



Historic District Commission

Minutes

The Provincetown Historic District Commission Public Meeting of Wednesday, February 16, 2022 at 3:30 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:833-579-7589) Phone Conference ID: 826 938 412#

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.

Members present: Laurie Delmolino (LD), Chair, Historical Commission Rep.; Hersh Schwartz (HS), Clerk, Chamber of Commerce Rep.; Chris Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep.

Members by remote: John Dowd (JD), Vice Chair, PGB Rep.; Anthony Iannucci (AI), Alternate.

Excused Absence: Michela Murphy, Alternate.

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

LD called the meeting to order at 3:30pm and gave roll-call. TS read the protocols per the State guidelines for hybrid Town Meeting then handed the meeting over to LD.

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

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 March 2, 2022 Public Hearing agenda and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

VOTES MAY BE TAKEN:

- i) [147 Commercial St., UL11](#) – To replace a window in kind.

No one presented.

LD noted PVC trim as existing, and dimensions replaced in kind at 52x52.

LD made a motion to approve as presented CM seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; CM, HS, LD.

- ii) [205-209 Commercial St.](#) -To replace 2 display windows.

Hal Winard presented by remote with window replacements to be all wood, tru-divided line, custom-built for property at the Aquarium Mall.

LD made a motion to approve as presented CM seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; CM, HS, LD.

- iii) [15 Conant St., U2](#) – To replace 1 door and replace/enlarge 2 windows on a second-floor front and back façade, the latter of which is not visible from a public way.

Michael Clement and Tej Nuthulaganti presented; said the rear units are not visible from a public way.

JD said it felt the plan was geared toward a correct replication. CM asked per the glass door in lieu of the Provincetown Door, which JD suggested would be preferable and Mr. Clement said he would defer to the HDC on the style. LD added that most of the examples shown are from Simpson. Mr. Clement said they were interested in a storm door; asked per Pella as an option.

LD made a motion to approve with the condition that the door be wood and of the style and variety shown. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; CM, HS, LD.

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

- iv) [31 Pearl St.](#) – To replace existing siding and windows, including adding new windows, to rebuilding an existing stoop, to install a new foundation under an existing sunroom, and to remove existing cinderblock chimneys.

- v) [53 Commercial St.](#) - The proposal is for the construction of a structure at the street/front of the site which has 2 stories with a 2-car garage within the footprint of the first floor.

- vi) [8 Court St., UA](#) - To replace 2 existing double hung window units on the south elevation, to relocate an exterior door on the west elevation, and to replace a window on the north elevation; neither location is visible from a public way.

CM seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; CM, HS, LD.

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

CM asked per the fence for the house being done at 8 Bradford St. at Cottage Street, to which AH said she discovered the 6x6 posts today.

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

None fielded.

4. Full Hearings:

a) HDC 21-242 (continued from the meeting of February 2nd)

Application by **Brian Alexander**, on behalf of **James A. Green et al.**, requesting to install new windows on the northeast corner sleeping porch on the structure located at **592 Commercial Street**.

AH said she was informed that this would be the last continuance requested.

LD made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of March 16, 2022. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; CM, HS, LD.

b) HDC 21-316 (continued from the meeting of February 2nd)

Application by **Michael Frattarelli** requesting to replace siding, windows, roofing, and doors, to construct a 512 sq. ft. addition and deck to the rear and east side of Unit 2 and 3, and to re-locate a front door on Unit 1 on the structure located at **11 Conant Street, U2**.

Michael Frattarelli and Kaye McFadden presented. Mr. Frattarelli addressed the adjusted window on the right of the addition on the front elevation; cornices applied on all the doors; recessed porch area eliminated; dormer on the side; added a secondary peak on the rear elevation, adjusted the slope of the roof – as on the front elevation; all windows half-sash; windows on corner pulled over from the corner and peaked window added; south elevation: all windows made same size as the rest of the house; Anderson A-series, 2/2.

JD congratulated the design but said he did not feel the corbels as proposed are correct; that brackets were sparingly used on these types of structures and that three, as planned, is overkill. Mr. Frattarelli said he would remove the side corbels and re-submit a plan for review.

AI said he agreed with the revision. CM said he could not comment as he was not at the last meeting and hadn't watched the videotape. HS and LD concurred with AI.

AH read a letter in support from AI Collins at 16 Montello and another expressing concerns from direct abutters Michael Fowler and John Napi of 15 Conant U3, about the expansion as it would block light from their home and negatively affect their quality of life; included a Google street view and their own property site plan.

LD said the proximity of the build is a matter for Zoning, to which Ms. McFadden said they meet all the set-backs.

LD made a motion to approve with the condition that front overhang be deeper and a design plan provided; right-side overhang on the south side wall be eliminated; overhang on back west side retained; all trim be wood, and based on revised plans of Feb. 2, 2022. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; HS, JD, AI, LD. CM, recused.

c) HDC 21-322 (continued from the meeting of February 2nd)

Application by **Jonah Swain** requesting to replace siding and roofing shingles and to install a privacy door on the structure located at **333 Commercial Street, U1B**.

Jonas Swain and Joachim Sandbichler, owner, presented by remote.

LD noted the new plan is markedly different from what was proposed. HS requested an explanation on the build. Mr. Sandichler replied that they felt this design was a more attractive option than the lattice work and would also provide a safety element, remarking on litter and other abuses of the area in the past. HS said she could not assure the applicant that the revamp as employed would have been approved by the HDC had it come before the Board prior to the build and that she found it not attractive at all.

JD asked if this would be the result if the owner had had the option to build from scratch and if there was an opportunity to go back and create something historically appropriate. Mr. Sandbichler solicited suggestions from the Board. JD commented that while the current is better than what was there before, the angled pediment does not properly relate to the rest of the structure and said he found the asymmetrical element odd in voicing support for a unified look. AI agreed in stating he'd like to see the addition better relate to the rest of the building and perhaps recede a bit. LD concurred and expressed that the design could be squared off; advised something more like fencing rather than a solid wall, such as a 4' picket with a locking gate – a plan to keep the attachment more open.

Mr. Sanbichler asked if the roof might be peaked or triangular. LD said the new drawings can be simple and hand-drawn as a starting-point with some options.

Peter, owner of other condo unit and retail store on the ground floor, referred to a package he had sent in regarding the design; said he had nothing against the lattice as long as it was painted and properly maintained; spoke of the walkway to the basement as an access for the fire escape and utility needs, and that the shed area is a common condo area that, he thought, might be a legal matter. Peter said he felt Mr. Sandbichler's remarks relating to the state of the property were disingenuous in that there have never been hypodermic needles or beer bottles and such in all his time at the property or in the experience of former owner of 25 years, Nancy Meads; added that the shed blocks the exhaust fan and questioned if a building permit should have been required based on the increased mass that the resulting shed has added to the property.

Mr. Sandbichler responded that the lease with the landlord would dictate what is allowed. HS said that in all the time she owned a store next door she had never seen anything in terms of serious debris in that area and agreed that use of the passageway is a key concern to which Peter said he wrote a letter to the fire department about.

LD made a motion to continue the decision to the hearing of March 2, 2022 based on new plans and the condition that if new plans are not submitted by the first meeting in April, the HDC will require removal of the new structure as built. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; HS, JD, LD. CM, recused.

d) [HDC 22-5](#)

Application by **Ted Smith**, on behalf of **Stephen Syta**, requesting to construct a new dormer on a north elevation mirroring an existing south elevation dormer and to install solar panels on an existing south dormer roof on the structure located at **5 Pleasant Street**.

Ted Smith presented; said dormer will be same length on north and south, but cannot be the exact same dimensions based on the elevations and height of the structure; said they not trying to sneak in an extra bedroom and that the awning windows will match.

JD cited the plan as simple and sensitive; no problem with it. HS concurred. LD asked why the face of the dormer was not pulled out further, which Mr. Smith said was based on height restrictions to code. JD asked if the window height could be raised to the molding in order to give a less flattened appearance, to which Mr. Smith said could be done and added that the solar panels will not be visible, but that they do not have the sky light drawings yet to address. AH noted the contractor as BlueCel Home Solar. CM asked if other Board members are comfortable with the degree of the slope as proposed, to which LD said she could go along with based on the existing.

LD made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the new dormer windows be narrower and taller in terms of the width of the second story units. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; CM, JD, HS, AI, LD.

5. Review and approval of Minutes:

LD made a motion to approve the HDC meeting minutes of February 2, 2022 with the amendment that the demolition at 5 Kiley Court refer to the damaged roof alone. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; CM, JD, HS, AI, LD.

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

Thomas Biggert, former Chair of the HDC of 473 Commercial St., presented; spoke of his appreciation for the work that the Board does on behalf of the Town and humbly requested to be considered for the position as the appointing authority to the Provincetown Museum and Pilgrim Monument on behalf of the HDC with plans to submit his application accordingly. LD said the HDC does not have the purview to nominate candidates but to approve candidates as they are put forth for consideration. Mr. Biggert asked if it was not the HDC'S purview to make recommendations to the Select Board, to which LD said she was uncertain, promoting Mr. Biggert to recommend that the HDC make a pick of its own choosing and see what happens.

CM expressed his opinion that the HDC be the first stop for Board candidates and offered to write language that could help to clarify requirements and conditions of candidacy

CM spoke of an opportunity to apply for a grant to review the raising of structures in creating guidelines for the Town; referred to the creation of a PDF with appropriate statistics for consideration in order to facilitate a uniform policy. LD said that being pro-active is important.

6. Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

Per HS, decisions are to be written as follows:

HS: 31 Pearl St.

CM: 53 Commercial St.; 8 Court St.

Per HS, the following decisions were filed with Town Clerk on February 4, 2022:

HDC 21-279, 191A Commercial St.

HDC 21-318, 161 Commercial St.

HDC 21-321, 211 ½ Bradford St.

HDC 21-325, 19 Center St., U1

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

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil