

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
Town Hall
Provincetown MA

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2018

Members Present: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep; Marcene Marcoux (MM), Vice Chair, Chamber of Commerce Rep.; John Dowd (JD), PBG Rep. Hersh Schwartz (HS), Alternate; Michela Carew-Murphy (MCM), Alternate.

Excused Absence: Laurie Delmolino, Historical Commission Rep.

Others Present: Annie Howard (AH), Building Commissioner.

TB called the meeting to order at 3:40pm.

1. Work Session: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

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

AH said she had just spoken to Michael Scott, owner of **18 Commercial St.**, who has been unavailable due to health issues, but has all the paperwork at home and will forward. AH said there was not a stockade fence there as far as she recalls so it should not signal a Full Review.

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 Nov. 7, 2018, and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

- i) 620 Commercial St. – *(continued from the meeting of Oct. 3rd)* –To remove and replace two chimneys.

No one presented.

TB read into the record the applicant's e-mail describing the details of the request; said the brick is red, grout grey on one chimney and white on the other; replacement will remain in the same location. AH said the applicant has roof leaks and would like to place a faux chimney in the same location, to mirror as much as possible; other is an active chimney, but the dimensions of the ridge are not given.

MM said they wanted the specs and an assurance the replacements would be the same; wasn't sure there is enough information to approve. JD said he'd want the work to be historically accurate, which MCM concurred. MM said the detailing must be maintained on both chimneys. JD asked if the board can stipulate clearly the approved conditions so the applicant needn't keep returning; mentioned the public's dissatisfaction with continual delay.

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

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the color of the brick remain as is, i.e., differing colors, and smaller chimney grout and size of grout lines and color to match the original chimney. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0.

ii) 73 Commercial St. – To replace roofing shingles.

Mark Kinane of Cape Associates presented; said none of the shingles on this building were asphalt shingles; other two buildings had a mix of asphalt and rubber.

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

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

iii) 389-391 Commercial St. – To repair a rubber roof.

No one presented.

TB noted emergency repair; replacing mahogany decking and balusters with rails.

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

iv) 104 Bradford St. – To replace a front door.

Mike Cyzoski presented; said the door is wood fir, with frame, side-lights, and ash top to remain.

JD said he doubted that the replacement frame and side-lights would have the same Federal style. Mike Cyzoski distributed a picture of the replacement, said the door frame is shot and the side-lights wouldn't be salvageable. JD said it's a fine piece of architecture and asked if when the replacement is substandard replica of the design is even possible. Mike Cyzoski said the replacement door shown is \$4,500 and can run to 10k. TB spoke of the door as a distinguishing feature of the house which when possible and per the bylaw should be repaired instead of replaced.

MCM said the solution should be cost-effective, and that there are companies that will sometimes be able to restore for less cost that a replacement would run.

MM asked it was possible to have the existing side-lights repaired. Mike Cyzoski replied that often a can of worms is opened up once a repair is started; original building was Provincetown Light & Power office.

JD asked if the details can be removed and the replaced on the new structure; said the design is in the moldings and casings.

MCM asked if casings may be replicated as a condition.

TB proposed a site visit at the end of today's meeting based on the proximity to Town Hall.

TB made a motion to postpone the determination to the end of the meeting of the Public Hearing following a site visit. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, MM, JD, MCM.

v) 572 Commercial St. – To replace a wooden picket fence in kind.

MM noted the replacement is not a picket.

