

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
Town Hall
Provincetown MA

WEDNESDAY, February 7, 2018

Members Present: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep.; Laurie Delmolino (LD), Historical Commission Rep; Martin Risteen (MR), PBG Rep; Hersh Schwartz, (HS), Alternate.

Others Present: Annie Howard (AH), Building Commissioner; Jody O'Neil, JON, Recording Secretary.

Absent: Marcene Marcoux, Vice Chair, Chamber of Commerce Rep.

1. Work Session: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

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

At AH's request, TB made a motion to postpone Update on potential violations until the end of the meeting. HS seconded, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, HS, LD, MR.

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 February 21, 2018 Public agenda and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

TB made a motion that items i.) through xii.) be treated as Administrative Review. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, HS, LD, MR.

TB made a motion to consider the following for Full Review: xiii) 9 Arch St.; xiv) 5 Brewster St.; xv) 26 Bradford St.; xvi) 466 Commercial St.; xvii) 535 Commercial St. #7 U9; xviii) 348 Commercial St.; xix) 3 Atkins Lane; xx) 225 Commercial St.

HS seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, HS, LD, MR.

Administrative Review:

- i. 472 Commercial St. – To re-roof.
TB read from the plan to install new asphalt roof in pewter grey, made a motion to accept as presented. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
- ii. 18 Pearl St. – To re-roof.
TB read from the plan to replace with architectural cobble-stone grey colors and made a motion to accept as presented. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0.

- iii. 495 Commercial St. – To replace a door and window in kind.
TB read from the plan regarding a slider and fixed window and made motion to approve as presented. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
- iv. 491 Commercial St. – To replace a door in kind.
Mark Kinnane (MK) from Cape Associates presented on behalf of Carol Adelman; confirmed for TB the evidence of rust in the photograph; said he wanted to do fiberglass because it would not rust and that the door was to a shed that faced the water.
LD asked for confirmation that it was not visible; MK concurred.
TB noted that it was not wood, but commented that HDC has approved fiberglass before and made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
- v. 277 Commercial St. – To re-side.
TB read from the plan utilizing red cedar shingles on the kite shop, and made a motion to approve as presented. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
- vi. 7 Cook St. – To replace a slider in kind.
TB asked if anyone was present to represent the application and when no one took the mic, he said he wanted to take the opportunity to encourage homeowners to do a non-contemporary door system; that a sliding glass door is not necessarily historic, but as it was in-kind, he was fine with it.
TB made a motion to approve as presented; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
- vii. 3 Standish St. – To re-roof.
TB noted all new shingles for a mansard roof and made a motion to approve as presented. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
- viii. 49 Bradford St., #5 & #6 – To re-roof.
TB noted Landmark architectural shingles in the plan and made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
- ix. 192 Bradford St. – To replace windows in kind.
AH confirmed for LD that the wood trim was treated wood. HS noted that the Anderson series wasn't wood; AH said the sashes are, but it's Fibrex, vinyl trim per the model that Mark Kinnane had brought in at last meeting.
TB remarked it was a very historic house in pristine condition.
LD noted HDC's approval of only wood for wood in recent cases and asked of the degree of visibility involved.
TB made a motion to table the application for further review at the Feb 21st meeting; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
- x. 381-383 Commercial St. – To re-roof.
TB noted asphalt roof replacement, made a motion to approve as presented. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

- xi. 47 Commercial St., UC – To replace windows in kind and re-roof. Kevin Bazarian (KB) presented. LD noted the replacements were at the rear of the building and property and materials were all-clad. KB said the replacements were simulated, true divided light 2-over-2 grids; wood inside and clad on the outside; same power windows that he's been using. LD said she thought the ones she was looking at in the submitted plans were 6-over-6's; KB clarified the replacements in the plan are 2-over-2's. TB made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion, and it passed 4-0-0. TB, LD, R, HS.
- xii. 331 Commercial St. – To replace siding, windows and roof in kind. KB presented. TB noted the large size of the project and asked it would all be submitted as Administrative Review. KB replied that he hoped it could be; that the re-build would be primarily in-kind with white cedar on the four beach buildings that are free-standing cottages, thought there was clapboard behind the aluminum siding on the front; added that he wanted shingles on one of the beach buildings, which was a block building, and thought that might make the project a Full Review. HS confirmed the shingle building in question is building #2, per diagrams. TB remarked that the design was an improvement and minimally visible, but that technically it would qualify as a Full Review; however, for the sake of moving things along he could go with it. LD sought confirmation on the visibility of building #2. TB made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the trim be wood, with shingling accepted for block building. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, HS, LD, MR.

c) Review and approval of Minutes:

TB made a motion to postpone the approval of minutes until the end of the meeting. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

a) Update on potential violations.

- i. 452 Commercial St.
TB said that although he had seen the property yesterday, he didn't feel HDC had had enough time to review this item, and suggested it be postponed for two weeks; remarked that the issue is the approved drawings showed 4" columns only it's now known that 6" columns are needed for support and the applicant is suggesting square columns with some trim attached to give a panel-look consistent with the corner boards. Ted Jones, speaking from the public forum, asked if this determination meant the work could not continue. TB responded that if the applicant did proceed with work on the project it could come before HDC with new requirements and find itself in violation. TB made a motion to postpone review on the case until the meeting of February 21, 2018. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

- ii. 479 Commercial St. - fence
No discussion.
- iii. 6 Cottage St., Unit #2
TB said he had been by this site, that it was a big project with inconsistencies concerning the shed.
AH corrected; said the property was a single family-residence and the rear building was what was in question; it was not a shed. AH said there has only been a permit for the foundation, that she just got the revised plans and that a full permit had not been issued.
TB said he thought they might be using Azek trim on the big building, Unit #1. AH said she would look into it; that a final site review was yet to be done.
- iv. 532 Commercial St. - corner of Kendall; steel gates.
TB mentioned gates had caught his attention; AH said she would look into it.
- v. 509 Commercial St.
TB asked of any news on #509 Commercial St. AH said she believed it was on request to be addressed at the meeting of February 21st. TB said it could be discussed then, but felt the site was an eye-sore, acknowledged that HDC had no jurisdiction over construction but asked if something could be done to make the site more attractive and possibly safer, that plywood was being used as fencing. AH remarked that the site was safer than 199 Bradford St.

3. Public Hearings: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

- a) HDC 17-130 (continued from the meeting of January 24th)
To extend a previously issued Certificate of Appropriateness for TMC New England, LLC's project at the property located at **132 Bradford St.**
James Veara (JV) presented on behalf of the applicant; referenced previous certificate of appropriateness and had had what he said was a hic-cup with Zoning Board since resolved; asked for a one-year extension on the project.
No public comments or letters.
TB made a motion to extend a previously issued certificate of appropriateness; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.
JV asked if there was a form to sign. AH responded that that was a very good question and TB said he would consult with Town Clerk on the matter.

HDC 18-056, 53 Commercial St., Rear; **HDC 18-107**, 509 Commercial St.; and **HDC-199, 349 Commercial St.**, UA: all noted as to be continued at the Feb. 21st meeting.

TB made a motion to accept the time waivers for 53 Commercial St. and 509 Commercial St. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

- b) HDC 18-141 (continued from the meeting of January 24th)
Application by **Peter Grosso**, on behalf of **Joseph Haley**, requesting to

install a second egress door and replace a window on the structure located at **214A Commercial St.**
Peter Grosso (PG) presented.

TB said he wasn't sure it could be seen from a public way, to which PG responded that the only way the property could be seen was by helicopter.

TB made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

c) **HDC 18-153**

Application by Peters Property Management, on behalf of **The Willows Condominium**, requesting to replace a window on the structure located at **214A Commercial St.**

Laurie Ferreri (LF) of Peters Property Management presented; stated Azek trim on the D-1 building had been accidentally left off the application.

TB said he thought that all the buildings in question could be seen from a public way with one exception. LF remarked that possibly there were two windows on the D-1 building that could be seen from a public way.

TB stated that a window and door could be seen from Tremont & West Vine.

LF said A-building has a wood window, but all others were in fiberglass; side-door was to be similar in-kind, fiber-glass; sliding door behind A-building is an Anderson 400 series, to be replaced in kind; windows in D-building to be replaced in kind.

HS asked for clarity on the difference between similar in style and in-kind on application. LF replied that similar in style and in-kind were the same; that A2 window on front of building was wood, to be replaced with Anderson 400 series; A2 rear building with French doors to be replaced with gliding, similar in kind; A2 fiber-glass door to be replaced with therma-true door; D-1, all windows are Anderson composite, wanted to trim out in Azek; rear of D-1, on side, awning window to be the same; rear window on D-1, double-hung, to be replaced with casement; octagon to be replaced in kind; F-1, currently wood door that cannot be seen from the street, to be replaced with therma-true, 9-light doors.

No public comments or letters.

TB said he was okay with the windows; it was the trim that was his concern. that D-building can be seen from Tremont and West Vine Sts; as with Building A.

LF said Building E was approved a couple of years ago to be replaced with composite and is visible from a public way. TB suggested that D & E buildings be accepted as presented for the sake of consistency, and as composite was previously allowed on the property.

TB made a motion to accept as presented on the condition that A-building trim be wood. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

d) **HDC 18-154**

Application by **Andrew Lindera**, on behalf of **Ed & Dottie Freitas**, to remove an octagonal window on the front gable and replace it with a fixed rectangular window similar to other windows on the structure located at **8A Commercial St., U4.**

Andrew Lindera (AL) presented; said the surrounding windows were casement. No public comments or letters.

HS said this case was presented previously before HDC and a spec sheet was wanting; presently had no problem with it.

MR said he had no problem with it.

LD asked if both octagonal windows were to be replaced. AL said one neighbor was waiting to see what would happen with the one window first before acting. LD said it would be good if both were replaced, for the sake of consistency.

TB said his problem was in not having a properly drawn elevation; figured the dimensions as 1'7 ¾" wide x 3' 2 ½" high. AL said the top of the window would start at the top of the octagon which is about 22" x 22".

TB said it was bit awkward as the forces seem to be fighting with each other, but he didn't have a problem with the design.

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

e) **HDC 18-155**

Application by **KA Bezarian Construction**, on behalf of **Joanne Cancro & Charlene Allen**, requesting to expand a deck on the south elevation, replace a door and window with a 6' slider, remove a half-round window and replace it with a transom above, and add a transom to a window on the right side of a slider and add two skylights to the west side roof on the structure located at **8D Commercial St., UA**.

Kevin Bazarian (KB) and Steven Cook (SC) of Cotuit Bay Design, presented.

No public comments or letters.

MR said he didn't have a problem expanding the deck, or with the skylights; asked for fixed panels and if, for consistency, all three doors could be the same.

LD agreed with MR; asked age on house. KB said he thought maybe 30 years old but it could be a lot older and had been redone prior.

LD said symmetry is one of HDC's big things; remarked that if this was ocean-side HDC would be more lenient, but the issue here is the front façade so the symmetry is important; recommended flanking windows.

HS said she liked the idea of three panels the same size,

TB agreed with commissioners, said he preferred windows and a door to a 6' slider which, as a 20th century feature, is less historic; asked if each panel of glass and each transom could be the same size; spoke of high visibility, asked if the units could go on the east-side for less visibility.

SC said they were trying to get some southern western light into the room; that the reason for the gap was due to the stair railing with an aspect of about 9".

KB said for the sake of symmetry that space was needed between the unit and the window on the left side; offered to put in wide trim so it looked like one unit.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the window panel match the door panel, and all transoms be the same size. HS seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, HS, LD, MR.

f) **HDC 18-156**

Application by **Tom Thompson**, on behalf of Premier Inns, LLC, requesting to remove and reconstruct existing roof decks and egress stairs, construct a small side stoop and replace existing side stoop railings on the structure located at **166 Commercial St.**

Tom Thompson (TT) presented; read outline of proposed changes; 2.5-story Italianate-style building operates as Queen Vic Guest house, built in 1882; owners asked to make replacements on rear west elevation with minor alterations for safety and to reduce mass; to replace with a more traditional-style railing; extend stoop on east side of building, materials to be in keeping; slightly larger and safer egress landing to connect with 2nd level decks with a set of spirals to eliminate a protrusion; second level deck to be made safer by eliminating a floor-height difference.

TT remarked that buildings in the immediately abutting area feature various alterations, roof lines, decks and spiral staircases; referenced bylaw Section 15-1, purpose of compatibility; 15-8-1, criteria for determination, relation to land area, degree of visibility to public way; Section 15-11, appendix 1, guideline 2: all architectural changes appropriate to original building or altered style; 15-11, appendix 1-9: roof decks and railing design; #13: outside stairs; Local Comprehensive Plan 4.2; Policy A, harmonious and compatible designs; Policy B, consistent with traditional Cape Cod styles.

TT said a good deal of the re-design had to do with public safety; noted a change in levels from floor to floor; presented a photo, probably from the 70's based on footwear, which proved that the building had not changed much.

TB read a letter in support from Robert Guttah, owner of Units 2 & 3 at 168 Commercial St., next door neighbors.

TB read a letter in support from the owners of the Inn at 7 Central St., Cory Conley & Curtis Helmus who felt the redesign improved safety and aesthetics.

TB read a letter in support from direct abutter Bob Sanborn at 164 Commercial St., who wrote that he had seen the designs by Josh Scaturro and Stan Cottner and believed modifications were essential for safety of guests and occupants.

MR asked if safety was the motivating factor for the re-vamp; AH responded that the condition of the deck and stairs spoke in support of a re-build

MR said it looked a lot cleaner and he had no problem with it; HS concurred.

LD said the plans fall within HDC's standards; added that once in a while HDC does balk at use of a circular staircase, but noted it was minimally visible from the next side-street, so she didn't see a visual impact.

TB agreed with the minimum visibility, noted improvement of design upgrades; spoke against brackets but said it was not a deal-breaker.

TB made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion, and it passed 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

g) HDC 18-157

Application by **Laurie Delmolino** requesting to install 20 solar panels on the east and west rear and south-facing roof of the structure located at **84 Commercial St.**

LD presented. TB asked LD if she was able to represent herself, as she is on the HDC board. LD said that, per the State Ethics Board, she was able to represent her own application, but could not be present during HDC's deliberations on her case in that she is the resident at 84 Commercial St.

LD remarked that the east-and-west roof has some sort of pitch to it, so those panels will be somewhat visible as one walked up Cottage St., which MR noted goes up on a hill. LD said that solar panels on the front of the building will not be visible as they are on top of a flat dormer. LD said she got the thinnest, lowest profile panel she could get, which is about 3 ½" in height. As a test, LD said she placed a piece of wood on the flat roof, walking up and down the street to make sure it could not be seen.

MR asked what is visible from the east elevation at Cottage St. LD said she doubted if they could be seen at the rear dormer until one got higher, past the house and would then have to turn around to get a view.

Ann McGuire, neighbor directly across at 97 Commercial St., spoke in full support and as a supporter of alternative energy, especially solar. TB said he would agree that Town is a green community that strives to do its part.

No letters in the file.

LD rescued herself from HDC's discussion on her case.

TB said that as HDC would not ordinarily allow solar panels on a south facing slope on Commercial St., but as it was such a flat roof with hardly any pitch at all, it was acceptable. HS noted that the applicant had set them back three feet.

TB made a motion to accept as presented; HS seconded the motion, and it passed, 3-0-0. TB, HS, MR.

TB made a motion to reverse the order of the following cases; to hear **HDC 18-160** requesting to demolish a cottage on the property located at **7 Bradford St.** before considering a removal and rebuild at the same property, as requested in **HDC 18-159**. HS seconded the motion, and it passed, 3-0-0. TB, HS, MR.

LD returned to the meeting, but then removed herself from hearing the cases, citing a financial relationship to the applicant. TB indicated to the applicant that he would need all three votes in a quorum of three for the request be accepted, or else could choose to hear the case at a further meeting. Applicant opted to have the case heard at that time, stating that he felt it was pretty straight-forward and a low-risk.

h) HDC 18-160

Application by **Steven H. Cook**, on behalf of **Matthew Metivier and Ricardo Gessa Abreus**, requesting to demolish a cottage 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 11-1-5, Demolition Delay Permit at the property located at **7 Bradford St.**

Steven H. Cook (SHC), Kevin Bezarian (KB) and Mathew Metivier (MM) presented; said applicants had purchased the property recently and initially sought to rehabilitate the cottage, but that he, SHC, determined it to be in very poor shape with an asphalt roof, concrete slab for a floor, single door at the rear and a whole host of issues and opted for a tear-down.

AH requested to TB that SHC's presentation of the new design be omitted from the current discussion of the demolition request.

SHC then stated that saving the cottage would not permit it to meet current building code requirements. AH said she'd been by but not inside the cottage.

HS read from an April 20, 2016 post by historian David Dunlap, who gave history on the former occupants at 7 Bradford St., including house painter John Oliver and his wife, Annie Meads Oliver, whose estate still owns the property and current occupant, grandson, Philip M. Roderick, Jr., a carpenter.

MR said that continuing from the Dunlap narrative, the structure would qualify as non-contributing and therefore be open to demolition.

TB said he was conflicted; suggested a delay to do a bit more homework. SHC offered up photographs which, he said, did not support historic value.

TB suggested the rebuild that HDC would be seeking would be more in keeping with the lines of the existing building.

TB made a motion to delay a decision on the demolition, quoting bylaw from Chapter 11-1-5-2 regarding buildings of significance over 50 years of age. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, HS, MR.

SC asked if the delay was for six-months. TB replied that while six months is possible, it is typically not that long of a delay.

i) HDC 18-159

Application by **Steven H, Cook**, on behalf of **Matthew Metivier and Ricardo Gessa Abreus**, requesting to remove and rebuild a section of a structure on the south elevation, to construct a new addition on the east elevation, to remove hip dormers and add shed dormers on the east and west elevations, to remove and replace a deck on the east elevation, and to add new windows, doors and siding on the property located at **7 Bradford St.**

SHC, KB and Matthew Metivier presented.

SHC pointed to new design featuring shed dormers, new doors, granite steps, the construct of a new story-and-a-half structure with dormers at the rear; 2-over-1 grills, clapboard siding and gable trim on new windows; new deck and small addition on east side; new door with pediment head on west side. SHC said they felt the design was in keeping with other neighborhood designs that have shed dormers.

TB read a letter in support from Frank Pantano, an abutter and homeowner of almost 20 years at 11 Bradford St, who felt the new plans were in keeping with the charm and character of the neighborhood.

MR said that, per the plans, he had no trouble with front or north elevations.

TB agreed, but mentioned that going from hip dormers to shed dormers on three-sides of the building is problematic in that hip dormers are features to be retained. SHC said all the other houses have shed dormers and that the hip dormers don't allow for proper space.

TB requested the door on the west elevation remain simple and match the front door, but that the secondary door needed simpler casing, possibly without an awning, referenced No. 11 Bradford as an example of the right look.

KB said he did No. 11 Bradford and felt the specs were the same; that the windows were double-hung.

Discussion ensued on the relationship between the height of the new wall and roofline.

TB noted the case where a contemporary door unit feature is put into an historic house where a door and a window might be more appropriate.

SHC made a case for the change in dormers, which TB said was too much in scale; stressed that public comments had closed and suggested that the applicant use the current feedback to foment new designs.

MR asked KB if he felt the dormer could be higher. KB said yes, to which MR said overall the design was a bit of an over-build where the amount of massing needed to be reduced.

TB suggested that applicant come back with some options, cited that, in general, applicants are better served by not coming in with a fully-designed house but with options; said that No. 11 Bradford looked great, but that the design for 7 Bradford needed to address the number of dormers and retaining historic features. MR agreed. HS said she had nothing to add.

SHC said he wasn't available for the Feb. 21st meeting. TB made a motion to continue the case to the meeting of March 7th; HS seconded the motion, and it passed, 3-0-0. TB, HS, MR.

AH said HDC had a legal delay of up to six months on the demolition; asked how to notify owners. TB replied HDC would have an update by March 7th.

LD returned to the meeting at 5:35pm.

j) **HDC 18-161**

Application by **Ted Smith, Architect, LLC**, on behalf of **Karl Broussard**, 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 11-1-5, Demolition Delay Permit at the property located at **57A Pleasant Street**.

Ted Smith (TS) presented; said no significant historical personages had been discovered in relation to the property, and that the property is not in the historic district.

No public comments or letters.

MR remarked that the cottage is a typical add-on as seen around town, called an accessory unit. AH said it was a full-fledged dwelling unit – that the accessory unit is another, recently-built unit on the property.

LD asked if any of the commissioners had received a notice from Truro concerning the proposed demolition of a small cottage asking if anyone might be interested in receiving the cottage on new land.

TB said he felt smaller buildings were becoming fewer and fewer and that they needed to be retained. AH said in an accessory structure, or artist studio, you are allowed to have a kitchen or bathroom but not both, based on water gallons; 110 gallons per flow. MR said he has no problem with removal for public housing.

HS said she'd like to see some research to determine if the building could be re-used. TS said he'd question the feasibility of moving the cottage, both from a financial and logistic point-of-view.

TB suggested HDC issue a time-delay to do a bit more homework on the case, referencing General Bylaws 11-1-5-2, per buildings over 50 years old and their determined significance. HS seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB,

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

a) Additional Services.

AH informed the HDC that they were over-budget and needed to follow certain steps in order to secure additional secretarial or other services in the future, such as the recent Excel spreadsheet JON compiled at Commissioner Marcoux's request; advised HDC to through the formalities so AH can check the budget.

b) Town Consul.

AH spoke of confusion in how access to Town Consul was arrived at per No. 132; said HDC needs to tighten that up and not do things on its own. TB mentioned that he had been contacted by Town Consul and not the other way around, but acknowledged that at the point one is approached that Town then needs to be notified and the proper channels followed.

c) 40 Commercial St.

Low-lying property with owners from Ohio that suffered extensive storm damage last month, and that HDC was due to have a site-visit and weigh in on.

MR said that mold is a very difficult issue. AH said that the tides were very high after the storm and the moisture is continuous.

MR said he had no trouble approving a tear-down with a re-build in kind; would need a whole lot more information.

AH said if the house is just being raised to comply and nothing is happening on the outside then HDC would weigh in on the raise; that perhaps the owners

would offer up some information on the materials used in the elevation. AH said if HDC was in favor of a tear-down, there are elements of that that HDC could have at its disposal in formulating a decision.

TB noted HDC's commitment to saving old houses. MR countered that water damage is serious business and beyond HDC's purview, added that if there are more of these cases, then HDC should be prepared to mitigate after an inspector has made an assessment.

AH remarked that the cost analysis done to retain the house, elevate it and return it to a new foundation was double what a demolition would run.

TB said this was a true moral dilemma. AH agreed, referenced an area in Louisiana that is served by the Gulf, with an historic section of eight blocks; this area had been hit by three hurricanes or tropical storms and that what was determined in these cases was that mitigation means elevation; added that parts of New Jersey might never be re-built.

AH said she would be back in touch with the owner, Mr. Kessler, to see if he might attend one of HDC's Wednesday meetings.

TB said he agreed with MR and that there needs to be a professional appraisal done on the property that is beyond the HDC mandate.

LD read from FEMA's Flood Plane Management Bulletin for Historic Structures, concerning guidelines for managing properties under scrutiny in the flood plane.

d) Historic District and the Flood Plane.

AH said she was in touch with Philip Scott and got pricing on a new survey to have the Town's historic district re-certified; noted the many changes to structures and the flood plane over the last 20-plus years. LD said that not every change to an architectural feature jeopardizes an historic designation.

LD referenced the 9' raise for the East End building. AH quoted flood insurance rates: for base-flood elevation the rate is about \$4500 a year; 2' or so below base flood costs about 10k a year; and 4' below is almost 20k a year, if not more. AH noted that people without a mortgage don't have to have flood insurance.

e) Ted Jones.

TB introduced Ted Jones, who had been in attendance for the duration of the meeting, as Provincetown Art Association & Museum's nomination as their representative on the HDC, replacing Lisa Pacheco-Robb. TJ said he was meeting the Board of Selectmen on February 12th and would be at the HDC meeting to follow.

1. c) Review and approval of Minutes

TB made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of Wed., August 2, 2017. HS seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, HS, LD, MR.

TB made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of Wed., Jan. 24, 2017. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

5. Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

Decisions by MR, read by MR:

a) HDC 17-085: 192-194 Commercial St. Decision from Nov. 6, 2016.

TB made motion to approve the decision; HS seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, MM, MR, HS.

- b) HDC 17-181: 192-195/4 Commercial St.** Decision from March 15, 2017.
TB made a motion to approve the decision; LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:19 pm. HS seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. TB, LD, MR, HS.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil