

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

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF**  
**January 20, 2016 3:30pm**

**MEETING HELD IN THE CAUCUS HALL ROOM**

**Members Present:** Thom Biggert, Marcene Marcoux, Martin Risteen, Laurie Delmalino, David McGlothlin, Lisa Pacheco Robb

**Members Absent:** Mark Westman

**Staff Present:** Leif Hamnquist, Permit Coordinator

**Meeting called to order by Mr. Thomas Biggert at 3:30pm**

**1. Administrative Reviews**

- a) 284 Commercial Street – replace 14 windows – **Approved**
- b) 167 Commercial Street – replace full lite door in kind - **Approved**
- c) 493 Commercial Street – replace double casement window in kind - **Approved**
- d) 481 Commercial Street – replace door and window in kind – **Approved with condition that door be wood – Vote is 4-1-0 with Mr. McGlothlin voting against**
- e) 606 Commercial Street – amend existing approval to use a new door design - **Approved**
- f) 543 Commercial Street – install new fence on bay side – **Approved with the condition the fence matches existing vinyl fencing**

**2. Review and approve minutes of the December 2, and December 16, 2015 and January 6, 2016 hearings**

*Motion made by Thomas Biggert to approve the minutes of December 16<sup>th</sup> 2015 as amended and was seconded by Laurie Delmolino. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.*

*Motion made by Thomas Biggert to approve the minutes of January 6<sup>th</sup> 2016 as amended and was seconded by Mark Westman. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.*

**Public hearing opened by Thomas Biggert at 4:04**

**3. Public Hearings**

**a. Case #FY16-44 (Continued from January 6)**

**Application by Tom Thomson and John DeSouza on behalf of Beverly Serabian** requesting to construct a ½ story addition on the rear of the building with shed dormers, construct a breezeway between main house and garage, construct a dormer on the existing garage structure and install additional fenestration at the property located at **18 West Vine Street**.

John DeSouza and Tom Thomson appeared before the commission to present the next iteration of the design for 18 West Vine Street to gain some feedback from the commission to see if they are heading in the right direction. Mr. DeSouza read a letter from Beverly Serabian, who could not be in attendance.

Tom Thomson presented some sketches for the boards review and the commission reviewed the redesigned drawings.

The commission found the new design to more appropriate.

Ms. Marcoux felt the new design integrated beautifully into the neighborhood and took the concerns of the board and abutters into account.

*Motion made by Thomas Biggert to continue case FY16-44 to the February 3<sup>rd</sup> hearing and was seconded by Marcene Marcoux. The motion passed unanimously 3-0-0.*

**b. Case #FY16-47**

**Application by Capizzi Home Improvement on behalf of Irv Morgan and Donald Vifadej** requesting to reconfigure fenestration with the installation of 3 double hung windows, 3 gliding windows and 1 picture window upon the north and west facades at the property located at **177 Commercial Street.**

Jean Bowden, project manager, and Irv Morgan, property owner, appeared before the commission to present the proposal and Ms. Bowden brought the commission through the changes.

No members of the public were present to speak and no letters were in the file.

Mr. Biggert wanted to note that many changes have happened to the structure but believed that double hungs would be more appropriate but since it is a commercial building he could understand the need for a large picture window, but would like to see a window that more reflects the type of window that is on the Perry Liquor building.

Ms. Pacheco Robb agreed with Mr. Biggert.

A general discussion about the front picture windows ensued and Mr. Morgan showed an option for the front windows that had been devised.

Ms. Marcoux stated she was ok with the proposal as presented.

Ms. Pacheco Robb would like to see the large picture window broken with a mutin pattern but would not vote against the proposal as presented.

Mr. McGlothlin felt the picture window was always odd but would like to see a divided lite type window.

Mr. Risteen would like to see the proposal passed as presented and felt the large picture window is consistent with other commercial properties

The discussion then went to the

Ms. Delmolino felt the new window on the west elevation detracted from what little was left of the historic nature of building. Mr. Morgan addressed Ms. Delmolino concerns and explained that they would like to add some more natural light into the space, and Ms. Delmolino restated her initial concern. Ms. Pacheco Robb agreed with Ms. Delmolino and felt it wouldn't be a window one would see on store front or even a historic home.

The commission discussed the new windows on the west elevation.

Mr. Biggert would like to see all the new window on the west elevation to match and then wondered about the size of the new double hung on the front elevation and discussed options.

The commission discussed what sized windows would be more appropriate for this structure and several options were given.

Mr. McGlothlin wondered why the new sliding window couldn't match the window on the front gable and a discussion about the interior function of the room led to the commission to get a better understanding of the reasons to use a more square double hung.

The commission agreed the front picture window was fine.

Ms. Pacheco Robb would just like to see more consistency in window size on the west elevation.

Ms. Marcoux stated that the structure is a commercial space so the functionality is a concern but would like to rein back the conversation and remind the board they need to suggest options and try not to design the fenestration.

Mr. McGlothlin would like to see some consistency across the west façade because currently there are 6 different types of windows now and the new windows should match what exists.

Mr. Biggert summarized the boards concerns that the proposal should be more consistent.

*Motion made by Thomas Biggert to approve case FY16-47 with the condition that the picture window be a four square window, new double hung window on the front be eliminated, the mulled sliding window towards the rear be the same size as the windows closer to Commercial St and was seconded by Lisa Pacheco Robb. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.*

**c. Case #FY16-48**

**Application by Pacheco Robb Architects LLC on behalf of Mitchell Baker and Thom Egan** requesting to install two skylights upon the east and west roof plane (4 skylights in total); install a window and alter the size and location of other windows on the west elevation and alter existing shed and stair on west elevation at the property located at **174 Bradford Street**.

**Lisa Pacheco Robb recused herself from the proceedings and left the room.**

Mitchell Baker and Thom Egan appeared before the commission to present the proposal and brought the commission through the changes elevation by elevation.

No members of the public were present to speak and no letters were in the file.

Mr. Biggert thought it was a good thing that they were placing more historic windows but felt the new smaller window was a little odd, and the applicants explained that the small window was at a stair landing.

The applicants presented an option to the small window where the size matches the rest of the window but the top two lites would be blacked out.

The commission agreed upon the windows but then turned their attention to the skylights.

Ms. Marcoux felt there were too many skylights and asked the applicants which skylight they would eliminate and they would like to eliminate the one on the west elevation toward the rear of the building.

*Motion made by Thomas Biggert to approve case FY16-48 with the larger window and the condition that the skylight farthest to the rear on the west elevation be eliminated and was seconded by Marcene Marcoux. The motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.*

**d. Case #FY16-49**

**Application by Jonah Swain on behalf of Clipper Ventures Realty Trust** requesting to recertify a certificate of appropriateness for case #FY10-39 with the scope of work to include construction of two dormers with 2/2 windows on both the east and west elevations; raise the roof ridge by four feet; construct a second floor open porch on the south side deck; demolish and expand the first floor kitchen under the existing south side deck; demolish and rebuild all existing decks; construct gable end overhang with trim and shingles on south elevation to match that on existing north side; add a six foot French door on the south side deck and add new 2/2 windows on the gable ends at the property located at **335 Commercial Street**.

Jonah Swain, general contractor, Dermot O'Neil, property owner and Robert Valouis, project designer appeared before the commission to present the proposal.

The commission needed clarification about how this proposal had lapsed so long and Mr. Hamnquist explained that this certificate had lapsed even with the Permit Extension Act and that is why the application is back in front of the commission.

Mary Jo Avelar spoke with concerns about the need to make sure that the construction doesn't impact the adjacent property in a negative way.

No letters were in the file.

Ms. Pacheco Robb stated that she was ok with the design as presented.

Ms. Marcoux would like to hear the case as a full review.

Mr. McGlothlin thought it was ridiculous that the commission would go over the proposal elevation by elevation, and make the applicants be brought through the ringer again once they had a previously approved full review.

Mr. Biggert stated his concerns about the design and did not like to see the amount of historic material being removed.

Mr. Valois addressed Mr. Biggerts concerns.

Ms. Delmolino would like to see the historic roof pitch to remain.

Ms. Marcoux felt the design was a radical change and out of context to the adjacent structure and finds the new dormers problematic.

Mr. Valois explained that at time of the first hearing they worked with the commission to get a more appropriate design.

Mr. McGlothlin would approve the application as presented, based on the fact that the applicants has already worked with the board and the past decision reflects that work and that other projects in town get less scrutiny and that had more impact on the district.

Ms. Delmolino felt that if this was a brand new application, the commission would not approve but since it has already been approved by a previous board she would be ok with approving as presented.

Ms. Marcoux readdressed her concerns and related those concerns to the HDC guidelines. She stated she was not completely against the changes being proposed but would like to see the main mass along Commercial Street being altered.

Mr. Biggert agrees with Ms. Marcoux and would like to see the roof pitch to remain and the height was problematic.

The commission discussed the character defining characteristics of the building.

Ms. Pacheco Robb expressed the fact that not approving the project would be a shame because of the extra housing that will be made with the proposal.

Ms. Marcoux still felt the front elevation and the increase in height was bothersome.

The commission was polled to see who would approve and three of the 5 would be in the affirmative.

Ms. Marcoux raised concerns about the location of kitchen vents and AC units.

Mr. McGlothlin addressed Ms. Marcoux's concerns that the board had been told certain AC units were difficult to regulate and felt the commission should not pick and choose which architectural elements to regulate and where.

***Motion made by David McGlothlin to approve case FY16-49 as presented and was seconded by Lisa Pacheco Robb. The motion passed 3-2-0.***

The work session was brought back to deal with the January 6<sup>th</sup> minutes and take votes for the request for demolition delay for 52 Franklin Street.

***Motion made by Thomas Biggert to find that the structure at 52 Franklin Street to require a full review to determine the structures cultural, architectural or historic value and was seconded by Lisa Pacheco Robb. The motion passed 5-0-0.***

The commission discussed the demolition of the garage at 832 Commercial; a structure that was granted demolition. Ms. Howard, building commissioner, appeared before the commission to explain the reasoning for her email to the chair of the commission and she discussed the procedures behind these projects that get drawn out due to time and financial constraints.

Ms. Howard just wanted to gauge the how the board would like to deal with demolition delay certificates that have expired.

***Motion made by Marcene Marcoux to recertify the demolition delay request to raze the garage structure at 838 Commercial Street and was seconded by Thomas Biggert. The motion passed 5-0-0.***

Election of officers postponed to the February 3<sup>rd</sup> hearing.

***At 5:30, a motion to adjourn was made by Thomas Biggert and seconded by Laurie Delmolino. Motion passed unanimously 5-0-0.***

Respectfully submitted,  
Thomas Biggert  
Chair