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

- vi) 116 Bradford St. –To replace a fence and move its doorway.
Kevin Bazarian presented; said it's his next door neighbor's fence and the gates are in too close proximity to cars coming and going into and out of the property.
MM said this triggers a Full Review based on the lattice, which is not a replacement in kind. Kevin Bazarian asked if he could suggest an option to move the door and not change the style. TB asked the board to consider moving the gate to the back of the property to help the neighbor.
MCM said they are the best photographs she's ever seen at the HDC. HS said she's good either way as it will be approved. MM said it's visible from a public way; spoke in favor of Full Review.
TB made a motion to treat as Administrative Review. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.
TB made a motion to approve as presented with no change to the style of the fence. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.
- vii) 3 Winthrop St., #2 – To replace three windows in kind.
Meghan Tappe presented; said the windows were Brosco wood windows; 6-over-6s.
TB made a motion to accept as Administrative Review. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, HS, MCM.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, HS, MCM.
- viii) 607 Commercial St. – To replace roofing shingles.
No one presented.
TB read the request details including asphalt roof, fox-hollow grey, new white rubber roof in kind.
TB made a motion to accept as Administrative Review. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, HS, MCM.
- ix) 542 Commercial St. – To replace a rubber roof in kind.
Elaine Quigley of the Surf Side Arms presented. .
TB noted the request was very straight-forward and MM said it was quite complete.
TB made a motion to accept as Administrative Review. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.
TB made a motion to approve as presented. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.
- x) 53 Commercial St., Front – To renew a Certificate of Appropriateness.
Mark Kinnane of Cape Associates presented for Jay Anderson, owner.
TB read the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to be extended for one year. MM said it wasn't clear if the HDC was treating these certificates as Administrative or Full Review. Mark Kinnane said they didn't want to miss the Nov. 29th deadline, but said the certificate had not expired.

TB made a motion to approve a renewal of a Certificate of Appropriateness which has not expired. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.

- xi) 466 Commercial St. – To replace doors, walls, sill, sidewalls and rebuild chimneys.

No one presented.

TB suggested a Full Review could be requested based on the amount of work involved; MM agreed. JD and MCM said they were fine considering the request as Administrative Review.

TB made a motion to consider for Full Review. MM seconded the motion and it passed; 3-2-0: TB, MM, HS, in favor; JD, MCM, opposed.

TB made a motion to consider the following for Full Review. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM:

- xii) 83 Commercial St.; xiii) 72A Commercial St.; xiv) 42 Commercial St.;
xv) 12 Franklin St., #1.

c) Review and approval of Minutes:

TB made a motion to postpone review and approval of minutes to the end of the meeting. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, MM, JD, MCM.

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

Fine Arts Work Center, 24 Pearl Street

Paul Kelly and Margaret Murphy presented with design plans.

Margaret Murphy said the renovations have been discussed for a while and they are here today to give an update regarding a renovation of the common room. Paul Kelly displayed a photograph of the existing south wall. Margaret Murphy said they will address proposed work on the north wall on Fisherman Court later as it is not as significant and also not in a public way.

Margaret Murphy said it was the 50th anniversary of the FAWC, founded in 1968 and that the property, which FAWC purchased in 1972, was formerly occupied by Days Lumber Yard, started in 1911; said that the common room has not been renovated since 1988 and needed to be made more staff and user friendly; job is aiming for the fall of 2019 ahead if the regulatory schedule and plans involving septic work would be sent through the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Paul Kelly referenced the existing columns in the function room, which make presentations miserable; idea is to remove them and add a new steel frame. Margaret Murphy said that the exterior is not being demolished, but will facilitate a build-out; that a cross-beam and steel-beam in the interior will extend the door on new posts and footings, which will require a 2' bump-out.

Margaret Murphy said they will also be looking to straighten out the interior, curved wall to make the room more functional; noted a change in the door configuration with the larger door close to Pearl St. set to be replaced and a few windows added overhead and the parapet increased, as well; concluded that that

the architect's aim is to provide greater balance to the building, said they welcome feedback from the HDC.

JD said he thought the design simple and clean and had no problem with any of it.

Paul Kelly asked the HDC's opinions on a glass door. TB said it could be argued that the glass door is more contemporary but they could go either way. JD spoke of the studio door as being like-minded with the new bump-out.

MM referenced earlier plans which she preferred, in terms of the doors, which Margaret Murphy said wouldn't function for the staff if rendered as single doors. MM said she sees the bi-fold door at odds with the design and the historical property. Paul Kelly said the bi-fold door forms a canapé over the entrance; re-uses a new contributing element. MM referenced previously installed vinyl windows that had not been well received by Mass Historical Commission and found the steel structure possibly negatively affecting its status as a contributing structure. MM believes the design needs review by Mass Historical Commission.

HS said she found it too contemporary for the property and would like to see alternatives.

TB said in this case he didn't necessarily think contemporary was a bad thing and that something forward-thinking might not be out of line, to which JD added he appreciated as cutting-edge.

Paul Kelly sought direction from the HDC going forward on this design, which has been approved by the FAWC board and said the design review committee are behind it. MCM remarked on the original garage door, which she likes and referenced a similar one that was approved at Bayside Betsey's restaurant. Margaret Murphy said they were told a traditional garage door wouldn't work at the FAWC based on the exterior elements needed to function properly.

MM added that she highly regards the FAWC among non-profits; that she has always appreciated the organization's record of consultation with the HDC and admires its well-drafted diagrams and drawings.

3. Public Hearing: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

TB opened the Public Hearing at 4:40pm.

a) **18-279** (*request to continue to the meeting of November 7th*)

Application by **Regina Binder**, on behalf of **199 Bradford St., LLC**, requesting to replace trim, siding and roofing materials, to add a covered porch and balcony on the south elevation, to reduce the size of window openings on the west elevation and to replace windows on the south and east elevations on the structure located at **199 Bradford Street**.

Angela McCarthy presented; said building is raised and they are working on pouring footings and are making no changes to the footprint.

TB indicated that the HDC has been largely left unaware of the many changes undertaken at the property and asked when there would be new plans available for review. AH said the time-waiver was still valid.

Angela McCarthy said she is awaiting her architect's drawings and that she has zoning issues in terms of the proposed basement.

No public comments or letters.

MM asked why Ms. McCarthy failed to appear on Oct. 3rd as directed by a September meeting. Angela McCarthy said she had hired a drafter, but then realized at that meeting that she needed a qualified

architect; said her goal is to preserve the structure and bring the house back to life; said it's her first time with an historical property and she wanted to get it right; referenced her father returning home from hospice and his passing; said she's had countless obstacles but is working on producing quality plans.

AH said that as she was not in attendance at the Sept. meeting, the information was not transferred to Angela McCarthy; said staff met with Ms. McCarthy two and a half weeks ago.

MM asked how the building was elevated without a request from the HDC for its raising. Angela McCarthy said they excavated and found the structure was not sound, lacked footings and is currently at work putting in a new foundation in order to save the building; said she wanted to get plans in to the HDC and staff next week, but is confident she'd have plans to present at the Nov. 7th meeting.

TB advised Ms. McCarthy to have the architect designs for the fenestration and other exterior elements by the next meeting.

AH said she had inspected the foundation, noted no height increase.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Nov. 7, 2018. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, HS, MCM.

b) HDC 19-007 (continued from the meeting of September 5th)

Application by **Peter Makrauer**, of **LDa Architecture & Interiors**, on behalf of **Thomas Tannariello**, requesting to add a second story residential unit, including extending the brick façade upward, to add an interior elevator, preserve a south portico and add a roof deck on the structure located at **170 Commercial Street**.

TB made a motion to accept the time-waiver. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, HS, MCM.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Nov. 7, 2018. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, JD, HS.

c) HDC 19-012

Application by **Peters Property Management** on behalf of **Waterfront West Condominium**, requesting to re-shingle a west elevation, including a dormer, and a north gable end with no pattern at the property located at **93 Commercial Street**.

Laurie Ferreri presented; said there are only two sections on the property that have the rounded patterns, which are on the dormers, and the rest are traditional shingles; requests to replace the rounded patterns.

MM said she felt the pattern is crucial for many similar buildings in the historic district and that it was important to be maintained.

JD said he had no problem with it, as the shingles are not original. MCM said she found it such a small portion of the building.

HS said she felt the pattern doesn't really fit and is okay with removing it. TB said he felt it was a defining characteristic and agreed with MM.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-2-0: HS, JD, MCM, in favor; TB, MM, opposed.

d) **HDC 19-047** (continued from the meeting of October 3rd)

Application by **Ted Smith, Architect, LLC**, on behalf of **Joshua Ronnebaum**, requesting to lift a structure pursuant to FEMA guidelines, install new windows, including skylights and sliding doors, rebuild a front porch, add a dormer on the east elevation and infill a corner area on the north elevation of the structure located at **122 Commercial St.** **Ted Smith** and **Kaye McFadden**, contractor, presented from new drawings.

Ted Smith read a letter from the owner, who could not be present, said the original plans were larger in scope and that these changes were made from the HDC's input and hoped to make a more functional space for themselves, their family and guests as well as honor the home's architectural precedent.

Ted Smith addressed elevations and noted, among other aspects of the design plan: a lean toward the Greek Revival aesthetic; 6-over-1 windows on the first floor; retained wood trellis on gable end; existing sliding door on second door to be replaced with French doors; porch to be re-built; modified one story shed; attempts to minimize shed dormers; per the east elevation in the back, plan is to achieve more head-height.

Kaye McFadden said the west elevation sits very close to the neighboring building at 120 Commercial, but there is no public view.

No public comments or letters.

MCM said she felt it was more appropriate from an historical perspective, said she would prefer to see the door remain in its original position and remove the proposed skylights above the dormers on the east elevation; cited a lack of information making the case for a raise, as was the case at the last presentation and is reluctant to start setting a precedent for raising structures without more specific information.

Ted Smith and Kaye McFadden said they didn't want to raise the structure and Ted Smith asked that if the raise was eliminated would the current plan be approved by the HDC.

AH read the bylaws including the three exemptions with confirmation of historical designation and proof that renovations will preclude the property as a contributing structure; said she is not qualified to make determinations on the property's status in regards to FEMA requirements other than to say it is in the flood zone; read further on the types of work done that may be included in the work estimates.

MM said the HDC needs the assessed, market values and what actions will trigger the FEMA raise and wants this in writing.

Ted Smith said the building has been determined to be 3' below the base flood elevation of 9'. TB added that while he felt the building would probably have to be raised, substantial written proof was needed.

MCM remarked that there are areas in LA where the flood zones have changed and now those structures do not have to be raised. JD suggested the HDC make their recommendations before voting to send the case to the Cape Cod Commission.

MCM said she felt the columns are too wide for the size of the structure and she preferred turn-columns.

JD said he felt the white fascia board and lamb's tongue detailing was in line with the original porch. MM and TB agreed.

TB said he agreed with MCM on employing turn-posts, that the door should stay where it is and to lose the skylights.

JD wondered if the square columns of the Green Revival might be more fitting, less heavy.

The HDC agreed with a plan to keep as much of the facade from the photograph as possible.

HS said she liked the doghouse dormer, but felt that too many windows looked busy.

TB recommended getting the new drawings before the HDC submits the request to the Cape Cod Commission.

Ted Smith said they were looking to make more definitive changes to the back or west side as it's less visible; asked if the door moves back to its original location, does the center orientation work better than to the side. TB said either way would probably work fine.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Nov. 7, 2018. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.

e) **HDC 19-050**

Application by **Bradford C. Walker, Trustee**, requesting to replace portions of a white picket fence in kind and to erect a new 4' high fence with inboard posts at the property located at **6A Cook Street, U3**. **Brad Walker** presented; said the Greek Revival house is from 1860 but has been re-designed during four different periods; said the fence they are proposing has four different heights, are looking for a bit more privacy between themselves and abutter at 199 Bradford St.

No public comments or letters.

MM asked per the diagram spacing, which Brad Walker clarified as a side-effect of the lines in the drawing.

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

TB made a motion to take the decision of i) **HDC 19-060** out of agenda order. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-1-0: TB, JD, HS, MCM, in favor; MM, opposed.

i) **HDC 19-060**

Application by **Frank Yamrus** requesting alterations to windows and an entry door on the structure located at **6A Cook Street, U1**.

Brad Walker presented as the architect on the project; said Mr. Yamrus is his neighbor and had applied for a determination of non-applicability.

JD said that as this is not visible from a public way, the HDC has no requirement to make a determination; MCM concurred and both said they had done a site visit. JD suggested that the things the applicant is proposing are all things the HDC would ordinarily approve

AH asked Brad Walker if his client was specifically looking for a determination of non-applicability. Brad Walker replied that he was not as he had already paid the additional application fee.

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

TB called for a short break at 6:00pm.

f) **HDC 19-057**

Application by **Josh Piper**, of **Cape Associates, Inc.**, on behalf of **Harvey Hauswirth**, to remove and replace a rubber roof with mahogany decking and to replace a section of wood deck railing with cable deck railing at the property located at **553 Commercial Street, UA**.

Josh Piper of Cape Associates presented; said deck to be removed is not really visible, privacy fence that is visible would be replaced in kind, same cedar wood, mahogany deck also to be replaced in kind; leaking rubber roof to be replaced in kind; owner wishes to keep wood posts and top rail and have cable for in-fill, as it's the same design on the sea wall.

AH said sea wall cable rail first came before the HDC in 2011, pertaining to Unit D.

MM said she'd rather see wood instead of steel cable, to which HS and MCM agreed. JD said he was in agreement as presented. TB agreed with JD in that steel cables can help to keep the railing looking more authentic.

AH confirmed for JD that there is a 4" threshold when using cable.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. HS seconded the motion and it failed, 2-3-0: TB, JD, in favor; MM, HS, MCM, opposed.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the beach side have captured balusters. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-1-0: TB, MCM, MM, HS, in favor; JD, opposed.

g) **HDC 19-058**

Application by **Nicole Barnum**, requesting to remove a brick chimney and replace it with a steel pipe in the same location with the cap to be replaced with a wood frame, cement board, stucco and paint to match the existing on the structure located at **259 Bradford Street**

Nicole Barnum presented; said the unit was an oil burner which was found to be deteriorating and had to be replaced. AH said it as basically a carbon monoxide situation waiting to happen.

No public comments or letters.

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

h) **HDC 19-059**

Application by **509 Commercial St., LLC**, requesting to demolish an existing building and build a new structure using plans previously approved in **HDC 18-107** at the property located at **509 Commercial St.** **Lester J Murphy, Jr.**, attorney, **Steven Cook** of Cotuit Bay Design, LLC and **Kevin Bazarian** presented.

Lester Murphy cited history of the property with the HDC wherein a 15' set back was approved to soften the FEMA required building raise of 6-9'; said building has been exposed to weather systems for over a year and referenced a Sept, 4, 2018 report which found erosion including deteriorated window sills and other portions of the original structure; said the engineer's recommendation is to demolish the existing structure and reconstruct a new structure that matches the HDC's requirements using wood piers to support the new structure rather than the concrete to be

poured into place which, he said, would make it look more like a building on a pier.

Steven Cook said piles driven vertically would further deteriorate what is there and stated there wasn't room to move back the building 15' with the condition that it is currently in.

Public Comments

Kristin Heine spoke as a neighbor at 508 Commercial St., read a statement on behalf of herself and Philip Cozzi wherein she said the owner and contractor at 509 Commercial have been in brazen disregard of the historic structure of the building and the concerns of the neighbors; suggested that they would get exactly what they wanted in the first place, which is to demolish and build an entirely new structure and use FEMA to raise the building 10' or higher, move it closer to the shore and have parking underneath; concluded by requesting that the HDC put restrictions on the applicant, requiring them to return to the original form with no dormers and to establish demolition punishment fees that can be deposited into an escrow account for those who cannot afford renovations such as new, in-kind windows that align with HDC requirements.

Philip Cozzi said it was easy to close up the building to the weather as has been done in the case presented earlier today, but that leaving the structure open to the elements has provided a wildlife sanctuary and that they knew very well all it would have taken was some plywood to protect and preserve the existing property.

TB read a letter from James Vesper and Graham Brown of 510 Commercial St. who voiced their dismay that a building in the historic district should be allowed to be destroyed without impunity; urged the HDC or local government to reaffirm the rules which apply to all by imposing a fine, penalty or other sanctions

Kevin Bazarian replied that the owner never wanted to raise the property and move it back; that nobody would have spent the money on the original plans were that the case; said boarding up the windows with plywood would not have prevented water damage.

HDC Deliberations

MM noted a contradiction in that the demolition request negates the approved structural changes of the new building previously approved by the HDC and puts the case in a different context; referenced other cases where demolition had been approved with the caveat that the new structure be an exact replica of the former with details provided to the HDC; referenced other cases where this rule applied, such as the three buildings at the Johnson Street Parking Lot and 170 Bradford St.

MCM voiced strong opposition to the lack of measures taken to protect the building during the winter season as the HDC's mandate is to protect and preserve the Historic District structures of the Town. HS concurred with MM and MCM and found it unacceptable that the building was allowed to sit in disrepair.

TB said he agreed with basically everyone who has spoken today; said that at each stage of this case the HDC had been backed up

against the wall on making determinations; said he felt it was a new application which was now required to go forward.

JD said he found his fellow board member's arguments compelling.

MM suggested a re-thinking on the applicant's part as to how much might be moved or saved in sistering the old with the new. MCM said before a vote on demolition could be made she would want to see plans to restore as much of the original structure as possible.

AH said the new structure would have to meet the base flood elevation; that the lowest horizontal number would have to be 2' above.

Jeffrey Ribeiro, Town Planner, expressed his dismay at this situation and said that at a meeting with staff it was determined that detailed engineering reports were required to confirm that the building was not salvageable. AH confirmed that a letter had been received but no reports.

MCM said it was her understanding from an issue LD had brought up that perhaps with all the new technology in construction there might be a way to save the building without moving it back and also stated her understanding that HDC was within its rights to hire its own engineer, to have the money put in escrow, in determining if there are ways and means to save the building.

Lester Murphy asked if the board would explore a situation where the existing structure is dismantled and then, to the greatest extent possible, former building elements re-used in the new footprint. MCM reiterated her request to explore money placed in escrow for the HDC to secure its own engineering report, which AH said was within the right of the HDC.

Kevin Bazarian said what is on the roof is new lumber and not historic, said a lot of the house is no longer salvageable, but offered to take MM's cue and make a determination of what might be spared.

JD noted that many of the things coming into play are interior items that will never be seen by the public, but that the HDC is now in a position where they have given a lot and are getting nothing in return.

Steve Cook said that as the current building is 40' long, there is likely not enough room to move it back.

Lester Murphy requested to continue at the Nov. 7th meeting. Kevin Bazarian requested a site visit with the HDC. MM said they also need documentation of what exactly can be salvaged.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Nov. 7th. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, JD, HS, MCM.

AH said there was no time-waiver required at this time.

AH secured signatures for **473 Commercial St.**

JD left the meeting at 7:00pm.

4. Update on 132 Bradford Street/CVS project.

AH demonstrated a sample model for the window muntin spacing; said current lite windows are steel single pane, true divided lite and the new windows would be a steel frame and have the same profile but more efficient; that there wasn't enough metal left of the existing to utilize for the new ones.

MM read the approved conditions of the original decision and suggested a site visit for those on the original case. AH said the garage doors are staying; that it is the fenestration that is the feature for review.

1.

c) Review and approval of minutes

MCM made a motion to approve with changes the minutes of September 19, 2018. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; MCM, MM, TB, HS.

TB made a motion to accept with changes the minutes of September 5, 2018. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MM, HS, MCM.

TB made a motion to accept with changes the minutes of August 22, 2018. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MM, HS, MCM.

TB made a motion to accept with changes the minutes of August 1, 2018. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MM, HS, MCM.

TB said the HDC was doing a good job of catching up on decisions and with Martin Risteen's help, but there was still a lot more work to be done in terms of outstanding decisions. MM recommended a work session to catch up on decisions and the board mulled over date options, settling on Monday, Nov. 5th at 3:30pm in the Community Development Conference Room which, Jeffrey Ribeiro said, was equipped for taping.

On the topic of a forthcoming inventory review, Jeffrey Ribeiro said he would continue to follow-up and that he thought AH had spoken to the former people tasked with the inventory to get a quote. TB asked if the board could interview candidates. Jeffrey Ribeiro mentioned exploring the possibility of securing Community Preservation Act funds to be used for the inventory which AH said was due the first week in December.

MM addressed the determination on **32 Bradford St., HDC 19-020** in that there was no Request for siding and, as such, he would need to return to the HDC to address the siding with the concern that it not be covered as Azec.

MM spoke of recently retired HDC commissioner Ted Jones in terms of his passion for and knowledge of the Historic District and as one who worked very hard and with a lot of energy and commitment; closed with a Leonard Cohen quote in dedication of Ted Jones' contribution.

104 Bradford Street: door

TB announced a recess at 7:20pm to conduct a site visit to 104 Bradford St. with HS. Upon return, TB said he'd seen worse; couldn't open the door to see the frame, said it wasn't clear if molding could be removed and that he wouldn't recommend its removal without a replacement in kind.

AH said that a new door would signal a larger frame; side-lights to be determined. TB made a motion to accept as presented with the condition that the replacement door should repair or replace all exact casement moldings, maintain existing sidelight panels and existing fan window above. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, HS.

5. Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

Decision by MM, read by MM:

HDC 17-281; 16 Prince St. TB made a motion to approve the decision of July 5, 2017. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, MCM, MM, HS.

TB read into the record the letter for demolition delay concerning **HDC 19-037**; **963 Commercial St., #10** from October 3, 2018.

MM said she felt the master list of filed decisions was useful and recommended maintaining it going forward; gave the hard copies to JON for updating.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:30pm. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, HS, MM, MCM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil