

TOWN OF PROVINCETOWN

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF
October 1, 2014 3:30pm

MEETING HELD IN THE JUDGE WELSH HEARING ROOM

Members Present: Lance Hatch, Polly Burnell, David McGlothlin, and Thomas Biggert

Members Absent: John Dowd, and Marcene Marcoux

Staff Present: Mr. Leif D. Hamnquist, Permit Coordinator

Meeting called to order by Mr. David McGlothlin at 3:30pm

1. Public Statements

2. Administrative Reviews

- a) 5 School Street – garage door replacement and fence replacement- **Approved**
- b) 571 Commercial Street – fence replacement- **Approved**
- c) 13 Wareham Street – replace window damaged in fire - **Approved**
- d) 36 Commercial Street – replace round window with square window - **Approved**
- e) 135 Bradford Street – replace patio door in kind - **Approved**
- f) 9 Pearl Street – replace 14 windows - **Approved**
- g) 11 Johnson Street – replace 2 windows in kind - **Approved**
- h) 350A Commercial Street – replace rotted fascia, soffit and replace clapboards on front - **Approved**
- i) 283 Bradford Street – replacement of windows in kind - **Approved**
- j) Any administrative reviews received that could not be reasonably anticipated.

The public hearing portion of the meeting was opened by David McGlothlin at 4:00 pm

3. Review and approve Minutes of the August 20, 2014, September 3, 2014 and September 17, 2014 meetings

Motion made by Polly Burnell to approve the minutes from the August 20, 2014 meeting as amended and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Polly Burnell to approve the minutes from the September 3, 2014 meeting as presented and was seconded by David McGlothlin. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Polly Burnell to approve the minutes from the September 17, 2014 meeting as presented and was seconded by David McGlothlin. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Hearings

a) **Case #FY15-15**

Application by Ted Smith Architect, LLC on behalf of Jim McGuire to redesign the roof, remove the exterior stair, relocate and add various doors and windows on the existing house and to construct an 8'x12' shed at the property located at **4 West Vine Street**.

-Ted Smith, architect, and Jim McGuire, property owner, appeared before the board to present the proposal.

Jim began by explaining background of the project and of his time living in Provincetown and that the plan was to return the structure to a single family home and restore the form of the structure to a more traditional Cape.

Mr. Smith expanded on Mr. McGuire's introduction by explaining the design and reasoning for the new shed and detailed the history of the structure and then went through the design elevation by elevation.

7 letters in favor were read into the record, no letters of opposition were presented and there were no speakers from the public.

Mr. Biggert expressed the fact that he doesn't want the change in roof orientation and design and had reservations about the second floor addition.

Mr. Hatch cannot approve the new design.

Mr. McGlothlin stated the mission of the commission, and wanted to see a design option 'B'.

Ms. Burnell saw the current form of the structure as 'perfect' and would not approve a design that deviated from the intent of the original design.

The commission deliberated about how to proceed and it was concluded to have the case continued to the October 15th hearing so Mr. Smith could present a new iteration.

Motion made by Polly Burnell to continue the case to the October 15th hearing and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously 4-0-0.

b) Case #FY15-18

Application by Winard Construction on behalf of Mark Birnbaum and Paul Endich to install four new windows and replace one window in kind at the property located at **281 Commercial Street**.

-Hal Winard of Winard Construction appeared before the commission to present the proposal.

Mr. Winard explained the history of the building and the scope of work that was being performed.

No letters were in the file and no one from the public was present to speak.

Mr. Hatch asked about a window in the drawing that wasn't within the scope of work that Mr. Winard had explained, and Mr. Winard answered that the drawings were of a speculative project that was designed years ago but the only windows that were being touched were highlighted on the drawings.

Motion made by Polly Burnell to approve the proposal as presented and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously 4-0-0.

c) Case #FY15-19

Application by George Tagaris to construct two dormers on the west side on the structure at the south end of property and install a new fence and gate at the property located at **143 Commercial Street**.

-George Tagaris appeared before the commission to present the proposal and explained the intent of the design was to preserve character and maintain the building separation and explained that the amendment being proposed was only for the dormers on the beach side cottages.

3 Letters of support were read into the record, no letters of opposition and there were no speakers present.

Ms. Burnell felt that the west end of Provincetown was filled with working/industrial type buildings that were turned into summer homes and she would like to preserve the small plain buildings.

Mr. Biggert stated that dormers suggest residential and doesn't keep with the idea of working buildings.

Mr. McGlothlin was on the fence about the project and hadn't heard any compelling reason to approve the dormers.

Mr. Hatch was in favor of the proposal and understood the intent of the design.

Ms. Burnell explained that between the Boat Slip and Flyers, all the buildings were simple working buildings and the proposed design was not keeping with that vernacular.

The applicant argued that since they were restoring the structure on the Commercial Street side to its original design that they hoped to compromise with the commission with new dormers on the cottages.

Mr. McGlothlin stated he was leaning toward agreeing with Ms. Burnell that the cottages should be simple in design and that the two cottages both having dormers seemed to diminish the individual qualities of the structures and that by removing one dormer would add interest to the design all together.

Mr. Biggert agreed with Mr. McGlothlin that there should only be one dormer.

Motion 1 was made by Polly Burnell to approve the proposal with the condition that the dormer on the southern beach side cottage should be removed and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously.

The applicant chimed in and mentioned that the original certificate issued by the commission had expired and requested that the commission extend his original certificates (FY14-17 & FY14-51) for another year and the commission agreed.

Motion 2 was made by Polly Burnell to withdraw motion 1 and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion 3 was made by Polly Burnell to approve the proposal with the condition that the dormer on the southern beach side cottage should be removed, extend the certificates for case# FY14-17 and FY14-51 for another year, and the applicant must submit new drawings showing the removal of the dormer and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously 4-0-0.

d) Case #FY15-20

Application by Scott Czyoski to remove a window on the west side of the structure and replace various windows, doors and a slider at the property located at **65A Commercial Street**.

-Scott Czyoski appeared before the commission to present the proposal and explained the scope of work, elevation by elevation.

There were no letters in the file and no speakers from the public presented themselves.

Mr. Biggert asked if the proposed French doors on the south elevation could be 12 light doors but Ms. Burnell disagreed and said a single light door was better looking.

Ms. Burnell made a public announcement stating that the commission gives more liberty to applicants with design in regard to water front elevations.

There was a general discussion amongst the board about various proposed windows and the conclusion was that the presented design was suitable.

Motion made by Polly Burnell to approve the proposal as presented and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously 4-0-0.

e) Case #FY15-21

Application by William N. Rogers on behalf of John J. Crickett to construct a roof deck and spiral stair and remove a window at the property located at **8 Cook Street**.

Gary Locke, John Crickett and Geno appeared before the commission to present the proposal.

Mr. Locke explained the design for the new roof deck, the new railing and the spiral stair and explained the desire for a better view of the harbor.

Mr. Crickett described the history of the property, that it was once a garage and had become an artist loft and that the structure had never been designed to fit within the historic vernacular of Provincetown.

Two letters of opposition were read into the record, there were no letters of support and there were no speakers from the public present to speak.

Mr. Biggert understands that the roof screams for a roof deck with its shallow slope but believes the proposal cannot be approved.

Ms. Burnell said that the structure couldn't be restored at this point but that the proposal is a hard sell.

Mr. Hatch referenced guideline #9a of the Historic District By-law that states that roof decks are not allowed in the district.

The commission agreed that roof deck and the spiral stair be denied, but that the removal of the window and the re-siding is acceptable.

Motion made by Polly Burnell to approve the proposal as with the conditions that no roof deck or spiral stair be constructed and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously 3-0-1, with David McGlothlin abstaining.

f) Case #FY15-22

Application by Ed Dusek on behalf of Church of St. Mary of the Harbor to reconstruct the exposed foundation wall at the property located at **519 Commercial Street**.

Ed Dusek of Manitoba Architects appeared before the commission to present the proposal and explained the current situation at St. Mary's Church. He detailed the numerous repairs needed and the history of the bad construction that led to the state of disrepair the structures foundation currently is in.

No letters in the file and no speakers from the public presented themselves.

Ms. Burnell proclaimed 'it must be done'.

Mr. Biggert asked if the copper detailing was to remain and Mr. Dusek described that certain aspects will remain but will be of better construction.

The commission wondered if the project was actually within their purview or not.

Motion made by Polly Burnell to approve the proposal as presented and was seconded by Lance Hatch. The motion passed unanimously 4-0-0.

g) Case #FY15-23

Application by George Libone and William Meves to install a skylight at the property located at **5 Young's Court**.

William Meves appeared before the commission to present the proposal and made clear that the skylight currently exists and gave his history with the town and his property.

No letters in the file and no speakers presented themselves.

The commission felt that the approval was a 'no brainer' and wondered if the skylight could even be seen from a public right of way.

Motion made by Polly Burnell to approve the proposal as presented and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously 4-0-0.

h) Case #FY15-24

Application by Ted Smith Architect, LLC on behalf of Nat Jellinek & Molly Heller to raise the roof and increase the roof's pitch to create an interior loft in the rear structure at the property located at **76 Commercial Street**.

-Ted Smith appeared before the board to present the proposal. He made the board aware that the owners of the structure were aware of the history of the property and that the owners wanted to respect the history with the new design but did not want the new design to contend with the existing building. Mr. Smith argued that the many different styles exist within the existing design of the structure and as such it was difficult to decide on a certain style to drive the design process. Mr. Smith also explained the owner's backgrounds and the need for more space as their children get older.

Two letters in favor were read into the record and two letters opposed were read into the record and 1 speaker, Todd Westrick of 76 Commercial Street, spoke in opposition to the project.

Mr. Westrick contented that there were inconsistencies with the drawings that were presented, such as certain heights not being drawn accurately and other details with the structure not being drawn accurately. Also Mr. Westrick felt that the proposed design was out of scale for the neighborhood and that the design for the large windows would contend with the window design at the Hoffman Studio that is located within the property at 76 Commercial Street.

Mr. Smith explained that the heights of buildings are hard to verify on existing structures and that may explain why the drawings looked inaccurate.

Ms. Burnell agreed that the design for the large window contends with the Hoffman Studio and that the second floor addition was too tall and she stated she could not approve the design as is and felt the design was to 'stand offish' with the other structure.

Mr. Biggert wouldn't mind the design if it was reduced in size and stated he did not think the horizontal awning window configuration was appropriate.

Mr. Burnell added that it is hard for her to look at the structure as a regular building because of the artists that occupied the main structure and history associated with those artists and also didn't find the design attractive and it was too big.

Mr. Hatch agreed with Ms. Burnell and stated that he understood the intent of the design but felt the design didn't deliver on the intent.

Mr. McGlothlin somewhat liked the design but after hearing about the history of the property found that he could not approve the design as presented.

Mr. Smith handed out sketches of alternate designs for the window and roof configuration to the commission, but those designs didn't address the height issue that concerned the commissioners.

Motion made by Polly Burnell to continue case FY15-24 to the October 15th hearing and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed unanimously.

At 6:45, a motion to adjourn was made by Lance Hatch and seconded by Thomas Biggert. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

John Dowd
Chair