

Public Meeting January 6, 2021

The Provincetown Historic District Commission will hold a Work Session at 3:30 PM and a Public Hearing at 4:00 PM on Wednesday, January 6, 2021.

NOTE: THIS IS A REMOTE PARTICIPATION MEETING

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the Provincetown Historic District Commission will be conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible. Specific information and the general guidelines for remote participation by members of the public and/or parties with a right and/or requirement to attend this meeting can be found on the Provincetown website, at <https://www.provincetown-ma.gov/>.

For this meeting, members of the public who wish to watch/listen and participate in the meeting may do so in the following manner:

1. Watch on PTV GOV Channel 18, as well as an online livestream of PTV GOV at <http://www.provincetowntv.org/watch.html>
2. To listen and participate in this meeting, dial **(833) 579-7589**. When prompted, enter the following conference ID number: **834 302 159 #**. Please do not speak until the chair or the meeting moderator asks for public comments or questions. Please mute your phone until you are called upon to speak.

No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings in real time, via technological means. In the event that we are unable to do so, despite best efforts, we will post on the Provincetown website an audio or video recording or other comprehensive record of proceedings as soon as possible after the meeting.

Members by remote: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep.; Hersh Schwartz (HS), Clerk, Chamber of Commerce Rep.; John Dowd (JD), PGB Rep.; Christopher Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep.; Michela Carew-Murphy (MCM), Alternate.

Excused absence: Laurie Delmolino, Vice-Chair, Historical Commission Rep.

Staff present: Anne Howard (AH), Building Commissioner; Thaddeus Soule (TS), Town Planner.

TS gave opening remarks at 3:34pm and called for TB to give quorum by roll call.

TB issued roll-call and called the meeting to order, then gave the meeting over to TS who read the rules governing Public Meeting protocols under current State guidelines regarding the pandemic.

1. Work Session: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

2. Update on potential violations reported to the Building Commissioner.

AH wished the Board a happy New Year; referenced HDC 20-2231 and the motion made on December 2, 2020 to continue the decision to the meeting of January 20, 2021; HDC 20-2251, 577 Commercial St. appearing as a request to withdraw without prejudice; HDC 20-2262, 419 Commercial St. as a request to postpone to the meeting of January 20, 2021.

Sidewall permit is in effect for 231 Bradford St., roofing permits for the Pier Building at 77 Commercial St., AU2 and for 8 Central St.; letters sent on behalf of the HDC for fences without Certificates of Appropriateness to 6 Wareham, 9 Bradford and 4 Atwood and a letter to be sent for non-compliance with a Certificate for Applicability to 522 Commercial St., which, she said, will need more investigation based on the initial request by the applicant and details involved; reported 509 Commercial St. has submitted an application to HDC for the rear rails; thanked TB for 471 Commercial St. which Mr. Nickerson has visited to investigate the issue with the sidewall, said the owner is imitating the hounds tooth decorative detail on the east side.

3. 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 January 20, 2021 Public Hearing agenda and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

TB made a motion to consider the following for Full Review; 452 Commercial St., U1 – To remove and replace a roof section, install 2 skylights and extend a brick wall; 6 Mechanic St., UE – To replace 7 windows in kind and a slider with a larger slider; 1 Winthrop St., UA – To replace a double deck with a larger double deck and to add a second set of stairs for access. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, JD, CM, MCM.

TB made a motion to consider i) through iv) as Administrative Review. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, JD, CM, MCM.

i) 166 Bradford St., U1 -To replace 2 windows in kind.

AH said the unit in question is the center of the three and that most of the windows are toward the back or the alleyway on the west side.

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

ii) 293 Commercial St., UA – To replace a door in kind.

Mike Cyzoski, contractor, presented, said store is the Black Dog, wood is fiberglass not pine. AH added that the trim is pine.

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

- iii) [577 Commercial St., U1W](#) – To replace 2 skylights on the west elevation.

Laurie Ferrari, of Peters Property Management, presented; said the proposal is to replace the two existing skylights with solar versions of the same size; owner requests asphalt shingles, per the roofer's recommendation. AH mentioned that solar skylights have rain sensors.

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

- iv) [10 Prince St., U1](#) -To replace all windows and doors in kind, except east elevation windows and north elevation slider.

Mark Lisbon presented. AH referenced the building as the former barbershop. TB suggested a Full Review, to which HS and MCM concurred. CM requested proper elevations for the next hearing.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of January 20, 2021. HS seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0; TB, HS, JD, CM, MCM.

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

Request by 577 Commercial Street, U3W, to add a window to a previously approved project.
Laurie Ferrari – not available.

TS said he and AH will be working on a RFQ to develop a template for a revised survey. MCM asked per the new Board member, who TB said is Anthony, referred by Board member, Laurie DelMolino and that more information would be forthcoming.

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

JD noted he had an item for discussion but would table the topic for now.

6. **Public Hearings: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN**

CM requested to hear case **HDC 20-2261 592 Commercial St.** out of order.

TB made a motion to take **HDC 20-2261, 592 Commercial St.** out of order. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, JD, CM, MCM.

j) [HDC 20-2261](#)

Application by **Brian Alexander**, on behalf of **James E. Green et al.**, requesting to re-side, add, replace, and reconfigure existing windows, replace a front entry door, and replace front corner boards and trim on the structure located at **592 Commercial Street**.

Brian Alexander and Lisa Pacheco-Robb presented, starting with the south elevation where the plan is to relocate the front door and add a bay. Ms. Pacheco-Robb said the owners seek to restore the home to the original design of the south façade. Plans for the east elevation involve an expansion and re-design of the corner boards, as with the west elevation where two windows are also to be removed; removal of chimney on the north elevation.

No public comments or letters.

MCM said her only issue is that the doorway on the south elevation appears a bit grand compared to other Provincetown doors. TB asked if there is a photo or any other

documentation that shows the entryway as presented. Ms. Pacheco-Robb replied that there isn't a photo, but there is evidence that the original door had possibly been moved at some point and they are seeking to take this opportunity to bump up the amount of detail

JD presented the case to honor the building for what is authentic to the original purpose and design; said he understands the inclination to trick-out and embellish the upgrade to satisfy what people are buying these days and wish to see, but that these kinds of houses were built plain and Spartan; disagrees with the plan to place the door to the left or any measures to jazz things up.

CM said he agreed with JD and that the beauty of the house lies in its simplicity; asked if windows proposed are 1/1 on the south elevation, to which Ms. Pacheco-Robb said they are all to be 2/2 except the narrow window over the Bay. CM said he was comfortable with the removal of the chimney on the north elevation and would not address the rear as it is not visible to the public.

HS voiced that she was not in favor of the north side chimney removal as did MCM. JD countered that while the center chimney is the original, the other chimney is 20th century and he was okay with its removal. HS said she still liked the chimney and wished to keep it. TB said he agreed with most of what was said in citing the charming simplicity of the house, asked if all felt the front elevation should remain the same.

Ms. Pacheco-Robb asked if she was to take the details down a notch, including the over-sized corner-boards, could a compromise be reached; remarked that the door relocation has to do with anticipated interior revamp.

JD cited the Victorian Bay as a clumsy addition. MCM repeated that for her, the main thing is the door on the south elevation, but could side with the applicant's design plan as there are things the HDC allows in other properties. CM reminded that there is a lot of the house that is not visible from a public way. HS asked the HDC is there is any remedy to make the plan work for the applicant pertaining to the desired water-view.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of January 20, 2021. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, JD, CM, MCM.

a) [HDC 20-171](#) (continued from the meeting of December 16th)

Application by **Ocazo Construction** requesting to replace a front door on the structure located at **606 Commercial Street**.

AH reported that there has been no movement on this application and that it would not be out of order for the HDC to withdraw the application from its agenda.

TB made a motion to withdraw the application from the current agenda. HS seconded his motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, JD, CM, MCM.

b) [HDC 20-2079](#) (continued from the meeting of December 16th)

Application by **Nathan Collins** requesting to install 8 solar canopies on the lots located at **132 & 134 Bradford Street and 10 Conwell Street**.

TB advised the Board to pay a site visit to 698 Commercial St., the Harbor Hotel, for reference and cautioned against discussing aspects of the case at this time.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of January 20, 2021. HS seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0; TB, HS, JD, CM, MCM.

c) [HDC 20-2231](#) (continued from the meeting of December 16th)

Application by **Kenneth Hale** requesting to demolish and rebuild a structure on the property located at **3 Kendall Lane, UA1**.

TB referenced the vote at the previous HDC meeting to hear this case at the meeting of January 20, 2021. AH concurred and said that no vote was needed at this time.

d) [HDC 20-2244](#) (continued from the meeting of December 16th)

Application by **Don DiRocco**, of **Hammer Architects**, on behalf of **Steven Tait & David Cook**, requesting to install a 6' wood privacy fence along the east and west property lines, a 4' wood fence and gate on the north elevation and a 4' fence along the seawall/deck to match the existing deck railings on the south elevation of the property located at **425 Commercial Street**.

MCM abstained from the decision.

Don DiRocco presented referenced revised plans and the modified orientation of the fence. TB said he hadn't had enough time to review the drawings. JD said he's seen the new plans on the portal and was good to go with it, as did CM.

Mr. DiRocco said the 48" fence section had been reduced to 42", 6' fence section to be dropped down to 48" on the side; railings to match previously approved.

TB took issue with the plank fence model being referenced as a picket, to which Mr. DiRocco said it contained $\frac{3}{4}$ " spacing between the boards. Steve Tait, co-owner, said the same fence has been installed a couple of doors down. JD agreed to the appropriateness of the fence style as presented, and suggested a picket as being too dainty for the mix of modern and old fashioned design aspects of the house at 425.

Mr. DiRocco said they often use pickets, but usually for enclosures of front yards and noted that this fence is for the rear.

AH read two letters which were previously submitted; one in favor from the Stewart family at 427 Commercial St. and a neighbor across the street who objected to the solid fence and steel cable as view-obstructing.

HS raised the issue of the plank fence as in defiance of the approved cedar picket.

CM cited the picket fence bylaw which would warrant larger openings than the proposed $\frac{3}{4}$ " between slates, sought confirmation the south elevation railing to match deck on 2nd level.

JD felt the objections to the plank fencing as nit-picking for a view that is non-existent. CM disagreed in expressing that there is a view to the water to consider. TB said he felt the fence as presented is a privacy fence, to which Mr. DiRocco said the definition on pickets is vaguely worded in the guidelines and agreed with JD that there is no view on three sides. CM suggested more spacing between the panels. TB concurred and added a change to the size. AH related that a 1x4 vertical board is traditionally paired with $\frac{3}{4}$ " spacing, to which Steve Tait agreed would be acceptable to employ.

JD asked if there might be a kind of square option that might better relate to the square posts. Mr. DiRocco offered that the pickets could be tapered, boards trimmed on the sides, but TB countered in noting a lack of consistency.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the pickets be 1x4 with a $\frac{3}{4}$ " spacing in between. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, HS, JD, CM.

e) [HDC 20-2049](#)

Application by **Bob Guenard** requesting to add a 9' by 13' glass and aluminum sunroom

on an existing deck on the structure located at **9 Cudworth Street**.

No one presented. AH explained the application as basically a sunroom for weather protection on a deck built within the last 7 years.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to later in the meeting. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, HS, CM, MCM.

AH later added that she had left a message for Bob Guenard but not heard back.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of January 20, 2021. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, HS, JD, MCM.

f) [HDC 20-2245](#)

Application by **Annette Andruss** requesting to add 3 skylights and a small window on the structure located at **6 Montello Street**.

Annette Andruss, architect Brian Beaudette, and builder Dan Silva presented. Ms. Andruss said the 3 new skylights would match and the new window is to be 2/2; added that two neighbors offered to give support to the project, unsolicited.

AH said there were no letters currently on file.

CM noted 3 or 4 skylights already on the structure at other elevations, said he was alright with the window in the plan, but has a problem with the ganged-together windows; asked if they might be separated. Ms. Andruss said that she replaced all the windows in kind when she bought the house in 2011.

JD said he didn't have any problem with the proposal, agreed with CM on the window separation opportunity, whereby the sashes could still be retained, but it's the owner's choice. Mr. Silva said the window unit on the right would be the only one which could move and Mr. Beaudette noted, as did Ms. Andruss, that the interior has been beautifully and historically rendered, as well as for symmetry. TB issued his distaste for the little added window.

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

CM left the meeting at 5:38pm.

g) [HDC 20-2251](#) (*request to withdraw without prejudice*)

Application by **Peters Property Management**, on behalf of **Provincetown Condominiums**, requesting to remove 2 skylights and install 1 skylight on the structure located at **577 Commercial Street, U1E**.

TB made a motion to approve the request to withdraw without prejudice. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; TB, HS, JD, MCM.

h) [HDC 20-2256](#)

Application by **Bradley Mallow** requesting to install a shed on the property located at **25 Winthrop Street, U5**.

Bradley Mallow presented; said shed is to be 8x10, one-story, all-wood with asphalt shingles; property has been before the HDC recently for windows.

No public comments or letters.

Mr. Mallow said the home is recently the primary residence for him and his husband.

JD recommended a greater pitch, but recognized that as the shed was an addition to a more contemporary building, he could be fine with the proposal, to which MCM and HS agreed.

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

i) [HDC 20-2260](#)

Application by **Bradley Mallow** requesting to add a fence in the front of the property located at **25 Winthrop Street, U5**.

Bradley Mallow presented; said the Crosby fence is part of a general upgrade to what had been an eyesore.

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

MCM left the meeting at 5:43pm.

k) [HDC 20-2262](#) (*request to postpone to the meeting of January 20th*)

Application by **Ginny Binder**, on behalf of **Christine Barker**, requesting to reconstruct a partially demolished structure, including constructing an addition on the south elevation, raise it by 3' 6" to comply with FEMA requirements, modify a porch on the north elevation, re-side, replace all windows and doors, and remove a cement block stack on a northwest corner on the property located at **419 Commercial Street**.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of January 20, 2021. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, HS, JD.

7. Deliberations on Pending Decision: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

TB made a motion to approve the January 6, 2021 decision of **HDC 20-2244, 425 Commercial Street**, written and read into the record by HS. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, HS, JD.

TB made a motion to approve the January 6, 2021 decision of **HDC 20-2244, 6 Montello Street**, written and read into the record by HS. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, HS, JD.

TB made a motion to approve the January 6, 2021 decision of **HDC 20-2251, 577 Commercial Street, UE1**, to withdraw without prejudice, written and read into the record by HS. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, HS, JD.

TB made a motion to approve the January 6, 2021 decision of **HDC 20-2256, 25 Winthrop Street**, written and read into the record by HS. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, HS, JD.

TB made a motion to approve the January 6, 2021 decision of **HDC 20-2260, 25 Winthrop Street**, written and read into the record by HS. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, HS, JD.

Per HS, **HDC 20-2072, 24 Pearl Street**, was filed with the Town Clerk on December 18, 2020.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:58pm. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; TB, HS, JD.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil