

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
Town Hall
Provincetown MA

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2018

Members Present: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep; Marcene Marcoux (MM), Vice Chair, Chamber of Commerce Rep.; John Dowd (JD), PBG Rep
Hersh Schwartz (HS), Alternate; Michela Carew-Murphy (MCM), Alternate.

Excused Absence: Laurie Delmolino, Historical Commission Rep; Ted Jones, PAAM Rep.

Others Present: Annie Howard (AH), Building Commissioner.

TB called the meeting to order at 3:40pm.

1. Work Session: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

a) Update on potential violations reported to the Building Commissioner.

AH said she is still working on 16 Cottage St. as the owner has been unavailable due to health issues.

MM asked per the status on the Acuri fence and when the HDC could expect it to be lowered and changed. AH said Tammy Acuri is appealing the HDC decision and is awaiting a determination from the Superior Court, that she would inform the HDC when the case is put on the docket.

TB said there is also an issue with 199 Commercial St., but it can wait for when it appears on the agenda, that it is important to a lot of people.

b) 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 Public Hearing agenda of October 17, 2018 and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

AH said that 6A Cook St., #1 should not have appeared on today's agenda, as the applicant has requested a Full Review.

i) 3 Young's Court – (continued from the meeting of Sept. 19th) –To replace clapboard, trim, decking and lattice.

No one presented.

TB said his concern was for the clapboard replacement, noted that the lattice is pine. HS referenced that at the last meeting there had not been enough information.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the trim be wood. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, MM, JD, MCM.

- ii) 620 Commercial St. – (continued from the meeting of Sept. 19th) – To remove and replace 2 chimneys.
AH said there was some confusion as to who reached out to Mr. Hensche, but that she had an initial meeting with him and said he is aware of the need to demonstrate the color of the brick and grout and thickness of mortar lines; suggested he may be out of the state as he needs to be out of the house to facilitate the work and she will reach out.
TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Oct. 17, 2018 at 4:00pm in the Judge Welsh Room, Town Hall. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.
- iii) 22 Bangs St. – To replace roofing shingles from asphalt to red cedar.
TB made a motion to consider the request as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.
TB made a motion to approve as presented; MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.
- iv) 54 Bangs St., U3-3 – To replace a skylight.
MM said it was unclear from the photo if it was the same exact size in the replacement.
TB made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the replacement be the same size. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.
- v) 10 Bradford St. – To replace roofing shingles.
TB made a motion to consider the request as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.
- vi) 5B Arch St. - To replace roofing shingles.
Jeremy Cohn, owner, presented.
JD asked if the replacement was for the same location. TB asked if the existing brick could be re-used. Jeremy Cohn said some might have disintegrated, but everything will be replaced in kind. JD requested a thin bond on the brick – a match to a 19th century style in color and mortar. MM said it should be similar in thickness to what is there now.
TB made a motion to treat as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS. JD made a motion to accept as presented with the condition that the replacement brick be in the color and style of 19th century brick and the bond between the brick be of a thinner quality than is used today; asked if it was a little short and had been remodeled.
Jeremy Cohn said it is a propane fireplace and never used. AH said a modern code specifies 2' above the ridge if it's within 10' of the ridge and 3' if it's coming directly through the ridge. JD presented a photo of the desired look and gave Jeremy Cohn his phone number for contact as JD has used the same builder for his own chimney.
TB seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; JD, TB, MM, HS, MCM.

- vii) 5A Arch St. – To replace roofing shingles.
Patrick Clifford presented; said everything was like for like.
TB made a motion to accept as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, MM, JD, MCM.
- viii) 259 Bradford St. – To remove a chimney and replace with a steel pipe.
TB made a motion to accept as Full Review. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.
TB made a motion to hear the decision at the meeting of Oct. 17, 2018 at 4:00pm in the Judge Welsh Room, Town Hall. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.
- ix) 6A Cook St., #1 – To alter windows and an entry door.
TB made a motion to accept as Full Review to be heard at the meeting of Oct. 17, 2018 at 4:00pm in the Judge Welsh Room, Town Hall. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, MM, JD, MCM.

2. Public Comments: On any matter not on the agenda.

HS brokered a discussion on HDC application procedures and the need for applications to be submitted correctly and with the completed information; after which she read the instructions aloud and into the record.

TB corroborated HS' request and reiterated that all drawings need to be in by the Thursday of the week before the HDC Wednesday meeting. HS added that if an applicant feels they may be missing something, they should bring their plans to the staff at Town Hall for review and verification. MCM said that Permit Coordinator, Ellen Battaglini, has always been very helpful in addressing questions and concerns that she, as an applicant, has had.

MM spoke of the need for clear photos and additional documentation as a photo alone is not enough and the elevations, scale and dimensions must all be clearly defined, and in quarter-scale which is not then further reduced on the printed plans.

JD asked if more documentation support might impact an applicant's finances. MM said that this guideline has been in effect for two years. TB said he felt the HDC may have been a little lax in its requirement for uniform specifications which HS added has become a serious issue.

MM made a motion to require all manufactured specs and drawings to be at quarter scale, including, but not limited to, doors, windows and fences. TB seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, TB, JD, HS, MCM.

3. Public Hearing: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

- a) 18-279 (*request to continue to the meeting of November 7th*)
Application by **Regina Binder**, on behalf of **199 Bradford St., LLC**, requesting to replace trim, siding and roofing materials, to add a covered porch and balcony on the south elevation, to reduce the size of window openings on the west elevation and to replace windows on the south and east elevations on the structure location at **199 Bradford Street**.

TB stated that Ms. Binder had left the project and that a meeting had been held last week with the owner and Town staff.

AH said that at that point deficiencies were revealed and the owner said she would be submitting new plans but would not have these available before today's meeting.

TB remarked that the house has been elevated and that the board is unaware of what exactly is going on and what work has or is being done and the concern is that this is a historic house that is now just floating; but cautioned that if the application is denied then the house will be waylaid for two years before they can submit a new one.

JD asked what, considering the circumstances, is the problem in waiting another two weeks until there are new architectural drawings. MM said the problem is the delay; that a vote was taken and now the owner has failed to show up; that the condition for advancing the determination was the applicant's presence before the HDC at today's meeting; suggested an option to withdraw without prejudice and re-apply.

JD noted that if the application is denied and a two-year wait imposed that the destruction of the building over that period would be on the HDC. MCM said the building is now completely stripped and asked if a violation could be issued. MM repeated that the HDC's vote should be respected. AH said the owner/applicant could not be present by the end of today's meeting as she is off-Cape and that in order to follow-up on the proposal to issue violations for work done, she would have to review the tape to determine what work was approved.

HS said they need to come to the next meeting fully prepared.

MM made a motion, based on JD's recommendation, that if the applicant is not present at the next meeting then the application will be denied. TB seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, TB, JD, HS, MCM.

b) HDC 19-007 (continued from the meeting of September 5th)

Application by **Peter Makrauer**, of **LDA Architecture & Interiors**, on behalf of **Thomas Tannariello**, requesting to add a second story residential unit, including extending the brick façade upward, to add an interior elevator, preserve a south portico and add a roof deck on the structure located at **170 Commercial Street**.

Peter Makrauer and **Thomas Tannariello** presented.

Peter Makrauer noted one error in the application in that they are no longer extending the masonry walls; gave a brief history of the property as a former bank built in 1953 and their plans to make a second floor full-time residence and said that the chimney would be extended.

Thomas Tannariello read from a prepared statement in support of the change in the mansard roof and praised Peter Makrauer for effecting the goal of maintaining a 1950s federal look while allowing the subordinate structure above to fulfill its purpose.

Robert Gutttag of 168 Commercial St., spoke, asked of the proposed building if his view would be completely taken away. Peter Makrauer responded that there is some misleading information out there relating to previous drawings and that the new height is less than adjacent buildings on Commercial St. and the deck will be sunken into the roof and not extending over Commercial Street.

Christopher Matthison spoke in support, said he lives across the street and feels that Peter Makrauer's previous designs have been well done especially the one on Watson's Court.

TB read a letter from Robert H. Quigley, AIA, of 8 Winthrop St., opposed, citing a lack of consistency in the design and its incompatibility to the neighborhood; that the second floor expansion seems alien and that in the plan are disparate elements.

Peter Makrauer suggested the letter-writer was responding to previous drawings. AH clarified the relevant drawings of Sept. 24, 2018. Peter Makrauer said the relevant drawings should list as revised, 9/24/18. MM noted the date of July 2nd for east and south elevations; north elevation of June 26th. Peter Makrauer said drawings that are unchanged will have the previous dates but the coversheet should state Sept. 24, 2018.

HDC Deliberations

JD addressed the photograph, noted a very fine Georgian-style building with a slate roof, asked if the HDC should be tasked with preserving such structures or to allow a re-sizing of these buildings which will dwarf everything around it; said he felt the rear, parking lot end is open for discussion but is not in favor of the front massing with its mansard roof or a situation with fenestration that might be comparable to Whaler's Wharf.

MCM said the building isn't like anything else around it, and liked the church motif that had been originally proposed, said she'd like 8-over-12 for the windows for the sake of continuity; but that she didn't feel there was anything particularly striking about the building in its present state.

HS said she felt the mansard roof did not go with the colonial revival style, agreed with JD in favoring dog house dormers on the second floor to reduce the appearance of much massing.

MM said she appreciated the applicant's attempts to keep the building as is as much as possible, referenced the success with 24 Bradford St., which JD said was one of his favorites. MM spoke in favor of the integrity of the design and said that she appreciated the contemporary improvements.

TB said he agreed with the letter-writer, and JD, in this case; that while he also appreciated the work done on 24 Bradford Sr., felt this re-design of one of the only brick structures serves to obliterate the original; spoke in favor of doghouse dormers but strongly objected to a mansard roof so out-of-scale as presented.

MCM referenced the approval of a mansard roof at the June 6th meeting wherein TB was not present. TB added that he objected to a door that would go directly into a chimney, whether the chimney is functional or not.

JD said he'd be open to a modernist approach at the back, but the front of the building is the Commercial Street streetscape.

Peter Makrauer replied that that they were up against space constraints to which Tom Tannariello said that this concerned the second floor height which is comprised of steel girders and trusses and that it is not livable. Peter Makrauer said the mansard was adopted to provide relief to the existing gable forms and to add to a gracious living space.

JD responded that the height on the front or streetscape side of a building is what the design is intended to be and suggested that it be accepted as a limitation. MCM disagreed in this case based on the relatively modern age of a building that used to be a bank. TB said the structure was built in 1963 as a bank, mentioned that the HDC's purview does not apply to interiors and that he felt the Winthrop and Commercial Street sides should remain as is, but would allow anything on the west side and the back.

MM remarked that the HDC has allowed second stories and much more than what is being presented here in this case, to which JD replied that he hoped past mistakes on the part of the board should not be the basis for future approvals. MM said the board was always making changes for living spaces, asked if the limitations proposed would still make the building livable; advised the HDC to be clear in following its guidelines, recommendations or conditions for revisions in order to best serve the applicant in their redesigns.

Tom Tannariello sought clarity regarding the Winthrop St. side height and the ridge line which TB said he felt should remain.

JD presented an adjustment directly to the applicant; recommending four as opposed to two dormers and something more modern perhaps than a mansard. HS asked if the door at the back could be moved a bit over to the right. Peter Makrauer said they would consider the change which would facilitate changing the egress, but that it seemed to run counter to everything they'd been hearing.

TB made a motion to accept a time waiver. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Oct. 17, 2018 at 4:00pm in the Judge Welsh Room, Town Hall. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.

TB called for a short break.

c) **HDC 19-026**

Application by **Don DiRocco, of Hammer Architects**, requesting to relocate a rear building that was previously approved, **HDC 18-056**, 27.5' landward at the property located at **51 Commercial Street, Rear**. **Lester J. Murphy, Jr.** attorney, **Don Diocco** and **Leif Hamnquist** of Hammer Architects and **Mark Kinnane** of Cape Associates, presented.

Lester Murphy gave an account of the history of the properties of 51 and 53, owned by Jay Anderson, through its prior applications and said they are now required, per the Dept. of Environmental Protection, to be compliant with Chapter 91 of the FEMA code in order to relocate the waterfront building further shoreward to take it out of the Chapter 91 footprint.

Don DiRocco said the initial plan was to pull the beach cottage out of the FEMA zone, but they then discovered that the State had issue with any movement on the building at all, which led to the current request.

MM asked if this situation could have been anticipated. Lester Murphy replied that Coastal Engineering, which did the original Chapter 91 license for the Dahill family, did not anticipate an issue with Chapter 91 as they were working toward a lesser footprint; however, at a meeting in Boston with Ben Lynch of the Waterways Division of the DEP, it was made clear that the license would be invalidated by any movement within the footprint. Don DiRocco added that they had never worked on a project that had such a large lot of land.

MM asked if public access will now be required, to which Lester Murphy said, no, that there will be no new license required in the jurisdictional area and the old license did not require public access; a new license will reflect the deck and bulkheads.

Leif Hamnquist said they would be back with the 53 Front as they are coming up on the one year mark but are hoping that can be put through as Administrative Review. Lester Murphy said they may have to return with 53 Rear if the revision to the licensing plan is not acceptable to the DEP as applied to Chapter 91.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. HS seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0; TB, HS, MM, JD, MCM.

d) HDC 19-034

Application by **Charles T. Westcott**, requesting to replace an existing white picket fence at the property located at **8 West Vine Street**.

Scott Fry, Colonial Westcott's son-in-law, presented; offered up a Crosby fence design, said the same fence proposed was put in by Mr. Crosby 25 years ago.

No public comments.

TB read a letter from James F. McGuire of 4 West Vine St. in support of the fence.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.

e) HDC 19-037

Application by **Michael & Donna Marie Piliere**, requesting to demolish a structure subsequent to 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 11-1-15, Demolition Delay Permit, at the property located at **963 Commercial St., #10**.

Lester J. Murphy, Jr., attorney and **Michael & Donna Marie Piliere** presented. Lester Murphy said the Piliere's were looking to make the structure which they've owned for 30 years a more permanent, year-round or three-season residence; cited HDC bylines permitting demolition and said contractors had already been engaged; added that in the 1950s Elizabeth Taylor and Mike Todd had stayed at a cottage that was not the one in question, but one closer to the beach.

Lester Murphy noted that many changes had been undertaken at the Beach Point Club through the years and asked the HDC not to invoke a

demolition delay as that would result in the work being done as a renovation rather than a take-down which is more expensive; said all work has to be done according to the FEMA zone code and require a slight raise.

No public comments or letters.

MM said she noted many modifications of the various cottages on the property, that the public had not come forward; gave her vote in favor.

HS said she didn't have a problem with it as most of the cottages would, in time, be built up. MCM agreed even as she thought the cottages had an old time look and feel. TB said he was also not opposed. MM remarked, for the public, that if the structure was in the Historic District it would be a different decision and that the HDC's purview in these cases was just for the demolition delay or not.

MM made a motion to allow a demolition of the property at 963 Commercial #10, application HDC 19-037. TB seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; MM, TB, HS, MCM.

MM said a letter needed to be sent allowing the demolition and referenced one that Martin Risteen had previously devised which should be retrieved for that purpose.

f) **HDC 19-039**

Application by **T. Kim Cromwell** and **Kathleen A. Cote**, requesting to replace 3 fences on the property located at **8 Cottage Street**.

Kim Cromwell presented, said she had e-mailed the specs to AH just a short time ago as, she said, no one downstairs would tell her what she needed to submit or when; referenced the look of the fence as white picket to resemble that of their neighbors; referenced a slight grade change on the Cottage St. side and requests a 3' height all around; approached the commission with photographs. AH retrieved the specs.

No public comments or letters.

TB said the only potential problem was the 5' portion, which Kim Cromwell said would be replaced in that part as 5'. JD asked why they went from 3' to 4' on the Nickerson St. side rather than keep it all uniform at 3'. TB said he agreed with JD that 3' all the way around might be a good way to go but acknowledged that MM was correct in commenting that the applicant is allowed to replace in kind.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.

JD clarified for AH that the board was accepting as presented with the suggestion of a 3' height all around.

g) **HDC 19-044**

Application by **Albert Cauzzo**, on behalf of the **14 West Vine Condominium Association**, requesting to extend the footprint of an existing 10' by 10' roof deck to a 10' by 18' roof deck on the structure located at **14 West Vine Street**.

Al Cauzzo presented; said they were in urgent need of roof repair and are seeking approval while the condo association has not weighed in on whether they will permit the full 18'.

No public comments.

TB read a letter against by Peter Rombult and Sean Murphy of 17 West Vine St. citing visibility and Historic District concerns.

JD read a letter against from the Board of Trustees of 14 West Vine Condominium signed by Michael Lynch and Ross Dube, dated Sept. 20, 2018, which stated that a 14' extension had been previously submitted and was pending approval.

TB read a letter against from Trustee Member Lisa Grattan at 14 West Vine #1 who wrote that a request for a 10'x14' extension was pending.

Al Cauzzo said the privacy panel would be eliminated and that Azec would be used only on the floor and the rest would be all wood, new railing wood with a captured baluster, per elevation A2.

MM and MCM said they had no problem with the plans.

Al Cauzzo asked if he wished to use a canvas as a privacy screen could he employ 6' posts, which TB said would not be allowed, that a 4' height is the limit for permanent fixtures.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the extension be limited to 14' in length. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.

h) HDC 19-046

Application by **Ted Smith, Architect, LLC**, on behalf of **Steve Lowinger**, requesting to replace 4 windows in kind on the south and east elevations, replace a door on the south elevation, relocate a window on the north elevation and remove and add a window on the west elevation of the structure located at **12 Mechanic Street, #2**.

Ted Smith presented, said the owners are looking to replace four of the windows in kind, as indicated on elevation A2.1

AH clarified that the percentage of size changes would not affect the neighbors as the properties are 3' and 4' apart.

No public comments or letters.

JD said he was fine with it.

Ted Smith said the windows are a mix; ones facing the street are 6-over-6s; ones on the south side are 1-over-1s and that he's made these all 2-over-2s to unify.

MM said the problem with the application is that the existing windows are not represented. JD noted the variation of fenestration in the area. HS and MCM said they were fine with it. TB and MM said they'd rather see 6-over-6 remain, which JD questioned why, based on visibility. TB agreed it was pretty minimal as far as visibility.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the 6-over-6s remain as 6-over-6's and the 1-over-1's can remain as 1-over-1s or be converted to 6-over-6s. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-1-0: TB, MM, HS, MCM in favor; JD, opposed.

i) HDC 19-047

Application by **Ted Smith, Architect, LLC**, on behalf of **Joshua Ronnebaum**, requesting to lift a stricture pursuant to FEMA guidelines, install new windows, including skylights and sliding doors, rebuild a front porch, add a dormer on the east elevation and infill a corner area on the north elevation of the structure located at **122 Commercial Street**.

Ted Smith and **Kaye McFadden** of Cape Tip Construction presented. Ted Smith said the clients live in Detroit and could not be present but requested that Ted Smith mention the award-winning team of designers they work with as an indication of their commitment to integrity.

Ted Smith said the building would need to be raised by 3' to 3 ½' to comply with FEMA regulations as the work proposed is more than 50% of the assessed value of the property; replacing doors and windows and need to replace the front porch; went through elevations and contrasted existing and proposed dimensions; noted a hodge-podge of added features through the years and expressed a desire to make the building more uniform in the revamp.

Kaye McFadden said the rebuild is to change the structure from a three family to a two family dwelling.

No public comments.

HS read a letter in support from Deb Martin at 134 Commercial.

MM read a letter against from Robert Paster at 128 Commercial.

JD read a letter against from William Vukowich at 4 Whorf's Court.

TB read a letter against from Michael Poniatowski, a neighbor.

TB clarified what is being addressed are not dormers but that the applicant has changed the slope of the roof.

MCM said these changes are dramatic and the HDC could expect to have properties in the future coming to them with requests for raises based on FEMA requirements and that, as in this case, additional documentation should be required; remarked that the proposal resembles a total demolition and wished to see more of the existing features preserved in the rebuild.

AH noted the field card has the building listed at \$706,300. Kaye McFadden concurred that they couldn't do a renovation for less than 350k.

MM agreed with MCM, said letters from the State or Federal were needed as well as an appraisal. AH said the applicant is not required to get an appraisal, to which MM said more proof of the need for a raise is still warranted. HS said she agreed with MCM and MM.

JD said that, even without the subject of raising the building, he cannot adhere to the complete eradication of historic property proposed in this application. Kaye McFadden presented photos of the property which triggered JD to ask why they would want to erase all the romantic Greek Revival elements and put in dental moldings. Ted Smith said the house had been changed so often over different time frames to which TB said, nevertheless, have come to be known as defining characteristics.

JD said it was his understanding that the owners, as is the case with many other applicants, don't want to maintain what is, but are seeking contemporary living as defined by more light, French doors, more space whereas someone seeking to honor the historical integrity of what is there, would be proposing designs that reflect a desire to uphold what currently exists.

TB said the ell is lost and the dormers needed to be reduced by at least a third, and the bulk should be reduced, as well.

Ted Smith clarified with AH that they are in the FEMA A zone. TB said it seemed questionable that a renovation could not be done for less

than 400k. Kaye McFadden replied that the plumbing, electrical and attendant work is at 100k before even touching the building. TB suggested shooting for a smaller unit on the second floor. Kaye McFadden said they are combining the two units on the first floor into one, asked if 4-over-1s would be acceptable. JD commented that 4-over-1s are not correct in this town and that 6-over-6s would be stylistically correct on the ground floor; 2-over-2s or 2-over-1s on the upper levels.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Oct. 17, 2018 at 4:00pm in the Judge Welsh Room, Town Hall, with a time wavier continuance to be signed and accepted if necessary. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, HS, MCM.

MM left the meeting at 7:03pm.

j) HDC 19-049

Application by **KA Bazarian**, on behalf of **521 Commercial St., LLC**, requesting to raise a shed roof, replace roofing and siding, replace existing doors and windows and add a window on the north elevation of the structure located at **521A Commercial Sreet** (Sea Urchin). **Kevin Bazarian** presented; said the only major change is to a little shed roof with walls lower than the rest of the house, cited leaking and sagging, requests to raise ceiling a bit higher, to use red cedar, copper flashing; siding and window replacement are as is; in north elevation request to install small portal window in bathroom; windows would change to double-hung if siding is used in revamp.

TB made a motion to approve as presented allowing the change of casements to double-hungs if the applicant desires and to allow a tiny, portal window. MCM seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

1. d) Any other business that shall properly come before the Commission:

AH said she needed MM, TJ and MCM to sign plans for 473 Commercial St.

TB recommended Martin Risteen be hired to conduct a new inventory survey and work on the backlog of decisions outstanding from August 31, 2018 and continuing backward. AH said she wasn't sure MR had the qualifications to conduct the new survey, but she would look into it.

4. Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

Decisions by TB, read by TB:

a) HDC 19-025, 18 Pearl St. TB made a motion to approve the decision of Sept. 5, 2018. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, HS, JD, MCM.

b) HDC 19-033, 575 Commercial St. TB made a motion to accept the decision of Sept. 19, 2018. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, HS, MCM.

- c) **HDC 19-034**, 411 Commercial St. TB made a motion to accept the decision of Sept. 5, 2018. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, MCM, HS.
- d) **HDC 19-027**, 53 Commercial St. TB made a motion to accept the decision of Sept. 5, 2018. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, MCM, HS.

AH noted that **HDC 19-034** is a duplicate i.d. number for 8 West Wine St. and 411 Commercial St.

Decision by HS, read by HS:

HDC 19-036, 8-10 Atlantic Ave., UF. TB made a motion to approve the decision of Sept, 19, 2019. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

JD left the meeting at 7:20pm.

JON said that the meeting minutes of August 1 and August 19, 2018 had been sent on Sept. 17, 2018 for HDC approval. TB requested that going forward all meeting minutes be sent to all sitting board members once completed for approval at a future meeting.

TB made a motion to adjourn at 7:30pm. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, HS, MCM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil