

TOWN OF PROVINCETOWN

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF May 7, 2014 3:30pm

MEETING HELD IN THE JUDGE WELSH HEARING ROOM

Members Present:, Mr. John Dowd , Mr. Thomas Biggert, Ms. Polly Burnell, and Ms. Marcene Marcoux

Members Absent: Mr. Ryan Landry, Mr. Lance Hatch and Mr. David McGlothlin

Staff Present: Ms. Gloria McPherson, Town Planner
Mr. Leif D. Hamnquist, Permit Coordinator

Meeting called to order by John Dowd at 3:30pm

1. Public Statements

No Public Statements

2. Administrative Reviews

- a) 405 Commercial St – replacement of 5 awning windows in kind - Approved
- b) 141 Bradford St – replacement of 1x10 pine siding with 1x10 azek siding - Approved
- c) 15 Cottage St Unit 9 – add deck railing to match adjacent unit – Approved, requiring captured balusters per Historic District guidelines
- d) 539 Commercial St – replacement of 2 double hung windows in kind - Approved
- e) 4 Anthony St – continued – replacement of chimney - Approved
- f) 586 Commercial – replacement and expansion of an existing deck using azek railings – Withdrawn
- g) 18 Bangs Street – add a vertical stair lift – Approved – under condition that it will be removed when property sells
- h) 17 Pearl Street – replace shed roofing in kind and replace rear flat roof under deck in kind – Approved
- i) 6 Nickerson Street – amendment to case #FY14- to keep a section of deck that was originally proposed to be removed – Approved with revised plans to be submitted to the HDC for signatures
- j) Any administrative reviews received that could not be reasonably anticipated

3. Review and approve Minutes of the April 16, 2014 meeting

Motion made by Mr. Dowd to approve the minutes and seconded by Ms. Marcoux. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Hearings

The public hearing portion of the meeting was opened by Mr. Dowd at 4:11 pm

Ms. Marcoux mentioned that she had heard that some of the abutters received their notices late.

Ms. McPherson stated that the bylaw says that abutters' notices should be sent out concurrently when the legal notice is posted, and that it also says at least 14 days before the hearing. Generally the legal notice is posted well before the 14 days, and the abutters notices go out a little later, but still 14 days before a hearing. This time, the abutters' notices were sent out after the legal notice was posted, as usual, but less than the required 14 days before the hearing.

Ms. Marcoux questioned the legality of the proposal due to the abutters' notices being sent out late and how the commission should proceed with the proposal.

The Commission generally agreed to look at this on a case by case basis.

a) **Case #FY14-62 (continued from April 16)**

Application by Don DiRocco on behalf of Christine Barker to renovate an existing 2 ½-story structure, including the replacement of all windows, siding and trim, and to construct a new addition at the property located at **169 Bradford Street**.

Mr. DiRocco briefed the members about the project and the changes that were made since the last meeting.

Discussion ensued about the alignment, placement and sizes of windows.

Ms. Burrell expressed concerns about the design looking to 'busy' and her dissatisfaction with the two options presented.

Mr. DiRocco presented door options and the members approved of the French door.

A motion to approve the application with the "alternate south" elevation was made by Mr. Biggert and seconded by Ms. Marcoux. Motion passed unanimously.

b) **Case #FY14-63**

Application by Mark Kinnane on behalf of John Isaacson to add a hidden door of white cedar shingles on the east side of the studio at the property located at **593 Commercial Street**.

Mr. Kinnane presented the application to the commission, and expressed the desire to not do the project but for egress the door is required.

The Commission discussed options to the proposal and asked the reason for a hidden door.

Mr. Kinnane explained that a second means of egress was required and the owners didn't want to draw attention to another door.

A motion to approve the application as submitted was made by Mr. Dowd and seconded by Mr. Biggert. Motion passed unanimously.

c) **Case #FY14-64**

Application by Renaissance Man Construction on behalf of Barry Clifford to add new siding, new windows, and a new door to the third story at the property located at **16 MacMillan Wharf**.

Dan Becotte presented the application.

The applicant further explained the project and the problems that exist within the structure.

Ms. Burrell questioned the about the age of the building to better understand the history.

Mr. Biggert brought up the fact that the awning windows are not truly consistent with historical norms.

The commission discussed that the windows matched that of the Harbor Master station across the pier and that awning windows would be appropriate.

A motion to approve the application as submitted was made by Mr. Biggert and seconded by Ms. Burrell. Motion passed unanimously.

d) **Case #FY14-66**

Application by Renaissance Man Construction on behalf of Barry Clifford to replace double hung windows with casement, awning, and picture windows, to replace a sliding door and add a transom window above and to replace a door with double-hung windows at the property located at **16 MacMillan Wharf**.

Case moved ahead to streamline the meeting.

Dan Becotte presented the application.

Mr. Biggert had reservations with the placement of the windows and was concerned that since the drawings were not to scale the project was not being truly represented.

Dan Becotte explained the windows were chosen to help bring air into the space

The commission discussed whether or not the proposed windows were appropriate and Mr. Dowd commented that the proposed windows looked like an elementary school.

Ms. Burnell expressed concerns of privacy with the large windows and the how hot the interior will get.

The applicant explained that the construction of the frames of the windows was extruded white vinyl.

Mr. Dowd suggested that the window sashes and frames be black and the commission agreed unanimously.

A motion to approve the application was made by Mr. Dowd with the condition that the new windows use black sashes and frames instead of white, and was seconded by Mr. Biggert. Motion passed unanimously.

e) **Case #FY14-65**

Application by Robert Quigley to replace a demolished shed with a new shed at the property located at **8 Winthrop Street.**

Mr. Quigley presented the application.

Ms. Burnell asserted that the shed should not have been razed so quick because of the historic nature of the structure and Mr. Quigley apologized.

Ms. Burnell expressed her reservations about the shed and stated she was against the proposed shed and was dismayed about the demolition of the former shed.

Mr. Biggert agreed with Ms. Burnell that the shed should not have been demolished without coming before the HDC.

Mr. Quigley defended that the former shed was in disrepair and an eye soar and that the age of the shed could be questioned.

The commission discussed if the new shed design is keeping with historical standards and begrudgingly stated that they approve the new shed design.

A motion to approve the application as submitted was made by Mr. Dowd, seconded by Ms. Marcoux. Motion passed 3 assenting and 1 (Ms. Burnell) dissenting.

f) **Case #FY14-67**

Application by David Milliken on behalf of William McLaughlin to extend a rear dormer and add windows, construct a recessed dormer with doors, and construct a roof deck with spiral stairs for access at the property located at **8-10 Atlantic Avenue.**

Mr. Dowd questioned about the inset roof deck and how it works with the building.

Ms. McPherson noted that, with respect to the late abutters' notices, this was the only case that had received calls from abutters to ask about the proposal. She also noted that although she spoke with two abutters, there were no letters submitted.

The commission discussed whether or not this case should be continued to give abutters more time to provide input or re-advertised. The Commission agreed the case needed to be legally noticed again.

A motion to allow the applicant to withdraw without prejudice was made by Mr. Dowd and seconded by Ms. Marcoux. The motion passed unanimously.

A new abutters list will be requested and the case will be advertised at no expense to the applicant.

g) **Case #FY14-68**

Application by Don Di Rocco to add a skylight to the northeast side of the roof at the property located at **73A Commercial Street, Unit Orion.**

Mr. DiRocco appeared to present the application.

No discussion was needed from the commission.

A motion to approve the application as submitted was made Mr. Dowd and seconded by Ms. Burnell. The motion passed unanimously.

h) **Case# FY14-56 (continued from March 19)**

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.**

Case was moved to the end of the meeting and a recess was taken so Mr. Dowd and Mr. Biggert could review the meeting from March 19, and invoked the Mullen Rule to legally sit on the case.

The meeting was reconvened at 5:58 and John Dowd and Thomas Biggert proclaimed they viewed the March 19, 2014 Historic District Commission meeting.

Glen Fontecchio and Hal Winard came before the commission to present the application.

Mr. Fontecchio began to explain the project and how the scope of the project will not only make for a more aesthetic building but a safer building as well.

Mr. Fontecchio continued with the explanation of proposed dormers and suggested the 'dog house style' dormers.

Mr. Dowd asked about the outdoor stair case that will be located on the bay side of the structure and the commission agreed the change in design was much better than the original proposal.

Mr. Fontecchio explained that the rafter placement allowed for the dormer to be constructed to without cutting any existing framing members in the roof.

The commission agreed that the 'dog house' style dormer was preferable to the shed style dormer.

Discussion about whether or not an existing window on the rear of the building should be removed, to be restored or replaced.

The commission agreed that a two over two style window should replace the derelict window in the rear of the building.

Mr. Fontecchio asked about what type of materials should be used for the new access stair in the rear of the building and argued the use of PVC trim.

Mr. Winard suggested that cedar could be used but was not desirable due to its softness.

A motion to approve the application as presented was made Mr. Dowd and seconded by Ms. Burnell. The motion passed unanimously.

At 6:25, a motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Dowd and seconded by Ms. Burnell. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Gloria McPherson
Town Planner