April 15, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-188; 36 Commercial Street**, written and read into the record by HS. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, HS, JD, MCM.

TB made a motion to approve the April 15, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-192; 414 Commercial Street**, written and read into the record by HS. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, HS, JD, MCM.

TB made a motion to approve the April 15, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-193; 19 Central Street U2 & 3**, written and read into the record by HS. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, HS, JD, CM.

TB made a motion to approve the April 15, 2020 decision of **HDC 20-195; 435 Commercial Street**, written and read into the record by HS. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, HS, CM, MCM.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:32pm. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, JD, CM, MCM.

AH said to JD that she will send photos, and look at the fence at 143.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil