



Historic District Commission

Minutes

The Provincetown Historic District Commission Site Visit and Public Meeting of Wednesday, September 15, 2021. Site Visit held at 2:30 PM at 53 Commercial Street; Work Session at 3:30 PM followed by Public Hearing at 4:00 PM in the Judge Welsh Room at Town Hall, 260 Commercial Street, Provincetown, MA 02657.

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, this meeting/hearing will be conducted **in person** and as a courtesy via remote means in accordance with applicable law. Please note that while an option for remote attendance and/or participation is being provided as a courtesy to the public, the meeting/hearing will not be suspended or terminated if technological problems interrupt the virtual broadcast, unless otherwise required by law.

Joining the Meeting: [Click here to join the meeting](#)

Microsoft Teams: Join on your computer or mobile app

Phone: Or call in (audio only) [\(833\) 579-7589](tel:8335797589) Phone Conference ID: 138 933 681#

To Participate during public comment:

- Teams: Raise hand to be called on to speak; or
- Phone: Speak name clearly to be called on to speak.

Please do not speak again until acknowledged by Chair or meeting moderator.

- Keep your phone muted at all times when not talking (*6 to mute & unmute your phone);
- Do not use speakerphone, Bluetooth devices (speakers or headphones); and
- Mute all background noises, including PTV, television or computer and use only phone audio.

Agenda item may be taken out of order and votes may be taken on any of the agenda items below.

2:30 P.M. Site Visit: 53 Commercial Street/Anderson shack

LD called the on-site meeting to order at 2:37pm. Present: HS, JD, MM, AI and LD. Staff: AH, TS. Board reviewed the structure's condition with the engineer, Sean Mullin. HDC requested an engineers report stating in detail the information presented by the engineer, including why the structure cannot be used in its current state and how it is beyond the usable lifespan of the building. Engineer agreed to provide a written letter.

LD made a motion to allow demolition of the structure with the condition that as much wood be salvaged and reused as practicable. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, AI, LD. LD made a motion to adjourn the on-site meeting at 2:49pm. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, AI, LD.

[NOTE: On-site meeting notes as reported by TS.]

Town Hall, members present: Laurie Delmolino (LD), Chair, Historical Commission Rep.; John Dowd (JD), Vice Chair, PGB Rep.; Hersh Schwartz (HS), Clerk, Chamber of Commerce Rep.; Christopher Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep.; Michela Murphy (MM), Alternate; Anthony Iannacci (AI), Alternate.

Staff present: Anne Howard (AH), Building Commissioner; Thaddeus Soulé (TS), Town Planner; David Gardner, Assistant Town Manager.

TS called the meeting to order at 3:30pm per the State guidelines for in-person Town Meeting protocols; handed the meeting over to LD.

LD welcomed the public, gave roll call.

3:30 PM Work Session

1. 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 October 6, 2021 Public Hearing agenda and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

LD made a motion to consider the following for Administrative Review: 16 MacMillan Wharf; 25 Winthrop St., U5; 165 Bradford St.; 155 Commercial St., U3; 240 Bradford St., U2; 18 Bangs St.; 7 Brewster St.; 460 Commercial St. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, HS, CM, AI, LD.

HS noted that 7 Brewster St. and 460 Commercial St. were previously determined to be Full Reviews.

- i) 16 MacMillan Wharf – To replace 3 doors in kind.
Unidentified man gave description of changes, including replacing doors in kind and also some interior renovations.
LD made a motion to approve as presented. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, HS, CM, AI, LD.
- ii) 25 Winthrop St. – *(continued from the meeting of September 1st)* – To replace 3 windows and a door.
Brad Mallow presented with a requested schematic and rough dimensions around the bay window; windows to be replaced like-for-like. CM noted an issue with the previous picket fence and said he's like to see the accurate dimensions for this proposal. Mr. Mallow said he would probably not be able to secure a draftsman within weeks, to which LD said a photograph could work as well. HS said she is fine with it, based on the location.
LD made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Oct. 6, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.
- iii) 12 Standish St. – To add a skylight.
HDC determined for Full Review; no vote taken.
- iv) 165 Bradford St. – To replace 8 windows in kind.
No one presented.

LD noted Renewal by Anderson, but questioned the nature and material of the windows at hand, requested more information.

LD made a motion to continue the determination to the meeting of Oct. 6, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

- v) [155 Commercial, U3](#) – To replace 2 patio doors and an entry door in kind.

Paula Koenig presented; said job is to replace with something that is functional; “4,000” series to replace Andersons as exist.

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

- vi) [240 Bradford St., U2](#) – To replace a window in kind.

Hal Winard presented; said the replacement is for a 1/1 to be replaced with a 2/1 to match other units on the building.

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

- vii) [18 Bangs St.](#) – To replace windows and siding in kind and asphalt roofing with red cedar shingles.

Kevin Bazarian presented; noted same 6/1 windows and all else in kind, with white cedar siding.

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

- viii) [16 Brewster St.](#) – To replace a fence.

Rich Mills presented; explained the situation as the need to replace the septic tank and address the distance between the earth as exists and the shed, which must hold 200 lbs as the area represents a walkway; proposal is to insert a 42” balustered railing with pressure treated tops and bottoms.

MM said she is for it, but noted the need to make a Full Review for neighbor notification as procedural; other commissioners agreed it would pass favorable in vote.

No formal vote taken to render as Full Review at the Oct. 6, 2021 meeting.

- ix) [613 Commercial St.](#) - To raise a structure and install a concrete pier foundation, add a new front porch and two stairways, and demolish and reconstruct an addition on the west elevation and a first-floor deck with associated stairways to match the existing.

HDC determined for Full Review; no vote taken.

- x) [522B Commercial St.](#) – To extend an existing fence.

HDC determined for Full Review; no vote taken.

- xi) [24 Standish St.](#) - To demolish a garage and replace it with a one-story addition on a west elevation, infill a southwest corner, and add a dormer on the southeast corner of a structure.

HDC determined for Full Review; no vote taken.

xii) [7 Brewster St.](#) – To replace existing wood trim with Azek trim.

TS reported that the applicant has been notified for a Full Review at next meeting.

xiii) [460 Commercial St.](#) – To restore an historic façade, including replacing 10 windows, corner boards, trim, siding, a former entrance door and repairing shutters, a transom, clerestory lights, and a brick stoop.

TS reported that the applicant has been notified for a Full Review at next meeting.

2. Appointment of PMPM member to the Commission *(continued from the meeting of September 1st)*

David Gardner spoke about the appointment of a PMPM representative to the HDC relative to the bylaw, chapter 15; gave background to the appointment process whereby the Select Board failed to make an appointment from among the PMPM's nominations, after which it went to the Town Moderator, who also failed to make a nomination. LD asked Mr. Gardner if he knew of any reason why the Select Board would fail to make an appointment in this case, to which he replied that he did not, but noted that the former Chair of the HDC and PMPM Rep., Thomas Biggert's, resignation dictated that a position of representative was needed to be filled, and, per the bylaw, in a timely manner. Mr. Gardner added that there is nothing stopping the Board from approaching the Town at Town Meeting to amend the vetting and nomination processes.

HS asked if it was possible to put the matter back on the shoulder of the Select Board or Town Moderator in noting that the HDC has never been placed in this position, to which Mr. Gardner said it was not permissible to return the vote to the Select Board or Moderator and that the appointment will remain with the HDC to render due.

MM said she has been asking since March to ascertain the date when the PMPM was notified of the vacancy, to which Attorney for the PMPM, J. Lester Murphy, Jr., gave as March 22, 2021, offering that the qualified nominee PMPM had submitted then withdrew; PMPM next requested that the HDC approve one of the two candidates it had put forth, Dr. K. David Weidner, PhD, and Executive Director of the PMPM; or AI. Mr. Gardner said the PMPM did comply within the correct time-frames by being responsive.

CM asked that Mr. Gardner bring the tone down a little bit as the HDC is present as a public service and doesn't need to be yelled at, to which Mr. Gardner said he was not yelling and continued in stating that Town Consul has weighed in on the situation. Attorney Murphy agreed that Town Consul has concurred that the PMPM has operated correctly.

MM asked per the nomination of someone who lives in Brewster, to which Mr. Gardner said was a legitimate application as he is on the rolls according to Town Clerk. CM repeated his discomfort at the Board being put in this position when their function is to relegate historic preservation. Attorney Murphy said he understood the difficult position the HDC is being put into and that the appointing authority can take the nomination to next June.

LD thanked Mr. Gardner and Attorney Murphy for their time and discussion on the matter concluded.

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

CM opted to postpone his scheduled presentation to the next meeting.

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

None.

4:00 P.M. Public Hearing: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

5. Full Hearings:

- a) **HDC 21-14** *(continued from the meeting of September 1st)*
Application by Nancy Lockwood requesting to enclose a porch and add a second story with a roof deck on the structure located at **1 Holway Avenue, U1A**.
LD made a motion to postpone the decision to the meeting of October 6, 2021 at the applicant's request. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.
- b) **HDC 21-138** *(continued to the meeting of October 6th)*
Application by **Ted Smith**, on behalf of **Howard Burchman**, requesting to convert an existing guesthouse to 3 residential units, including reconfiguring an existing roof and various windows and doors, expanding a one-story appendage on the north elevation, adding a bay window on the south elevation, adding a second floor, and constructing a deck on top of an existing first-floor roof on the structure located at **12 Center Street**.
- c) **HDC 21-144** *(continued from the meeting of September 1st)*
Application by **Joe McCarty**, on behalf of **GS PTown, LLC**, requesting to demolish and rebuild a structure in a larger footprint by expanding it 7' on the west elevation on the property located at **193 Bradford Street**.
Joe McCarty presented.
LD read a letter into the record from Eric Larsen, structural engineer, reporting that the structure suffers from a litany of issues and, as such, is uninhabitable or safe.
MM said she was fine with the request for demolition based on the engineer's report and having conducted a site visit. AI cited visibility from Bradford St. and questioned the need for an exterior staircase on a single family home. MM and JD noted very minimal visibility.
LD made a motion to approve demolition of the existing structure based on the engineer's report and the re-build based on plans received June 8, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.
- d) **HDC 21-174** *(continued from the meeting of September 1st)*
Application by **Casey Clark**, on behalf of **Stephane L. Ginez Revocable Living Trust, Stephane L. Ginez, Trustee**, requesting to replace windows on all elevations and a door on the north elevation and to re-side with cedar shingles on the structure located at **8 Montello Street**.
LD recused herself; JD stepped in as Acting Chair.
Stephane Ginez, Alex Guerra (sp) and Casey Clark presented. Mr. Ginez noted changes made with the HDC's guidelines, including removal of the wall in the front and re-doing the sidewalks for unity; provided dimensions; went with 6/6 as recommended by the HDC; shutters replaced in cedar except front; change of the kitchen door was not a problem.
JD said his only concern is that the windows retain their same sizes and openings as dictated by the front facade. Proportions of the panes were discussed to maintain uniformity.
JD made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that north side ground floor windows are the same as the front façade and second story north windows are the same ratio as the ground floor and front facade at 26"x44". MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, HS, CM, AI, JD.

e) [HDC 21-178](#) (continued from the meeting of September 1st)

Application by **Kurt Raber**, on behalf of **Riley Brothers Realty, LLC**, requesting to improve an existing structure by removing and replacing a one-story wing on the rear elevation and replacing it with an addition housing a compliant stair to a three-bedroom residential unit on the second and third floors and to continue the use of a second structure on the rear elevation to house a bicycle storage on the ground floor and two one-bedroom residential units on the upper level on the property located at **136 Bradford Street**.

Kurt Raber (remotely), and Lester J, Murphy, Jr., Attorney, presented.

CM addressed the west elevation of the existing structure which, he said, appears to have gone up in height with a window added, diminishing the historic context of the structure, as with the garage addition, re-orienting of the stairs and removal of a window; trim on the door is different from what is proposed and approved; added picture window diminishing as well as the roof change; three garage doors not two, which, he noted, was `approved.

Mr. Raber said the combined buildings are smaller than what was approved, and that four garage doors were previously approved. CM noted the HDC's purview as exterior views only, said the massing feels diminished and detracts from the structure.

MM agreed with CM and said that while this is a new application, anything the HDC approves should be as close as possible to what was previously approved. HS and JD concurred. AI said he can only consider this new app as he was not on the Board when the previous proposal was approved. Attorney Murphy remarked that the bottom floor is the commercial space in explaining the need for the garage doors.

JD addressed the approved single 2/2 window on the ground floor, farthest left, east elevation, which they want to see retained; ogee molding preference; keep with existing rather than cutting into the bay, per 1950s-like canapé. Mr. Raber replied that they can stick with the flat membrane roof. JD said per the third floor dormer tower which originally had two windows ganged together and is now repped by a single that he would like to keep with the former plan. AI sought clarity on drawings marked as "existing" and "proposed" elevations.

JD asked per the new railing height and suggested making the balusters appear shorter by adding a base; reviewed the HDC requests for the east elevation; per west elevation, sought retention of molding as an original defining feature; cited approval of the stairs as not as exposed as it now appears. Mr. Raber said that as the size of the structure was reduced by the ZBA, the stairs revamp concerns the lower commercial space. LD added the HDC preference would be to see the west elevation preserved as previously approved.

JD expressed a plan to realign all three sides of the addition to conform to 2 ½ rather than 3 ½ stories under the gable on the back 'L'; per A2.3, or east front façade, to stick with what was approved in this section – the Italianate rather than shed feature. Mr. Raber cited a need for egress out of the commercial space. JD also suggested running an OGEE molding for consistency, with no false bracket and a hip roof to the corner.

Second Building

AI spoke of the extension on the existing building in the front as would have a mansard on the third floor around the entire structure; that it seems appropriate with the new building to continue that feature so it reads like a single story building with the mansard roof on top of it – to continue with this building's extension, as well, so it is cantered in.

Mr. Raber remarked that every time they are called in to address new plans it costs his client \$100,000. JD responded by saying that if the original design they approved had been permitted to go through six months ago as planned the costs would have been lower, to which Mr. Raber said is not true. JD said the fact that plans did not pass the Zoning Board is not the fault of the HDC; that the HDC is trying to keep the same square footage and that

what is now presented is not close to what was initially proposed; cited several new design features which, he said, appear to be sneaked in. Attorney Murphy said he appreciated where the HDC was coming from and agreed that the intent should be to try and come as close as possible to what was originally approved. LD said, essentially, that the Board wants the front façade to look as approved, as with the left side of the building when facing front from Bradford St. with a modification to the right side as recommended per the hip roof. Attorney Murphy commented that the bump out in the rear will resemble a lower height.

Mr. Raber said the height of the new, second building is the same height as previously approved with the new garage door configuration as 9' high by 10' wide - with three, not four doors as formerly drafted, but which LD said looks more looming than before. AI said the original drawings had a certain kind of carriage-house look to them whereas these appear more like a loading dock. Mr. Raber said he would discuss this aspect with his client and they might be able to reduce the height from 9' to 8'. AI asked if more precise language can be employed in the new drawings, to which Mr. Raber said they would conform as building #1 and building #2.

LD made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of October 6, 2021 with revisions due by September 30th. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

f) [HDC 21-183](#)

Application by **Lucy Siegel** requesting to construct a 9' by 17' addition to an existing structure, replace an exterior stairway, several windows and an existing vinyl fence on the property located at **18 Pearl Street**.

Lucy Siegel and Frances Sullivan, architect, presented. Mr. Sullivan spoke of the proposal to remove the existing second story back porch and existing stairs down to the yard; to replace with an addition to expand the kitchen, including a new landing and new spiral stairs to access a roof deck; several existing windows to be changed out to energy-efficient units, Series 400 Anderson, vinyl clad with true divide-lites inside and out and glass dividers; windows to be 6/6 in keeping with existing; removal of an encroachment to the second floor at 6'; vinyl fence replaced with a wood fence; work to be done to match with white cedar shingles; deck of wood with white painted balusters and hand rails; said new roof is a very low slope with rubber membrane.

MM read three letters in support from the neighbors at 19 Pearl St.; 21 Pearl St. and one opposed from the owners at 151 Bradford St., citing set-backs. AH read a letter in support from Scott Martino and Ryan Landry, direct abutters to the rear. LD clarified that the HDC does not have set-backs in its purview. Ms. Siegel said a surveyor report confirms that they are within the regulated set-back.

AI asked per the staircase to the deck. Ms. Siegel said the stairs allow family to access the lower level without going through the house, as well as non-family or renters and possibly a care-taker for her in her later years.

JD addressed the south elevation in terms of the window exchange to which Mr. Sullivan said the door there would be removed and a new window installed to match the one that exists. JD asked if the spiral stairs could be tucked further behind the building. Mr. Sullivan said he looked into this possibility but that he came up with an issue of space and an impact on the bathroom at that location which, Ms. Siegel said, is quite small. LD added that the HDC does not approve spiral stairs with this level of visibility. Mr. Sullivan proposed a set of wooden straight-run stairs with an L-shape that would run alongside of the house which Ms. Siegel and the HDC said they would favor.

JD said the correct design for the boxed bay on the north elevation has all the windows contained within the bay, with 2/2s as basic big light-wells. Ms. Siegel offered two double hungs to align with the HDC's recommendations. JD suggested better porch options.

LD advised submitting new plans no later than September 30th for a continued hearing on October 6, 2021.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing to the meeting of Oct. 6, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

LD called for a brief recess at 6:03pm.

g) [HDC 21-187](#) (continued from the meeting of September 1st)

Application by **Casey Clark**, on behalf of **Topknot Properties, LLC**, requesting to amend a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness (HDC 20-051) regarding the replacement of windows on the structure located at **225 Commercial Street**.

AH reported that the applicant has requested a site visit in that projected photographs may not be able to tell the whole tale. October 6th at 2:30pm was selected for the site visit.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing to the meeting of Oct. 6, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

h) [HDC 21-189](#)

Application by **Audrey Mostaghim** requesting to flatten a roof, add a roof deck over an existing structure and add a spiral stair as a second means of egress on the property located at **133 Commercial Street**.

Audrey Mostaghim and George Tegarlis, technical historic consultant, presented. A narrative was passed around to the Board and historic photographs displayed.

LD remarked that a second floor to the building was previously approved several years ago by both HDC and the ZBA. Ms. Mostaghim said the reason for submitting a reference to the Zoning moment now is to provide a visual to the exterior stair on the left which she aims to replicate and that she is prepared to provide elevations and architectural renderings after she has received the HDC's guidance and recommendations.

MM counted seven letters on file per application; pro and con, some with questions. JD recommended seeing the final design plans first before receiving public comment.

Ms. Mostaghim read from a narrative outlining her plan to preserve the historic integrity of the building by minimizing the height of the roof top deck by flattening the roof, per historic photos; recreate top railings and smoke-tempered glass to mimic the roof line; adding two electric copper lanterns; door to have 12 glass patterns and replicate with copper sheeting; seeking to recreate original bay windows with original details; copper sheeting; access to deck will be provided by a stairway on the east side; stairs to have lattice greens on the left side to provide for privacy; small bar on the back deck with eight seats facing the door and a wall covering the mechanicals or hood fans; enclosed bathroom 10' high; said she has the betterment rights for 87 seats and has a current capacity for 66; looking to cover the deck with a removable shade; proposing a spiral staircase for second form of egress which, she said, can change to a straight staircase; per personal motivations, mentioned the negative impacts of Covid on her business which has no outdoor seating and added that she has received pandemic funding based on the creation of this application for restructuring.

JD said the flattening of the roof is possibly the only reason he would vote for the proposal; stated his concerns for what the bathroom might look like and what other elevated structures might be and how they would appear from the street; asked if an upstairs bathroom is necessary. Mr. Tegarlis said the mechanicals are pre-existing and stand to 7'; green wall, per plantings and sound proofing to mask mechanicals. Ms. Mostaghim said the

bathroom is to reduce traffic up and down while people are consuming alcohol. LD suggested the seasonal covering be further back, as with all visible elements that could negatively affect the plans. HS said she felt it was a good way to go. CM said he is looking forward to seeing the plans. MM gave advice as one, she said, who has gone through a lengthy process with neighbors regarding her restaurant, to examine carefully the previous Zoning approval. JD advised shying away from any kind of heavy, permanent structure for the overhang.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing to the meeting of October 20, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

AH said the materials would need to be in by October 14th; conveyed to Mr. Tegarís that a waiver from the Architectural Access Board would probably be needed for ADA compliance based on the new upper service area. Mr. Tegarís said there should be 12 or 13 letters of support on file.

i) [HDC 21-190](#)

Application by **Deborah Morrison** requesting to replace 2 doors with casement windows, add a window and to construct a new shed dormer on the northeast side elevation on the property located at **5 Cottage Street, U1**.

LD and MM recused themselves as abutters. JD assumed the Chair.

Deborah Morrison, Raquel Alvarez and Tom Thompson presented. Ms. Alvarez said she and her wife, Ms. Morrison, have made Cottage St. their only home, which they bought in 2016, following the Covid pandemic and its work complications; said the second floor or attic as exists is non-functional as they have access only by ladder and must crawl on all fours to enter fully into the space. JD remarked that the dormer addition would be barely visible.

Mr. Thompson cited guidelines #5 and #8 for windows and dormers, respectively; led the Board through the site plan and said a small deck would be filled in to facilitate a stairway. JD asked if people on Mechanic St. have expressed any problems with the design. AH read a letter in support from Michael Samuelain of Mechanic St. LD of 84 Commercial St. said she supports the project, citing low visibility and lovely neighbors; MM of 99 Commercial St. voiced the same reasons of support as LD.

JD made a motion to accept as presented. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; CM, HS, AI JD.

j) [HDC 21-193](#)

Application by **Seth Kaplowitz** requesting to laterally expand an existing dormer on a south elevation of a structure located at **457-459 Commercial Street**.

Seth Kaplowitz presented; said they bought the house in 2013 and renovated in 2015-16; now have two children and need to expand, utilizing like materials.

AH reported no letters on file; no public comments.

LD referenced approving a dormer on top of a dormer at the property, which was and is very rarely done. HS said she only has a problem with the spacing of the windows. MM said it was within the corner boards. AI said the windows don't seem to exist on the same plain, but doesn't present a problem as it has a charming appeal. JD said that after he analyzed the $\frac{3}{4}$ view of it, the first two levels project so far out that there is a retreat which follows and he would not have a problem with it. AI said it's a heavy house but surrounded by super hefty homes. CM said he didn't like it; that the expansion as proposed diminishes the beauty and uniqueness of it, although he wouldn't necessarily be a hold-out if no one on the Board concurs. LD agreed with CM, said making a dormer on top of a dormer is even less historic and expanding on that does not comply with policy.

MM made a motion to approve as presented. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-1-1: MM, HS, JD, in favor; LD, opposed; CM, abstained.

k) [HDC 21-194](#)

Application by **Bill Fornaciari**, on behalf of **198 Commercial PropCo, LLC**, requesting to remove an existing first-floor rear addition, construct a new third-floor rear addition, and to add a fourth-floor equipment deck and a new front-facing third-floor balcony on the structure located at **198 Commercial Street**.

Bill Fornaciari, architect, Stuart Jackson, owner, and Lester J Murphy, Jr., Attorney presented. Attorney Murphy said Mr. Jackson is seeking to add more rooms and make major improvements and upgrades. Mr. Jackson addressed the rear elevation as failing, looking to replace this addition and include a second means of egress; new third floor would allow for two more rooms and to store mechanical equipment on 4th floor roof deck; proposing small door and Juliet balcony; return to original windows and replace siding with original materials.

Mr. Jackson said he was welcoming advice from the HDC; that the new roof deck will be properly masked from street-view; seeking year-round occupancy, to include artist studio.

CM said he preferred option #3 in that it is more in line with the historic photos as supplied, not a fan of Juliet balcony, felt it was a cleaner look minus the window as proposed.

JD requested an explanation for the three options at the back, to which Mr. Jackson said he hoped to place the manager in one of the rooms, merge two rooms with the Juliet balcony and add a third for rental income. LD, JD, CM and MM, as well as Mr. Jackson, expressed a preference for option #3.

Mr. Fornaciari noted the bay in the front as an incorrect size and Mr. Jackson asked if there might be no other windows on the front other than the bay. JD suggested the front windows match those on the side. LD said she'd like to see larger, correct sized windows. Mr. Jackson said the window configuration would not allow for furniture within the rooms. JD said it would be nicer to have the symmetry there. CM asked what kind of door is proposed for the Carver St. side. Mr. Jackson replied he would go for whatever is historic or relevant. JD said he agreed with CM about no windows in the front.

JD asked per the high points, to which Mr. Fornaciari said DPW has informed that Mr. Jackson owns the railing, that they had sought more information before proposing a cut. HDC agreed that Option #3 was their preference; Juliet balcony eliminated; windows removed on the first floor, side, south elevation; added window on the 1st floor of the west elevation.

LD made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of October 6, 2021 with revised plans received no later than September 30th. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

JD left the meeting at 7:43pm.

l) [HDC 21-196](#)

Application by **Eric Larsen**, on behalf of **Paul A. Saucedo et al.**, requesting to remove a second-floor deck and replace the deck structure, decking, railings and egress stair on the property located at **20 Court Street, U2**.

Eric Larsen, Ken Ross and Paul Saucedo presented. Mr. Larsen said they are seeking to square off the deck which is 99 sq. ft. existing and to feature a proposed addition of 53 sq. ft., new wood railings, balusters and railings to match figure #2 in the photos; existing spiral stairs to be replaced in a cleaner fashion with a better foot path.

No public comments or letters.

LD noted a remote visibility. MM said she was fine with it.

LD made a motion to approve as presented. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; MM, HS, AI, LD.

m) [HDC 21-197](#)

Application by **Eric Larsen**, on behalf of **Marcene Marcoux**, requesting to install a shed on the property located at **186 Bradford Street**.

Eric Larsen presented; said they were trying to right said-wrongs as the Town has filed a motion to cease and desist on work that was in progress. AH noted the visibility as owing to Bangs St. – before it becomes the private way.

No public comments or letters.

LD clarified that the applicant was seeking approval for a deck that has already been constructed; asked what all the joists were for, to which Mr. Larsen said they were for the deck. LD said the deck looms and should be considered for approval as well as rail details. Mr. Larsen asked if the application following a site visit could be considered as Administrative Review, to which LD said it could not as it signals a new build.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing to the meeting of Oct. 6. 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, HS, CM, AI, LD.

n) [HDC 21-200](#)

Application by **Gordon Siegel** requesting to install 3 sheds on the property located at **27 Standish Street**.

Gordon Siegel presented; said they recently sold a property in Connecticut and the sheds are to hold items from that property; clapboard proposed with shingles on top. AH said the quality of shingles at this time is not great, to which Mr. Siegel said they would stay with clapboard; single window, glazed; referenced submitted elevations. CM asked if all the sheds would be aligned, to which AH said they would be in three different locations and all comply.

LD made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the sheds be all wood material, single glazed window, cedar shingle roof. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, HS, CM, AI, LD.

6. Review and approval of Minutes:

HS made a motion to approve the HDC meeting minutes of July 21, 2021, MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, HS, CM, AI, LD.

7. Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

Per HS, the following decisions were written and approved at today's meeting: [21-144](#), [193 Bradford St.](#); [21-190](#), [5 Cottage St.](#), U1; [21-193](#), [457-459 Commercial St.](#); [21-196](#), [20 Court St.](#), U2.; [21-174](#) , [8 Montello St.](#); [21-200](#), [27 Standish St.](#)

AH reminded the HDC of a site visit on Oct. 6th at [225 Commercial St.](#), Canteen, to inspect the grilles at the request of the applicant; said the shed at [186 Bradford St.](#) is not visible from anywhere but Bangs St.

LD made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:02pm. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, HS, CM, AI, LD.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil