

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Town Hall Meeting Room

December 21, 2016

Members Present: Thomas Biggert, Lisa Pacheco-Robb, Martin Risteen, Marcene Marcoux, Laurie Delmolino (late arrival)

Others Present: Anne Howard, Kathy Barrett

Thomas Biggert called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

WORK SESSION:

- a. Update on potential violations reported to the Building Commissioner
Anne Howard reported that there has been no activity since the last meeting**
- b. Meet with applicant regarding deviation of approved plans at 29 Alden Street**

Simie Maryles and Moe Van Dereck presented regarding the garage renovation. Simie Maryles presented a handout of the changes for review. The plan was not for historic reasons. There was supposed to be windows on either side. The NW side faces the taxi stand, and the other side faces into the condo roof. It would be nice to have windows facing the community. The board had wanted shiplap siding, but it is not a good construction material and cedar shingle was used. Moe Van Dereck stated he was hopeful not to have to move the window as the roof is not symmetrical. Thomas Biggert stated that once a plan is approved, it should not be changed, and that usually a wall has a window. Marcene Marcoux stated that the plan was not consistent with what was approved, and that there is no problem with two windows, but she would like a window on the other side. Marcene also stated that it was a good job on the renovation and that the cedar shingles are appropriate.

Marcene Marcoux made a motion to accept two windows, to add a window to the north elevation, and the cedar shingles were approved. The motion was seconded by Thomas Biggert and passed 4-0-0 (Laurie Delmolino was not yet in attendance).

c. 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 January 4, 2017 agenda and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission

i. 192-194 Commercial Street – to install 3 steel doors in previously approved openings.

There was no representative present at the meeting. Thom Biggert raised questions that the committee members have regarding the type of steel doors, where they will be located, and questioned if this is related to rental units. Martin Risteen added that committee is waiting for specific information on this project.

ii. 553 Commercial Street, Unit A – to replace 3 windows; 2 in kind and 1 in a slightly larger opening.

Josh Piper discussed handout with committee members. Lisa Pacheco-Robb stated the need to review elevation and style of windows and review drawings of exterior windows. Lisa Pacheco-Robb made a motion for a full review which was seconded by Thomas Biggert and passed 4-0-0

iii. 2 Daggett Lane – to replace 2 skylights in kind.

Josh Piper discussed project with a hand-out of photos and stated they will be vented. Thomas Biggert made a motion for administrative review and to accept as presented which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb and passed 4-0-0.

iv. 611 Commercial Street – to replace 11 windows in kind.

There was no one representing the project at this meeting. Thomas Biggert made a motion for administrative review and to accept as presented which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb and passed 4-0-0.

- v. **25 Bangs Street, #2** – to replace 9 windows and 2 sliders in kind and wood with ipe decking.
There was no one representing the project at this meeting. Thomas Biggert made a motion for administrative review and to accept as presented which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb and passed 4-0-0.

- vi. **277 Commercial Street** – to replace 4 exterior doors in kind.
Thomas Biggert made a motion for administrative review and to accept as presented which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb and passed 4-0-0.

- vii. **384 Commercial Street** – to replace rotted siding and plywood doors with new wooden doors
Pavel Fiodarau discussed the project and stated that the structure was replaced, but the garage remained. Lisa Pacheco-Robb made a motion for administrative review which was seconded by Thomas Biggert. Thomas Biggert made a motion to accept as presented which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb and motions passed 4-0-0.

- viii. **6 Lovett's Court** – to replace front steps and railing in kind.
Deborah Drown discussed the project with homeowner Neva Hansen and stated that project would be all wood. Marcene Marcoux made a motion for administrative review which was seconded by Thomas Biggert, and Lisa Pacheco-Robb made a motion to accept as presented which was seconded by Thomas Biggert and motions passed 5-0-0.

- ix. **23 Watson's Court** – to replace existing wood window sashes in kind, remove and replace a small room on the rear of the structure and relocate a shed on the property.
Thomas Biggert made a motion for a full review which was seconded by Martin Risteen and passed 5-0-0.

- x. **153 Commercial Street, #1** – to install 2 new windows.
There was no one present to discuss this project. Thomas Biggert made a motion for a full review as there are no windows there now. The motion was seconded by Laurie Delmolino and passed 5-0-0.

- xi. **14 Standish Street** – to replace all windows and siding and to add 2 new windows. Thomas Biggert made a motion for a full review which was seconded by Laurie Delmolino and passed 5-0-0.

- xii. **12 Cudworth Street** – to add 2 dormers, a farmer’s porch, continue a ridge over a flat roof section, raise a ridge by 3’ and replace all doors, window, roofing and siding. Thomas Biggert made a motion for a full review which was seconded by Laurie Delmolino and passed 5-0-0.

Four applications were determined to be Full Reviews.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

a) **Case #FY17-080**

Application by Russ Crosby on behalf of Charles Westcott, requesting to remove and replace a shrub wall with a cedar wood fence on the property located at **6-8 W Vine Street**

Russ Crosby presented the plan to remove the hedge that is there, and photo of the fence was provided. Marcene Marcoux stated that there are no photos of the house causing confusion as to where the fence will be and what size it will be. Russ Crosby stated that the fence starts at the front of the property and goes 10 feet back. Thomas Biggert shared his concern regarding a solid privacy fence, and Marcene Marcoux stated she would like to see a photo of the structure itself. Lisa Pacheco-Robb stated she feels this project is within the guidelines and questioned the need for photos. Laurie Delmolino questioned the fence size, where it will be located, and that it has to be 10 feet going back. Thomas Biggert discussed having a privacy fence at the rear only and that solid panels are a privacy fence. The group also discussed a picket fence vs. a privacy fence. Laurie Delmolino stated she would prefer a picket fence, and that the fence could be picket or lattice. Martin Risteen also stated he would like to see photos at the next meeting on 1/4/17. Lisa Pacheco-Robb stated she feels the HDC is going against the guideline. A neighbor is

paying for the fence on their section of the property, and they also want to replace in the back of the property. Committee stated a time waiver is needed. Thomas Biggert made a motion to continue until 1/4/17 which was seconded by Marcene Marcoux, and passed 5-0-0. Martin Risteen again stated that the definition of a fence is confusing.

b) Case #FY17-107

Application by Don DiRocco, Hammer Architects, on behalf of Jay Anderson, requesting to renovate an existing structure, including the removal of all existing windows, shingled siding, and an addition on the south elevation, and to add PV solar panel array on the southwest roof elevation of the structure located at 51 Commercial Street, Front

Don DiRocco shared a drawing of the project stating their desire to remove a section on the back and add a dormer. He continued to say that from the street it will look the same, the eave will raise 10', and red cedar will be used on the roof and new wood shutters. The boiler chimney will be removed as they want to add a new masonry chimney and put in a fireplace. Thomas Biggert asked about letters and there was a letter on file in support of the project. Laurie Delmolino questioned raising the ridge line only on the dormer. Lisa Pacheco-Robb stated she had mixed feelings, and Laurie continued that she has concerns of raising the ridge. Thomas Biggert shared that he agreed with Laurie, stating that where it is now seems to be where it should be as the little tack-on is part of the story of the structure, and he would like to see the dormer stay a little lower. Martin Risteen would like to have the small cottage stay attached in the back as it shows the story of Provincetown. Don DiRocco questioned whether the HDC would consider moving it to another section of the property. The committee is okay with moving it instead of keeping it attached. Thomas Biggert suggested continuing in two weeks, and made a motion to accept as presented with the condition the cottage in the rear be retained on the property, the EI stays as existing, and new proposed drawings be submitted. Don DiRocco stated the cottage floor

would need to be elevated a little. The motion was seconded by Marcene Marcoux and passed 5-0-0.

c) Case #FY17-108

Application by Don DiRocco, Hammer Associates, on behalf of Jay Anderson, requesting to renovate an existing structure, including the removal of all existing windows, shingled siding, a second floor deck and an exterior stairway, to replace an existing concrete block foundation with a poured concrete foundation with a brick façade, to construct a 14' 10" by 11' addition on the north elevation, to add a PV solar panel array on the southwest roof elevation, and to re-locate the structure approximately 18" to the north and elevate it 18" pursuant to FEMA regulations at the property located at 51 Commercial Street, Rear

Don DiRocco stated they are requesting a continuance as they are in the process of working out details with abutters. A time waiver will need to be signed. Thomas Biggert made a motion to continue which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb and passed 5-0-0.

d) Case #FY-17-112

Application by David Berarducci, on behalf of James McGuire, requesting to construct two pergolas, a picket fence mounted on the perimeter curb-wall, a raised terrace with fieldstone pavers, a palletized wood deck, a 4' high trash enclosure and a 6' privacy fence in the rear yard at the property located at 4 W Vine Street

David Berarducci presented detailed drawings of the project, and discussed the proposed changes. Thomas Biggert complimented the drawing and advised there were no comments or letters. Thomas Biggert stated that the material of the curb wall simulated stone, 12" wide with capstone on top, looked like natural stone or rough cut stone. Marcene Marcoux asked about the height of the curb wall and pickets. David Berarducci stated it would be 1'8" of fence higher on top of the wall, and Marcene Marcoux stated the curb wall and picket fence would not be more than 3'. David Berarducci responded it would not be higher than 3' and the curb would vary. Laurie Delmolino questioned why not a 2-3' picket fence instead of wall, and David Berarducci responded that the wall helps keep water retained. Thomas Biggert expressed two concerns: that

brick might be a more appropriate material for the curb wall, and that granite pavers in the driveway was not historic to Provincetown but that it was not under the HDC purview. David Berarducci asked if fieldstone would be more appropriate than brick, and stated that they are looking for a rounded stone for the terrace. Laurie Delmolino questioned the fencing from the shed to the property line, and David Berarducci stated that the fence would be 12' back. Laurie Delmolino also questioned granite slab entry steps (now brick) stating that she feels it should remain brick. Thomas Biggert stated the steps should be all brick or wood. Marcene Marcoux questioned what would be used on the pergolas, and David Berarducci stated that azek would be used. Thomas Biggert made a motion to accept as presented with the condition that planned granite steps would be brick or wood. The motion was seconded by Marcene Marcoux and passed 5-0-0.

e) Case #FY17-118

Application by Tom Boland and Jim Farley requesting to demolish a structure under Building Permit #BLD-17-000528 and requesting a determination by the Historic District Commission that said demolition will not be detrimental to the historic, architectural or cultural heritage of the Town as set forth under General Bylaws Chapter 11, Section 11-1-5. Demolition Delay Permit at the property located at 7 Duncan Lane

Tom Boland and Jim Farley presented on the project stating that the house originally was built as a shed, and that they would like to build a new structure on the property. They shared pictures and a letter from the engineer, and stated the house was built 1900-1920 as a shed, demolished 1907-1908, and rebuilt in 1909. Tom Boland stated that the garage would stay as well as the bedroom EI, which is in good shape structurally, they will reuse the picture windows and floorboards but not sure of the 3 windows in the front. From the public, Ross Sormani, abutter, spoke in favor of the project, and there was a letter in support from Regina Binder. The house is not in the historic district. Marcene Marcoux stated that holding to the 6 month demolition delay, it is

important to keep the garage and El. Martin Risteen thanked Mr. Boland for his work on the project. Thomas Biggert made a motion that under Provincetown General Bylaw 11-1-5-2 I move that the structure located at 7 Duncan Lane is not a significant building or portion thereof which is not subject to regulations under the provisions of Massachusetts General Law Chapter 40c for regulations under the Cape Cod Commission Act as a development of reasonable impact, and it is over 50 years of age, and is not associated with one or more historic persons/events contributing to the cultural, political, economic, or social history of the Town of Provincetown or its historic or architectural importance in terms of period of style, method of building construction, or association with famous architects or builders either by itself or in contact with a group of buildings. The motion was seconded by Marcene Marcoux and passed 5-0-0. A certified letter will be sent by the Historic District Commission to the owner officially notifying him of the decision.

