

TOWN OF PROVINCETOWN

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF
March 5, 2014 3:45pm

MEETING HELD IN THE JUDGE WELSH HEARING ROOM

Members Present: Mr. John Dowd, Ms. Polly Burnell, Mr. David McGlothlin and Mr. Thomas Biggert

Members Absent: Mr. Ryan Landry, Mr. Lance Hatch and Ms. Marcene Marcoux

Staff Present: Ms. Gloria McPherson, Town Planner

Meeting called to order by John Dowd at 3:45pm

1. Public Statements

None

2. Administrative Reviews

496 Commercial Street – fence replacement - approved

4 Montello Street – replacement of 3 windows and one door in kind – approved

48 Commercial Street – door replacement only – approved; etched glass in mermaid pattern – return to HDC with detail of design and photos

22 Court Street – roof replacement – approved

24 Pearl Street – replacement of two windows and street side shingles in kind – approved

3 Central Street – replacement of French door in kind, with interior and exterior grilles – approved

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

Motion made by John Dowd to approve the minutes as written, and seconded by Mr. McGlothlin. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Hearings

The public hearing portion of the meeting was opened by John Dowd at 4:00 pm

a) **Case# FY14-48**

Application by Ted Smith on behalf of David High requesting approval to remove and replace various windows on north, east and west elevations and to remove two skylights at property located at **19 Tremont Street**.

Tom Fitzgerald presented the application.

Delwyn Trent spoke in favor of the project, believing it will improve the property greatly. He noted that the condo association gave them approval to move forward with the changes.

Mr. Biggert generally likes what they are doing to the structure, but wished there was something that could be done around the window on the left side at street level.

Mr. Dowd asked if the second story east façade window could be larger to match the first floor windows.

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that the second story window matches the window around the corner, which is limited in size by the roofline.

Ms. Burnell confirmed with the applicant that the windows would be true divided lights.

A motion was made by Mr. Dowd to approve as submitted by the applicant, and seconded by Mr. Biggert. The motion passed unanimously.

b) **Case# FY14-49**

Application by Mark Kinnane/Cape Associates, Inc. on behalf of Rich Porreca requesting approval to install a skylight at property located at **3 Carver Court**.

Mr. Kinnane presented the application.

Mr. McGlothlin asked if the skylight was visible from a public way.

Mr. Kinnane responded in the negative.

Ms. Burnell noted that the skylight was very large.

Mr. Dowd stated that the HDC has a policy that a skylight cannot be larger than the house windows.

Mr. Biggert stated that this building is small in scale and he's afraid the proposed skylight will potentially dominate the roof. He'd prefer it to be scaled down one size.

Ms. Burnell stated that it would be helpful to have a scale drawing.

Mr. Kinnane stated that it would not be larger than the dormer window. He went on to ask the Commission if they would consider reviewing a request to replace the red side door with something that would allow more light into the kitchen.

Mr. Dowd noted that the door was an old Greek Revival door, but it didn't seem original to the location on the structure and that it was likely moved from somewhere else to this later addition. He also noted that the door was minimally visible.

Ms. Burnell stated that the Guidelines support the preservation of original material and that she believed the HDC should be encouraging restoration rather than replacement.

Mr. Dowd thought that the Provincetown door with a half-light above and three panels below would be appropriate in this location, that it was reasonable to have a half-light door in the kitchen.

Ms. Burnell stated that the HDC was not supposed to take into consideration interior spaces when making decisions.

Mr. Biggert thought the door should be preserved and reused and thought it would be a good idea to have a repository for old materials.

Mr. McGlothlin stated that he believed the HDC should be more fluid, that sometimes things have to be replaced rather than restored for quality of life. Honor the historic nature of the town first, but recognize that this is the 21st century.

Ms. Burnell stated that if that was the case, then the guidelines should be changed to be more lenient.

Mr. Biggert stated that the role of the HDC is to find the balance.

A motion was made by Mr. Dowd to approve the application with the conditions that (1) the skylight shall not be larger than the dormer window and (2) the door shall be replaced with a half-light above, multi-panel below,

solid wood door that shall be a salvaged, antique door. Mr. McGlothlin seconded the motion. Motion passed 3-1, with Ms. Burnell opposed.

c) **Case# FY14-50**

Application by Mark Kinnane/Cape Associates, Inc. on behalf of Jim Watkins requesting approval to remove three sections of existing deck and construct a new deck at the same level as existing deck at property located at **6 Nickerson Street**.

Mr. Kinnane presented the application.

Mr. Dowd confirmed that the deck and Juliet balcony are projecting no more than existing. He asked the reason for the shingle wall with railing at the top as opposed to a simple railing.

Mr. Kinnane stated the reason was for privacy.

Mr. Biggert stated that it was very visible and he was not in favor of the wall.

Mr. Kinnane stated that he could do an open railing on the Juliet balcony but preferred more privacy on the larger deck.

Mr. Dowd preferred an open railing on both decks; Mr. Biggert suggested that they could get privacy another way, such as backing open rails with canvas.

Delwyn Trent stated he would prefer something that was easier to maintain; Mr. Kinnane suggested captured balusters on both, open rails on the Juliet balcony and white pvc panels behind the balusters on the larger deck.

Mr. Biggert thought that could be awkward, but better than a shingled half-wall.

Mr. McGlothlin confirmed from the applicant that the location was highly visible from Tremont, and stated that in that case, he prefers open balusters.

The HDC continued to discuss the need for privacy versus the look of the railing.

A motion was made by Mr. Dowd to approve the application with the conditions that the Juliet balcony would have open, captured balusters, the other deck would have captured balusters backed by pvc panels or wood, and the HDC would need to see that shown on revised plans. Mr. Biggert seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

d) **Case#FY14-51**

Application by Sean Curran on behalf of George Tagaris requesting approval to demolish two existing rear cottage structures, to be rebuilt per prior HDC approval, at property located at **143 Commercial Street**.

Mr. William Rogers distributed a revised plan to the HDC and explained that there is a coastal dune adjacent to where they will be building and it was unlikely that the Conservation Commission would allow machinery in the area. He stated it would be easier and require less equipment to demo the buildings and rebuild as opposed to lifting them up to meet the required flood elevations.

Ms. Barbara Fortier, 142 Commercial Street Unit 1, spoke against the demolition request, stating that these small beach shacks are an important component to the history of Provincetown, that they are a dying breed seen from the water, and that they are worthy of preservation.

Mr. Dowd read one letter in opposition into the record.

Mr. Len Bowen asked the HDC how old the structures were and what was going in their place.

Mr. Dowd stated that the HDC had previously approved changes to the structures, and that they look to be from the 1920's.

Sean Curran, the architect, confirmed that the assessor's card said 1920's.

Mr. McGlothlin stated that it appeared that they could not build the approved plan because of limits on machinery in the resource area.

Ms. Burnell stated she wasn't sure this would have been approved originally if it had been presented as a demolition.

Mr. Dowd posed the larger question of whether it makes sense to make them save some beams on the inside that you'll never see.

Ms. McPherson noted that the HDC did just that at 9 Wareham Street.

Ms. Burnell read from the Guidelines regarding demolition, which is not allowed except for extraordinary and unusual circumstances. She thought preserving a coastal dune fit that criterion.

Mr. Dowd made a motion to approve the application as presented, based on the Guideline that this was an extraordinary and unusual circumstance. Mr. Biggert seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

e) **Case# FY14-52**

Application by Martha Brousseau requesting approval to replace and add multiple windows on north and east facing walls at property located at **12A Pleasant Street.**

Ms. Burnell recused herself from this case, as she is an abutter.

Mr. Bruce Pollard presented the application.

Mr. Dowd read two letters of support into the record.

The HDC discussed the smaller awning windows, which should be 6-light windows rather than the 4-lights shown.

Mr. Dowd made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the awning windows be 6-light windows. Mr. Biggert seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

f) **Case# FY14-53**

Application by Christopher Regan on behalf of Hugh Jones and Stephen Watson requesting approval to remove an existing casement window and replace with 3 double hung windows on front of house and replace siding to match original at property located at **444 Commercial Street.**

The applicant was not present to present the application, so Ms. McPherson explained the project to the Commission.

The HDC discussed the application.

A motion was made by Mr. Dowd to approve the application as presented, and seconded by Mr. McGlothlin. Motion passed unanimously.

g) **Case# FY14-54**

Application by Derik Burgess/Cape Associates, Inc. on behalf of Jackie LaLode requesting approval to add a dormer to building located at **5 Dyer Street.**

Derik Burgess presented the application.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Biggert strongly opposed the addition, stating that the slope of the roof was wrong, as was the awning window. He stated that there was nothing about the application he could support and it degrades the view from the street.

Ms. Burnell also opposed the proposal, stating that it's more of an addition than a dormer, almost like a tower, and that it is nothing she could approve.

Mr. Burgess showed the HDC an alternate drawing that showed the dormer slightly shorter, with the roofline brought down from the ridge, which necessitated a flat roof. He stated it would be minimally visible from the street.

The Commission generally agreed that this alternative was also unacceptable.

Mr. Dowd stated that he would like the HDC to do a site visit to determine if it would be visible to a pedestrian on Dyer Street.

The Commission continued this hearing to the end of the meeting, after a site visit.

h) **Case# 14-55**

Application by Kenneth Johnson requesting approval to relocated existing stairs and deck and add door, add second floor balcony and door, and install two skylights at property located at **4 Bradford Street**.

Mr. Johnson presented the application.

Mr. Dowd noted that the deck off the rear façade looks like it's being held up by the trim.

Mr. Johnson stated that it's a very small deck just big enough for a table and two chairs and that he would rather not do a big deck structure attached to the house to support it since it's not necessary.

Mr. Dowd agreed, and noted that it is on the rear façade and minimally visible from a public way.

Ms. Burnell stated that she believes quirky details like this add to the charm of the house.

A motion was made by Mr. Dowd to approve the application as presented, and seconded by Mr. McGlothlin. Motion passed unanimously.

Case# FY14-54 (continued)

At 5:45 the HDC left the Hearing Room to do a site visit at 5 Dyer Street, and they returned at 6:04.

Mr. Dowd stated that the proposed dormer would be barely visible, and only from a 3-foot strip of Dyer Street, and that a pedestrian would only be able to see the cornice.

Mr. Biggert asked if the applicant was sure the client really wanted this, that even though it was minimally visible from the street, it still degraded the historic structure.

Mr. Burgess stated that since they opened up the ceiling in the kitchen, the clients wanted to add back the fourth bedroom that was lost because of the cathedral ceiling in the kitchen. He said the only place they could do that was in the attic and they needed to add headroom. It wasn't made clear why they also needed to add doors and a deck.

Mr. McGlothlin stated that he prefers the alternative that is lower than the roof peak, Alt. A5, but he thought it still looks awful.

Mr. Dowd agreed.

A reluctant motion was made by Mr. Dowd to approve the alternate plan, shown as Alt. A5, and seconded by Mr. Biggert. Motion passed 3-0-1, with Ms. Burnell abstaining. She noted that she would not oppose the project because it was barely visible, but that she could not vote for it.

Mr. Burgess showed the HDC another alternative, with 3 skylights and no dormer, in case the project is not approved by the ZBA because the structure is already over scale.

The HDC discussed the skylights and requested that it be revised to show only two skylights. The Commission told Mr. Burgess to revise the plan and that it could then be approved administratively if necessary.

At 6:10 pm, a motion was made by Mr. Dowd adjourn, and seconded by Mr. McGlothlin. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Gloria McPherson
Town Planner