

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
January 9, 2019 Meeting
Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting

Present: Kristen Carron, Chair; Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair; Gregory Maxwell, Erinn Calise, Nicole D’Amato and Lauren Drury.

Absent: Andrew Barkley.

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner and Andrew Teitz, Legal Counsel.

Ms. Carron, Chair of the Commission, started the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Ms. Carron read the procedures into the record as follows: Each person addressing the Commission will state his/her name for the record. Although the Commission does not generally swear in applicants or their representatives, all witnesses are responsible for providing the HDC with true, accurate, and complete information. The applicant or the applicant’s representative shall present the request before the Commission along with arguments and material in support of the application. HDC members will then have the opportunity to discuss the proposal and ask questions which are pertinent to the application. All other persons wishing to speak in favor of or against the application will then be asked to do so. All speakers are asked to avoid repetitive comments and confine their comments to those which are relevant to the application at hand. Cross examination by the general public may be allowed only if the Commission feels it would be appropriate and useful. All questions from the floor will be directed through the Chair only. After all of the relevant facts have been heard, the Chair will call for a motion. Once the motion has been made and seconded, the HDC only will discuss the motion followed by the Chair’s call for a vote. Only active members of the Commission shall vote. The alternate will sit as an active member with full voting rights only when a regular member is unable to serve at any meeting. During the discussion among voting members, no further testimony from the floor will be accepted unless specifically requested by a Board member. Every effort will be made to render a decision this evening. The minutes of this meeting will be on file in the Planning Department within 14 days. Certificates of Appropriateness granted this evening will be available in the Planning Department within two (2) days of this hearing. The hearing of any

HDC application which has not yet started before 10:30 p.m. will not be heard this evening and a special hearing date will be scheduled. This rule, however, may be waived by a majority vote of the Commission. All decisions of the HDC are final and legally binding under the authority of Article XI of the East Greenwich Zoning Ordinance and Article 45, Section 24.1 of the RIGL. All decisions of this Commission may be appealed to the Zoning Board of Review.

Ms. Carron added the HDC considers local standards as well as Federal guidelines when reviewing applications and noted this is a collaborative process between the Board and the applicant. Ms. Carron explained the sequence for review of applications and its helpfulness to understand how the process works before the Board hears the applications. She noted each application is reviewed in of itself; the Commissioners receive the applications prior to the actual meeting in order for each Board member to review the content. The Board members identify properties and character defining features and historical and architecturally significant to the district that are taken into consideration. When applicants come before the Board there is a discussion in order to better understand the project at hand and answer questions that arise. The Board determines the standards that apply; hearing applications in this type of forum allows the Board to discuss alternatives, offer suggestions and provide support for the applicant to hopefully have a successful outcome and possibly save money.

Ms. Carron introduced the Board members and Staff present and read the application items into the record.

Historic District Commission Hearings

- 1. East Greenwich Yacht Club
10 Water Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 1
Modifications, Window Replacement, Roofing & Siding to
Structure formerly known as “New England Yacht Rigging”
building, located on the northeast corner of parcel – FINAL**

Ms. Carron recused herself from the application. Mr. McGeorge took over as Acting-Chair.

Mr. McGeorge stated Commission Standards 4, 7 and 8 apply to the application. *Standard 4* states that all proposals for additions and architectural changes shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes which have historic significance of their own. *Standard 7* states exterior siding must be appropriate for the building to which it is applied. Vinyl and other modern composition sidings which may damage historic buildings are not appropriate and shall not be approved. *Standard 8* states original window sashes can usually be repaired and retained. In the event that a window sash must be replaced the replacement shall match the original in size, operation, materials, configuration, number of lights, muntin width and profile.

Mr. John Mollicone, represented the application and the EGYC. He explained that since the last meeting he has eliminated the request to use vinyl siding and will now use cedar shingles and wood trim. As for the windows he has also changed the proposed configuration; the proposed new windows will be exactly like the existing ones – they will have raised grids on the exterior and open at the bottom. With regard to the existing garage door Mr. Mollicone noted he plans to make the new door slightly smaller, being 6' wide and have it be a plain garage door.

Mr. McGeorge acknowledged the Applicant had made significant improvements since the original submission. He added he liked the simplified plan and it is a move in the right direction to use cedar shingles and wood corner boards and trim. Mr. McGeorge pointed out there was some key information lacking regarding the windows and garage door but suggested those parts of the application be refereed once Mr. Mollicone had shop drawings prepared.

Mr. Maxwell agreed with Mr. McGeorge's comments. Mr. McGeorge and Mr. Maxwell volunteered to referee the windows and garage door.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the two entry doors. Mr. Mollicone mentioned the two doors are relatively new and those doors would be incorporated into the renovation.

At the December review there was mention of adding windows to the back side of the building; Mr. McGeorge did not think windows needed to be added to the back elevation since the project is a lot more benign than originally proposed.

Mr. Maxwell commented the structure will now match the Yacht Club's main building and will look nice.

Mr. Mollicone inquired if a cupola could be installed on the roof of the building. Mr. McGeorge did not have objections to the cupola considering it is a noncontributing structure and it will essentially break up the mass of the building. Mr. Maxwell also did not object especially if a roof vent was to be installed there.

Mr. McGeorge expressed his appreciation for the level of effort the Applicant made taking the HDC's recommendations into consideration from the last meeting.

No public comments.

With no further comments Mr. McGeorge asked for a motion.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by the East Greenwich Yacht Club, represented by John Mollicone.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 10 Water Street (building formerly known as the "New England Yacht Rigging" building, located on the northeast corner of parcel 85 001 001).
- 3) The property in question is a noncontributing structure; it is representative of a c.1980 cinder block commercial building, mid-century industrial style.
- 4) The building does not contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would improve the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application at 10 Water Street to make exterior modifications, window replacement, roofing and siding modifications. The siding and trim must be wood material; any other material used will be a violation of approval. This is consistent with Commission Standards #4, 7, and 8. Conditioned upon approval, the windows and new garage door must be

refereed by the HDC. HDC members Maxwell and McGeorge volunteered to referee the project.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

**2. Libby Bancroft & Daniel Pettersson
162 Peirce Street; Map 75 AP 1 Lot 190
Complete Demolition of Detached Garage (1st hearing)**

Ms. Carron stated Standard #9 is applicable to this application. *Standard 9* states demolition, either partial or total, shall only be acceptable provided it would significantly benefit the Town, would serve the greater interest of the community as a whole, and that there are no alternatives to demolition available. Demolitions shall not result in a significant threat or loss of an historic and/or architectural resource to the Town, State or nation.

Ms. Libby Bancroft, homeowner and Mr. Richard Pastore, of RP Engineering, represented the application.

Mr. Pastore explained the existing garage was constructed of hollow cinder block and built on a dry stacked stone wall along the shared property line with Cathay Garden restaurant. The stone wall has washed out in three different areas and has undermined the garage causing multiple structural cracks. Mr. Pastore said he and the homeowner would like permission to remove the existing garage and construct a new garage which will be in keeping with the Italianate style of the primary residence.

Ms. Carron confirmed the new proposal is not before the Commission this evening but just the demolition of the existing garage. Mr. Pastore said yes.

Atty. Teitz suggested to conceptually discuss the new design since he had a feeling there might be a conflict between the Commission wanting something that reads as new with an Italianate style but not a copy of the house style – the discussion should take place before Mr. Pastore spends time designing elaborate plans.

Ms. Carron explained the process for a demolition application which requires two separate hearings; the first is for the Commission to decide whether the application is complete and whether the subject building is contributing or not. The second hearing is for public comment and for the HDC to vote on the application.

Mr. McGeorge was of the opinion that considering the structure is an outbuilding the application should be fairly straightforward. He pointed out the Commission needs to determine whether the garage is contributing to the significance of the district, and valuable to the Town, State or Nation. The Commission members unanimously agreed the garage was not contributing to the significance of the district, and valuable to the Town, State or Nation. Mr. McGeorge asked if the garage is contributing to the significance of the district and valuable for the period of architecture it represents, or to the district – again the Commissioners unanimously expressed their opinions as no. Lastly he asked if the garage is non-contributing to the significance of the district. The Commission members said yes.

Mr. Pastore noted the new wall will be a geotech reinforced wall with a geogrid constructed for structural and security purposes; he estimated it will be 4 feet high and the garage will be setback 5 feet. Mr. Pastore commented that this property is unique in that the land survey of the subject property notes “the face of the wall” denotes the property line and is not defined by metes and bounds. The “face” has since moved which is a concept he has never dealt with before and questioned where the true property line is now located.

Ms. Carron asked for a motion regarding the completeness of the application and significance of the garage.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to approve the submitted application for demolition of the detached garage as complete for the first hearing. Additionally Mr. McGeorge found the detached garage not to be a contributing structure of the district. Seconded by Ms. Drury.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

Conceptually speaking, Mr. Pastore noted the idea of the new garage would be to have corbels and white cedar shingles. Mr. McGeorge thought a bracket

detail would be appropriate but cautioned to be consciences of any door or window openings. Mr. Pastore mentioned the idea of a widow's walk on the garage. Atty. Teitz recommended being careful not to match the house but instead pickup small details of the house to implement into the garage design; being sympathetic but not identical.

(Mr. McGeorge and Atty. Teitz left the meeting at 6:45 pm.)

Mr. Pastore acknowledged the whole existing dry stone wall will be removed since it has collapsed in three areas. The intent is to rebuild with a segmented block wall; he wanted full transparency that the new wall will not look like the former beautiful laid up stone wall. Ms. Carron explained the wall which is essentially a retaining wall is exempt from HDC review.

Historic District Commission Business – After Hearings

1. Minutes: Review and approval of the August 8, 2018, November 14, 2018 and December 12, 2018 meeting minutes.

Motion by Ms. Drury to approve the August 8, 2018 and November 14, 2018 minutes as written. Seconded by Ms. D'Amato. Approved 4 -0.

The December minutes were tabled to the following month.

2. Commissioner Comments/Other:

No comments.

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Carron. Seconded by Mr. Maxwell. Approved 4 – 0.

Adjourn at 7:10pm.

For additional information, please contact the Planning Department.
Respectfully submitted by:

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner