



Historic District Commission

Minutes

The Provincetown Historic District Commission Public Meeting of Wednesday, August 3, 2022 at 3:30 P.M. 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: 947 335 349#

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.; John Dowd (JD), Vice-Chair, PGB Rep.; Hersh Schwartz (HS), Clerk, Chamber of Commerce Rep.; Chris Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep.; Michela Murphy (MM), Alternate; Anthony Iannucci (AI), Alternate.

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

LD called the meeting to order at 3:30pm, gave roll-call. TS read hybrid meeting protocols.

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

The meeting will end at 7:00 PM. Any application not heard will be postponed or continued until the next scheduled meeting.

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**

September 7, 2022 Public Hearing agenda and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

VOTES MAY BE TAKEN:

- i) [19 Standish St., U1](#) – To replace a fence.

No one presented. AH offered that sufficient reason had been supplied by the applicant to make the case for replacement, which LD noted as in kind.

LD made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the replacement be exactly in kind. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: JD, HS, CM, MM, LD.

- ii) [15 Cottage St., U7](#) – To add a dormer and install 2 windows.

LD made a motion to consider the decision for Full Review at the hearing of September 7, 2022. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: HS, JD, CM, MM, LD.

CM requested a review of the existing property.

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

Discussion of 24 Standish Street Project.

Kevin Bazarian and Ted Smith, architect, presented. Mr. Bazarian said they had acquired demolition and foundation permits and that during the demolition all gables had to be removed to raise the walls with some small sections saved, per submitted pictures.

MM apologized for her previous remark regarding the issue in noting that Mr. Bazarian can be recognized for correcting work that has been done in error, as well as doing good work and being respectful of the HDC policies. AI said that, in recalling the previous approval, the explanation of work involved indicated the addition of a dormer but not the level of reconstruction involved, to which Mr. Smith and the Board debated, indicating the need to raise the roof height and the changes incurred when a pitch is altered to accommodate structural adaptations.

LD made a motion to direct the Building Commissioner to remove the stop work order and not find the aforementioned party in violation of the Certificate of Appropriateness that was issued on December 1, 2021 for work to be done at 24 Standish Street. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: HS, JD, CM, MM, LD.

Retaining Wall at 8 Cudworth St.

Todd Westrick presented; said he has been hired to design a full brick veneer retaining wall at 8 Cudworth St., where previous work had been found in violation due to lack of HDC approval; said a hand rail is required but that since the land is 14" off the ground the hand rail should not technically be required to be attached to the house; requesting to go with a simpler wrought-iron design and asked if the HDC would need a specifically historic feature. AH said three or more risers require a hand rail but not necessarily balusters if less than 36" out from a 3' drop. Mr. Westrick said the grade is to be to the top of the retaining wall, or 2'8" at most.

Mr. Westrick presented examples of rails in the neighborhood and said he would prefer to attach the rail to the house for the sake of continuity but asked if the HDC would need this element in wood with balusters which would add oddly to the mass; seeking lamb's tongue return at the bottom; relayed steps at 6 + 5/8, with brick to match the foundation.

LD concluded that application could be made for a Full Review.

Door Construction at PAAM

LD said there may be an issue with the, as yet uncompleted, door work at Provincetown Art Association and Museum on Commercial St.; noted a tiny bit of trim where more trim can be expected in the build-out but that the side-lights and transom are not in keeping with the previous photo as submitted. JD said he reached out to PAAM in suggesting that this would be a good time to have a discussion on the front door project but has had no reply; said the HDC had been extremely specific regarding fluting and retaining the historic elements during the presentation at the hearing; foresees issues with adding onto vinyl or metal features in place.

AH stated the situation as of now is that PAAM has been put on notice and should they proceed any further they invite a risk for potential intervention. LD said she received a response via e-mail and the party is aware of the prospect of appearing before the HDC under Any Other Business. HS suggested the party be invited to address the Commission. CM suggested a site visit which might save time and expense as the HDC will not be meeting again until September 7th. LD said she would reach out to PAAM with this advice.

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

None fielded.

4. **Full Hearings:**

- a. [HDC 21-242](#) (continued to the meeting of October 19th)
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**.
- b. [HDC 22-11](#) (continued to the meeting of September 7th)
Application by **Brian Calhoun**, on behalf of **Rainbow Connection Realty, LLC**, requesting to replace balconies on the south facade and to reconstruct the west facade decks, balconies, and stairwell to include a lift so that the first floor becomes more accessible on the structure located at **174 Commercial Street**.
- c. [HDC 22-119](#) (continued from the meeting of July 20th)
Application by **Cass Benson** requesting to replace an aluminum railing with wooden railings on the property located at **6 Johnson Street**.
Cass Benson presented; acknowledged examples sent to her by JD from which she preferred the railing with captured balusters at 6 Carver St. JD recommended ball caps atop the posts for more of a turn-of-the-century Victorian look. LD pondered the look of 6x6 posts but said the grandeur of the entrance could probably support the ratio.
JD made a motion to accept as presented with the following conditions: front post replacement of the circular post be the width and design of the pilasters on the building, the railing system be captured baluster with a cut-out design, and the base of the railing feature a ball-cap. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: JD, CM, HS, MM, LD.
- d. [HDC 22-139](#) (continued from the meeting of July 20th)
Application by **Doug Dolezal**, on behalf of **Thomas G. Myers et al.**, requesting to demolish 2 structures on a parcel, divide the parcel into 2 Lots (A and B), and construct 5 new dwelling units on Lot A and a two-family structure on Lot B on the property located at **27 Winthrop Street**.

Doug Dolezal, Thomas Myers and Joe Castro presented. Mr. Dolezal went through the changes to the design of 27 Winthrop St. (Lot #1): chimney options offered, units lowered by 3' with adjustment or reduction of flues. Lot #2 identified as 34 Court St.

Options for Building A: A1, A2; Building B: B1, B2; Building C: C2, C3.

HS's choices were A1, B2 or C3. JD noted that historically chimneys tend to sit on the roof, but as these buildings are not being engendered as historic, he would defer to the planners. LD, CM, MM and AI agreed. Mr. Dolezal stated his chimney preference as B1 with a matching scheme of A1 and C2.

Mr. Dolezal addressed roof pitch preferences against an anticipated building height of 28'-30', dependent on a flat site and AH's calculation. JD withdrew his objection to the narrow look of the new building construct based on Mr. Dolezal's research of neighboring architecture. LD said the HDC does not usually permit dormer pitch to reach the roof ridge line and asked for other options. Mr. Dolezal replied that his hope was to keep the 12 over 12 pitch. AH shared that roof conditions per Zoning Code could be useful .

JD said he felt the dormer and roof pitch were working in the same language. CM said the dormer is his least favorite thing about the design, which Mr. Dolezal quoted as a 6' depth. LD asked for a 3D contextual drawing, which Mr. Dolezal said he did not have in his current presentation. AI said he didn't have a problem with the dormer but asked per the variety of wall cladding applications to which Mr. Dolezal referenced the utilitarian look of area structures such as have been modified through time. Dormer roof materials were discussed, with Mr. Dolezal pointing to zinc copper or rubber, and an expressed preference for rubber in gray as cost affected but offered no objection to what he coined the more nobler copper upgrade if chosen by the Board.

Narrow window adjustments presented with reduced jams, the slightly set-back or stand-alone unit to the left of the door eliminated, fixed slider. Mr. Dolezal's preferences were for G2 or H2, which JD suggested were minor modifications but said the narrow windows are not seen in Town and the second story units do not relate to the lower level. CM said he felt the second story windows do not work or fit for the structure, appear as outliers and LD agreed that these windows appear inappropriate. HS and MM said they were fine with the flat dormer pitch.

Mr. Dolezal cited the proposal to remove the retaining wall.

LD summarized the conclusions of adjustments as follows: chimney options as A1, B1 or C2; keeping roof pitch at 12/12; dormer pitch to remain and materials as zinc or rubber; door as H2; upper windows as G2.

Public Letters

MM reported and read into the record letters in support from: Lee Olsen at 27 Court St., Suellen Rubin, Kieran Murphy of 27 Court, U3.; Steven Scot Dean, Jr., Jared William Schwocho of 27 Court St., 7B.; and Kristin Hatch, Executive Director of the Provincetown Housing Authority.

MM reported and read into the record letters in opposition including an e-mail exchange between owner, Joey Castro, and Brad Mallow and Danny Skahen of 25 Winthrop St.; Russ & Thom of 23 Winthrop St. and David Carey, at 25 Winthrop St., U3.

LD called for a short break at 5:21pm.

Public Comments

Anu Advani of 28 Winthrop St. spoke in opposition but presented what she said was a feasible compromise: keep shell of the 1960 home and place condos inside with one addition; build a retaining wall for the cemetery to hold up the sand dune; leave the barbershop alone and add a two family home alongside it for family and seasonal help.

Brad Mallow of 25 Winthrop St. spoke of the retaining wall in expressing his opinion that the sand will not support the new construct and cited the historic needs of the neighborhood as not honored by this project.

Sharon Bunn, Chair of the Cemetery Commission, mentioned a Commission meeting on July 13th which the applicant attended and where questions were fielded; expressed concerns for the existing vegetation and new access to the 300 year old cemetery which the new proposal would invite and which, she said, could also pose problems through disturbance of the graves; said fencing was discussed with naturalized materials.

Danny Skahen of 25 Winthrop St. requested the HDC delay its determination based on the objections of the abutters and absence of all pertinent facts and parameters regarding demolition which, he said, goes against the HDC's policy of preservation; cited the 1960s building as an historic designation and lamented that the ZBA and HDC do not work more in concert on behalf of these types of projects.

MM responded to the abutters' remarks in stating that while the HDC is charged with preservation of the Town's properties, the need for affordable and seasonal housing is paramount for the Town to sustain its communities; added that the current Long-term Comprehensive Plan addresses Town Boards working in better tandem.

David Carey spoke by remote; objected to the development being referred to repeatedly as an affordable housing project when, in fact, only one of seven dwellings is being consigned to that end.

Demolition

Mr. Dolezal gave further history on the origins of the existing buildings and went through the demolition plans and its effects on the current footprint, including both street facades and the cemetery.

HS sought clarity on the breakdown of units in the new plan, outside the private residence; these were stated as one affordable, one seasonal/family use and four at market-level.

LD noted no historically identifying features and that demolition was in the HDC purview under these conditions, which she endorsed. HS agreed and no Board objections were fielded.

Design

LD suggested a rotation of the two-family units to hide the connections. MM recommended returning with a pared down presentation, to which CM agreed.

LD ran down the revision plan details to which all polled were in agreement including chimney choices and zinc material, zinc or rubber on roofs, door choices; demolition as a settled issue and windows still not resolved.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing to the meeting of September 7, 2022.
HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: HS, JD, CM, MM, LD.
AH to send a time waiver to Mr. Dolezal to be signed and filed.

e. [HDC 22-148](#) (*request to continue to the meeting of October 19th*)

Application by **Bradford Walker**, on behalf of **Terrence A. West**, requesting to renovate a structure, including replacing, relocating, and reconfiguring windows, replacing front and rear doors, replacing a fence, relocating a shed, lifting an existing gable roof by 36", removing two block chimneys, adding a new cross-gable extension on the east elevation, and adding a sloped dormer on the west elevation on the property located at **15 Bradford Street**.

LD made a motion to continue the decision to the hearing of October 19, 2022. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: HS, JD, CM, MM, LD.

f. [HDC 22-155](#) (*continued from the meeting of July 20th*)

Application by **Lucas Colburn** requesting to replace siding, roofing, and fencing, to add a dormer, to replace doors and windows, and an existing rear porch with a deck, and to add a railing on a front porch on the structure located at **12 Winthrop Street**.

Luca Colburn, Contractor, presented; said he did not have existing plans but would get his hands on them and forward as requested; made case for a hip roof dormer position and went through changes, indicating rotting railing to be replaced probably with wood; windows replaced with patio door; porch starting to erode and will probably have to be replaced; defective white cedar shingles and vinyl to be replaced; roofing to be replaced with architectural shingling; sliders added on second level out to the deck; slider to replace double-casements on rear porch first level which is not visible from any street-view.

CM said he has suggestions to the proposal and could provide guidance but that existing elevations would be needed to make any approval, which LD concurred.

JD spoke of centering the proposed dormered bathroom to make the construct less clumsy or asymmetrical; expressed his hope that the 1980s modern building could be upgraded for a more classically balanced, symmetrical look; suggested uniformity per alignment of posts. AI noted an aspect of the design as being underbuilt in the part where it should be better articulated. JD recommended a railing for the first floor to reciprocate the upper deck and break up some of the verticality; expressed indifference to sliders.

CM proposed wood in lieu of PVC for the railing; said he has issue with the partition of the second-floor decking; not in favor of the dormer; suggested a wider window on the second floor between the sliders and two windows instead of one above the garage; uniformity of shutters, doors; railing pulled closer to the roof; one, not two, beacon lights; encouraged a connection with the wave feature of the picket fence.

LD voiced for a shed rather than a hip dormer centered over the box, and re-alignment of posts. Mr. Colburn said he would also bring back uniform siding. JD added that trimmed-out window units would contribute to elevating the shoddy '80s design.

LD made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of September 7, 2022. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: HS, JD, CM, MM, LD.

g. [HDC 22-164](#)

Application by **Terrell Jordan** requesting to modify and replace a fence on the property located at **165 Commercial Street**.

Terrell Jordan, Owner, and Trustee of the Sandpiper, presented three modifications for the rear beach-side fence: matching pickets; PVC, due to a lot of vegetation including rose bushes and weather elements that add to the deterioration of the wood as well as a lot

of beach traffic at night with the public attempting to access the fence to get through to Commercial St.; and added height to mitigate this practice.

MM recommended another material as PVC ends up looking like plastic, to which Mr. Jordan said they were not seeking a plastic-look, but the Trex composite. LD said the HDC would want to see this option first-hand, which JD concurred. Mr. Jordan said he would drop off a sample; quoted fence heights as 43" to 72" and opting for the fence style that is currently at the front of the property as three different styles currently exist on the grounds.

LD made a motion to continue the decision to the hearing of September 7, 2022. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: HS, JD, CM, MM, LD.

MM asked per the house on 19 West Vine St. which, she said, appears to be covered in Azek.

JD left the meeting at 6:53pm.

5. Review and approval of Minutes:

LD made a motion to approve the HDC meeting minutes of July 20, 2022. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: CM, HS, MM, AI, LD.

6. Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

LD made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:54pm. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0: CM, HS, MM, AI, LD.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil