

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
Town Hall
Provincetown MA

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 2, 2019

Members Present: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep.; John Dowd (JD), PBG Rep.; Christopher Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep. Hersh Schwartz (HS), Alternate; Michela Carew-Murphy (MCM), Alternate.

Others Present: Jeffrey Ribeiro (JR), Town Planner, Community Development.

TB called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

1. Work Session: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

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

JB said he had nothing to report in Building Commissioner, Annie Howard's absence.

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 January 16, 2019, and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

- i) 610 Commercial St. (continued from the meeting of Dec. 19, 2018) – To re-side and replace rotten trim with Azek.
No one presented.

TB said he felt the entire west side was highly visible; made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, HS, JD, MCM.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the trim be wood. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

TB made a motion to consider the following as Full Review:

- vi) 21 Commercial St.; xiii) 54 Bradford St., U3-2; xv) 43 Bradford St.; xvi) 41 Bradford St., Bldg. D; xvii) 41 Bradford St., Bldg. C; xviii) 77 Commercial St., #1.

HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, HS, JD, MCM.

- ii) 505 Commercial St – To replace windows and doors in kind.
.No one presented.
HS remarked on the poor quality of the photographs submitted.

TB made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the Commercial Street-side window and trim be wood. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

MCM clarified that the approval is reserved for the window submitted in the photo only and TB suggested the applicant would probably be returning as there is more work to be done.

iii) 7 Anthony St. – To replace windows and doors in kind.

No one presented.

TB noted an old wood-paneled door as indicated but said the door is difficult to see from the pictures provided. HS suggested there wasn't enough info to vote on.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition the door be wood-paneled. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, JD, HS, MCM. [Note: No vote on consideration as Administrative Review.]

iv) 422 Commercial St., #2 – To repair a roof.

No one presented.

TB made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, JD, HS, MCM.

v) 293 Commercial St. – To replace a door in kind.

No one presented.

TB noted fiber glass door, commercial property, ice-cream shop, made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

vii) 543 Commercial St. – To replace 17 windows and doors in kind.

No one presented.

TB recognized the property as the Surfside Hotel & Suites and that this, he thought, was the third phase of ongoing work to the structure.

TB made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

viii) 128A Commercial St. – To re-side.

No one presented.

TB lamented that the work had already been done and so it was not possible to see what had been in place prior; made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, JD, HS, MCM.

- ix) 45 Commercial St. – To re-side.

No one presented.

TB noted cedar shingles, made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, HS.

CM joined the meeting at 3:50pm.

- x) 353B Commercial St., U15 – To re-side and add Azek water table trim.

No one presented.

TB made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, CM, HS.

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

- xi) 244 Commercial St. – To re-place brick surfaces in kind, pattern and color and replace treads with bluestone.

No one presented.

TB said it was not an in-kind replacement and made a motion to consider as Full Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, CM, HS.

- xii) 536 Commercial #2 – To re-side.

No one presented.

TB made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, CM, HS.

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

- xiv) 199 Commercial St., #12 – To replace deck boards, handrails and stairs.

No one presented.

MCM said she would approve with a condition of wood. TB noted an Azek handrail system.

TB made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, CM, HS.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the handrails be wood with captured balusters. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, JD, CM, HS.

c) Any other business that shall properly come before the Commission.

Roofing Approval

JD asked if the HDC mandated specifications about roofing surfaces. MCM thought that during her tenure there was a case on Bradford St. possibly involving wood shingles with a rubber material request, later referenced as possibly HDC 18-263 Bradford St.

JD suggested not having a roofing issue clutter up the review process if there is a clear mandate.

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

Tom Thompson asked if 281 Commercial St., with a request for a change in rear deck railings, had been left off today's agenda. HS said it was reviewed and approved with the condition the material be wood at last week's meeting.

3. **Public Hearing: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN**

a) **HDC 18-279** (continued to the meeting of February 6, 2019)
199 Bradford Street.

b) **HDC 19-104** (request to continue to the meeting of January 16th)
26 Bradford Street.

TB made a motion to continue the case to the meeting of January 16, 2019. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, JD, HS, MCM.

c) **HDC 19-119** (postponed from the meeting of December 19th)

Application by **Kevin A Bazarian**, on behalf of **Steven Ballerini**, requesting to renovate a kitchen and north wing of a structure and replace and restore windows, siding and roofing shingles on the property located at **72B Commercial Street.**

Kevin Bazarian presented; apologized for moving or missing the last meeting, said the structure is a 200+ year-old Cape with kitchen ceilings that are about 5' high in a shed dormer, request to reconfigure and move for greater height; said owners wish to retain as much of the original features as possible, including windows.

No public comments or letters.

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

TB noted plans dated Nov. 8, 2018. HS reminded the public that three copies are required for the HDC to sign-off on approvals.

LD joined the meeting at 4:13pm.

d) **HDC 19-120**

Application by **Randall Sell & Ed Gilligan** requesting to add 37 linear feet of 2.5' high picket fencing on the property located at **6 Cottage Street, U2.**

Todd Westrick presented; said the property is on a slight hill and fencing is intended to mask planting and handicap accessible decking, with a landscape feature; said fence is to match what was there previously, that the grade change is about a foot to a foot and a half; at the far side the grade dips way down at 3'6" high; pickets would run 2'6" to 3'6".

JD asked if the retaining wall could be left in place and the fence run along on top of it to prevent the look of having a fence change height when running along a slope.

No public comments or letters.

LD recused herself from the decision, and it was determined that MCM is not an abutter.

TB suggested the board was trying to come to grips with the sloping section and requested fence grade height. CM said he didn't see enough of a difference in the grade to facilitate the change in fence height. Mr. Westrick replied that CM was correct but that at the same time, they were trying to blend the look and, in any case, would need a lower fence where the steps are located and they are hoping not to have any of the retaining wall exposed, explained the need for a landscape feature.

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

e) **HDC 19-122**

Application by **Fine Arts Work Center in Provincetown** requesting to renovate a common room including altering a south façade, creating a bump-out and framing an entrance area, adding and replacing windows, replacing doors and increasing the height of a parapet over a framed area, and to improve an adjacent outdoor courtyard, including adding a deck, seasonal planters and outdoor furniture on the property located at **24 Pearl Street**.

Margaret Murphy, FAWC board president, and **Betsy Farrell Garcia** of **Flansburgh Architects**, presented.

Tom Thompson spoke from the floor, asking if there is a conflict of interest with any sitting board members. JD replied that while he has received an honor from FAWC he has never served on their board nor operated under its aegis in any other capacity. JB added that the inquiry was not something which concerned the Open Meeting Law, in any event.

Ms. Murphy spoke at length of the history of the property as a former lumber yard and supplier of coal started in the early 1900s, and of the area of concern as the Stanley Kunitz Common Room, first and last renovated in 1988, and decking; said the renovation would make the space ADA-accessible; that the project is multi-year and the result of a financial campaign with an intended start date of September, 2019.

Ms. Murphy spoke of removing the interior columns, installing steel cross beams and an entry beam over the south wall, and a bump-out that adds eleven square feet to the structure; a large glass garage door and side glass double doors at the entrance, adding that two single doors would not be functional for the needs of the space which seeks to fuse the Common Room with the outdoor area during the summer months to extend audience seating and no permanent landscaping utilized; said an overhead glass door is not feasible for the design based on the fire suppressant system required and cannot be customized for their needs.

Ms. Farrell Garcia said lighting would also be affected by a standard garage door that would block lights during exhibits and presentations.

Jackie Sperry of 31 Pearl Street said she's lived at her residence with her partner, Nancy Ross, since 1991 and that FAWC has been a complex neighbor with parking being a continual problem for year-round residents, noting her partner is handicapped. TB said he understood Ms. Sperry's concerns but that parking stands outside the HDC purview. Ms. Sperry asked of the railing or parapet, which Ms. Farrell Garcia said would be above the new door. JD said he understood they weren't changing any of the parking and that the ADA design in the revamp would make the

facility better accessed. Ms. Murphy invited Ms. Sperry to come by for a private consultation on the design plan.

Mr. Thompson took the mic again and read from a three-page letter opposing the design as an abutter at 3 Fishburn Court with the following objections: large, modern garage door and framed parapet as alien and massively out of scale; changes to north façade; raised deck to the lawn area on the north side of the Common Room which he feared would be used for open-mic commercial performances; concern that the Common Room feature unlicensed public performances, and that the proposed renovations are not compatible with the HDC's mission and authority statement.

TB replied that function of the space is not in the HDC's purview, which JD concurred.

Mr. Thompson asked Ms. Murphy if FAWC was planning on creating a theatre space. Ms. Murphy said no, that it is not intended to be a theatre space and that it will remain to be used as it's always been – to host events, readings, fundraising and other events, some of which have been licensed in the past and which may occur again.

TB read a letter into the record handed off by Mr. Thompson submitted by Catherine Russo, abutter at 5 Fishburn Court who stated her concerns that the re-design render what she said was its funky, artistic look and history as so upscale that it no longer fit the neighborhood.

Ms. Ross took the mic to say that Ms. Murphy had always been very helpful in addressing their concerns.

Todd Westrick spoke, said he has worked in design trades and is a former owner of a property once inhabited by local artist, Hans Hoffman; that he had looked over the proposal and was in favor of its return to a more industrial look that harked back to the property's origins, and that the new door design is reminiscent of large pallets of wood being transported from the former lumberyard.

Ms. Sperry spoke about the need to take people's concerns into proper context when these proposals are presented.

TB read a letter in support from Steven Nason and Paul Glover, neighbors at 32 Pearl Street, who noted what they felt were functional and aesthetic improvements in the design.

Ms. Murphy presented a pre-dated plan, an ad from the Days Lumber Yard, which served to attract the public to the studios at that time.

HDC Deliberations

LD said she had a little concern for the size of the garage door, a loss of the utility look as a coal-bin door; asked of the panel squares on the garage door, which Ms. Farrell Garcia explained, adding that a 30' wide beam was needed for the load it will carry. LD asked if the double door could mimic the door it would replace, concerned that the new door would make the structure ultra modern.

Ms. Farrell Garcia said the door will be an Anderson 400-series door and Ms. Murphy said the proposed garage door would be down for most of the year, weather dependent, and other doors will promote views inside and out by being set in glass. LD said she wasn't sure of the double

glazing above the door and suggested having plans reviewed by Mass Historical Commission if FAWC is looking for future granting.

JD countered that the current structure is not from the original 1911 structure but from the 1980s. Ms. Murphy said the design had the support of the Historical Commission, as per Julia Perry, which holds the preservation restriction. JR said that as it is the building to the south in question that there wouldn't be a conflict from an historical perspective.

JD said he liked the proposal as is; compared the new heights of the openings as similar to the previous; appreciated the proportions and that this design seemed to go against a local trend to make things twee and Disney or hark back to a time that did not exist.

MCM said she appreciated the work done at FAWC but did prefer the original garage door proposed that served to imitate the one at Bayside Betsey's, said she's concerning for all the Azek, as the HDC typically asks for wood. Ms. Farrell Garcia spoke of the present deterioration and that the Azek would be just for the trim.

HS asked of the frequency of the front door being opened. Ms. Murphy said they expect the door to be functional in the summer season when they are having readings, lectures and slide shows; but otherwise will be weather dependent and there aren't many events off-season. HS said she finds the door too massive. TB said to keep in mind that it is glass and so begs the question if it looks heavy or not. MCM said she felt it looked heavy and ultra-modern. Ms. Farrell Garcia described the door design as not yet being fully realized, but to involve glazing.

CM said he liked the clean, simple lines, or a Phillip Glass look as opposed to the new design which, he said, looks very 'now;' that he can understand the aspect of functionality from the applicant's point-of-view. TB asked if they have considered a bi-fold door. Ms. Farrell Garcia said they had but that it wouldn't work when folded as it blocks a quarter of the room. Ms. Murphy said they looked at a number of options.

TB said he liked the design in that it gives the building a focal-point; that the arch is a good visual; that sometimes the HDC is too safe and doing something a little more creative is in keeping with the spirit of the Town; asked of the north elevation, why shingles were proposed to be replaced with vertical boards. Ms. Murphy said it is not visible from a public way. TB took a poll on Azek, which the board said it was fine with as proposed.

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

f) **HDC 19-123**

Application by **Cass Benson** requesting to remove a block chimney on the structure located at **359 Commercial Street, UG.**

Joe Zaloom presented as a member of the board of Trustees; said he thought the chimney was put together in the 1960s, is cinder-lock, serves no purpose and leaks.

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

TB announced a five-minute break.

g) HDC 19-125

Application by **Lou Eyster**, of **T. M. Crowley & Associates**, requesting to replace existing steel windows with historic steel replica windows on the structure located at **132 Bradford Street**; future CVS building. **Bryce Hillman**, Project Manager at BKA Architects, presented; referred to 13 windows that are failing; that an outside company had been brought in to assess the potential of saving the windows, but that it was determined they needed to be replaced with steel, would be single-paned with shutters on the inside but no glazing required for interior installation; said these treatments have been used in many other historical properties across the U.S. and nearby at the Ethan Allen building in Hyannis.

MCM asked if the replacements were single or multi-paneled and HS asked if the window replacements will keep the building as contributing and that they would need to be steel, not aluminum. JB said he would locate the determination as to if the building was or was not contributing.

MCM asked if the applicant would consider rebuilding the existing windows. Mr. Hillman said the one company they spoke with per renovation could not recommend the feasibility of renovation. TB and HS offered up the names of companies that work with steel window renovation and repair.

TB asked if the replacements as proposed would render the windows as fake and if that affected the historical aspect of the structure.

Mr. Hillman noted the time and costs associated with companies that renovate and repair steel windows. HS countered that CVS has 6,000 stores and that it should be in their interest to explore these options. MCM requested that the work done be given to locals.

JD said he'd be willing to allow changes as long as the new product resembled the old look and profile.

CM said he agreed with other board members' commentary and said he wanted more information, including the results of the building in Hyannis.

LD suggested that what worked in Hyannis might not be appropriate for this structure. JR said the Ethan Allen store was from a few years ago and the building prior to that was in a strip mall so that these are not viable examples for the sake of comparison.

Mr. Hillman confirmed the rough opening would remain the same. TB read the window bylaw on restoration, asked if any of these can be restored. Mr. Hillman said the restoration company determined that in pulling apart the windows, the integrity of the building might be compromised. LD suggested pulling out the flange in restoring the window as an option.

TB surmised that the HDC is fine with replication, but that the model currently presented does not meet with approval, and a double-pane window might not ever work, that true divided life is perhaps needed. LD said 'contributing' in status relates to granting and tax-write status but that the HDC uses the same set of guidelines in determining historic preservation.

JB said there were no time constraints on continuing the decision. MCM asked if the HDC could approve an in-kind replacement to save time at the next meeting. CM said he felt there were too many issues at hand to make a vote at this time, which TB concurred.

TB made a motion to continue to the meeting of January 16, 2019. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, JD, MCM.

LD and JD said they would not be at the next meeting.

JON asked for the status in continuing to update the master list of filed decisions. TB said he hadn't heard back from staff on the matter but that JON should continue as the document was needed for now to help the HDC get caught up on tracking its filed decisions and that perhaps in the future the task might be taken up by a elected clerk.

4. **Review and approval of Minutes:** Dec. 5, 2018 and Dec. 28, 2018 were available for approval, but not voted on.

5. **Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN**

None.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:29pm. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, LD, JD, CM.

Respectfully Submitted, Jody O'Neil

OK
Thom
2-6-19

