

TOWN OF PROVINCETOWN

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF
March 19, 2014 3:45pm

MEETING HELD IN THE JUDGE WELSH HEARING ROOM

Members Present:, Ms. Polly Burnell, Mr. David McGlothlin, Mr. Lance Hatch and Ms. Marcene Marcoux

Members Absent: Mr. Ryan Landry, Mr. John Dowd and Mr. Thomas Biggert

Staff Present: Ms. Gloria McPherson, Town Planner

Meeting called to order by David McGlothlin at 3:45pm

1. Public Statements

None

2. Administrative Reviews

- a) **48 Commercial Street** – review of design of mermaid etching on door – **Denied; the HDC would like to see more options**
- b) **286 Commercial Street** – replacement of six double hung windows in kind - **Approved**
- c) **90 Bradford Street** – replacement of a slider door with a solid wood door and sidelights - **Approved**
- d) **12 Pearl Street** – replacement of three sliders and two doors in kind - **Approved**
- e) **3 Winthrop Street** – replacement of two sliders in kind - **Approved**
- f) **25 Watsons Court** – replacement of deck and railing with mahogany decking and azek railings - **Approved**
- g) **4 Bradford Street** – clarification that garage structure can be demolished and rebuilt per HDC approved plans – **Denied; this requires a full review**
- h) **23 Court Street** – construction of bay window at rear of structure - **Approved**
- i) **17 Cottage Street** – replacement of asphalt roof and cedar shingles in kind on shed – **Approved**
- j) **240 ½ Bradford Street** – replacement of a wood door with a fiberglass door in the same style – **Approved with the condition that the replacement door is wood (in kind) since it is a highly visible front door**
- k) **7 Central Street** – replacement of 9 doors and 8 windows – **Approved**
- l) **171 Bradford Street** – replacement of 12-light double hung window in kind – **Approved**
- m) **14 Brewster Street** – replacement of existing wood front door with new wood door in kind – **Approved**
- n) **162 Bradford Street** – replacement of window and wood door in kind – **Approved**
- o) **543 Commercial Street** – replacement of 38 casement windows with same size double hung windows – **Approved**
- p) **586 Commercial Street** – replacement of deck with mahogany decking and railings with azek railings – **Approved with the condition that the Azek must be “Premier” or other matte finish (no shiny finish)**
- q) **23 Winthrop Street** – addition of 2 skylights – **Approved (not visible)**

3. Review and approve Minutes of the March 5, 2014 meeting

Motion made by Ms. Burnell to approve the minutes with a minor correction by Ms. Burnell, and seconded by Mr. McGlothlin. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Hearings

The public hearing portion of the meeting was opened by Mr. McGlothlin at 4:02 pm

- a) **Case# FY14-56**

Application by Glen Fontecchio on behalf of Eugene Bryant requesting approval to add four dormers, replace various windows, construct new exit stairs on the east side and install two new doors and construct new exterior stairs and 4-ft high solid screening on the south side of the building at property located at **467 Commercial Street**.

Mr. Fontecchio presented the application and supplemental information, an alternate geometry for the proposed stairs, for the HDC to consider.

Mr. McGlothlin clarified that the exterior stairs will be on the water side of the building. He stated that there is no detail for the trim around the dormer windows and explained that this was important because the HDC is trying to be more mindful of trim and details since some recent renovations have not been historically accurate in these details.

Mr. Fontecchio stated that the dormers are strictly for egress so each one is just a window, and that they would come back to the HDC with final details.

Mr. McGlothlin asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. George Bryant stated that he was opposed to the project and clarified that it's his brother's plans and not his. He pointed out that the plans are labelled 465 Commercial Street but that the actual address is 467 Commercial. He is concerned that the proposed changes have no regard for Provincetown or it's architectural history and noted that all the work proposed is on the original part of the structure. He stated that this is one of the few buildings on Commercial Street whose roof hasn't been altered by dormers.

Ms. McPherson confirmed that the address is 467 Commercial, the Angel Foods building.

Ms. Marcoux asked Mr. Bryant if there are any proposed changes that he could accept.

Mr. Bryant stated that he was not in favor of the dormers because the original roof structure has never been cut into. He also noted that the glass size was greater than the traditional Provincetown 24"x24". The changes being proposed aren't standard and are not historic.

Mr. McGlothlin expressed his concerns that there are a lot of red flags with regard to who can legally speak on behalf of the estate. He doesn't want to address the proposed project until the applicant can address the legality of who can propose it.

Mr. Fontecchio asked the HDC to provide guidance regarding what they were looking for.

Ms. McPherson echoed Mr. McGlothlin that it was premature to comment on the proposal with the outstanding questions about the estate.

There was general agreement among the Commissioners.

Ms. Marcoux advised the applicant that when there are this many changes being proposed, it helps to have alternatives for the HDC to review. She said she would feel more comfortable with alternatives.

Ms. Burnell added that the HDC has allowed dormers in the past, but when a building is pristine like this one, the Commission does not always approve. She noted that she might not.

Mr. McGlothlin noted that the location is prominent, an anchor in the neighborhood.

The Board discussed a convenient date to continue the hearing.

An initial motion to continue to April 2 was passed; however, after further discussion of a quorum, a new ***motion was made by Mr. McGlothlin to continue the hearing to the April 16 meeting at 4:00 and seconded by Ms. Burnell. Motion passed unanimously.***

b) **Case# FY14-57**

Application by George and Sandra Haunstrup requesting approval to demolish a shed and construct a taller structure on the same footprint at property located at **29 Alden Street**.

George Haunstrup presented the application. He stated that he repurchased the old shed for a workshop, but it's in bad shape structurally and should be demolished. He would like to put a full basement under it and raise it above flood level. He presented revised plans that were scaled back from those submitted originally and which now show the shed rebuilt exactly as is, but raised up, with a full basement under and a new dormer added.

The Commission read three letters from abutters into the record.

Ms. Marcoux commented on the letters, stating that issues of parking, water usage, landscaping, timing of construction and construction noise are not in the purview of the HDC.

Mr. Haunstrup stated that he will take care of all their concerns if the project is approved.

Ms. Marcoux remembered this project from a prior application and noted that the HDC had voted against the demolition and rebuilding. She added that the Commission is generally opposed to demolition and would like to keep as much as possible, but noted that she preferred the revised plans which would maintain the characteristics of the original structure.

Ms. Burnell stated that a building being demolished in the Historic District isn't to be taken lightly. Little outbuildings and working buildings are important. She would prefer to have an independent opinion about whether it can be restored. She said that in general, she is reluctant to say something can be demolished. She read from the Guidebook for Mass. Historic District Commissions: "Just because a building is in poor condition doesn't mean it is structurally unsound."

Ms. Marcoux said it looks like it's in bad condition but asked if they could at least preserve the street-side façade.

Mr. Haunstrup replied that it was built in 1865 and has no sills.

Ms. McPherson asked the Commissioners if they've ever in the past had an independent review but someone who could take a more nuanced approach to the review and look at how much of the original fabric could be saved.

Mr. Hatch said that regarding demolition, he would prefer to see the building or a majority of the building saved and we have to find out if that's possible. He went on to say that he preferred the revised plans showing the structure reconstructed in kind, but would still like to see if any of the original structure can be saved.

Mr. McGlothlin agreed that he would like to see what could be saved. He also prefers the revised plans but would prefer that it be reconstructed exactly as it looks now, with no dormer, so that it looks exactly like a shed built in 1865.

Mr. Haunstrup stated that it's put together with second-hand wood.

Mr. McGlothlin replied that that's what makes it historically significant, and that he would like the historic integrity maintained. He said it's easy to tear down a structure and build new, but what the HDC is asking is to maintain the exterior look of an important structure.

Ms. Burnell added that the patina, the look of it, and the fact that it's a cobbled together old shed from an historically poor area of town is what's important.

Mr. Haunstrup stated that he didn't know how to rebuild it to look old and that he can't do something ridiculously expensive.

Ms. Burnell stated that it is iconic to the neighborhood and the HDC tries to keep as much original materials as possible, which is in the Guidelines, and a reproduction isn't the same.

Ms. Marcoux agreed and asked if there was a creative way to “sister in” some of the original material?

Mr. Hatch reiterated that he would prefer it not be demolished and save as much material as is possible. He noted that whatever happens on the inside of the structure is not within the purview of the HDC, but ultimately from the exterior, it should look like the shed it has always been.

Mr. McGlothlin said he would like to continue this to the next meeting so the HDC can do a site visit.

Ms. Burnell made a motion to continue the hearing to the April 2 meeting at 4:00 so the HDC could gather additional information to be able to make a decision on this case. Mr. Hatch seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

At 5:38, a motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Burnell and seconded by Mr. Hatch. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Gloria McPherson
Town Planner