

TOWN OF PROVINCETOWN
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF
March 4, 2015 3:30pm

MEETING HELD IN THE JUDGE WELSH HEARING ROOM

Members Present: Marcene Marcoux, Martin Risteen, Lisa Pacheco Robb, Laurie Delmolino and Thomas Biggert

Members Absent: David McGlothlin

Staff Present: Leif D. Hamnquist, Permit Coordinator

Meeting called to order by Mr. Thomas Biggert at 3:31pm

1. Administrative Reviews

- a) [10 Young's Court](#) – amend previously approved decision (change window) – Justin Burley and John Pompeii appeared before the commission to present the amendment proposal. The applicants brought the commission through the amendment. Mr. Biggert read a letter into the record from the neighbor that lives to the south of the structure. Mr. Biggert would like to hold to the decision that was originally supported and was agreed upon by Ms. Marcoux. Mr. Biggert stated that since the façade was more visible so he cannot support the change. The commission agreed to approve of the double hung windows being separated. – Approved
- b) [344-346 Commercial Street](#) – amend previously approved decision (change fenestration on west elevation) – Tom Tannerilo appeared before the commission to present the proposal and explained the proposed change. The commission found the fenestration change to be appropriate. - Approved
- c) [481 Commercial Street](#) – replace 5 windows in kind – Postpone to next hearing for more information.

2. Review and approve Minutes of the February 18, 2015 meeting

Motion made by Thomas Biggert to approve the minutes as amended and was seconded by Ms. Marcoux. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.

The public hearing portion of the meeting was opened by Mr. Thomas Biggert at 4:00 pm.

3. Public Hearings

- i) **Case #FY15-51 (Continued from January 7; applicant requests to continue to the March 18th meeting)**
Application Guy Plourde requesting approval to construct 5 dormers and replace an existing deck on the front of the house and add a new second floor deck above at the property located at **18 Pearl Street**.

Motion made by Thomas Biggert to continue the case to the March 18th hearing due to lack of information and was seconded by Laurie Delmolino. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.

- ii) **Case #FY15-53 (Continued from January 7; applicant requests to continue to the March 18th meeting)**
Application by Russell J. Perry on behalf of Andrew Sullivan requesting approval to construct a trellis on the front of the structure at the property located at **415 Commercial Street**.

Motion made by Thomas Biggert to continue the case to the March 18th hearing due to lack of information and was seconded by Marcene Marcoux. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.

iii) [Case #FY15-59](#)

Application by Derik Burgess requesting approval to construct a 2nd story addition on the rear of the structure, reconfigure the fenestration on the front façade, replace existing round columns on the front of the structure with square columns and add various windows to all elevations at the property located at **506 Commercial Street**.

-Derik Burgess appeared before the commission to present the proposal, and took the commission through the work being proposed elevation by elevation.

Christine Hyne and Philip Cozi of 508 Commercial spoke against certain elements of the proposed design. Mr. Cozi had problems with the massing of the addition and had concerns about solar access and privacy due to the second floor addition. Ms. Hyne referenced numerous policies and bylaws to back up her argument against the proposed design and had concerns about the proposed transom windows on the east side of the structure. One letter in support was read into the record.

Mr. Burgess spoke to the issues raised by the neighbors and gave arguments against the concerns presented.

Ms. Delmolino asked for clarification about the windows on the west elevation and Mr. Burgess clarified the difference in the photo and drawings. Ms. Delmolino had questions about the historic photo. Ms. Delmolino believes the large double hung window on the front detracts from the historic nature of the structure. She also believes that the windows should match the windows on the second floor or put smaller mullied double hung on the first floor and that the roof on the addition supersedes the main roof.

Mr. Biggert would like to concentrate the discussion elevation by elevation.

Ms. Marcoux has concerns about the front elevation.

Mr. Biggert agreed with Ms. Delmolino about the two large double hung windows on the front. He also doesn't see any real reason to flatten out the roof on the addition.

Mr. Risteen would like to see the store front windows brought into the design because Mr. Burgess had stated he wanted to

Ms. Pacheco Robb had concerns about the drawings not representing the existing conditions and believes that windows have been drawn incorrectly. She also agreed with Ms. Delmolino that if the front windows matched the windows on the front second floor elevation.

The commission agree that the first floor windows on the front match the second floor windows, agreed that it's hard to make decisions based on one historic photo and the commission cannot agree on the fence in between the columns.

Mr. Biggert had problems with Mr. Burgess talking during deliberations.

Ms. Pacheco Robb had no problem with fence because she saw it as a railing on a porch but Mr. Biggert and Ms. Marcoux did not agree.

Mr. Biggert thinks that there is a lack of creativity amongst applicants and the town as a whole.

The commission moved on the west elevation and Ms. Pacheco Robb started by stating that the addition is out of scale and out of character and thinks it could be nested within the frame of the existing house.

Mr. Biggert feels that the structure is difficult because bad changes have been made in the past and doesn't agree with the arched windows and they should be two double hungs and thinks the addition is out of scale.

Ms. Marcoux agrees with Mr. Biggert and Ms. Pacheco Robb and believes the applicant can do better.

Ms. Delmolino concurred with everyone.

The commission moved on to the east elevation and Ms. Delmolino started the conversation. She stated that the east is very visible from the street and has problems with the proposed transom windows.

Ms. Marcoux read from the guidelines 'criteria of determination' from the town's bylaws and had problems with the transom windows.

Mr. Biggert had issues with the transom windows and suggested that the windows match the front double hungs.

Mr. Risteen agreed about the transom windows and feels that he needs more accurate information.

The commission moved on to the north elevation and Mr. Biggert and Ms. Delmolino had no issues with the north elevation. Mr. Burgess asked about what windows would be good.

Ms. Marcoux thinks the case be continued.

In summary the commission would like to see the windows on the front be replicated around the whole structure, would like to see the addition nested within the original structure, and there was no real agreement about the columns.

Motion made by Marcene Marcoux to continue the case to the March 18th hearing and was seconded by Laurie Delmolino. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.

iv) [Case #FY15-62](#)

Application by William N. Rogers on behalf of Kevin T. McCaughlin requesting approval to relocate a door on the west, reduce the size of a window by 12 inches, install a new French door on the rear of the structure and construct a dormer on the west side of the structure at the property located at **283 Bradford Street**.

-Gary Locke of William N. Rogers and Kevin T. McCaughlin, home owner, appeared before the commission to present the proposal and Mr. Locke brought the commission through the design elevation by elevation.

Chris Snow spoke in favor of the proposal. No letters were in the file.

Mr. Risteen stated his love for the structure, and then started with the front elevation and would like to see the it remain the same, thinks the new dormer detracts from the quaint nature of the structure and would like to see the east elevation remain the same.

Mr. Biggert read the HDC policy and guidelines for windows and doors and thinks that based on those guidelines feels they cannot allow the door to be relocated.

Ms. Pacheco Robb feels that the door can be moved because it's moving from one quirky location to another quirky location. Feels the proportion of the dormer is great and she can approve the design in its current form.

Ms. Marcoux feels it would be ideal to not let doors be moved and she can approve as presented.

Ms. Delmolino likes the dormers size and proportion but has a problem with the short window and thinks there has to be a way to work around interior work. She feels the door has been moved to far and maybe could work better with a shorter distance.

Mr. Biggert feels the original door placement, while not ideal, gives the home character and does not agree with the French doors. Feels it is sacrosanct to move the door and thinks the short window shouldn't be passed.

Ms. Pacheco Robb feels that since the short window matches the windows in the dormer, the window seems like it has always been there.

Mr. Biggert asked if there was any way to keep the window from being shortened. Ms. Delmolino agreed that the window should not be shortened.

Motion made by Marcene Marcoux to approve the proposal with the condition that the door only move half the distance and the window on the east remain as presented and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.

- v) **Case #FY15-65 (Postponed from February 18th meeting)**
Application by Ted Smith on behalf of Becky and Pat Lee requesting approval to relocate and replace various windows and doors on the entire structure at the property located at **41 Commercial Street**.

-Ted Smith appeared before the commission to present the proposal and took the commission through the design elevation by elevation. Mr. Smith had the commission review the provided photos and argued that there were a lot of different things going on so it's hard to get consistency.

No body from the public was present to speak and there were no letters in the file.

Mr. Biggert likes the south elevation and the only problem he has is the 4/1 muntin pattern on the proposed windows but otherwise feels the design is appropriate.

Ms. Pacheco Robb agreed with Mr. Biggert and asked Mr. Smith if the clients have any preference.

The commission had a general discussion about what muntin pattern would be appropriate.

Motion made by Thomas Biggert to approve the proposal with condition that the windows be 2/2 or 6/1 muntin pattern and was seconded by Marcene Marcoux. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.

- vi) **Case #FY15-66**
Application by Aline Architecture on behalf of E.S.B.H Provincetown LLC requesting approval to remove the center double hung window from a set of three double hung windows with no change to the masonry opening at the property located at **627 Commercial Street**.

-Trevor Pontbriand of Aline Architecture appeared before the commission to present the proposal and took the commission through the design, but stated that there were some more issues with building and presented some additional items that would otherwise be an administrative review, except for item two on the provided list which needs to be advertised. Mr. Pontbriand took the commission item by item. The commission approved all new items that were to be administrative

Motion made by Thomas Biggert to approve items 3-7 on the list provided as administrative review as presented and was seconded by Laurie Delmolino. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.

The commission would like to see options about what will go in place of the window being removed

Motion made by Thomas Biggert to continue the proposal to the April 1st hearing and was seconded by Laurie Delmolino. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.

- vii) **Case #FY15-67**
Application by Chris Nagle on behalf of Romaine A. Macomb requesting approval to demolish single story addition in the rear and replace with a two story addition, relocate and redesign a shed dormer on the rear,

construct two new dormers on the front of the structure, replace windows and doors throughout, construct two door awning on the rear, replace roofing and siding material and replace fencing around the whole property at the property located at **532 Commercial Street**.

-Chris Nagle and Mark Kinnane appeared before the commission to present the proposal and Mr. Nagle brought the commission through the proposal elevation by elevation.

No one from the public was present to speak and there was one letter from Polly Burnell, in opposition to the rear addition read into the record.

The commission started with the front elevation.

Mr. Biggert has no issues with the new dormer, Mr. Biggert had no issues, Ms. Marcoux has no issues and Ms. Pacheco Robb feels the dormers enhance the front façade.

The commission moved on to the east elevation.

Mr. Risteen feels the addition is out of scale to the original house, and Ms. Marcoux and Ms. Delmolino agreed the addition was too big.

Ms. Pacheco Robb feels there may be something off within the drawings from elevation to elevation and feels the west elevation, since it was set back doesn't seem as large as what the drawings suggest.

Mr. Biggert feels the addition is too large but believes the general detailing is good and thinks the northern elevation needs to be simplified and lose some doors.

Ms. Pacheco Robb thinks the ridge of the additions roof needs to go down more.

The commission and applicant had a general discussion about the overall design.

The commission would like the applicant to come back at the March 18th with some options showing a reduction in scale in the addition and less doors on the north elevation.

Motion made by Marcene Marcoux to continue case 15-67 to the March 18th hearing and was seconded by Laurie Delmolino. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.

Ms. Delmolino asked if the commission was able to hold a work session so the new commission members could get up to speed with the rest of the commission. The commission agreed that holding work sessions would help to provide more consistency for applicants and work sessions could be used as public education for the general public to better understand the mission and objectives of the commission.

At 6:30, a motion to adjourn was made by Thomas Biggert and seconded by Marcene Marcoux. Motion passed unanimously. 5-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas Biggert
Chair