

TOWN OF PROVINCETOWN

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF
April 16, 2014 3:45pm

MEETING HELD IN THE JUDGE WELSH HEARING ROOM

Members Present:, Ms. Polly Burnell, Mr. Thomas Biggert, Mr. Lance Hatch and Ms. Marcene Marcoux

Members Absent: Mr. Ryan Landry, Mr. John Dowd and Mr. David McGlothlin

Staff Present: Ms. Gloria McPherson, Town Planner

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

1. Public Statements

Ms. Burnell read a letter from Mr. Richard Porreca to the HDC into the record regarding both the initial cost of installing a wood door and the continuing increased costs of heat with a wood rather than fiberglass or steel door.

Ms. Marcoux stated that she understood the issue being raised, that the cost of replacing a door with a wood door might be higher, but pointed out that the house was within the Historic District, where a wood door is more appropriate.

Mr. Biggert added that the HDC is sensitive to everything that people go through regarding permitting, and the associated costs, and takes comments seriously. He agreed that wood doors are more appropriate in the Historic District.

2. Administrative Reviews

- a) **48 Commercial Street** – review of design of siren etching on door – Approved
- b) **9 Ryder St ext** – roof replacement; replacement of casement window with double hung - Approved
- c) **16 MacMillan Wharf** – replacement of siding in kind and repair of existing windows and door - Approved
- d) **16 Cottage Street** – replacement of second floor deck and railing - Approved
- e) **162 Bradford Street** – replacement of gable window - Approved
- f) **259 Commercial Street #2** – replacement of 3 second floor windows in kind – Approved
- g) **182 Commercial Street** - replacement of 11 windows in kind – Approved
- h) **426 Commercial Street** - replacement of French doors in kind – Approved
- i) **65 A Commercial Street** - replacement of decking in kind and replacement of railings with azek posts and steel cables – Approved
- j) **4 Anthony Street** – replacement of chimney – Continued; HDC would like to speak with applicant for more information and details

3. Review and approve Minutes of the March 19, 2014 meeting

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

Review and approve Minutes of the April 2, 2014 meeting

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

4. Public Hearings

The public hearing portion of the meeting was opened by Ms. Burnell at 4:12 pm

a) **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**.

Ms. McPherson reported that the applicant has requested that the hearing be continued until the next meeting and has sent an email to that effect.

A motion to continue the hearing to the May 7 meeting at 4:00 pm was made by Ms. Burnell and seconded by Ms. Marcoux. Motion passed unanimously.

b) **Case #FY14-58**

Application by Pavel Fiodarau on behalf of Johnny Pak requesting approval to install corrugated roofing over an existing pergola at the property located at **39 Bradford Street Unit 4**.

Mr. Fiodarau presented the application.

Mr. Biggert stated that he thought adding a roof over an open pergola was a significant change.

Ms. Marcoux thought a roof could be approved, but corrugated plastic isn't historic.

Ms. Burnell read from the Guidelines regarding roofing material.

Mr. Biggert agreed with Ms. Marcoux and stated that cedar shingles are more appropriate and would look more permanent.

Mr. Fiodarau said he would check with the owner regarding the shingles and he would decide whether to do shingles or take the roof off and do nothing.

Mr. Hatch thought that asphalt roofing would be acceptable since it would be an extension of the existing roofline from over the house.

A motion to approve a roof of either cedar shingles or asphalt shingles over the pergola was made by Ms. Burnell and seconded by Mr. Biggert. Motion passed unanimously.

c) **Case #FY14-59**

Application by Cape Tip Construction on behalf of Chris Van Genderen requesting approval to add one window to the south side connector building to match an existing window on the north side at the property located at **7 Conant Street Unit 3**.

A representative from Cape Tip Construction presented the application.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Burnell read one letter of support into the record.

The HDC generally agreed that it was a straightforward proposal and there were no problems with the request.

Ms. Burnell read the applicable Guidelines.

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

d) **Case #FY14-60**

Application by George Nicholson requesting approval to remove an existing garden shed and construct a new artist studio at the property located at **260 Bradford Street**.

Mr. John Golden presented the application.

There were no public comments.

Ms. Burnell read two letters received into the record, one in support of the project, and one having nothing to do with the purview of the HDC.

Mr. Biggert confirmed from the contractor Mr. Scott White that the side of the existing shed was 8ft x 10ft and the proposed structure is 10ft x 12ft.

Mr. White clarified that the corners of the structure had flat pilasters rather than columns, and noted that elevations are often misleading.

Ms. Burnell asked if this is a demolition.

Ms. McPherson stated that the existing shed is not an historic structure.

Ms. Burnell stated that she liked the eccentric little building being proposed, that it is very much in the character of Provincetown to have this little folly located behind the main structure. The Guidelines talk about the character of buildings and that this fits the spirit of our town.

Ms. Marcoux asked whether the building would have any effect on the condo association as abutters.

Mr. Golden responded that the owner has no problem with taking on the expense of doing this project without using their property for access.

Ms. Burnell added that their easement isn't a public right-of-way, so the view of the new structure from the condos is not the purview of the HDC.

Mr. Biggert stated that he likes the idea, but wonders if the style of the structure should take its cue from the main house since both are visible from Bradford Street. He is conflicted because in general, the HDC likes new structures to blend with existing.

Mr. White showed photos and spoke to the variety of architectural styles in the immediate neighborhood, including a lot of Greek revival elements.

Ms. Burnell agreed that it is a very eclectic neighborhood, and added that a lot of artists used to live in the neighborhood over the years, so an artist studio made sense.

Mr. Golden read a description of a "folly" and Mr. White added that this folly would be in an English garden setting.

Mr. Hatch said he was not concerned about the increase in size, because he thought the style, a simple version of Greek revival, fits in well with the neighborhood.

Mr. Biggert asked about the materials to be used.

Mr. White state that they were planning to use white painted clapboards on the structure and with the HDC's approval, they would like to do all the trim, including the pilasters and pediment, out of azek.

Ms. Marcoux requested that they consider limiting the use of azek.

Mr. Biggert stated it was especially important to minimize the use of azek on this project since there is almost more trim than clapboard.

Mr. Hatch stated that considering where it is sited on the property, far back from Bradford Street and behind the main house, he would support azek.

Ms. Burnell agreed with Mr. Hatch and the fact that the azek would not be on the main house.

Ms. Marcoux stated that she was not in favor of the proposed amount of azek, that one third of the building in azek is too much for the Historic District. She would like to see less azek in order to feel comfortable approving.

Mr. Biggert agreed with Ms. Marcoux. He added that the small window panes were not consistent with the larger panes of the doors.

The HDC discussed the windows and generally agreed that the 6 over 6 sashes were acceptable.

Ms. Marcoux stressed that she was more concerned about the amount of azek being proposed.

Mr. White stated that they could use wood for the pilasters, but in general, it's not great to mix materials.

Ms. Marcoux responded that they should therefore use all wood. She is concerned that this might open the door to future houses using all azek for trim and details.

Mr. Hatch stated that he was only ok with the azek here because it is not on the house and far from the street.

The HDC and the applicant discussed what parts could be azek and what parts should be wood.

A motion was made by Mr. Hatch to approve the application with the following conditions:

- ***The pediment, gable ends, capitals and bases could be azek***
- ***The pilasters, window and door trim must be wood***
- ***The safety rail is black wrought iron, as proposed***

Mr. Biggert seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

e) **Case #FY14-61**

Application by Deborah Paine on behalf of Carolyn Sandel to remove two double-hung windows and one picture window and replace them with three double-hung windows at the property located at **488 Commercial Street Unit 15**.

Ms. McPherson stated that the applicant's representative had to leave the meeting early. She described the proposal to the Commission. She also stated that she had discussed the application with the HDC Chair, John Dowd, who thought that the 3 double hung windows was not an historic fenestration pattern and would prefer to see only 2 windows pushed to the sides of the existing opening, with a space between them.

There were no public statements.

A motion was made by Ms. Burnell to approve the application with the conditions that only two double hung windows shall be used in the existing opening with a window's space between them, and that the windows shall be the same size as the existing window to the left that is not proposed to be replaced. Ms. Marcoux seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

The Commission also noted that if the applicant wants to come back before the HDC for three windows, they would entertain the request administratively, rather than with a full hearing.

f) **Case #FY14-62**

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**.

Don DiRocco presented the application.

The HDC read 16 letters of support into the record.

Mr. Biggert stated that he was glad something was being done with the property. He thought it best to review the plans elevation by elevation.

On the Bradford Street elevation, Mr. Biggert noted that the chimney was going away, which is something the HDC doesn't like to see. He also stated that the window spacing is changing and he prefers that windows are not placed together, that it's more historically accurate for them to be spaced.

Ms. Burnell stated that the existing fenestration pattern is probably original and the Guidelines do not allow changes in the fenestration pattern.

Mr. DiRocco said it was hard to fit the shutters with the existing spacing.

Ms. Burnell stated that the Guidelines also do not allow the removal of the chimney.

Ms. Marcoux added that it doesn't have to be functional, but it has to be there. Use the same brick if possible, but it's important that it be put back in the same place and same size.

Ms. Burnell questioned the appropriateness of the 6 over 1 windows and asked the age of the building.

Mr. DiRocco talked about the old structure of the first floor, which shows evidence of being a really old cape that was greatly expanded.

Ms. Burnell commented that the addition is adding a lot of mass to the building, but Mr. Hatch noted that it's still much smaller than the main house and the roofline is broken.

The HDC discussed the window sashes and there was general agreement that 2 over 1 windows would be most appropriate to the structure.

Mr. Hatch added that the windows on the second floor should be the same height as the windows on the first floor and to use the same double hung window in the bathroom instead of the proposed square window.

Mr. DiRocco said that they would like to use azek for the gutters, roof soffit and fascia, as they don't want metal gutters. Wood would be used around the windows and for the shutters. Red cedar or azek elsewhere.

The Commission then reviewed the Dyer Street elevation, where there were no changes proposed.

Mr. Hatch noted that the windows should be changed to 2 over 1 rather than proposed 6 over 1 windows.

Mr. DiRocco then presented the rear elevation, stating that it is currently a mishmash, and he's not sure any of the windows on the first floor are in their original locations because they are in the kitchen and bathroom, which have been remodeled.

Ms. Marcoux asked for an explanation of the door in the addition, to which Mr. DiRocco replied that it was an egress stair landing that could not be seen from the street.

Mr. Biggert stated that even if the windows aren't in the original location, they ended up in a pleasing pattern with a good ratio of window to wall space.

Ms. Burnell agreed and said she would like to preserve the main house and the rhythm of the windows that are there. She stated that there is a pleasing simplicity.

Mr. Hatch stated that he had a problem with the windows not aligning between the first and second floors, and the HDC discussed a few options of the fenestration pattern they would like to see.

Ms. Marcoux asked them to bring back revised drawings with at least 2 fenestration pattern options for the HDC to consider.

The HDC then considered the Southwest elevation.

Mr. Biggert stated that the only issue he had was with the doors; that they should really be windows as it looks too contemporary with French doors. Ms. Burnell agreed.

Mr. DiRocco said that one door was needed for egress.

The HDC generally agreed to one door and one window on the first floor of the SW façade, and that the door should be the typical Provincetown door.

Mr. Hatch requested cut sheets for the proposed doors, as well as the window specs that were provided.

Ms. Marcoux also requested that the applicant present some options on the doors.

A motion to continue the hearing to the May 7 meeting at 4:00 pm was made by Mr. Biggert and seconded by Ms. Marcoux. The motion passed unanimously.

At 6:44, a motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Burnell and seconded by Mr. Hatch. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Gloria McPherson
Town Planner