A short break was taken at 5:25 p.m. - the meeting resumed at 5:33 p.m.

f) Case #FY17-123

Application by Alan R Cabral, ARC Designs, LLC, on behalf of David Kubayko & Chip Holtz, requesting to add a rear shed dormer with four new windows and a 5' by 10' second floor addition over an existing first floor bump-out with two new windows on the structure located at 300A Commercial Street

Alan Cabral presented the project with photos and stated that the building is concealed. It is a stated land-marked property, and has a very visual impact. Alan Cabral stated they are adding one additional overhung window in the front, and the siding will remain the same. There was one public letter presented in support of the project. Martin Risteen shared that he had visited the property, it is a secret garden, and that the plan is appropriate. Lisa Pacheco-Robb stated that the new addition has no windows in the back and only one on the side which is not a problem, but seemed strange. Thomas Biggert questioned the proposed dormer, and Alan Cabral stated there is now a knee wall and no soffit line.

Thomas Biggert made a motion to accept the plan as presented which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb and passed 4-0-0 (Laurie Delmolino did not participate in this discussion).

g) Case #FY17-126

Application by KA Bazarian Construction on behalf of RBA Flyer's, LLC, requesting to extend an existing deck on the southwest elevation by 7.5' and construct a shower enclosure underneath and to replace existing glass panels on the deck with stainless cables on the structure located at 52 Point Street

Lynn Plummer and Kevin Bazarian presented. Lynn Plummer discussed the rear elevation of the house explaining that they want to extend the deck which is existing there now over the hot tub, and that the house was built in 1999. The drawing was presented with the site plan highlighted. There were no public comments or letters regarding the project. Martin Risteen questioned what sections were involved, and Lynn Plummer stated only on the west side. Thomas Biggert made a motion to accept the plan as presented which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb and passed 5-0-0

h) Case #FY17-127

Application by Tom Thompson, on behalf of Hal Z Katzen, requesting to construct new dormers on the east and west elevations and a 4' addition on the south elevation of the structure located at 307 Bradford Street

Tom Thompson and John DeSouza presented the project with photos, stating the building has been a multi-family dwelling. John DeSouza discussed the elevations, and presented a roof plan. Marcene Marcoux stated that there is an outstanding fence violation that the HDC has been waiting two months to get resolved, and the issue has still not been addressed, and now new changes are being presented. Presenters stated they are only hired to make changes to the house, and are not involved with the fence issue. Lisa Pacheco-Robb shared her feeling that the HDC should not address this project while there is a violation pending. Anne Howard stated that on 12/7/16 this was determined to be a Full Review,

and that the owners have not responded to any requests regarding the fence. Martin Risteen moved that before reviewing this case, the fence matter needs to be resolved. Thomas Biggert stated that there is an application for 1/4/17 regarding the fence, and Marcene Marcoux agreed with handling the fence issue before reviewing this case. The HDC did give feedback on the plan without hearing the case. Martin Risteen discussed his feelings regarding the current application stating that the 2 windows punched in should be removed, the east elevation is okay, the north elevation is fine, and on the south elevation he does not like the punch in, preferring the original door and windows. Marcene Marcoux agreed with Martin Risteen. Lisa Pacheco-Robb commented regarding the dormer, suggesting one dormer with 3-1-3. Thomas Biggert made a motion to continue until 1/4/17 to have the fence hearing first which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb, and passed 5-0-0.

i) **Case #FY17-128**

Application by Joseph T Realmuto requesting to demolish and rebuild a new elevated structure pursuant to FEMA regulations, including the addition of solar panels on the south, east and west roof elevations of the new structure located at **579 Commercial Street**

Joseph Realmuto, John Bologna, and Paul Korenberg presented on this project. Paul Korenberg stated the house was purchased 11 years ago and had serious structural issues. Paul Korenberg shared that the floor was down 2-3 " (upper floor) and had to be jacked up, the 2nd floor is dipping, mold and wood rot is pervasive, and the house has begun to split apart. An extensive design was presented, and presenters stated that they are trying to work with the neighbors. The scale value has gone down, and there is a floor level of 18'6" with changes. The ridge height is 31'9", adding to the 8' ceiling on the first floor, and the architect took down the ridge. Paul Korenberg discussed raising the structure to comply with FEMA, and also discussed a small flat roof and removing windows that leak and replacing them with one window. Deconstruction minimizes the cycle time, and they want to start mid-September, and

have everything completed by July. There will be cedar shingles, wood piling, and brick walkway which will lead to wood planking. The same fence will be put up and be raised somewhat by the entrance. Joseph Realmuto discussed demolition in a historic building, and that the house is L-shaped. John Bologna stated that mold is a house safety issue. Laurie Delmolino read a letter from Peter's Property Management who are in favor of demolition but have concerns regarding construction height, raising the deck and fencing (want open air), HVAC, and plantings. There is also concern about someone using the top as living space. Laurie Delmolino read letter from Trustees of 577 Commercial Street who are okay with the demolition but concerned about the height of the new structure, and A/C and mechanicals as they do not want it to interfere with quietness. The presenters discussed the deck, planting, and fencing stating they will use lattice fencing, will use vertical planters, that windows on east/west elevations is only for access to mechanicals, and that there will be two stories and a crawl space with the half story not for habitation. Martin Risteen and Lisa Pacheco-Robb read letters from unit members at 577 Commercial with some being supportive. There was a letter with no objections from 581 Commercial Street. Marcene Marcoux commented that there are no demolitions in the Historic District so they need to keep a wall or something or rebuild as it is. Lisa Pacheco-Robb stated she is not comfortable with the plan and would like a site visit. Laurie Delmolino agrees with arranging a site visit. Marcene Marcoux recommended committee members going together as a group and then discussing the project. Marcene Marcoux also discussed past issues requesting demolition, and that they need to look at cases which did allow demolition stating it needs to be extraordinary due to guidelines, and that the more that could be saved would affect the vote. Marcene Marcoux made a motion to continue this case after the site visit which was seconded by Lisa Pacheco-Robb and passed 5-0-0. The committee members will set up a time and notify the applicants. A time waiver does need to be signed. Committee members will share views after the site

visit. The presenters will arrange to have the engineer there from Coastal.

3. Any other business that shall properly come before the Commission

- a. Committee members voted to accept minutes of 12/7/16 which passed 5-0-0.**
- b. (i) 192 – 194 Commercial Street Thomas Biggert made a motion for this to be an administrative review and be back on 1/4/17 which was seconded by Marcene Marcoux and passed 5-0-0**
- c. Marcene Marcoux discussed the CVS design on Riley’s Property on 132 Bradford Street. Marcene Marcoux made the following motion: Given that the property at 132 Bradford Street, currently Riley’s T-Shirt Outlet, is being proposed with designs for a CVS, and given that CVS is the largest pharmacy chain in the USA with 9,600 stores, and given that the Town of Provincetown passed a Formula Business By-law in 2010, the Historic District Commission will delay considering this case until either the Zoning Board of Appeals or the Planning Board first rules on its status under the Formula Business By-Law. The motion was seconded by Thomas Biggert and passed 5-0-0.**

Thomas Biggert adjourned the meeting at 7:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Katherine Barrett

