

Public Meeting February 17, 2021

The Provincetown Historic District Commission Work Session of 3:30 PM and Public Hearing of 4:00 PM on Wednesday, February 17, 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 live-stream 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: 390 986 740#. 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.; Laurie Delmolino (LD), Vice-Chair, Historical Commission Rep.; Hersh Schwartz (HS), Clerk, Chamber of Commerce Rep.; John Dowd (JD), PGB Rep.; Christopher Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep.; Michela Carew-Murphy (MCM), Alternate; Anthony Iannacci (AI), Alternate.

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

TS gave opening remarks at 3:31pm 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 said she would defer to later in the meeting for a report on violations based on the current time and number of cases on today's agenda.

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

- i) [20 Bangs St.](#) (continued from the meeting of February 3rd) – To demolish a portion of a structure and construct an addition that will not be visible from a public way.

TB said there is visibility from a public way as witnessed during a site visit.

TB made a motion to consider the following as Full Review: i) [20 Bangs St.](#); vi) [12 Howland St., U12A](#) -To add a dormer; vii) [177 Bradford St., UB](#) – To replace a bay window with a slider; viii) [15 Court St., U5](#) – To replace deck boards and railings; ix) [10-12 W. Vine St., U3](#) – To add a skylight. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; LD, JS, JD, CM, TB.

TB made a motion to consider the following for Administrative Review: ii) [535-537 Commercial; St., U2](#) – To replace 11 windows in kind; iii) [54 Bradford St., U1-1](#)- To replace a window in kind; iv) [441 Commercial St., U2](#) – To replace 4 windows in kind; v) [334 Commercial St., U3](#) – To replace windows in kind. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; LD, HS, JD, CM, TB.

TB made a motion to consider [535-537 Commercial; St., U2](#) – To replace a window with a bay unit as Full Review. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; LD, HS, JD, CM, TB.

- ii) [535-537 Commercial; St., U2](#) – To replace 11 windows in kind.

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

- iii) [54 Bradford St., U1-1](#)- To replace a window in kind.

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

- iv) [441 Commercial St., U2](#) – To replace 4 windows in kind.

TB noted the windows as located on the side of the building with about 6' between, somewhat visible from Commercial St. and in somewhat pristine condition; said ones he saw looked to be the original wood, possibly some with wavy glass.

CM said he thought Fibrex was offered as the replacement material. TB said Fibrex has been approved in the past. CM said he would opt for a Full Review and LD suggested restoration could be offered to the applicant as an option.

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

- v) [334 Commercial St., U3](#) – To replace windows in kind.

TB identified the property as the Blue Monkey building.

Peter Okin presented; said the wood clapboard would be replaced with wood and that

there are two casements with no mullions and two half-rounds. JD asked if some mullions could be employed to help relate to the rest of the building. Mr. Okin said the rough dimension would need to be changed. TB said that the mullions added to the casements will make for a more traditional match. Mr. Okin asked if a grille was available for this option, to which TB said there is and Mr. Okin said they wanted energy-efficient windows where Anderson 200 series are the existing and all other replacements have been 6/6 or 4/4.

AH pointed out that they were looking at a generic tear sheet with an illustrative grille and that the window would necessarily look as represented. JD offered that a 12-light configuration on the single casements could come to resemble a 6/6. AH said that if Anderson does provide this option they would have the snap-in grilles but not true or simulated divided-light. LD and HS agreed with JD, as did CM who added that the height location of the windows should not make the lack of true-divided light a major issue.

JD made a motion to approve with conditions: pairs of windows, third floor façade have a 12-light configuration for each casement; siding to be wood, as well as wood for any trim to be replaced. TB seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; JD, TB, LD, HS, CM.

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

6 Mechanic St., UE

AH gave background on previous approval of UF, which shares a wall with UE that has been restricted to a 2/1 with historic sills whereas UF was not. Hal Winard presented; noted that there are seven units in the compound and Units E & F would stick out like a sore thumb if not allowed to align with the others with a 1/1 configuration. JD mentioned the previous application for UF that faces Tremont St. with an entry door on Mechanic, a 1/1 was not allowed and the change-out was to re-orient the window and remove the octagonal unit. TB referred to the Dec. 2, 2020 decision that, he said, confirmed the approval for 1/1 as Mr. Winard indicated. HS read the previous decision as voted on. CM recalled prior negotiations, including his rejection of massive sliding doors on the balcony, advised going back into the previous application to render a judgment based on the entirety of the project. LD said she felt that if 2/2 wasn't specified when the previous motion was made then the HDC is stuck with 1/1 if this has been installed.

JD stated that the Board had stipulated 2/1 as more historically correct but an argument had been made that the next door neighbor and neighboring units had been approved for 1/1, to which LD said she'd rather see consistency in the building fenestration. CM argued that the applicant is seeking to put in a 4-panel all-glass slider on a small balcony fostering significant changes to the building which goes against the argument for consistency in the building. LD said a set of plans would be useful and asked to delay the decision. Mr. Winard replied that the windows have a 6-week lead time and they were supposed to be ordered a month ago. HS said she would go along with the popular vote. MCM declined to weigh in. TB said his inclination is to allow the 1/1s.

TB made a motion to allow all windows to change from 2/1 to 1/1 to match the existing. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-1-0: LD, HS, JD, TB, in favor; CM, opposed.

5. Public Comments: On any matter not on the agenda below None.

6. Public Hearings: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

- a) [HDC 20-2231](#) (continued from the meeting of January 6th)
Application by **Kenneth Hale** requesting to demolish and rebuild a structure on the property

located at **3 Kendall Lane, UA1.**

No one presented.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to later in the meeting. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; HS, JD, CM, TB; LD recused. *Continued later in the meeting:*

Kenny Hale presented; referenced new drawings, elevations; said he is in need of a new foundation 2' off the ground; new height is about 4'+ higher in the middle with a little more living space inside, offered the design is to scale and compatible with other surrounding structures.

Nicole Barnum of 259 Bradford St., referenced her two prior letters, noted that the engineer's report promoting demolition of this historic property is not based on photographs but on Mr. Hale's own diagnosis. Mr. Hale said his architect, Steve Cook, did take many pictures; said that he is willing to save whatever wood is salvageable.

TB asked AH if she is still in favor of demolition as the best application, to which AH said she has not stated that demolition is the only recourse, but questioned options for preservation.

JD said he appreciates the recent application and some of the HDC concerns which have been addressed, noted that this design is the closest yet to the original, to which HS agreed, but asked if it is allowable to see a one story structure be elevated to one and half; issue with varying window styles. TB agreed with JD that the center portion could come down a bit, liked that the revamp has retained some of the original building. CM agreed with JD & TB per the center-piece, windows.

JD made a motion to accept as presented with the condition that the height of the center section be reduced by a 1' ½"; windows in north and south gable ends be eliminated; north elevation corner board or vertical trim member be eliminated; roof between the center gable and two flanking walls not be broken by trim; all three doors be Provincetown style door; south elevation wall windows be: (2) 30x41 and (1) single sash awning 20x30; eliminate south elevation center gable corner board on the left side of the center so it resembles original building, and to reuse as possible any materials from the teardown. TB seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; JD, TB, HS, CM, MCM.

b) [HDC 20-2261](#) (continued from the meeting of February 3rd)

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**.

Lisa Pacheco-Robb and James Green presented. Ms. Pacheco-Robb reviewed previous case, recalling HDC's reservations with the south and east elevations; read sections of a 5-part document by Mr. Green highlighting the history of the property, leading to a determination that much of the character of the house has been stripped away through the years and how the pre-renovation of 594 Commercial served as a model for a new plan to the property.

AH read a letter in support from Linda Lisbon, neighbor across the street at 597; another in support from Leslie Stutsman-Hand of the Trust at 592A Commercial St., directly behind 592, and Mr. Green reported a third, also in support, from Susan Peskin at 594 Commercial St.

Mr. Green referenced photos that show a former wrap-around porch and recessed door.

JD said no changes have come in to recommend an alteration, encouraged other Board members to go onto Google Street-view to observe how intact the building at 592 Commercial is at this time; said he sees no evidence to replicate the gussied-up structure next door.

CM thanked the applicant for the amount of time and detail that went into the proposal, noted that the building, excepting the porch, hasn't substantially changed in form per the mass

as evidenced; complimented the pristine poetry and beauty of the building in a historical context, per the 1905 and 1932 pictures which reveals the same basic lay-out; said movement of the front door takes away from the symmetry; is opposed to changes on the Commercial St. side as well as to the bump-out on the east elevation, but would be okay with two windows.

MCM also thanked the applicants for their attention to detail concerning the plan; has issues with changes to the front door but noted there is already a bump out and is not opposed to a second one; requests to keep the front façade as is as much as possible. HS concurred.

TB said he felt the house is simple in nature and is not in favor of making it into something more formal.

Mr. Green spoke further to make the case for revamping the house to what he noted was a throw back to an earlier iteration. Ms. Pacheco-Robb said she would like the opportunity to change the bay and make a change to a shed roof with a simpler design plan, with Mr. Green's approval. JD suggested a change in the dormer that reconfigures the second bump-out to make it something more organic. TB requested Ms. Pacheco-Robb offer more than one option going forward.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of March 3, 2021. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MCM, HS, JD, CM, TB. LD, recused.

AI left the meeting at 5:10pm.

c) [HDC 21-7](#) (continued from the meeting of February 3rd)

Application by **Patrick Archibald**, on behalf of **Jay Anderson**, requesting to add a garage to the footprint of a structure on the property located at **53 Commercial Street**.

Lester J. Murphy, Attorney, and Peter McDonald presented. Mr. Murphy expressed that there was more time given to the change out of windows at the last presentation rather than the garage and Mr. McDonald related changes made to the initial plans, including an added window to the kitchen to match others; garage windows to be elevated as recommended. Mr. Murphy said new plans were filed ten days ago, highlighting the new window configuration.

CM spoke of the ganged windows on the upper level and a lack of cadence in the five lower units. JD said the application looks good to him, referenced the east elevation and found great improvement in the separation of ganged windows. HS agreed, as did MCM.

TB spoke against the negative space, but said he appreciated the changes made per HDC's recommendation.

TB made a motion to approve as presented per plans of Feb. 8, 2021. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-1-0: HS, JD, MCM, TB, in favor; CM, opposed. LD, recused.

AH announced that an application has been received to demolish a structure at [53 Commercial](#).

d) [HDC 21-6](#)

Application by **Mark Kinnane**, of **Cape Associates**, on behalf of **Thomas Shirk**, requesting to add a dormer, with skylights and double-hung windows, and two windows on the north elevation of the structure located at **7 Johnson Street**.

Mark Kinnane, and owner of the White Porch, Tom Shirk, presented. Mr. Kinnane said Anderson windows would be the same as previously employed, 2/2; bathroom set back, pitch kept appropriate; added dormer to plans this afternoon that would directly match the approved model at 8 Carver Street; wood shingles and wood trim to match, mostly all white, clapboard.

Mr. Shirk said this addition will allow them to restore the house to its former glory; least amount of work done to the north side which now needs a bit of attention; referenced a document of signatures of approval from direct abutters which was uploaded for review in viewpoint. TS said applicants are requested to introduce all document to the online system.

TB asked if the only changes are to the north side and would involve adding a dormer to a dormer. CM relayed that a dormer on top of a dormer does not have a historic precedent that he is aware of, in spite of the photo supplied by the applicant to the contrary. LD agreed with CM, noting that HDC had approved one on the bay side a few years ago but which, she said, was basically a processed mistake. JD agreed that a dormer on top of a dormer isn't correct, as did HS and TB.

Mr. Kinnane proposed re-positioning one dormer to be taller than the other. JD considered a gabled roof to run at 90 degrees, but suggested that a three-story wall would not be correct as you would lose the view of the roof.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of March 3, 2021. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; LD, HS, JD, CM, TB.

e) [HDC 21-9](#)

Application by **Kevin Bazarian**, on behalf of **Odd Future, LLC**, requesting to modify a south elevation deck by replacing east and west solid panels with wood posts and captured balusters and the south side railing from captured baluster to wood columns and rails, adding stainless steel cables, on the structure located at **509 Commercial Street**.

Kevin Bazarian presented; referenced east and west elevations in the drawings as previously approved, but which looked wrong when constructed and so are to be swapped out for captured balusters; cited other properties as approved for cable railing on the water side.

TB referenced previously contentious applications at this property but said that the new owner's proposals should be given objective considerations.

MCM said she was fine with everything but is never in favor of cable railing as historically appropriate. HS said she is pleased with the captured balusters, as did JD, who added that as steel cable has been approved on many properties on the water side it would not be right to oppose the detail in this case. LD said she felt the design is an improvement.

Derik Burgess, direct abutter at 506 Commercial St., said he felt it was unfair to approve cable rail on this project as cable rails have not been approved on several projects that he has done on the water side. CM responded by saying that captured balusters don't allow the historical texture of the houses to be properly viewed as is the case with cables. TB agreed.

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

f) [HDC 21-11](#)

Application by **Rebecca Sander** requesting to remove four ground-floor casement window groups and replace them with double-hung windows, one set ganged with a fixed frame window and centered on the west façade, and to re-frame an existing pressure-treated deck with Brazilian teak on the property located at **6A Cook Street, U1**.

Rebecca Sander and Brad Walker, architect, presented. Ms. Sander said they bought the unit last year and need to replace the casement windows while improving the architectural integrity of the house; also seeking to replace the existing deck with Brazilian teak.

Margo Hammer, neighbor across the driveway, said she felt it looked good.

CM cited an improvement in the plans, questioned the full glass door, which Ms. Sander said will be retained not replaced. LD noted she had had a financial relationship with the applicant from over a year ago and that they did not collude in any way on this application; asked per visibility, to which Mr. Walker said is partially visible from Bradford St. AH confirmed.

JD agreed to everything as presented; asked why ornamentation over the windows was not carried over in the design flow; said level of visibility precludes any in depth analysis but the bump-out, if it is to be considered as a Victorian bay, could be addressed per context. HS said she agreed with JD.

TB asked for the motivation for the changes, to which Mr. Walker replied they were trying very hard to be respectful in the re-balancing of the façade by removing the casements and to trim it out in a handsome way, without trying to suggest these windows are in the vein of the 1800s. CM said HDC seeks to nurture the community in terms of its architecture and suggested that over-hangs above two of the windows would accomplish two things at once.

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

g) [HDC 21-12](#)

Application by **Deborah Paine**, on behalf of **Kenneth Gabriel**, requesting to add a third window to the east of the double windows on the far west of the third floor of the southeast façade on the structure located at **577 Commercial Street, U3W**.

Deborah Paine presented with Ginny Binder. Ms. Paine said the added window would match in kind, referenced the view from the beach, said third window is mostly obscured from the deck railing as it is on the east side; Association has no problem with the third window.

No public comments or letters. AH noted the building is a non-contributing structure located within a delineated historic district.

JD asked if the opening to the left could expand to center the three windows in the tower structure. Ms. Paine said she'd have a good look at it to make that determination. JD said he had no problem with adding another window to improve the view. Ms. Paine related that a scoffer is due to be replaced and that in its current location, the down spout keeps water off the balcony. HS said she is fine with the design. LD stated her financial relationship with the new owner of less than one year and that she would recuse herself.

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

TB called for a five minute break.

h) [HDC 21-15](#)

Application by **Ginny Binder**, on behalf of **419 Commercial St Partners, LLC**, requesting to demolish and reconstruct a structure on the property located at **419 Commercial Street**.

HS recused herself from deliberations on the case.

Ginny Binder and Lars Jensen, engineer, presented. Mr. Jensen referenced a structural review submitted in two parts from which he gave highlights, including the two main points of evidential proof resulting in the current proposal for demolition: evidence of a lack of footings in the current foundation system and mortar joints of the clay brick work that are no longer capable of supporting the structure laterally; cited a long list of inconsistencies and insufficient construction that recommend the building's removal as well as indications it could

collapse upon elevation with harmful impact on Commercial Street; concluded the overview by relating that rehab in installations would virtually result in a new dwelling.

Jeffrey Burchard, architect, spoke of the substantial re-design of the front of the house to match the existing building and footprint; gambrel and the bulging bay to be built exactly to current dimensions; said building dates to around 1900-1910, no photography but evidence that the gambrel portion of the building at 21½" wide x 28" long has had a number of additions through the years; dormers to be re-done; narrower south side addition to have a gable roof which, he said, is consistent with the type of roof previously seen on that section; north or Commercial St. side: front doors believed to be added sometime last century when the property became a two-family house; window sizes to be retained, some changes to the porch; new building to be lifted per FEMA compliance to about 4' from the sidewalk in order to make the basement level habitable.

Christine Barker, owner, said she has restored other properties including 169 Bradford St. and that they originally bought the property not with the intention for a tear down, but based on the lack of structural integrity this is now their plan.

Kellie Buckley, owner of two properties in town, said she is very supportive of the application and, while it is heartbreaking to lose a building, advised listening to the experts.

AH reported 7 letters in support, 7 letters in opposition, and 2 letters of concern; gave highlights at TB's request, including opposition to demolition based on a centuries old footprint and support from those who have witnessed an eyesore prior to new ownership as well as engineers findings to support demolition and concern from those who have seen the neighborhood undergo continuous renovation over a small area.

TB read a letter of support into the record from Deborah Paine based on the recorded reports and findings as expressed in the recent Zoom meeting, then read from the bylaws on demolition according to HDC guidelines. AH mentioned a couple of Town people who have written in opposition based on their vote at Town Meeting to establish the Historic District Commission and question how demolition could be permitted based on that charter mandate. TB responded by stating that these decisions are made on a case-by-case basis where safety is regarded as the prime indicator for consideration.

Demolition

JD asked the applicant team what was so compelling about this structure that renders it a tear-down rather than a more costly renovations, said he loved the new design as a restoration of the original, but has some concern; agreed with TB that safety concerns trump historical imperatives within the HDC. Mr. Jensen noted the deficiencies of the original construction through details such as the crumbling mortar joints that signal a total loss of integrity in calling for a tear-down. AH said she was last in the building when the finishes were removed by the last contractor, observed the terrible state of the flooring and structure to be in tough shape.

LD said she has worked with Mr. Jensen in the past in her own home and can attest to his excellence; concurs with demolition even as she laments the loss. CM said he had not yet seen the video and could not make an informed decision on demolition until that time. MCM said that while it breaks her heart to have to approve a demolition, it does seem validated in this case and questioned how the house was allowed to be partially demolished in the past and exposed to the elements; noted new design will slightly reduce the overall footprint, trusts the team.

Before TB could go to vote, JD expressed his wish to contingent the demolition on the condition of approval for the re-build, to which MCM and CM agreed that the two measures should be jointly voted on.

February 8, 2021 Design Plans

JD said that having studied the plans for the new building and how it compares to 149 Bradford St., this is one of those rare examples where the new design is an improvement on what had been originally conceived, happy to see the building in the front to retain all its original features. CM took issue with what appeared to him as a more modern construct in the rear that would not blend into the neighborhood quite as well with the Cape Cod architecture a bit lost, found the sides a bit odd. LD said her biggest concern is that the new building would stand at a foot and a half higher, noted contemporized Bay-side façade, which, she said, is allowable; questioned the oddity of the chimney design. Mr. Burchard said the chimney top compliments the modernized rear façade.

MCM stated her preference for wooden not cable railings and a more historically appropriate chimney. TB considered that maybe the top of the chimney could be squared off, appreciates the gambrel roof and agreed with LD on the roof height but also thinks it could work well with the perspective of the house; not in favor of five different styles of windows on the east and west elevations and not in full agreement with the rear of the house and it's modern aspect but could go along with the other Board members in approving this facet. Mr. Burchard clarified the window dimensions, related seven different window sizes in the existing. JD noted the new window design as an improvement over what was; suggested just a sliver view on the right side. CM added that he felt the window design needed to be re-worked for consistency.

AH reminded the HDC to consider that the east and west elevations will limit the percentage of glazing on these wall planes, as there are set-backs for fire resistance ratings that will come into play and may not respect window cadence as a design element. Mr. Burchard said that as the buildings are so close together smaller windows are better; compared a side elevation at 149 Bradford. CM said he would not feel comfortable voting on the demolition per the design plan today in stating that the HDC serves the public and this re-design will of necessity be scrutinized at a higher level by the community. TB disputed the lack of visibility as expressed, said the gambrel elevation is important from the perspective of public view.

TB took a poll of the Board: JD was okay with front elevation as was MCM who was not in favor of the chimney; JD was fine with the glass structure on the south elevation, while CM was not. LD was fine with the south elevation but took exception with the new addition height dwarfing the existing as a precedent she didn't think the HDC wanted to set, to which CM concurred. MCM was not in favor of the cable railing, but okay with the new structure. JD questioned why the additional foot was needed but didn't think it would be seen from the street and weighed in favor of a modernized chimney as compatible; found the hint of the new rear structure against the antique front façade as a clever design, to which CM agreed, but questioned the 6' steel fence and brick wall at the rear.

CM said he'd like to see a rendering in context with adjacent structures from the water side. Mr. Burchard said a rendering is possible but can be quite expensive. JD referenced previous submitted photographs from the beach-side. LD said she understands why the proposed chimney is flared, but cannot vote for an added structure to be higher than the roof pitch. MCM said she could relate to LD's objection on the height differential, but is torn. Ms. Barker reminded the HDC that the front structure is a gambrel at 22 ½" in height while the rear is a gable and non-conforming; slightly lifted per safeguarding against future storm surges.

LD questioned if today's vote was premature in lieu of anticipated window design elements. Mr. Burchard replied that the window plans would have to pass the Building Commissioner's specifications to be permissible. TB said that while he could agree with LD on the height addition, in this case the taller ratio could work in the environment in this case; is still curious about the east and west elevations. Mr. Burchard said the extension is planned for 1'4" to allow for the overhanging eave, depth of the soffet and roof above; a decrease would need to be 3'.

JD spoke strongly about his preference for the design as stands in citing a world-class architect in a restoration that will be highly superior to its predecessor. TB took a poll: JD in favor; MCM in agreement with JD, but would like to see the chimney more historically appropriate. LD and CM are opposed to approval as is; CM requested a perspective drawing and rendering per the fence, east and west facades regarding the windows; TB, in favor.

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

AH left the meeting at 8:55pm.

HS recommended a short meeting to read today's decisions. TB made a motion to postpone reading of meeting minutes and current decisions to Monday, February 22, 2021 at 11:00am. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; HS, JD, CM, MCM, TB.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:59pm. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; HS, JD, CM, MCM, TB.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil