

**TOWN OF PROVINCETOWN**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF**  
**January 21, 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:** Ms. Gloria McPherson, Town Planner

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

-A general discussion regarding the use of 'Azek' composite trim ensued and Ms. Pacheco Robb pointed out that 'azek' is a brand name and not all PVC composite material is the same and that closed cell PVC material is preferable to open cell PVC composite materials

**1. Public Statements**

**2. Review and approve Minutes of the January 21, 2015 meeting**

*Motion made by Thomas Biggert to approve the minutes of the Jan. 21<sup>st</sup> 2015 hearing as amended and was seconded by Martin Risteen. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.*

**3. Administrative Reviews**

- a) 637 Commercial Street – replace windows, siding and trim in kind on the south –**No representative was present**
- b) 581 Commercial Street – replace trim on harbor side of structure - **No representative was present**
- c) 188 Commercial Street – replace storefront window in kind - **Approved**
- d) 538 Commercial Street – demolish chimney and replace white cedar shingles in kind – **Derik Burgess presented the proposal. Ms. Marcoux felt the chimney was important and should be saved, but Mr. Burgess didn't think the chimney was historic but couldn't find any documentation to support that claim. Mr. Biggert is under the impression that the chimney was original to the structure and read the guidelines pertaining to chimneys and then moved to allow the removal of the chimney. Ms. Marcoux felt the chimney removal should be a full review. Then Mr. Biggert moved to allow the demolition of the chimney with the condition that they return for a full review to see if they have to rebuild the chimney by the first meeting in March. Ms. Marcoux seconded the motion and was approved unanimously.**
- e) 161 Commercial Street – replace windows and doors in kind- **Approved**
- f) 92 Bradford Street – replace windows and doors in kind – **Approved with condition that the windows have a 6/6 muntin pattern and the door be replaced with wood.**

The public hearing portion of the meeting was opened by Mr. Thomas Biggert at 4:05 pm

**4. Public Hearings**

- i) **Case #FY15-50 (Continued from the January 7<sup>th</sup> hearing) – applicant request to continue to the February 4<sup>th</sup> hearing**  
**Application by AJ Santos on behalf of Charles Conner** requesting approval to construct a second story on an existing single-story house and replace roofing and siding material at the property located at **476A Commercial Street.**

*Motion made by Thomas Biggert to continue the case to the February 4<sup>th</sup> hearing and was seconded by Laurie Delmolino. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.*

**ii) Case #FY15-51 (Postponed from January 7)**

**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**.

Guy Plourde appeared before the board to present the proposal.

Michael Poniatowski spoke in opposition to the project, thought the number of proposed dormers was overwhelming and detracted from the roofline. Thinks if dormers are inevitable they can be better designed.

One letter from Mr. Poniatowski was read into the record.

The commission members discussed the proposal. Mr. Risteen noted that there are a lot of dormers and are out of proportion. He looked at the site the day before and thinks the double dormers are out of scale. Thinks the dormers would work better if they were smaller. He also felt the front second floor deck completely destroys the character of the building and thought that the structure could handle 4 single window dormers instead.

Ms. Pacheco Robb asked if there was a correlation with the windows and floor plan because the north elevation dormer placement doesn't make sense. She also felt the column under the deck on the front elevation looked too small.

Mr. Plourde said they are replacing the existing columns with new, larger ones.

Ms. Pacheco Robb said she would have to see the new columns in plan. She added that the proposed porch is not proportional and erodes the entrance and referred Mr. Plourde to look at a porch addition near Mr. Biggert's home as an example of a well-designed porch.

Ms. Marcoux had a problem with the number of dormers and also the front porch, all too big and out of proportion. Thought that some of the smaller decks on the side are of better proportion and looked good.

Mr. Biggert mentioned to the viewing audience that they can now access the project drawings on the town website under agenda and minutes so they can follow along with the commission from home.

Ms. Delmolino is concerned about setting precedence for putting a second floor porch on the front façade and thinks the house need more simple, symmetrical detailing. She felt the dormers were a bit 'supersized' but doesn't have a problem with the number of them.

Mr. Biggert agrees that the porch doesn't work on the front façade and couldn't support it. He thinks the number of dormers is ok, but the size and placement is a problem. He would also like to see the dormer centered over the bump out and some of the dormers reduced in size.

Ms. Marcoux agreed with Mr. Biggert that if the dormers were reduced in size she could support the amount.

Ms. Pacheco Robb wondered is the applicant had considered shed dormers instead of the proposed dog house dormers.

Mr. Plourde said the gable dormers are more in keeping with the style of the house and would consider reducing the size of the 8ft dormers to 4 ft and place 2 dormers on the front and eliminate the 4ft dormer on the rear of the house.

Discussion of the second floor porch on the front ensued. Ms. Marcoux would like to see a smaller porch and a smaller door. Ms. Pacheco Robb would like to see the revised sized columns. Ms. Marcoux asked for two options for

the porch, one full size and one reduced and Ms. Pacheco Robb added that it would be mre appropriate if the top and bottom porches align, no matter the size.

***Motion made by Thomas Biggert to continue the case to the February 4<sup>th</sup> hearing and was seconded by Marcene Marcoux. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.***

**iii) Case #FY15-53**

**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.**

Russell Perry appeared before the commission to present the proposal.

No comments from the public were heard.

One letter from Michael Poniatowski was read aloud into the record by Marcene.

A general discussion about the project amongst the commissioners ensued.

Ms. Marcoux would like to see the rear elevation showing the size and proportions of the existing pergola and thinks the current proposal needs some simplification. She felt the columns proposed for the front look too large and out of proportion compared to what is on the rear, as shown in the provided photographs.

Mr. Biggert wondered if it is a rendering issue and noted that it is not in the vernacular of Provincetown but this particular structure has its own vernacular. He would like to see the pergola extend over the front door to define the entrance to give the front of the house more integrity.

Ms. Marcoux agreed with Mr. Biggert.

Ms. Pacheco Robb felt like it would be out of scale with the building, but agreed with Mr. Biggert that in plan the design is a bit off.

Mr. Perry did not think the owners wanted the pergola casting shade over the whole front porch.

Ms. Marcoux said the turned columns on the drawings do not appear to be the same size as the existing.

Ms. Delmolino asked if Mr. Perry has a view from the northwest side so she could get a better sense of what it will look like.

Ms. Marcoux would like to see alternatives, showing columns at the correct size and showing an alternative using Mr. Biggert's suggestions.

The commission agreed that as long as the materials match the existing on the rear façade, the design would be ok. They also agreed that it was ok to add something to the front and discussed options.

***Motion made by Thomas Biggert to continue the case to the February 4<sup>th</sup> hearing and was seconded by Marcene Marcoux. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.***

***At 4:55, 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