

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
Town Hall
Provincetown, MA
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2019

Members Present: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep.; Laurie Delmolino (LD), Historical Commission Rep.; Hersh Schwartz (HS), Chamber of Commerce Rep.; John Dowd (JD), PGB Rep.; Christopher Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep.; Michela Carew-Murphy (MCM), Alternate.

Excused Absence: Martin Risteen, Alternate.

Others Present: Annie Howard (AH), Building Commissioner

TB thanked the Board for attending yesterday's special work session with local historian and New York Times writer, David Dunlap; encouraged the public to read Mr. Dunlap's book, "Building Provincetown."

Work Session: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

1. **Update on potential violations reported to the Building Commissioner.**
2. **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 June 19, 2019 and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.**

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

9 Commercial St. #11; 114 Commercial St.; 466 Commercial St.; 359 Commercial St., UB; 353 Commercial St., U24; 16 Winthrop St.

HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, LD, JD, CM.

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

509 Commercial St.; 6 Law St.; 7A Point St.

CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, HS, JD.

- i) 9 Commercial St., #11 – To replace windows in kind.
LD noted two types of windows, with the newer models of unknown materials, asked if viewed from a public way would the replacements be wood. TB said the applicant listed Anderson 400 series to match, but no tear sheet is on file.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, LD, JD, CM.
- ii) 248 Commercial St. – To replace a door in kind.
TB noted wood door.
TB made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, LD, JD, CM.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

- iii) [114 Commercial St.](#) – To replace rotted trim and shutters.
Laurie Ferrari presented.
TB asked what is body-guard, to which Ms. Ferrari said is pine from New Zealand.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.
- iv) [606 Commercial St., Unit 2](#) – To replace a door in kind.
Bob [] presented on behalf of the owner, said the replacement would be wood, same configuration and that present door might be the original, but has rotted away.
JD objected to the proposed altered look of the entryway. Bob replied that the replacement would be double-paned. TB acknowledged the current unit is in bad shape but agreed with JD. MCM suggested approving with a condition. LD and HS agreed with JD and TB's objections.
TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the transom window be tru-divided lite and rebuilt to the same dimensions. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, HS, JD.
Bob confirmed the replacement would be single-paned.
- v) [72A Commercial St.](#) – To alter a previously-approved plan by removing proposed decks.
Deborah Paine presented; noted previously approved decks on south and west sides of building, but that plans changed after speaking with the architects and that there were set-back issues which resulted in the decision to eliminate decks.
TB made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, LD, HS, CM.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, LD, HS, CM.
- vi) [466 Commercial St.](#) – To replace a door in kind and a window to match others on the structure.
Deborah Paine presented; noted past approvals, said they found a door on the set-back on the far right side and proposed a beautiful four-paneled door; referenced the rear stairs to the deck with a small window which was the site of a second kitchen, seeking to put in a proper-sized window.
LD asked if the rear window was visible from a public way, which AH said would be improbable.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, LD, JD, CM.
- vii) [509 Commercial St.](#) – For review of a previously-requested piling plan.
Lyn Plummer presented; said the change in pilings was from the engineer and that they must be secured.
TB sought clarification in what was being presented and what has changed. Ms. Plummer said the review of the piling plan was to be scheduled as a courtesy meeting of Administrative Review, that the HDC had approved a wooden piling plan.
TB asked after the proposed parking under the building, which AH said was one of only three uses including access and storage, as per FEMA designation and that no other Town buildings have been elevated to this degree as yet.
MCM questioned the state of the current application based on the previous application and approvals; that the current structure proposal does not look like a house sitting on a dock and that they should return with a new application and a request for demolition.
TB pointed out that there is a certificate for appropriateness to move the house back and MCM reminded the Board that the building had been deliberately left open to the elements and that sub-level parking in this situation would be setting a precedent.

JD concurred, said the vote was made on the mitigation of the height and design and that cross-beams and parking underneath are not consistent in the way the HDC had previously voted.

LD agreed that the pilings aspect was up for a return review but that a return to the minutes or the video would be prudent to proceed before any further approvals are granted.

TB made a motion to consider as Full Review at the next meeting. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

viii) [359 Commercial St., UB](#) – To replace a deck in kind.

Josh Piper of Cape Associates presented; said the existing structure is rotting and will be taken down and re-built as the same; wood-baluster system, pressure-treated framing, and that the only difference would be the hardware used.

TB confirmed the area in question is only the third, rear deck, said captured balusters would be requested.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition of captured balusters. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

ix) [353 Commercial St., U24](#) – To replace a deck rail in kind.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the applicant match the drawing to feature true captured balusters. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, LD, HS, CM.

x) [16 Winthrop St.](#) – To replace roofing shingles.

AH said the roof had been piece-meal replaced, staggered panel by panel. CM asked if a replacement in kind is permissible if it pre-dates the HDC and its mandate. AH requested a vote on the shingle aspect of the application before moving on.

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

xi) [72B Commercial St.](#) – To demolish and replace a chimney.

Kevin Bazarian presented; said it will remain a functioning chimney, to which AH said is why it is set to the length indicated, noting that the firebox is being redone.

TB made a motion to approve with the conditions that the chimney is no higher than currently exists including the clay cap; and that the size and color of brick, mortar joints and detailing be retained. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

3. Any other business that shall properly come before the Commission:

4. AH said she would pass.

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

Angela McCarthy and Ricardo Torres presented for [199 Bradford Street](#) with a three-panel sample; said they opted to close the window opening in the front. Mr. Torres said of the 3-D model samples there was poly-ash or Boral, Versatec – his company's item – and real wood, all painted with white, Benjamin Moore paint and asked the Board to tell the difference.

MCM said she'd be in favor of Mr. Torres' company's product as a green alternative considering the environmental aspect, which HS concurred. LD said she'd agreed but only in a test case capacity and noted that the HDC has not previously approved this product, to which TB agreed, after stating his mixed feelings.

TB made a motion to approve the use of Versatec on the trim as presented in a test case capacity. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, LD, HS, CM.

AH asked how the HDC planned to address others who would come before the Board with the same request. JD replied that time would tell of the product's viability, asked Mr. Torres of the

down-side of his product. Mr. Torres said there are practices the installer has to follow and that he shows up on site to educate the builder; that if a piece is ripped, there are repair measures including sanding down the piece and employing acetone with a clean rag to close the cells.

TB made a motion to move Potential Violations to the end of the meeting. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

6. Public Hearing: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

a) [HDC 19-228](#)

Application by **Mark Kinnane**, of **Cape Associates, Inc.**, on behalf of **Barry Peskin**, requesting to amend a previously-approved plan by eliminating 2 windows and moving a door to meet fire code and eliminating 2 roof overhangs on the structure located at **11 Brewster Street**.

Mark Kinnane presented; referred to eliminated window in the drawings based on a firewall between the three windows and the need of a 5' distance at the L-corner; also, window eliminated on the second floor for the same reason; other change is to the trim on the driveway side as it didn't fit under the window; showed pictures of salvaged fence at property line.

No public comments or letters.

HDC deliberated by elevation. Mr. Kinnane clarified dimensions on the north elevation pertaining to the dormer plane wall.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the ledges or roof line on the south elevation be retained. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

TB informed Mr. Kinnane that the proposal for Azec would require another hearing.

b) [HDC 19-237](#) (continued from the meeting of May 15th)

Application by **Diane Burcz** requesting to add and replace windows, siding, a front entry door, pilasters and a deck, including reducing its size and replacing the existing decking with Azek and natural cedar, on the south elevation and to replace an existing door with a sliding patio door and decking material with Azek and natural cedar on the north elevation of the property located at **252 Bradford Street**.

Diane Burcz and **Charles Navratil**, architect, presented; noted changes in the packet distributed highlight two outstanding issues; one including the pediment above front door and an actual door selection as an alternative to the "Provincetown door."

JD remarked that the base molding in the front may not be appropriate and is not typical in Town. Ms. Burcz approached the panel and was not clearly heard stating a case for new design aspects, including a window configuration. Mr. Navratil referenced the Greek Revival compatibility and 2-over-2s, based on the period in use. CM said his research found that 90% of Greek Revival called for 6-over-6s. JD made the case of various nuances that make a building correct in look, or not. LD said she thought the door proposal would render more of a Mission-style look. Ms. Burcz spoke of the preference for the door replacement to match all the interior doors and noted that bright lights shine in from cars parking at the Surf Side Inn. JD noted the horizontal door is not in keeping with what is acceptable, but that inclusion of glass could make the unit appropriate.

TB summarized that all were in agreement with the door having single lights, agreed on base corner boards, not water table board and Ms. Burcz said she could agree to 6-over6s on the front of the house. Ms. Burcz said the three-sides of the house were cedar and the front is wood with Harvey board. AH explained the situation with chimneys based on altered cavities. HS reiterated that the floor can be Azec but all else is wood. LD requested a spec sheet for the 6-over6s and cautioned the applicant not to purchase the units until approved.

TB made a motion to approve with conditions that the windows be 6-over6s with spec sheet provided; door be Provincetown door, #F117; base board along the front is eliminated;

trim, clasps, railing be wood with captured balusters. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, LD, HS, JD.

c) [HDC 19-239](#)

Application by **Peter Rombult** and **Sean Murphy** requesting to replace a split-rail fence in kind and extend it by 47 linear feet, including 6 linear foot returns on each side of the stairs from the yard to the street on the property located at **17 West Vine Street**.

Mark Kinnane presented; said the replacement is in kind and to be extended.

CM said he felt the fence extension should be a picket variety, to which Mr. Kinnane said would be stupid, having two different styles, and that the owners wouldn't go for it. LD said she thought there was originally a split-rail fence along the property. MCM noted the stables at the top of West Vine St., asked if the poured concrete would be continued, to which Mr. Kinnane said it would. HS said she preferred to keep the fence consistent, to which CM said the existing fence could be taken down and a picket be replaced all around. JD said he felt CM was correct historically, but in this case the incongruity takes precedence.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-1-0: TB, HS, LD, JD in favor; CM, opposed.

d) [HDC 19-241](#)

Application by **Guy Busa** requesting to construct a two-story addition with dormers on a main house on the property located at **2 & 2A Conway Street**.

TB recused himself as an abutter.

Regina Binder and Guy Busa presented. Ms. Binder gave background on the house, said the addition will be keeping with the context of appropriateness of the house and neighborhood; addition maintains a consistent ratio of surrounding houses, reuses material, north is minimally visible from a public way – the west side not at all; solar panels to be brought onto next roof line and windows to match; happy to do a brick or veneer chimney to match what is in the area, including mortar profile.

LD noted five letters in support on file from residents at 282 Bradford St.; 0 Conway; 1 Conway; 579 Commercial St.; 572 Commercial St.

JD felt the design, scale and detail are appropriate and issued his high approval. MCM agreed with others that it's a good thing to have so many neighbors offering full support.

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

LD asked for any comment from the public; there was none.

e) [HDC 19-244](#)

Application by **Mark Kinnane**, of **Cape Associates, Inc.**, on behalf of **Sean McConnell**, requesting to replace a door and window with a slider, replace 4 skylights, remove a window and frame-in a bump out on the north elevation of the structure located at **25 Watson's Court**.

Mark Kinnane presented; said the window and door is on the back of the property and cannot be seen from a public street, that the change is to open up the kitchen; skylights to be replaced in kind with solar shades; little bump-out is to remove a window for a fireplace; using white cedar shingles; one additional item is to replace a wooden door in kind on the cottage in the rear which is not visible from a public way.

No public comments or letters.

LD said she had an issue with the proposed bump-out. JD said the building was originally a half-Cape and was built wrong in a variety of aspects, employing a master scale for what is a small property, that nothing is original or historically worth preserving. CM said he felt the roof-line looked original; that both surrounding properties have chimneys as well as the house across the street and that a gas fireplace is not contextual to the neighborhood and that the bump-out was like insult to injury.

MCM said she was fine with it; that she understands the others' objections, but that everyone needs a heat source in the winter and that as this is not the original Cape, was inclined to approve. LD suggested there is an alternative to a bump-out which TB concurred.

TB took a poll and learned there was not a majority on the bump-out.

TB made a motion to approve without the addition of the proposed bump-out. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-2: HS, LD, CM in favor; TB, JD, abstained.

f) [HDC 19-245](#)

Application by **Elena C. Hall** requesting to erect a 6' high fence on the property located at **397 Commercial Street**.

Elena Hall presented; distributed new drawings. Ms. Hall said the fence was required by her deed and described the look as being see-through with a spread of a hundred feet and use of 2x4s rather than 1x3s between pickets to have it spread out better and create a kind of ripple on the Bay effect; said historically it was a big, green wall; pickets are 1x4 cedar.

TB read a letter in favor by the resident, John, at 396 Commercial St., who suggested 5' might be more neighborly, but that it would be beneficial for passersby; and another letter in favor by a neighbor named Mark, with no address included.

HS cited the restriction of 48" on the high end, or 6' if in the rear of the building. Ms. Hall said that this would cause a problem in that 48" would loom in proximity to the cottage.

CM said he felt a regular picket fence, traditional and white, would be more acceptable. Ms. Hall countered that the cars will be visible and asked if this was not less scenic. MCM suggested landscaping might be an option and beyond the HDC's jurisdiction.

Ms. Hall said she would return in two weeks with a different style to present.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of June 19th. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, HS, JD, CM.

g) [HDC 19-249](#)

Application by **Ezra Block**, on behalf of **Matt Metivier** and **Ricardo Gessa**, requesting to renovate a cottage on the property located at **7 Bradford Street**.

Ezra Block, architect, presented; said the property is a non-contributing structure and that the one-and-half story cottage has been recommended for complete replacement, including the foundation, and to move it away from the rear property line, going from 1.4' to 4.5' and from 14.5' to move 20.4', closer to the main house on the other side; said the design will include unified windows, cedar shingle roof and matching clapboards.

LD recused herself from the decision.

TB said the appearance of the building does not appear stressed and questioned the demolition request; read into the record a letter in favor of demolition from the engineer. HS asked if a second opinion would be an option. Mr. Block said he would consult the owners to learn if paying for a second opinion from an engineer of the HDC's choice would be an option.

HS said she did a site visit and said it looked structurally fine but wondered if another perspective would substantiate the claim for demolition. Mr. Block said he felt that the costs of improving plumbing and electrical is prohibitive and that the framing for the construction is 2x4, which is not supportive. JD agreed, said the structure is a shed and HS added as a dwelling would not be up to code. JD noted the absence of existing drawings or photos, asked if the pitch of the roof is the same as existing in the proposal, which Mr. Block said was the intention.

TB recommended a site visit and a review of drawings of the existing structure. AH asked if inside access was requested. TB made a plan to meet at 3:00pm at the site before the next meeting for a review of the property, including the interior. JD recommended Mr. Block have someone on hand at the site visit to answer to the call for demolition.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of June 19th. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, CM, LD, HS, JD.

h) [HDC 19-250](#)

Application by **Don DiRocco**, of **Hammer Architects**, on behalf of **David A. Deckelbaum**, requesting to construct a painted picket fence on top of a low brick landscape wall along the north and west elevation of the property located at **101 Commercial Street**.

Don DiRocco, **Leif Hamnquist** of Hammer Architects and **Greg Connors**, owner, presented. LD and MCM recused themselves. MCM stated that she and nine other abutters have not received proper notification; cited letters on file in opposition and recommended the HDC postpone deliberations until all abutters concerns can be properly addressed.

Mr. DiRocco countered that they have confirmations of abutter notifications. AH read off the list of all abutters of record who did receive notification. LD recused herself, regardless of not being on the abutter notification list.

Mr. DiRocco said the fence adheres to the HDC bylaws and is from the June 2016 which was then approved; that the proposed fence is for the Commercial Street side and only a portion of the western side.

MCM spoke from the public and as resident at 99 Commercial St., referred to five former applications from the applicant; said no fence has ever existed between the properties and that if the oyster shell driveway is removed one is left with a picket fence on a beach, adding that a parking easement is not permitted at Mr. Connors' property and that he would have to exit his vehicle onto her property and that this specific application has been twice denied. MCM repeated her request that abutters who have not been notified have a chance to give voice to the application.

Gary Rhinehart of 107 Commercial St. said he had spoken two years ago in opposition to the raising of the house but that since it was approved and elevated, he is now in favor of the application regarding the fence in that it could help to mitigate the current height of the building, saying that the Town likes its picket fences.

TB read a letter in support from the owner of 3 School St. JD read a letter in support from a direct abutter at 99 Commercial St., Unit #1. HS read a letter in support from residents with no address given. TB read a letter in support from a resident with no address given. JD read a letter in support from a resident with no address given. HS read a letter in support from a neighbor with no address given. TB read a letter in support from a resident with no address given. JD read a letter in support from a direct abutter with no address given. HS read a letter in support from a neighbor at 79 Commercial St. TB read a letter in support from a resident at 7 Commercial St., #17.

Mr. DiRocco submitted three more letters in support. TB read the names of the residents in support at 4 Mechanic St.; 5 School St., and 73 ½ Commercial St.

HS asked if the proposed fence was far enough away from the pilings. Mr. DiRocco said they received full approval from the Conservation Commission which is on file, and that there would be a grate to allow water flow.

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

i) [HDC 19-253](#)

Application by **KA Bazarian**, on behalf of **Bradford Realty Trust**, requesting to construct new hand rails on the property located at **31 Bradford Street**.

Kevin Bazarian and **Liz Lovati** presented.

TB questioned the nature of the application in coming after the fact, but which AH said was all performed below grade.

Mr. Bazarian said they had constructed the stairway prior to HDC support for safety reasons.

No public comments or letters.

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

j) [HDC 19-255](#)

Application by the **Town of Provincetown** to replace 2 booths at the MacMillan Pier Parking Lot at the property located at **19 Ryder Street Extension**.

Eric Sussman, Emergency Manager/Transportation Coordinator and **Jeffrey Robiero**, Town Planner, presented. Mr. Sussman explained the application as a project that had been delayed for a year and that the software used by the booths is no longer serviced and that this company is thought to no longer exist; said they had to cut back the project and now only request replacement of the exit booth, that the other booth would be re-applied.

Mr. Sussman said the costs of the initial design aspect proposal proved untenable and as such he has provided new designs for consideration but that UPS had lost the sample box intended for today's meeting; said the color matches the pavilion at the Pier with windows all the way around, that the size is 5' by 7 ½'.

Mr. Robiero said the metal is necessitated by the materials being contained within the booth, which LD questioned, but that Mr. Robiero assured was constructed for that purpose; said that any historic preference for the structure is in some regard non-applicable.

TB said he felt the new design appropriate. Mr. Robiero said the window is single-paned and not tru-divided lite. CM asked if there was a plan to make both booths visually compatible. Mr. Sussman said the time-line for that would necessitate going before the Town for more funds. MCM said she's fine with it, preferred a clapboard cabin look, but that at the end of the day we need the parking and to consider the taxpayer. CM asked if putting out to local artists was a way to go for the exterior, to which JD strongly objected and MCM said color is not in the HDC's purview.

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

TB promoted a workshop to follow the HDC meeting of June 19th to discuss the VFW site.

435 Commercial Street

Tom Thompson presented on half of 435 Commercial St, asking for the HDC's consideration of new design options based on the HDC's conditioning; deck removed and two sets of casement windows added; dormer change on west elevation and spiral staircase on the rear is presented; top gliding window on front is hoped to be replaced by a double-hung 6-over-6 egress-compliant unit.

TB asked about the walk-out between the two dormers and if single windows were proposed, suggested single-casements would be more appropriate than a 6-lite casement, which he said, could be single not double.

Mr. Thompson presented drawings of the existing configuration. JD asked if three windows might be optioned on a smaller scale. Mr. Thompson said that would require moving out the two closets. AH gave dimensions to save the closets and employ the proposed casements, questioned if the egress components would be compromised.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition the casement windows in the center section of the third floor on the west elevation be reduced from four to two. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, CM, JD. Note: LD and HS not sitting on decision. HS directed JD to write the decision.

Mr. Thompson asked if he could have the submitted drawing signed and stamped and that he will bring in the west elevation change tomorrow, to which the HDC agreed.

Review and approval of Minutes: June 1, July 20, August 3, September 21, October 5, 2016, February 1, February 15 and April 19, April 26, May 3, May 17, June 7, June 21, 2017, May 1 and May 15, 2019.

TB made a motion to approve the minutes of May 1, 2019; MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, HS, CM.

TB made a motion to approve the minutes of May 15, 2019. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, HS, CM.

Update on potential violations reported to the Building Commissioner.

TB questioned the emollients of the windows at 195 Bradford St. AH said the siding and deck and roofing had been approved, but the windows had not been changed out. TB asked about a 6' tall plastic fence at 31 Bangs St. which AH said may not be in the Historic District, but that she would confirm. TB asked about what he said was an awful railing system at 244 Commercial St., and said that it was the fault of the HDC. AH said there were captured balusters to which the HDC all decided were, nonetheless, of an entirely inappropriate design.

7. Deliberations on Pending Decision: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

HS noted which Board member elected to write which decision from today's hearing as follows and to be completed and read at next meeting:

CM: 19-237; TB: 19-228, 19-255; JD: 19-239. LD: 19-241; MCM: 19- 244, 25; MCM;
HS: 19-250; 19-253; 19-230.

HDC 19-230: 435 Commercial St.

HS said she had a note that this decision had been read on May 1, 2019 but that the paperwork was not filled in and so she would take care of it.

Per HS, the following decisions were filed:

HDC 19-200, 425 Commercial St., written by HS and read into the record by MCM, was filed on May 16, 2019.

HDC19-208, 114 Commercial St., written by TB and read into the record by TB, was filed on May 10, 2019.

HDC 19-212, 11 Tremont St., written by TB and read into the record by TB, was filed on May 10, 2019.

HDC 19-215, 1 Atlantic Ave., written by TB and read into the record by TB, was filed on May 10, 2019.

HDC 19-229, 170 Commercial St., written by TB and read into the record by TB, was filed on May 10, 2019.

HDC 19-160, 6 Pleasant St., written by Martin Risteen and read into the record by TB was possibly not filed on April 17, 2019.

8. Other Business

6 Commercial St.

AH noted an incongruity on the decision wherein a roof deck was not approved. JD said it was to be a recessed deck. AH said the written decision needed to be corrected.

HDC signed drawings and decisions for filing.

MCM left the meeting at 7:43pm.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:46pm. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, LD, JD, CM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil