

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Public Meeting

October 25, 2006

Judge Welsh Hearing Room

2:30 p.m.

Members Present: Polly Burnell, John Dowd, Marcene Marcoux,
Carol Neal, and E. Clothier Tepper

Members Absent: Nathan Butera

Staff: Maxine Notaro.

Work Session 2:30 p.m.

The work session was called to order by Carol Neal at 2:43p.m.

Marcene Marcoux handed suggestion detailing her opinions on what does and what doesn't come under the purview of the Historic District Commission (HDC). Each of the other commissioners also had their notes and the following discussion was held. Maxine Notaro reported that a contractor had come in just today and said what he wanted from the DRM and the HDC was a consistency about what projects need an Administrative Review and what projects need a full review.

Discussion centered on the General By-Laws 15. Local Historic District specifically on 15-7-2 which deals with "Certificates of Non-Applicability." It was clear that Maxine wants direction from the HDC in how to handle all the projects that come before her.

Carol Neal was wary of approving decks without dimensions. It would have to be an exact replacement if we were to approve it administratively. Polly would like to start out looking at all deck applications until they feel comfortable about people replacing them. Carol said we have policies on windows, fences, etc. We have worked on it and now have policies in place.

Carol wants to get opinions from the Commissioners. What do we want to see and what do we want to hand out to the staff?

It was stated that Town counsel said that the general by-laws couldn't change because they were adopted by the town meeting. The only way to change them would be to have a public hearing.

John Dowd said he was not really in favor of the "one for one" replacement not requiring any oversight by the HDC because then we can't improve on the design. Is there a way we can have the people come before us? He cited a building that could have been immensely improved but "one for one" proved to be expedient and that's why that route was chosen.

On a "one for one," Marcene said, "Let it go." John Dowd continued discussing how buildings could be improved but instead they chose "one for one." John said that's because the applicants didn't have anyone in there helping them and educating them.

Clo feels there is a conflict by giving people more issues than they want.

Marcene Marcoux feels people should be able to replace a "one for one." Polly Burnell said that we're not here to convince applicants to do something.

Maxine emphasized that it's very important when people come before us to give them firm guidelines. Carol responded by saying that we're not always dealing with black & white issues.

The rules now reads that if the project involves 25% of the value of the house and a specific dollar amount, then the project needs to be reviewed. This rule then involved many contractors who began presenting projects in phases. To close this loophole, the projects will be reviewed for the past two years. Do we have to do that with HDC?

Roofing is not an issue and will be done administratively through the Building Commissioner. HDC will oversee windows and decks; roof decks should be minimally visible from a public way.

John Dowd suggested that maybe the Monday before each meeting – one of the Commissioners should go down and go through the pending cases with a sub- committee and decide on whether a project is an administrative review or a full review. Windows should wait for the next available Board meeting. **Motion: Roofing and siding will come under the Building Commissioner provided they are clapboards and shingles in a "one for one" installation with the proviso that the clapboards have a 4" exposure. These changes will be put on at the next public hearing.**

Motion: John Dowd Seconded: Polly Burnell Vote: 5-0-0.

Approval of minutes for October 11, 2006 meeting.

A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to approve the minutes of the October 11, 2006 meeting.

Correction to minutes of September 27th.

Meg and Maureen sent an e-mail to make a correction to the September 27th minutes. At the top of page 3, DPW should read DEP. It was so noted.

Administrative Review 3:30 p.m.

Pending Cases

Neal Kimball, 135 Bradford Street

This case was postponed per Neal Kimball's request.

59 Commercial St

Deborah Paine presented a letter from a structural engineer saying the cottage at the rear, directly on the water, has to be demolished. He completed a walk-thru of the cottage and determined that it should be demolished.

Deb believes that 1) it has no historic significance, and 2) there is too much powder post beetle damage.

Marcene Marcoux said that the last meeting was not a full review – just a conversation – and if the demolition is allowed – we have to have a full review with complete plans. The project has to be noticed out. The last meeting was an informal meeting. Deb Paine said she has a permit to remodel. Marcene continued saying the Commission needs to see a plan with dimensions. Deb Paine said to tell her what to do and she'll do it. Deb would like to come back with a plan with trim details that you will

The owner didn't like the final product and asked the architect to redraw the plan and increase the height. It was built in 1920 and Polly cited Guideline B – the structure shall be retained. A new building will be too out of scale and too tall. Clo Tepper agreed with Polly. Carol Neal said that the structure now becomes completely out of scale –and she cannot support this. John Dowd agrees. Mark wondered, "What if we eliminate the dormer?" The answer was No.

At 15.5 feet – it would now become 2 ft higher than the original proposal. Marcene Marcoux said that the design previously approved was much more in keeping with neighborhood.

Motion: Deny proposal of permission to make the cottage larger by increasing the wall height of the cottage by 3 ft. given Guideline 15-8-1 Criteria for Determination

Motion: Polly Burnell Seconded: Marcene Marcoux Vote: 5-0-0.

Motion: Give permission for the elimination of two formerly approved attic windows in the main house. Given Guideline 15-8-1

Motion: John Dowd Seconded: Carol Neal Vote: 5-0-0.

2006-79

Application by James Watkins and Delwyn Trent for a Certificate to be issued in accordance with the Provincetown Historic District Commission established under the General By-Laws, Chapter 15 of the Town of Provincetown. The applicants seek approval for the full demolition and reframing of 1 of 3 roofs (left side of house parallel to Nickerson Street) due to failing rotten support system, raise this single roof height from existing 7.6 feet to 9.8 feet (exterior) and from 6.5 feet by 8.6 feet (interior) and to expand the existing shed dormer on Nickerson Street to 12 feet wide by 8.6 high from 6 feet wide to 6.5 feet and to add two windows (from 1 to 3 total) at property located at **6 Nickerson Street, Provincetown, MA.**

Carol Neal was recused as she is a direct abutter. Deb Paine presented the plan and history of the project. She wants to raise the roof 2 feet since everything is very small and rotted.

Deb Paine stated that she doesn't have enough ceiling height to work with. She has no room for headers for the windows and thus wants to increase the ceiling height. Also she wants to enlarge the dormer. Would like to take the roof down and rebuild it.

Chip Brock, a neighbor, said it's very hard to navigate when you're in the house. Just going up a couple of feet won't have that much of a visual effect.

He spoke in favor of the proposal.

As presented, the HDC is not yet convinced. Polly Burnell said that it's on a street with unaltered houses.

If Deb Paine could get a foot and a half she would probably be able to make do.

John Dowd said that the bow window downstairs is the key feature of that house and the dormer above it diminishes this.

Deb said what she's trying to accomplish with the dormer is to gain room for a bed and needs headroom. Clo Tepper feels the design proposed makes the whole house out of scale. Deb wants direction about the dormer.

Motion: Roof height can be added by 1 ft to agree with the pitch of the roof and remain the

same. Dormer of shed confederate having 2 windows of the same size and proportion with spacing between to agree with the already existing. Trimmed the same. in accordance with **Guideline 1-8-1 Criteria for Determination**

Motion: John Dowd Seconded: Clo Tepper Vote: 3 in favor- 1 opposed Polly Burnell
Deb Paine will be coming back with suggested plan complete with elevations, etc.

Adjournment happened at 5:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn Gaudiano

E. Rogers Gaudiano

Approved by _____ on _____, 2006.

John Dowd, Chair